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Abstract

Sport Education (SE) (Siedentop, Hastie, & van der Mars, 2011) is a curriculum and instructional model for physical education that has received a wealth of research attention (Hastie, de Ojeda, & Luquin, 2011; Kinchin, 2006; Wallhead & O'Sullivan, 2005). However, little attention has been afforded as to how teachers learn to teach SE in a Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) programme (Kinchin, Penney, & Clarke, 2005; McCaughtry, Sofo, Rovegno, & Curtner-Smith, 2004). The purpose of this project was to address this gap in the literature by examining a method of including SE in a PETE programme and investigate how pre-service teachers (PSTs) interpret and deliver SE as a result.

To achieve these aims the research was conducted in four sequenced phases. Firstly, the effectiveness of a practical SE experience in PETE to prepare PSTs to teach SE was investigated. Secondly, one PST who completed this module had his delivery of SE observed on his teaching placement. Thirdly, the effectiveness of assessments within the practical SE experience in PETE were examined. Finally, a comprehensive analysis was conducted of seven PSTs’ interpretations and delivery of SE. Multiple methods of data collection were employed across all phases of the research including interviews, focus groups, observations and document analysis and investigated perceptions of the lecturer, PSTs and the researcher. Data were analysed using triangulation thematic coding and constant comparison.

Results from all phases of the research highlighted the effectiveness of the practical SE experience in preparing PSTs to deliver SE effectively. Findings highlighted the shortcomings in the assessment methods used during the experience. It was also found that PSTs delivered SE in a variety of forms during their teaching placement due to various influences. It was concluded that amalgamating SE into an existing applied practical studies modules would provide effective educational experiences for PSTs.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Setting the scene

Researchers are advocating for teachers to teach physical education through curriculum and instructional models (Gurvitch, Metzler & Lund, 2008). In Ireland, curriculum models are a key feature of the proposed senior cycle physical education curriculum framework (NCCA, 2011). The senior cycle physical education draft curriculum framework is particularly innovative in the sense that it attempts to align the content of physical education with a choice of six curriculum and instructional models. Sport Education (SE) is arguably the most popular physical education curriculum and instructional model (Ayers & Housner, 2008), receiving a wealth of attention in the research literature over the past three decades with the completion of three comprehensive reviews of literature (Hastie, de Ojeda & Luquin, 2011; Kinchin, 2006; Wallhead & O’Sullivan, 2005). These reviews of literature have highlighted the successful implementation of SE in a variety of settings from primary physical education to third-level physical activity programmes with both male and females. They also report SE’s effectiveness in pupil enjoyment, tactical awareness, teamwork and the inclusion of pupils with differing skill levels. Research has begun to investigate qualified and pre-service teachers’ (PST’s) perceptions and delivery of SE (e.g. Curtner-Smith, Hastie & Kinchin, 2008, McMahon & MacPhail, 2007)

It is acknowledged that teachers play a crucial role in the effective delivery of SE (Kim, Penney, Cho & Choi, 2006; Kinchin, 2003). However, there is a recognised lack of literature regarding qualified teachers’ and PSTs’ delivery of SE (McMahon & McPhail, 2007; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2010), with the related research reporting varied
findings. Some research has illustrated that teachers enjoy using SE as it provides more enjoyable, motivating and effective learning environments (Li & Cruz, 2009; Taggart, Medland & Alexander, 1995). It has also been observed that PSTs prefer SE to multi activity teaching (Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004) and that qualified teachers intend to make SE a permanent feature of their physical education curriculum (Alexander & Luckman, 2001; Pill, 2008). On the other hand, it has also been observed that some PSTs do not enjoy teaching SE and do not intend to use it again (McCaughtry, Sofo, Rovegno & Curtner-Smith, 2004). Qualified teachers and PSTs have also had difficulty teaching SE and use it selectively with certain pupil groups (Curtner-Smith et. al, 2008; McMahon & MacPhail, 2007; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a). There is a shared appreciation regarding the importance of physical education teacher education (PETE) programmes in preparing teachers to deliver SE effectively (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; McCaughtry et al., 2004; McMahon & MacPhail, 2007; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a).

It is acknowledged that in order for teachers to deliver SE they must experience it in some depth in their PETE programme (Jenkins, 2004) and it is widely recommended that SE should be a primary component of any PETE programme (Alexander & Luckman, 2001; Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Dyson, Griffin & Hastie, 2004). However, teachers are not always prepared to teach SE and Ayers and Housner (2008) observed that only a quarter of the PETE programmes in their study included SE in their programme. It is acknowledged that research on the area of including SE in PETE is vital for the development of SE (McCaughtry et al., 2004). Despite this, there is still a shortage of recommendations as to how SE should be included in PETE programmes (Curtner-Smith, 2012).
1.2 **Research aims and research question**

The aim of this research was to investigate PSTs’ experiences of learning SE and their subsequent delivery of SE in post-primary schools. To achieve this aim, a number of specific research questions were identified.

