
Team-Based Learning

An Approach to Teaching Leisure Service Management and Leadership

Rasul A. Mowatt

Assistant Professor, Leadership

Department of Recreation, Park, and Tourism Studies

Indiana University

Bloomington, IN

Abstract

The practice of management continues to be important in leisure service delivery and in the academic preparation of future practitioners. As leisure and business research direct a conscious eye to leadership and management, similarly pedagogical research should direct attention to effective course content and teaching design. Team-based learning (TBL) is a promising approach to teaching that yields increased discussion, learning, and preparation of future managers on the intricacies of management and the importance of leadership. Also, TBL is a conscious use of cooperative and collaborative learning techniques in a permanent group structure. Support of this approach is based on the initial feedback and information collected from a redesigned course that emphasized semester-long group work and a group final exam. The findings supported previous research on team-based learning where students' perceptions of the learning environment and experience was remarkably higher while their performance on course content was also higher than in previous incarnations of the course, and learning of group skills was identified.

KEYWORDS: Team-based learning, group work, leisure services, management, leadership

Please address all correspondence to: Rasul A. Mowatt, Assistant Professor, Leadership, Department of Recreation, Park, and Tourism Studies, Indiana University, 1025 E. 7th St., HPER 133 Bloomington, IN, 47405. Phone: (812) 855-4711; Email: ramowatt@indiana.com.

Introduction

In viewing teaching within the context of pedagogy, active learning that is augmented with collaborative and cooperative models of learning highlighted increases the responsiveness and participation of the student. In professional arenas, managers and supervisors find that group decision making, idea development, and joint task completion increase productivity, expansive creative process, and employee buy-in. Specifically in leisure service agencies, the ability to work with others is a central aspect of departments or units that program, deliver services or products, and conduct general organizational operations. The need for courses that teach leisure service delivery/management to prepare students with leadership abilities articulated within self-managed teams is paramount. Team-based learning (TBL) is a pedagogical strategy that introduces active learning into a classroom, incorporates dimensions of collaborative and cooperative learning, implores the creation of permanent teams from small groups, encourages leadership and self-direction, and presents itself as an effective approach to responding to preparatory needs within the field (Michaelsen & Black, 1994). Based on the perceived benefits of TBL, a required "Management of Leisure Service" course at a Big Ten University was restructured using a teaching approach that emphasized group development. In addition to providing a tangible and working knowledge of the field, TBL may also offer students a new set of interpersonal skills and abilities as they are preparing to venture out to improve the quality of life within communities.

The focus of this article is to highlight the initial benefits and structures of a course that utilizes team-based learning. Taking on TBL as a teaching strategy is supported by a review of the varying ways that team management, leadership, and decision making have been discussed in business management research, leisure studies textbooks, and National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) Council on Accreditation (Council of Accreditation 2004; 2008; Edginton, Hudson, Lankford, & Larson, 2008; Michaelsen, Knight, & Fink, 2002; Morgeson, DeRue, & Karam, 2009). Additionally, there is a need to differentiate the TBL strategy from other group-based learning methods (collaborative learning, cooperative learning, study teams, and group work). This is followed by details of the leisure service delivery course redesign, along with initial feedback and information from students which served as points of reference rather than indices for further revision. The article concludes with the discussion of additional aspects of team-based learning incorporation.

The Need for Teams: A Background on Management

Leisure studies classrooms are in a position to incorporate an understanding of practice in the field (Szucs, Hawdon, McGuire, 2001). Although there is continued discussion on the relationship between practitioners and researchers in leisure research (Hemingway & Parr, 2000), as well as in other professional degree fields such as business (Bartunek, 2007), pedagogical articles in leisure studies tend to not raise this dichotomy. Within courses there are numerous textbooks and articles used to supplement lecture points presented to students to provide a view of how organizations and agencies render leisure services. Within many of those source materials, working in teams is often highlighted as an effective management practice.

In business, teams are a structural form designed to maximize flexibility in task completion, improve consumer demands, address the unavailability of advancement opportunities, and reduce costs associated with operations and performance (Byrne, 1993). It has also been commented that because interagency communication is crucial as organizations become more decentralized due to using this structure, teams have the unique ability to tap into a range of leadership and abilities and address issues that organizations face (Dumaine, 1994).