1. What are the perceptions of those involved in a SE-PETE experience where SE is modeled to PSTs?
2. To what extent does the SE-PETE experience inform a PST’s delivery of SE on teaching placement?
3. What are the perceptions towards the enactment of assessment methods of those involved in a SE-PETE experience?
4. How do a group of PSTs, teaching in varying school environments on teaching placement, deliver SE having participated in a SE-PETE experience?

These research questions were addressed through the four phases of research which were conducted consecutively and consequently addressed the aim of the research. It was essential to investigate both PSTs’ experiences of learning SE and delivery of SE as they cannot be fully understood in isolation of each other. In order to understand how effective PSTs’ experiences of learning SE were, we need to examine if they are able to enact SE in schools.

1.3 **Research context**

The research was conducted in a four-year undergraduate PETE programme in a university in Ireland. The PETE programme enrolls approximately 80 PSTs each academic year. Along with physical education PSTs choose an elective classroom based subject which they are qualified to teach in a post-primary school. PSTs experience
applied practical studies modules in all of the areas of the Irish physical education curriculum i.e., aquatics, adventure activities, athletics, dance, games, gymnastics and health related activity. The PETE programme also provides PSTs with two teaching placements, the first in the second semester of second year and the second in the first semester of fourth year, lasting six and ten weeks respectively.

The SE net-games module, which was the focus of phases one and three of the research, was offered to PSTs in the first semester of the third year of the PETE programme. This module was compulsory and prepared PSTs to teach tennis, badminton and volleyball in post-primary school settings. The module was designed to be delivered through SE so PSTs would experience a SE season as a participant and learn SE in a practical setting. Phases two and four were conducted during PSTs’ final teaching placement in their fourth year. Each PST was teaching in a post-primary school where they were required to teach physical education classes and classes in their chosen elective subject.

1.4 Significance of the research

This research carries significance across many domains of the literature and also has practical applications. Firstly, there is a recognised paucity in the research regarding how PSTs learn to deliver SE and how PETE institutions should include it in their programmes. Although there have been some attempts to provide recommendations as to how SE should be included in PETE programmes (Curtner-Smith, 2012), few have provided evidence of PSTs’ accounts of such experiences or how PSTs should be assessed during these experiences. The research also investigated how to assess SE-PETE experiences, an aspect of the SE research that has received no attention in the
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research. The research is also significant in that it explored PSTs’ perceptions and delivery of SE after participating in the SE-PETE experience. Few accounts of teachers’ continued delivery of SE during their career are available and it had been identified that the presence of SE in physical education programmes can diminish over time (Alexander & Luckman, 2001). This research set out to address these gaps by (i) observing one PST’s perceptions and delivery of SE both during his teaching placement and first year of qualified teaching and (ii) exploring seven PSTs’ perceptions and delivery of SE during their teaching placement. The research also contributes to the theories of authentic assessment and occupational socialisation which were used to frame various phases of the research.

The research is also significant to current developments in the Irish post-primary physical education curriculum. As physical education teachers will be encouraged in time to teach physical education using a number of curriculum and instructional models, it is pertinent that Irish PETE programmes identify how they can prepare PSTs to deliver a range of curriculum and instructional models. Although I have focused my research attention on one particular curriculum model, implications can be transferred to other curriculum and instructional models and other PETE programmes.

1.5 Thesis structure

The thesis presents each of the four phases of research separately. The phases of research are presented as individual papers as all have been prepared for publication in peer-reviewed journals to maximise the exposure of the findings. Accordingly, each of the papers will be presented as required for their submission to their respective journals. As required by the journals there will be instances of inconsistency between style and
terminology used across the phases/ chapters, but the terminology used is always clarified in the paper. To avoid duplication of references from chapters that are based on peer-reviewed papers all references appear in the bibliography. The four phases of research will be preceded by a comprehensive literature review on SE, qualified teachers’ and PSTs’ delivery of SE and SE in PETE. The research methodology across all four phases will then be presented. The research phases will be succeeded by a conclusions and recommendations chapter which will aim to link the findings and provide recommendations for PETE programmes and future SE research. A brief introduction to each of the four phases of research and the related research question is presented here.

1.5.1 Perceptions of a SE season in PETE (Research Question 1)

A SE-PETE experience was developed in conjunction with the lecturer of an applied practical studies module in the PETE programme. A 13-week SE net-games module was developed where the lecturer modeled the delivery of net-games through the medium of SE, exposing the PSTs to experiencing a SE season. The PSTs selected and affiliated to teams, adopted roles and responsibilities, and participated in record keeping, competition and culminating events. Data was gathered during phase one from researcher observations of one class group who experienced the SE net-games module lessons. At the end of the module, interviews and focus group interviews were conducted with the PSTs and lecturer to understand their perceptions of the SE net-games module. This phase of research has been peer-reviewed and published as; Deenihan, J. T., MacPhail, A. and Young, A. M. (2011) “Living the curriculum’: Integrating sport education into a Physical Education Teacher Education programme ’, European Physical Education Review, 17(1), 51-68.
1.5.2 A PST’s delivery of SE on teaching placement (Research Question 2)

The second research question led to focusing on the effectiveness of the SE-PETE experience by observing one PST’s delivery of SE on his subsequent teaching placement. Having experienced the SE net-games module, one PST was observed weekly during his teaching placement to examine to what extent the SE net-games module influenced his perception and delivery of SE. Researcher observations, post-lesson interviews, pre-, mid- and post-teaching placement interviews and document analysis were used to explore his perceptions and delivery of SE. To gain a further insight into his perceptions and delivery of SE, a follow-up interview with the PST was conducted at the end of his first year teaching as a qualified teacher. Occupational socialisation was used as a framework to understand his perceptions and delivery of SE. This phase of research has been peer-reviewed and accepted for publication as; Deenihan, J. T. and MacPhail, A. (In Press) ’A Pre-service Teacher’s Delivery of Sport Education: Influences, Difficulties and Continued use’, Journal of Teaching in Physical Education.

1.5.3 Perceptions of assessment methods in SE-PETE (Research Question 3)

There is also a lack of engagement in the SE literature on the assessment of SE-PETE experiences. The importance of this area of research was heightened from informal conversations with PSTs and the lecturer of the SE-net games module. During this phase the SE net-games module was revised to accommodate recommendations from phases one and two. Two authentic assessment methods, portfolios and microteaching, were employed to assess the PSTs during the module, and these were the primary focus of this phase. Researcher observations along with interviews and focus
group interviews with the PSTs and lecturer were undertaken to explore their respective perceptions of two authentic assessment methods. This phase has been submitted for review in Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport.

1.5.4 PSTs’ delivery of SE on teaching placement (Research Question 4)

The final research question was concerned with exploring the extent to which PSTs deliver SE during their teaching placement. Four PSTs experienced the SE net-games module in phase one and three PSTs experienced the module in phase three. These PSTs possessed differing acculturations to teaching and were teaching in various school contexts. Pre-, mid- and post-interviews were conducted with the PSTs to understand their perceptions and delivery of SE and also explored their acculturation to teaching and the organisational socialisation of the school in which they were teaching. Occupational socialisation was used again in this phase to explore the seven PSTs’ perceptions and delivery of SE. This phase of research has been prepared for review in Sport, Education and Society.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

This chapter provides a summary of Models Based Instruction (MBI) and its relevance to the research. The chapter will then provide an overview of the SE model including its characteristics and some of the research findings including the domains in which SE has been researched and pupils’ experiences of SE. This provides grounding for the two main foci of the chapter that will inform the research which is to discuss research relating to qualified teachers’ and PSTs’ perceptions and delivery of SE and the inclusion of SE in PETE programmes.

2.1 Models Based Instruction

A number of PETE programmes encourage their PSTs to use a variety of instructional models while teaching (Gurvitch, Lund & Metzler, 2008), an approach that has been identified as MBI (Metzler, 2005). Instructional models have been defined as “a plan or pattern that can be used to shape curricula, to design instructional materials, and to guide instruction in the classroom and other settings” (Joyce & Weil, 1980 pg 1, in Metzler, 2005). Instructional models have developed from early work completed by Mosston (1966) where he proposed a Spectrum of Teaching Styles. This was the first time a series of teaching styles were presented together rather than in isolation of each other, with the spectrum ranging from styles which were strongly teacher centred to strongly pupil centred. These teaching styles were developed to achieve specific objectives and typically used for a short period after which another teaching style was used. Instructional models provide a richer perspective by recognising learning theory,
long-term goals, context, content, classroom management, related teaching strategies, verification of process, and the assessment of pupil learning (Metzler, 2005).

Metzler (2005) outlined eight distinctive instructional models; direct instruction, personalised system for instruction, co-operative learning, SE, peer teaching, inquiry teaching, tactical games and teaching for personal and social responsibility. The selection of which instructional model they use is determined by a number of factors including the class group, content and goals for the module (Gurvitch et al., 2008).