Richter, West, van Dick, & Dawson (2006) recommended that organizations desiring to optimize teams as a structure “should ensure that intergroup working is on a group’s agenda” (p. 1267). By making the group (its identity and function) an area of work, as much as the task at hand, individuals within a group are forced to make the group a priority in their own enterprise (Bak, Vogt, George, & Greentree, 1994). In particular, the self-managed teams become extensions of the individual and hold team members accountable, as employees lead and empower themselves to complete tasks as well as develop the group (Stewart & Manz, 1995). The aspects of employee involvement and buy-in, self-management and empowerment, and collective task completion contribute to a shared vision that in turn reflects dimensions of transformational leadership (Bass, 1998; Basu & Green, 1997; Mezirow, 1991).

In leadership, decision-making responsibility is integral. With a team structure, decisions become a collective matter, as individuals may not be solely responsible. Any given situation may require a revolving table of leadership to direct a team and facilitate decision making (Pierce & Newstrom, 2000). As further research continues to shed light on effective team structure, it is clear that teams are a central and favored aspect to most organizations today (Druskat & Wheeler, 2003; Morgeson, DeRue, & Karam, 2009).

Similarly, leisure service agencies have emphasized the usefulness of teams in service delivery (Edginton, et al., 2008; Williams, 1985). However, a “lack of leadership, lack of shared values, lack of resources and commitment to the team’s purpose, lack of accountability for team members’ performance, lack of synergy, lack of group cohesiveness” could undo the good teams can offer the field (Hurd, Barcelona, & Meldrum, 2008, p. 127). In addition, effective leadership in leisure service organizations is often viewed by employees as actions and decisions that empowers them in task assigning and completion (Kent & Challadurai, 2003). Researchers have gone further to state that variations of management should be a core competency in a curriculum (Msengi, Farland, Pedescleaux, McGloster, & Yang, 2007; Sessoms, 1998). The NRPA’s Council on Accreditation emphasized general administration/management and management in specific areas in leisure service delivery in the 2004 standards, and this continues as one of the three core areas in the foundational curriculum of the 2013 standards (Council on Accreditation, 2004; 2008). Because of this, leisure studies departments across the country are in a position not only to address issues facing the field but to also prepare students in ways that increase their organizational management, communication, leadership, interpersonal, and cultural competency skills.

Conceptualizing Team-Based Learning

This study took the stance that active learning through formal and informal learning groups has been influenced by the contemporary model in organizations to utilize team management (Belbin, 1981). As many instructors use groups within a course, students have responded to groups with disdain due to group work imbalance, inability to deal with group conflict, and lack of clear instruction or expectations from the instructor (Feichtner & Davis, 1985; Watson, Michaelsen, & Sharp, 1991). Based on this, courses that utilize small group work to prepare students for management in organizations are necessary but need to go beyond collaborative and cooperative learning methods. However, clarity of what TBL is and is not needs to be provided before further elaboration.

TBL imparts knowledge and empowers in a transformational environment of group-based learning (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Koh, Steers & Terborg, 1995). According to Michaelsen, Knight & Fink (2002), TBL transforms the teaching and learning process in four ways and can be evaluated as follows (p. 4):

1. *Turns small groups into teams.* This involves the use of cooperative and collaborative learning principles more intensely and over a longer period of time.
2. *Turns technique into strategy.* Teams become a fundamental part of the course learning objectives as opposed to only being a teaching aid or method.
3. *Quality of student learning.* For the student, learning becomes their own interpretation of materials and the overcoming of difficulties while learning from their peers, instructor, and course readings.
4. *Restores the joy of teaching.* The level of activity and interaction in the course will increase, thereby providing the instructor with immediate and regular feedback. The feedback serves as both an opportunity for increased engagement with students but also an ability to immediately impact the course that is instructed.

TBL establishes permanent teams for in-class and out-of-class work that are formed by the instructor at the beginning of the semester and sustained throughout the semester instead of assigned groups for only a specific time or activity (Connery, 1988). Instead of focusing on a technique to deliver content, TBL becomes a part of course content and operates as a strategy to help students achieve learning objectives throughout the semester (Michaelsen, Knight, & Fink, 2002). Because students understand that their group is a permanent team for the entire semester with varying and ongoing responsibilities, students recognize and commit a higher level of effort to their group, the work that is assigned, and the learning that is required to complete the course (Michaelsen, Watson & Black, 1989).