The application of MBI in one particular PETE programme is examined in detail in the Journal of Teaching in Physical Education 2008 Monograph edited by Gurvitch, Metzler and Lund (2008). The editors stress that the development of MBI should be viewed as ‘new and different’ rather than ‘new and better’ as there is yet little evidence to suggest the effectiveness of such an approach. In light of such an admission, findings presented in the monograph need to be recognised as early small-scale findings rather than significant concrete findings.

The Journal of Teaching in Physical Education 2008 Monograph provided a starting point in which to pursue the concept of MBI further and initiated a number of encouraging findings. The monograph examined the role in which the various change agents were involved in the adoption of MBI, the early successes of the model and the areas of research which still need to be addressed. The monograph provided evidence in support of MBI’s use from the perspective of both PSTs and the pupils they worked with in schools. It was identified that the PSTs who used MBI effectively on their teaching placement appreciated and enjoyed using it and that they saw the advantages to using MBI rather than traditional approaches (Gurvitch, Blankenship, Metzler & Lund, 2008). Research following these teachers into their careers as initial teachers identified
that direct instruction strategies were still favoured, with all initial teachers reporting that they either sometimes or always use direct instructional strategies. The majority of initial teachers admitted they would sometimes use the more pupil centred and indirect instructional models (Gurvitch & Blankenship, 2008). One of the most acknowledged instructional models within MBI, and the most frequently taught in PETE programmes (Ayers & Housner, 2008; Kinchin, Penney, Clarke, 2005), is SE. As SE can be classified as both a curriculum and instructional model (Tannehill, van der Mars & MacPhail, in press) it will be refereed to as a curriculum and instructional model herein.

2.2 SE introduction

SE (Siedentop, 1994; Siedentop, Hastie, & van der Mars, 2004, 2011) is a curriculum and instructional model for physical education that aims to develop pupils as “competent, literate and enthusiastic sportspeople” (Siedentop, 1994, p. 4). ‘Competent’ in the sense that pupils are able to play the game with a required level of skill and tactical knowledge, ‘literate’ in the sense that pupils understand and appreciate the rules and traditions associated with the sport and ‘enthusiastic’ in the sense that pupils wish to enhance and protect the sporting culture through their participation. SE achieves these aims by providing pupils with positive and authentic sporting experiences. There are six key characteristics which underpin SE. Sports are organised into ‘seasons’ that are generally longer than traditional sporting units taught as part of a physical education programme. All pupils select and affiliate to a team and adopt roles for the duration of the season. Sport seasons are defined by practice and ‘formal competition’ where the emphasis on affiliation and competition make the sport seasons more meaningful. Sport seasons usually end with a ‘culminating event’, which provides goals for the player to work toward throughout the season. ‘Record keeping’ provides feedback for individuals...
and teams. Finally, ‘festivity’ is encouraged and enhances the meaning for participants and adds an important social element to the experience.

The development of SE arose from Siedentop’s doctoral work in the late 1960s, believing that physical education was being taught ineffectively and that effective teaching practices and imaginative curricula were necessary for physical education to prosper (Siedentop, 2002). From these experiences the concept of SE was born and, throughout the 1980s, Siedentop began to develop and promote the SE model. SE was provided its first international exposure when it was included in a text by Siedentop, Mand and Taggart (1986). However, it was not until SE was adopted in a national trial in New Zealand high schools that a major turning point in the development and adoption of SE was achieved (Grant, 1992). Grant (1992) investigated SE’s implementation in 34 schools consisting of 86 teachers and over two thousand students. Although the teachers were initially sceptical about the model, the students enjoyed it and the teachers appreciated the model and intended to make it a permanent feature of their physical education curriculum. This initial trial was followed up by state and national trials in Australia which helped build an empirical record of the successes of SE and encouraged the beginnings of continued research on SE (Siedentop, 2002). The model has since become the focus of extensive further research with a plethora of research conducted on disparate aspects of SE (Hastie et al., 2011; Kinchin, 2006; Wallhead & O'Sullivan, 2005). The extensive research on SE has required two revisions of Siedentop’s initial text on SE (Siedentop, 1994; Siedentop, Hastie, & van ver Mars, 2004, 2011) to acknowledge and adopt developments in the model. The newer editions of the text provided additional information on the use of student roles, classroom management, assessment and interdisciplinary learning.
Research has provided strong support for the SE model, with positive findings being observed in the areas of gender inclusion (MacPhail, Gorely, Kirk, & Kinchin, 2008), pupil enjoyment of the model (MacPhail, Kinchin, & Kirk, 2003), enjoyment of roles (Hastie & Sinelnikov, 2006), teamwork (Hastie, 1998b), game performance (Carlson, 1995), the inclusion of lower skilled pupils (Pill, 2008) and fair play (Sinelnikov & Hastie, 2008). Not all research has generated positive findings of SE. It has been noted that some pupils were happy when the season ended (Kinchin, Wardle, Roderick, & Spronsen, 2004), and the quality of the pupil coaches along with the pupils’ knowledge of fitness and skill development have been questioned (Alexander & Luckman, 2001). Studies producing less positive findings of SE contribute to a minority of the published research but require recognition as they provide a critical insight into an otherwise positive database of research findings.

The published research on SE has spread across many countries and aspects of the model. Research has been conducted in the US (Hastie & Trost, 2002), Australia (Curnrow & Macdonald, 1995), the United Kingdom (Kinchin, 2004), Ireland (McMahon & MacPhail, 2007), Spain (De Ojeda, Luquin, & Hastie, 2012), Cyprus (Tsangaridou, 2012) and Russia (Sinelnikov & Hastie, 2010). Research has examined the perceptions of boys (Kinchin, 2004) and girls (Hastie, 1998a) to the model. A variety of sports have been taught through the model including netball (Clarke & Quill, 2003), rugby (Kinchin et. al, 2004), badminton (Brunton, 2003), soccer (Mowling, Brock, & Hastie, 2006) and ultimate Frisbee (Hastie, 1998b). SE has also been implemented among a range of age groups including primary (MacPhail et al., 2003), secondary (Carlson & Hastie, 1997) and collegiate physical activity courses (Meeteer, Housner, Bulger, Hawkins, & Weigand, 2012).
A number of adaptations to the SE model have been introduced, complementing Siedentop’s (2002) own notion that it is unrealistic to teach exactly as described. In response to an earlier criticism of lack of skill development and the recognised difficulty of teaching indirectly, Alexander and Penney (2005) have devised a model called “Clinic-Game Day” which complements SE’s structure while allowing the teacher an opportunity to teach directly on some occasions during the course of a SE season. Other practitioners have started to develop their own interpretations of the model including amalgamating the model with teaching games for understanding (Hastie & Curtner-Smith, 2006) and teaching personal and social responsibility (Hastie & Buchanan, 2000). Other researchers believe modifications of SE are necessary for some pupil groups (Mowling et al., 2006) and it is accepted that SE is not a replacement model within physical education where no other curriculum or instructional models would be used (Taggart et al., 1995). Implications and considerations for the delivery of SE have also been identified. SE outcomes are not achieved easily and it requires a considerable amount of time to enable the teacher and pupils to become comfortable with this relatively new teaching and learning style, appreciating that difficulties are inevitable when both teachers and pupils are using SE for the first time (Brunton, 2003; Kinchin, 2003). It is also questionable whether SE is sustainable over a number of years in a school (Alexander & Luckman, 2001). Mowling et al. (2006) question whether prolonged exposure to SE’s format would lead to decreased motivational levels from pupils who were repeatedly unsuccessful, while others call for longitudinal research to be conducted to verify the continual success of SE’s positive outcomes (MacPhail et al., 2008).
2.3 Pupils’ experience of SE

Much of the early research conducted on SE concerns pupils’ perceptions of the SE model, and this trend has continued to dominate current literature although other lines of inquiry are now being followed. The majority of the research has found that pupils like SE (Hastie & Sinelnikov, 2006) and in most instances they preferred SE to their previous physical education experiences (Kinchin et al., 2004; MacPhail et al., 2008). Participation levels and pupil engagement have been assessed frequently to establish the effectiveness of a SE season. Although O’Donovan (2003) observed no noticeable change in participation rates, the majority of the research contradicts this and has provided resounding support for SE with many authors commenting on enhanced participation levels during the SE season (Alexander & Luckman, 2001; Carlson & Hastie, 1997; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Hastie & Curtner-Smith, 2006; Pill, 2008).

As pupil enjoyment is not the sole goal of physical education, it is critical to assess these findings with a view on the pupils’ skill development where findings are not as complimentary. While some pupils believe that their skills did improve during the course of a SE season (Brunton, 2003; Hastie, 1996), it should be noted that some increase in skill level is inevitable from participation in any module of physical education regardless of the curriculum or instructional model used. Other researchers have discovered that pupils and teachers were divided as to whether SE was more effective in achieving skill development than traditionally taught physical education classes (Carlson, 1995), while Parker and Curtner-Smith (2005) noted that only 13% of the physical education class was devoted to skill practice when using SE.