Collaborative and cooperative methods are dimensions in active learning as they each encourage the use of small groups for learning course content (Bouton & Garth, 1983), and assigns group work based on course tasks and activities (Rockwood, 1995). Collaborative learning and cooperative learning differ from each other as collaborative learning groups tend to be informal or with less structure where cooperative learning

is formal and has intentionally structured groups (Rockwood, 1995). However, the key difference between the two is also the significance of TBL, cooperative learning's ability to transfer knowledge to students and collaborative learning's empowerment of students in the process of learning. TBL incorporates the emphasis and importance of the instructor's role in delivering content and setting the tone (traditional knowledge transference) and the need for students to engage in self-discovery as well as places learning in their hands (empowerment) (Michaelsen, Black, & Fink, 1996).

TBL is neither collaborative learning nor cooperative learning. Collaborative learning increases the likelihood of the understanding and retention of course content when students are collectively responsible for what they learn (Bruffe, 1999; Hamilton, 1997). A typical example of collaborative learning may be assigning groups to work on a project (research or service) and present their work for a grade. In this example, students are placed into situations where communication, decision making, and completion are dependent on joint collaboration. Cooperative learning is an instructional goal that utilizes small groups of students to tackle course content together through structured course activities (Millis & Cottell, 1998; Slavin, 1983). The jigsaw and partnering techniques are examples of cooperative learning that use groups of two to five students to learn, discuss, and present a perspective on course content. TBL expands on these aspects of collaborative and cooperative learning by compensating for some of their weaknesses.

As a result of these benefits and in an effort to revitalize a leisure service delivery course at a Big Ten University, "Management of Leisure Services" was restructured using TBL. The course has faced numerous issues in recent years as students have submitted formal and informal complaints about the content being redundant due to the development and offering of additional management courses (in specific areas such as facilities, legal aspects & personnel) as well as the growth of concentration areas (such as tourism, recreational sports, and outdoor recreation) among student majors and department faculty. The course has also increased the emphasis of management as a theory and concept to assist students in understanding management-based content that may be centered in on one area of specialization, and differentiates the course further from courses dealing with risk management, liabilities, and human relations.

The course topics were organized as follows: 1) Management Theories, 2) The Organizational Perspective—formal and informal structures, vision/mission statements/goals/objectives, 3) The Employee Perspective—managerial leadership, decision making and problem-solving, ethics, and teamwork, and 4) The Community/Public Perspective—knowing your target audience, customer service and service quality, and diversity. Team-based learning revised and re-structured the course process as follows: assigning of permanent teams, smaller activities to develop team, ongoing team feedback, group involvement grade, a project-based major assignment, and a final team exam.

Assigned Teams. Students were assigned to a team on the second day of classes with four to five other students from their area of specialization (tourism/hospitality or event planning, recreational sports, outdoor recreation, and parks and recreation) to ensure activity-content relevancy for the entire semester. Students did not have a choice in switching to another team at any point during the course or to work in another team for any other activity (Michaelsen & Black, 1994).

Smaller Activities. From there, students were expected to plan, complete, and submit three smaller activities and two papers. Those activities were structured as three interconnected assignments in selecting an organization from their area of specialization. The activities encouraged the teams to understand the inter-relationship between 1) mission, vision, and goals, and 2) authoritative bodies. In developing this understanding, teams were also expected to 3) interview managers of the organizations to gain up-to-date insight on the balance between achieving goals, working on day-to-day operations and arising issues. These activities were decision-based assignments that encouraged decision making in selecting with which organizations to conduct all three activities.

Frequent and Immediate Feedback. Teams members were required after each submission to assess the team as a whole as well as each individual's contribution to the completed activity. This assessment was gathered from a questionnaire given to each team member at the beginning of class on the day that the submission was due. Teams were also required to meet with the instructor once a month throughout the entire semester to discuss ideas, issues, or concerns, and then each student was encouraged to schedule one solo meeting during the semester. Feedback to and from students was frequent and immediate throughout the semester, and led to the resolution of all known issues of team conflict (much to the dismay of some unproductive students) (Michaelsen, Knight, & Fink, 2002). In addition, much of the information gathered from peer-assessment and team meetings contributed to a separate grade for group work involvement (and not included within the grade of any given activity) (Rau & Heyl, 1990). The assessments, team meeting, and individual meetings that TBL emphasizes prevented any student from becoming a 'free loader' and kept the team from relying on 'academic stars' to lead the way as both are typical behaviors that may not be addressed in using collaborative learning methods (Frash, Kline, & Stahura, 2003; Michaelsen, Knight & Fink, 2002).