There has been an abundance of research conducted on the suitability of SE to different groups of pupils, with gender inclusion fore-fronting this research. Many
researchers have paid particular focus to girls’ perceptions of the model and the research findings have proved positive. Hastie (1998a) observed girls taking part in a SE season and found that, although the boys had more opportunities to respond, the girls preferred SE to their regular physical education class. In this instance, it is worth noting that the SE season was taught by an expert in SE and he was aided by the presence of 12 PSTs who helped each team during the early phases of the module. In another study SE was taught by a teacher who had not used SE before and the girls in this instance liked SE, in particular the greater freedom from teacher instruction which they once found intimidating (Brunton, 2003). It has been noted that boys dominate the more influential roles such as coach and captain in SE (Curnrow & Macdonald, 1995; Hastie, 1998a) although it has been observed that SE is still gender inclusive (Carlson & Hastie, 1997; MacPhail et al., 2008) with girls believing they were included (Hastie, 1998b). However, girls in Curnrow and Macdonald’s (1995) study reported that they were not treated equally and the boys in the class ridiculed one high-skilled girl. There is still some uncertainty as to the extent of gender equality promoted by SE, prompting a need for further research to be conducted to determine this factor.

The inclusive nature of SE has made it a positive learning experience for lower-skilled pupils. Lower-skilled pupils believed that they had learned more and were more competent as a result of experiencing SE (Carlson, 1995), and that they improved their skills (Hastie & Sinelnikov, 2006). The format of the teams and peer teaching also facilitated the lower-skilled pupils to be included more (Clarke & Quill, 2003) and there was an increased motivation among lower-skilled pupils during a SE season (Pill, 2008). It has also been reported that higher-skilled pupils dominated games and performed better as a result (Hastie, 1998b), while another study suggested that high-
skilled pupils did not respond well to the roles and just wanted to play a game (Pill, 2008).

The pupils’ perception of roles is another focus area of research, with the majority of findings in favour of pupils’ roles. In many studies the pupils reacted positively to the roles (Clarke & Quill, 2003; Hastie, 1996, 1998a; Hastie & Sinelnikov, 2006; Sinelnikov & Hastie, 2008). The selection and allocation of roles has been conveyed by some to be an area of concern with the more influential roles clearly being more sought after (Kinchin et al., 2004). In addition, the inclusion of roles can be problematic for teachers with some suggesting that roles may be too advanced for some lower grade pupils (Mowling et al., 2006) and teachers reporting that roles need to be taught repeatedly (Taggart et al., 1995). Brunton (2003) observed and interviewed pupils during a SE season and reported that there was a mixed reaction to the roles and that some roles did not work effectively.

Further to this the role of pupil-coach is one that has continued to be debated in the SE literature. Some researchers have found the pupil-coach to be effective (Clarke & Quill, 2003) with pupils preferring the pupil-coach role (Hastie, 1996; Hastie & Sinelnikov, 2006), enjoying the autonomy of the pupil-coach (Brunton, 2003; MacPhail et al., 2008) and responding well to increased responsibility promoted through the role (Sinelnikov & Hastie, 2008). However, concerns have been expressed about the effectiveness of pupil-coaches (Alexander & Luckman, 2001; Carlson, 1995; Carlson & Hastie, 1997; Curnrow & Macdonald, 1995). Many believe pupils do not possess either the content knowledge or pedagogical knowledge to teach their peers and further believe that no curriculum model should “sideline” the expertise of the teacher (Alexander & Penney, 2005). The same authors further observed that teachers’
interventions are necessary during practices and that when intervention took place the success rate of the pupils was much higher.

2.4 SE and teachers

Although there is a wealth of research qualifying SE’s effectiveness in a number of domains (Hastie et al., 2011; Kinchin, 2006; Wallhead & O'Sullivan, 2005), there is a recognised shortage of research regarding the area of qualified teachers’ and PSTs’ uses of SE (McMahon & MacPhail, 2007; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2010). The importance of teachers in the effective delivery of SE cannot be underestimated (Kinchin, 2003), acknowledging that effective teacher leadership is crucial to successful seasons of SE (Hastie, 1998a; Kim et al., 2006). Table 2.1 illustrates research which has been conducted specifically investigating qualified teachers’ and PSTs’ delivery and perceptions of SE.