Major Group Project. One large project accompanied by an in-class presentation was required of each team during the last half of the course (Norling, Kim, Compton, & Silverberg, 2006). In the development stage, both in-class time and out-of-class time was provided for teams to meet and plan their project along. This was done to remedy the known difficulties in students meeting as a team outside of class but to also continue the strategic practice of the team structure. Within class, the same teams worked to dissect current case studies on relevant management related issues, answering questions posed by the instructor, and posing questions back to the instructor to assist them with modeling and in understanding the complexities and expectations of their finished project (Young & Myllykangas, 2006). Teams discussed their intended project and presentation format at their monthly meeting.

Team Test (Group Final Exam). Students knew entering the course that the final would be taken as a team. In preparation for the final exam, students researched an area related to a selection of five questions, studied as a team, and reviewed their researched materials with the instructor at their monthly meeting (Smith, 1986). The final exam was given in an open-book format with questions provided 30 days prior to the exam date. The final exam tested the teams' ability to develop detailed answers as a group to multi-layered questions about leisure service delivery representing their areas of specialization (Hendrickson, 1990; Toppins, 1989).

“Management of Leisure Services” also had an attendance policy that was strictly enforced due to the needs of teams to have team members present for any given course lecture, in-class discussion activity, or in-class project preparation work. There were opportunities for individualized work in the first half of the course, such as individual reaction papers and a mid-term management key terms and definitions examination in order to gauge the individual abilities outside of peer-assessment feedback.

Methods: Management of Leisure Services Revised

During the most recent offering, 67 majors were enrolled in the course that implemented TBL. The study was guided by the following questions:

1. Did team-based learning alter students’ perception of group work?
2. Did students perform at an increased level within a team structure?
3. Did students leave the course learning an ability to lead or be a part of teams effectively?
4. Was learning and teaching effected based on the four transformative ways of team-based learning principles?

Each question respectively coincided with the four transformative ways that TBL is expected to impact a course:

1. *Turns small groups into teams*
2. *Turns technique into strategy.*
3. *Quality of student learning.*
4. *Restores the joy of teaching*

Students’ perception at four intervals would serve as an indication of groups becoming teams. Students were asked to complete an assessment questionnaire after each of the team activities (three smaller activities and one major project), four surveys per student in total. Each questionnaire consisted of six items with questions covering the assessment of learning and the group experience using a seven-point Likert scale. Another set of 12 survey questions were used to solicit qualitative feedback and to guide the teams’ discussions with the instructor in their monthly meetings. Student grades on all course assignments and examinations were also used as indicators of whether the strategy (as opposed to technique) was effective. For further in-depth feedback and indication of the quality of the learning experience, students were also requested to provide a final description and feedback of their involvement in the course and the semester-long group structure at the end of the semester. This feedback and the scheduled meetings throughout the semester served as the source of data to inform the favorably altered perception (joy of teaching) of the instruction of the course.

Results: Evidence from Students Feedback

Accordingly, the aim of this endeavor was to determine the effects of integrating TBL into a leisure service delivery content oriented course. The questions that were raised asked, did TBL alter students’ perception of group work? Did students perform at

TABLE 1: Student Assessment of Team Activities

Item	M	SD	N
This activity taught me a new set of knowledge and skills	5.87	0.983	261
The activity introduced me to a different approach to group work than in other courses	6.43	0.662	257
The group work challenged me in ways that improved my communication and abilities with others in my group	6.17	0.974	265
I believe that others in my group also improved their communication and abilities	5.46	1.256	261
Having a meeting with the instructor was helpful for problems, ideas, and feedback	6.32	0.643	259

an increased level within a team structure? Did students leave the course with the ability to lead or be a part of a team effectively? Was learning and teaching affected based on the four transformative TBL principles? Quantitative and qualitative data was collected to answer these questions and to gauge the possible effectiveness of TBL through the use of a six-itemed Likert scale survey questionnaire, a second questionnaire (used for interviews in group meetings), and a final feedback form.

Survey Questionnaire. An aggregate mean score was derived from the six-itemed assessment questionnaire (using a seven-point true Likert scale) shown in Table 1. The questionnaire allowed for responses from one indicating strongly disagree, to seven, indicating strongly agree. Enrollment in the course was set at 67 majors and questionnaires were given at four specific times during the course, in class. Because 67 students were surveyed four times, the number of surveys collected was quite large. The mean score related to students' perception of learning and the group experience, which students' responses to the TBL strategy showed to be rather high. Potentially, students learned more due to studying and preparing for the course in a team as they indicated that an activity introduced them to knowledge and skills that were useful. Students clearly recognized that they were in a group work structure that was different from what they typically have been used to, as this was the response with the highest mean. Working within their teams challenged them personally and structurally in completing course assignments according to the high mean. The lowest mean was associated with their perception of their peers' learning and abilities but was still relatively high out of the seven-point scale. Lastly, the second highest mean with the lowest standard deviation was associated with the scheduled meetings with the instructor that students felt were helpful in offering guidance and resolving conflict.