Many teachers believe that SE was beneficial to their pupils in a variety of areas. It has been found that teachers believe physical education classes became more enjoyable as a result of using SE (Cruz, 2008; Li & Cruz, 2009; Taggart et al., 1995), and that pupil motivation also increases (Kinchin, 2003; Li & Cruz, 2009). Teachers reported that SE improves pupil learning experiences (Cruz, 2008; Li & Cruz, 2009), although this has also been contradicted in the literature with many PSTs believing multi-activity teaching promotes greater learning than SE lessons (Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004) and that SE detracts from motor skill learning (McCaughtry et al., 2004). It is likely that these beliefs are formed by the role of pupil-coaches. While many teachers have commented on the effectiveness of pupil roles in SE (Clarke & Quill, 2003; Kinchin, 2003; Li & Cruz, 2009), it has been recognised that some teachers have negative experiences of pupil roles (Cruz, 2008; McMahon & MacPhail, 2007; Pill,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004             | • Three of the 15 PST preferred the multi-activity while nine preferred SE and three had no preference  
    • Seven of the 15 PST felt that multi-activity facilitated greater learning while six PSTs felt SE was better and two had no difference  
    • All 15 teachers recognised that pupils preferred SE to v and that an even mix of both models should be taught  
    • As their experience progressed the PSTs began to value giving their pupils more responsibility  
    • Being off centre stage allowed PSTs to focus more on lesson outcomes  
    • The PSTs also believed that SE built more positive relationships with their pupils |
| McCaughtry, Sofo, Rovegno & Curtner-Smith, 2004 | • PSTs left out vital aspects of the SE model when teaching and did not appreciate the model  
    • They also thought it was too much work and often retreated to the traditional instructional approach because of the lack of support and a fear of failing as new teachers  
    • Most of the PSTs would not use the model again because its too much work for a new teacher, it detracts from motor skill learning and pupils don’t care or can’t do it anyway  
    • Group one PSTs struggled with tactical instruction and retreated to the safety of skill drills or non-instructional games; they also expressed resistance to incorporate some of the most unique characteristics of SE into their future secondary classrooms  
    • Group two PSTs misunderstood the role of skill development in SE. In terms of learning to teach SE it was the teachers’ initial misunderstanding of the model that hindered their learning most |
| Kim, Penney, Cho, Choi, 2006           | • The teacher gradually shifted from teacher directed to pupil directed learning  
    • The teacher found assessment difficult within SE  
    • SE is still part of the school physical education curriculum |
| McMahon & MacPhail, 2007               | • The PST was unsure how to teach roles and responsibilities  
    • The PST had difficulty in getting the pupils to buy into having a role and responsibility for their learning, the pupils did not see the roles as important and were doing them as a formality to please the PST so they could play a game  
    • The PST found the teaching of tactics difficult  
    • The PST felt that she had to put more work for her SE class than other classes, and her cooperating teacher did not help her with her SE class as he had no knowledge of SE  
    • The PST struggled to create situations where pupils learned from each other and struggled to teach tactical game play |
| Cruz, 2008                             | • The two teachers encountered difficulties planning and organizing SE, dealing with their role change, lacking support, managing environmental constraints, and getting pupils to take on roles correctly |


Table 2.1: Qualified teachers and PSTs delivery of SE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curtner-Smith, Hastie &amp; Kinchin, 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• One teacher did not use SE at all, because he didn’t think it would be as valuable to his pupils at this time in their lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Four teachers used the full version of SE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Three of the teachers used SE in a watered down style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Two teachers taught with a cafeteria style approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pill, 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher reported implementing SE as more work but he did appreciate the benefits to the pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher acknowledged the influence of peer support from the researcher as they had someone to “bounce ideas off”, reporting that a lot more things would have gone wrong and less outcomes achieved if it were not for the presence of the researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher in this instance used SE in the 3rd quarter of the academic year and stated that they would use it at the start in future so they can “create a more inclusive environment from the start”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Li &amp; Cruz, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The teachers encountered difficulties teaching SE and specifically felt that SE required more time and effort to plan lessons. Other difficulties noted included, monitoring pupil progress, assessment and helping pupils search for information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sineelnikov, 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Both of the teachers delivered SE successfully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teachers were concerned with the managerial structure in a SE lesson and encountered difficulties letting go of control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stran &amp; Curtner-Smith, 2009a, 2009B, 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Both PSTs used the full version of SE. A significant factors influencing their implementation of SE were the cooperating teachers and university supervisors, the extent to which they were held accountable for their learning and the nature of the pupils they encountered was the single most significant factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Key to the PSTs success was their knowledge of the structure and features of SE. The PSTs also emphasized the importance of good pedagogical knowledge within three main areas of, effective teaching, teaching styles and classroom ecology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Their initial value orientations strongly influenced their deliver of SE where their disciplinary mastery focus ensured they delivered full but conservative seasons of SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Often the teachers had to deal with behavioural and management problems which made the implementation of SE difficult, further one of the teachers was advised not use SE with one class as they were too disruptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The PSTs tended to use relatively direct teaching styles and were concerned with keeping pupils engaged and provided them with a great deal of feedback. As the season progressed they started to use more indirect teaching styles and broadened their scope of the SE season</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2008) and that roles need to be taught several times (McMahon & MacPhail, 2007; Taggart et al., 1995). Teachers note that SE is positive in catering for a variety of pupil groups (Li & Cruz, 2009; Pill, 2008).