In addition, students' grades on activities that were also given to individuals in past course offerings showed a five-point increase. Final exam scores showed a minimal increase due to the creation of an entirely new final exam. Both increases are consistent with TBL results used in other courses (Michaelsen, Knight, & Fink, 2002).

Second Questionnaire. An additional set of 12 survey questions was solicited from students also at four times (after each of the three smaller activities and after the major project) during the semester, and provided the first of two qualitative data sources. The 12 questions were divided into two sections, with six questions each: 1) The evaluation of team as a unit, and 2) The evaluation of members of team. The information contained in the survey responses was collected and used to guide monthly team meetings with the instructor. Examples of some of the categories on the survey that became discussion points are as follows: group cooperation, distribution of group tasks, group leadership, communication among group members, listening to others' points of view, showing respect, source of conflicts, assistance, attendance and readiness, attitude, and focus on the task.

A number of communication and group attendance issues did arise and were addressed. The meetings with the course instructor prevented teams from understanding the requirement of an assignment in ways that would have been detrimental to their grade. Teams meetings also allowed for conversations on linking management theories and concepts to effective work within teams. Only two students failed to improve their involvement within their team that resulted in one early withdrawal from the course and one unsatisfactory completion. In the past, the course has typically had three withdrawals and up to six unsatisfactory completions.

Final Feedback. At the conclusion of the final examination, groups were requested to, but not graded on, provide an additional qualitative response to open-ended questions which were collected via the course website. As a result, students' responses were not anonymous but were only readable after final grade submission. Students were asked two questions: "What did you like most about the course?" and, "What could the instructor do to improve the course?" Feedback from students was analyzed using constant comparison method and enumeration technique. Three emerging themes became evident upon analysis: 1) A favorable surprise to group work ("required meeting is a great idea"), 2) An appreciation for working with others in their area of study ("material directly related to my area and it kept my interest"), and 3) The perception of applicability to real situations ("I feel I have an accurate grasp of what goes on in an organization or department"). Suggestions for improvements ranged from: "let groups pick themselves" and "use a book instead of readings," to "include a field experience." Only one response for improvement remarked that the course should not have group work.

Assessing Team-Based Learning in Management of Leisure Services Course

Michaelsen, Knight, & Fink's (2002) four ways that TBL transforms the practice of teaching and learning was used as the basis for comparing responses. Questions were developed prior to the implementation of the revised course. Based on the four transformative ways, the four specific questions were posed and asserted.

Turns small groups into teams. Since group work is an often-used pedagogical method, it was important to ascertain if students perceived this experience differently than other group work in other courses (non-permanent groups). In assessing students' involvement and experiences in a team, the following question was posed:

- Is there a perceived or evidence of a factual difference in teams with groups?

Students in the department have noted that far too many courses use groups. This overuse of groups has fostered displeasure of being placed in or having to work in groups. Furthermore, if groups are an expected part of day-to-day class work, students prefer to select them. For students, the team approach was a slow process to comprehend, since at the beginning their teams operated very similarly to group work. However, once repeated use of the teams were implemented for discussions, additional tasks, and regular meetings, students were able to distinguish between traditional group work and team-based learning as described by one student, because

“... [teams] allowed us to solidify as a group and become aware of the individual strengths and weaknesses within our group ... we focused on our group’s individual talents and brought them together to form a cohesive and cogent response to our test question of choice ...” (Group Response #2 of 12)

Turns technique into strategy. Teams were a fundamental part of the course since this was inserted as an additional learning objective. In analyzing this, the following question was posed:

- Did students understand the connection and importance to management and leadership in organization with their experience in teams?

Discussion points at meetings allowed for in-depth conversation on the potential nuances of management in a hotel or community center, for example. In a course with students pursuing a wide of range of career tracks, students felt that the content catered to their career path and was preparing them better. One group commented,

reflecting upon the semester, our group went through ups and downs; however, we feel that these individual incidents, made us stronger as a whole, and therefore we feel that we performed well at the end. As a management team we came together and comprised and learned the strengths of each individual group member and utilized these strengths to contribute to the team. We grew as managers and learned real from issues... (Group Response #5 of 12)

Quality of student learning. With the emphasis on teams discussing, researching, and deliberating course content, their own interpretation of materials became just as important as overcoming the difficulties of working with others. The question posed:

- Did students learn to work in teams and also strengthen their learning of course content?

Evidence of students’ perception are exemplified by statements on how the team experience,

allow[ed] us to work together to answer a question more in depth than if just one person were to answer it on their own. Having resources provided by four people instead of one allowed greater response to questions. ... Having everyone’s perspectives made it a good way to thoroughly answer the questions, and also made it more efficient during the semester when outlining ways to solve class projects, including the final project PowerPoint and presentation. This course properly prepared us in many aspects pertaining to management, and has done a good job preparing us for the role we are going to assume once we graduate. (Group Response #12 of 12)

Restores the joy of teaching. Instructing a course with TBL can be time consuming due to the level of preparation needed for team-specific course content and the supervision of teams. However, when most students typically never meet with an instructor unless there is a major problem, the redesigned course required teams to meet monthly. Most teams met more than once and this, in turn, encouraged more individuals to also meet for such matters as career and internship advice, resume review, graduate school consideration, and to clarify course content.

- Is there evidence from operating in teams that shows an enthusiasm by the student to the efforts implemented by the instructor?

Students' comments went as far as to state that this was, one of the best classes we have had and definitely one of the best interactions with a teacher, by far. We liked that the instructor related all of the class material to each of the specialized areas that we are interested in. We also liked that we had mandatory meetings with the instructor so it made us actually meet with him and discuss any issue we had. We definitely feel that we are headed in the right direction for the real world. (Group Response #3 of 12)

Summary Discussion and Future Steps

The intended purpose of revising the course was to take advantage of the ability that groups have in integrating active learning into teaching while also providing the practice of working within teams. Management is an extremely abstract and difficult subject matter for students with a lack of extended employment or management experience, however it is vital in their studies. As stated previously by Young and Myllykangas (2006), "management is hard to teach students with little experience," so approaching the instruction of management calls for creativity and a high degree of involvement from instructors (p. 125). Courses that incorporate TBL with structured activities such as projects seem to be more effective (Haberyan, 2007). In addition, TBL offers instructors an opportunity to gauge students' understanding of course material through their articulation of content in carefully prescribed and relevant course assignments (Pileggi & O'Neil, 2008). TBL, with its emphasis on permanent teams held throughout the semester delivered an effective tool to delivering a dimension of management.

As a minor limitation, TBL was modified for this particular course offering, as the Readiness Assurance Process (RAP) was not employed during this initial revision. Further implementation of TBL in this course will incorporate Michaelsen, Knight, and Fink's (2002) RAP, which is administered to students before transitioning from one topical area to another to ensure that students have read the necessary preparatory assigned articles to understand the next course content. RAP is a mini-test on the new content and covers key terms and concepts. Students are given RAP individually and then as a group. Both are graded, combined, and added to the course grade. In addition to gauging students' comprehension of material, it also assists the instructor in focusing class discussions on areas of known deficiencies.

As outlined in a seminar lead by Michaelsen (November 2009), TBL is an overall teaching approach and strategy rather than a teaching activity and the use of the RAP is not required but is highly useful to assess the effectiveness of groups during specific

topical or assignment instances. Another limitation is that it is unknown to the degree that students could transfer what they perceived they learn from the course. Future studies may want to interview students who register for their internship or are in their first job post-course. The strengths of the study are centered on the large class size of 67 students and that the course is required rather than an elective, which emphasizes the level of student buy-in to the manner of instruction. However, a study within leisure research that examined the implementation of this strategy across universities in similarly themed course would be far more effective in offering a recommendation to the field as shown in a two-year, 10 University, and 18-course study that examined TBL in medical schools (Thompson et al., 2007)

However, TBL does show promise, as evidenced by student feedback, for a leisure service delivery course. A second testing of students would confirm whether this is true and if it should be a permanent teaching strategy in the course. As mentioned previously, group work is begrudgingly placed on students in a number of courses; however, to operate with the same group for an entire semester through studying, class discussion, project presentations, and test taking may be a new experience. The favorable responses to this semester-long group experience may or may not be experienced by another cohort of students. TBL is a practical approach to teaching management, but such issues as group conflict and group contribution may need to be mitigated and controlled (Frash, Kline, & Stahura, 2003; Meeuwssen & King, 2004). However, the peer assessment and evaluation within a course with TBL has been shown to improve the overall learning environment (Cestone, Levine, & Lane, 2008).

As mentioned in the preceding paragraph, the second testing of this approach would also incorporate the RAP to offer additional findings on student performance alongside their perception of the experience. It imparts on students a range of knowledge both traditional (in-class lecture points) and from peers. But it also empowers the students to actively control their involvement in the course and make the content relevant to their interests and career paths while still exposing them to various configurations of leisure service delivery. Following up with graduates in their jobs would also offer further confirmation of this exposure as TBL has been shown to enhance long-term retention of material in course work (McInerney & Fink, 2003). The work in teams offered students a chance to make sense of an abstract concept of management and to gain valuable communication and social skills. But teaching teams offered an instructor the chance to reinvigorate their own teaching practice and pedagogical mission, with students that were highly engaged and with students that submitted assignments showing a level of depth that was hard to be matched by the most able of individual students.

References

- Bak, C. A., Vogt, L. H., George, W. R., & Greentree, I. R. (1994). Management by team: Innovative tool for running a service organization through internal marketing. *Journal of Service Marketing*, 8(1), 37-47.

-
- Bartunek, J. M. (2007). Academic-practitioner collaboration need not require joint or relevant research: Toward a relational scholarship of integration. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(6), 1323-1333.
- Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industry, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Basu, R., & Green, S. G. (1997). Leader-member exchange and transformational leadership: An empirical examination of innovative behaviors in leader-member dyads. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 27(6), 477-499.
- Belbin, M. (1981). *Management teams*. London: Heinemann.
- Bouton, C., & Garth, R. Y. (Eds.). (1983). *Learning in groups. New directions for teaching and learning*, Vol. 14. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cestone, C. M., Levine, R. E., & Lane, D. R. (2008). Peer assessment and evaluation in team-based learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2008(116), 69-78.
- Connery, B. A. (1988). Group work and collaborative writing. *Teaching at Davis*, 14(1), 2-4.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 471-482.
- Council on Accreditation. (2004). Standards and evaluative criteria for baccalaureate programs in recreation, park resources, and leisure services. *National Recreation and Park Association*.
- Council on Accreditation. (2008). Learning outcomes, standards and assessment. *National Recreation and Park Association*.
- Druskat, V. U., & Wheeler, J. V. (2003). Managing from the boundary: The effective leadership of self-managing work teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(4), 435-457.
- Dumaine, B. (1994). The trouble with teams. *Fortune*, 5, 52-59. September.
- Edginton, C. R., Hudson, S. D., Lankford, S. V., & Larson, D. (2008). *Managing recreation, parks, and leisure services: An introduction* (3rd ed.). Champaign, IL: Sagamore.
- Feichtner, S. B., & Davis, E. A. (1985). Why some groups fail: A survey of students' experiences with learning groups. *The Organizational Behavior Teaching Review*, 9(4), 58-71.
- Frash Jr., R., Kline, S., & Stahura, J. (2003). Mitigating social loafing in team-based learning. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 3(4), 57-78.
- Haberyan, A. (2007). Team-based learning in an industrial/organizational psychology course. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 9(1), 143-152.
- Hamilton, S. J. (1997). *Collaborative learning: Teaching and learning in the arts, sciences, and professional schools* (2nd ed.). Indianapolis, IN: IUPUI Center for Teaching and Learning.
- Hemingway, J. L., & Parr, M. G. W. (2000). Leisure and leisure practice: Three perspectives on constructing the research-practice relation. *Leisure Sciences*, 22(3), 139-162.
- Hendrickson, A. D. (1990). Cooperative Group Test-Taking. *Focus*, 5(2), 6.
- Hurd, A. R., Barcelona, R., & Meldrum, J. T. (2008). *Leisure services management with web resources*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Kent, A., & Challadurai, P. (2003). Multiple sources of leadership and employee reactions in a State parks and recreation department. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 21(1), 38-60.
- Koh, W. L., Steers, R. M., & Terborg, J. R. (1995). The effects of transformational leadership on teacher attitudes and student performance in Singapore. *Journal of Organized Behavior*, 16, 319 - 333.
-

- McInerney, M. J., & Fink, L. D. (2003). Team-based learning enhances long-term retention and critical thinking in an undergraduate microbial physiology course. *Journal of Microbiology & Biology Education*, 4(1), 3-12.
- Meeuwse, H. J., & King, G. A. (2004). Michaelsen's model of team-based learning applied in undergraduate kinesiology classes. In R. G. Milter, V. S. Perotti & M. S. R. Segers (Eds.), *Education innovation in economics and business: Breaking boundaries for global learning* (pp. 33-48). Netherlands: Springer Link.
- Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Michaelsen, L. K. (2009, November 12). *Designing group work that really works*. Presented at Scholarship of Teaching of Learning Event at Indiana University. Office of The Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Education.
- Michaelsen, L. K., & Black, R. H. (1994). Building learning teams: The key to harnessing the power of small groups in higher education. In S. Kadel & J. Keechner (Eds.), *Collaborative learning: A sourcebook for higher education*. State College, PA: National Center for Teaching and Learning.
- Michaelsen, L. K., Black, R. H., & Fink, L. D. (1996). What every faculty developer needs to know about learning groups. In L. Richlin (Ed.), *To improve the academy: Resources for faculty, instructional and organizational development*, Vol. 15. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.
- Michaelsen, L. K., Knight, A. B., & Fink, L. D. (Eds.). (2002). *Team-based learning: A transformative use of small groups* (pp. 3-52; 137-148). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Michaelsen, L. K., Watson, W. E., & Black, R. H. (1989). A realistic test of individual versus group consensus decision-making. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(5), 834-839.
- Millis, B. J., & Cottell, P.G. (1998). *Cooperative learning for higher education faculty*. Phoenix: Oryx Press.
- Morgeson, F. P., DeRue, D. S., & Karam, E. P. (2009). Leadership in teams: A functional approach to understanding leadership structures and processes. *Journal of Management Online First*, 1-39.
- Msengi, I, Farland, J., Pedescleaux, J., McGloster, M., & Yang, H. (2007). Program effectiveness and curriculum competencies of the leisure youth and human services division at a Mid-western University. *Schole: A Journal of Leisure Studies & Recreation Education*, 22(1), 29-43.
- Norling, J. C., Kim, K., Compton, D., & Silverberg, K. (Fall, 2006). Project-based learning in a public park and recreation agency: Multidimensional approaches to university student learning. *Schole: A Journal Of Leisure Studies & Recreation Education*, 21(1), 69-85.
- Pierce, J. L., & Newstrom, J.W. (2000). *Leaders and the leadership process* (2nd ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Pileggi, R., & O'Neill, P. N. (2008). Team-based learning using an audience response system: An innovative method of teaching diagnosis to undergraduate dental students. *Journal of Dental Education*, 72(10), 1182-1188.
- Rau, W., & Heyl, B. S. (1990). Humanizing the college classrooms: Collaborative learning and social organization among students. *Teaching Sociology*, 18(2), 141-155.
- Richter, A. W., West, M. A., van Dick, R., & Dawson, J. F. (2006). Boundary spanners' identification, intergroup contact, and effective intergroup relations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(6), 1252-1269.
- Rockwood, H. S. (1995). Cooperative and collaborative learning. *The National Teaching and Learning Forum*, 4(6), 8-9.
- Sessoms, H. D. (1998). The National Curriculum Conference on Parks and Recreation. *Parks and Recreation*, 33(6), 22-24.
-

- Slavin, R. E. (1983). *Cooperative learning*. New York: Longman.
- Smith, K. A. (1986). Cooperative learning groups. In S. F. Schmoberg (Ed.), *Strategies for active teaching and learning in University classrooms*. Minneapolis: Office of Educational Development Programs, University of Minnesota.
- Stewart, G. L., & Manz, C. C. (1995). Leadership for self-managing work teams: A typology and integrative model. *Human Relations, 48*(7), 747-770.
- Szucs, F. K., Hawdon, J. E., & McGuire, F. A. (2001). Learning styles of leisure science majors compared to management, psychology, and sociology. *Scholar: A Journal Of Leisure Studies & Recreation Education, 16*(1), 15-32.
- Thompson, B. M., Schneider, V. F., Haidet, P., Levine, R. E., McMahon, K. K., et al. (2007). Team-based learning at ten medical schools: Two years later. *Medical Education, 41*, 250-257.
- Toppins, A. D. (1989). Teaching by testing: A group consensus approach. *College Teaching, 37*(3), 96-99.
- Watson, W. E., Michaelsen, L. K., & Sharp, W. (1991). Member competence, group interaction, and group decision-making: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 801-809.
- Williams, J. G. (1985). Team integration: Key to working together more effectively. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 3*(4), 44-53.
- Young, S. J. & Myllykangas, S. A. (2006). Teaching management in a recreation curriculum: Application of reality-based learning. *Scholar: A Journal of Leisure Studies & Recreation Education, 21*(4), 113-129.