It has been recognised that PSTs prefer SE to multi-activity teaching (Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004). The PSTs who preferred SE reported that the SE lesson ran smoother, had more structure and was more beneficial to their pupils. All PSTs believed that a mix of both models should be delivered to pupils. Some teachers recognise and appreciate that their role changes to more of a facilitator role during SE (Clarke & Quill, 2003; Taggart et al., 1995), although other teachers have expressed difficulty managing this role change and find it difficult to hand over control to their pupils (Cruz, 2008; Sinelnikov, 2009). Teachers also commented that using SE provided them with more time to observe, correct and praise pupils (Brunton, 2003; Pill, 2008), made assessment easier (Clarke & Quill, 2003), resulted in pupils having a better understanding of the game (Carlson, 1995), and promoted teamwork (Kinchin, 2003; Li & Cruz, 2009).

Alexander and Luckman (2001) provided a detailed insight into teachers’ perceptions of SE with a large-scale account of 377 physical education teachers who used SE. Their findings suggest that SE was suitable for most pupils’ skill levels and gender, except for pupils with disabilities, absent or disorganized pupils. Teachers noted that when using SE, fitness and motor skill development was not one of their teaching goals. Instead they believed that knowledge of rules and strategy, values and attitudes towards physical education, interest in physical education, participation levels, pupil cooperation, interpersonal skills and cooperation with teacher were all achieved more successfully under SE. Teachers also believed that they had more time available for assessment when using SE. Although the majority of teachers believed their pupils
performed their roles well, only 48% of primary and 18% of secondary teachers believed that pupil-coaches were effective. In addition, while 90% of the teachers reported that SE would become a permanent feature of their physical education curriculum, on later visits to the same schools the authors noticed that SE’s presence had diminished. Teachers’ intention to use SE again and to make it a feature of their physical education curriculum has been identified by a number of authors (Cruz, 2008; Kim et al., 2006; Li & Cruz, 2009; MacPhail et al., 2008; Pill, 2008; Taggart et al., 1995). Conversely, PSTs in McCaughtry et al.’s (2004) study expressed that they were unlikely to continue using SE after their initial experiences with the model. The PSTs in this study were divided into groups of two or three with a team of seven pupils to instruct for the entire season, conveying minimal replication of the reality of teaching SE in a standard school setting. Such findings should be viewed in consideration of this.

Teachers have encountered a number of difficulties using SE, primarily believing that SE requires additional time and effort in the planning stages (Cruz, 2008; Li & Cruz, 2009; McCaughtry et al., 2004; McMahon & MacPhail, 2007; Pill, 2008; Taggart et al., 1995). While some teachers acknowledge the benefits that come with the planning (Pill, 2008), others are not as appreciative (McCaughtry et al., 2004). PSTs face difficulties when teaching SE (McCaughtry et al., 2004; McMahon & MacPhail, 2007) and research reports that PSTs omit vital aspects of SE, do not appreciate SE and often retreat to traditional instruction (McCaughtry et al., 2004). PSTs also struggled to create situations where pupils learned from each other and to teach tactical game play. Although Curtner-Smith et al. (2008) and Stran and Curtner-Smith’s (2009a) studies highlighted instances where teachers were successful teaching SE, some teachers in these studies were encouraged not to use SE, encountered difficulties teaching SE with
particular class groups, delivered SE seasons omitting many of Siedentop’s (1994) recommendations or did not deliver SE in any form.

Teachers are considered to teach SE in one of three versions, ‘full version’, ‘watered down version’ or ‘cafeteria approach’ (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). Teaching SE in its ‘full version’ involves teachers delivering SE seasons which adhere to all of Siedentop’s (1994) recommendations, remaining faithful to the model throughout the entire season. Teaching SE in a ‘watered down version’ involves teachers omitting parts of SE’s framework within their SE seasons. Teaching a ‘cafeteria’ approach involves teachers using only parts of SE’s framework within more traditionally taught units. Kinchin (2003) is concerned with the appropriateness of assessing PSTs’ delivery of SE, believing that the pedagogy of SE would be unfamiliar for even the most experienced teacher. He contends that while teachers are in the pre-service stage in their career they are presented with considerable challenges and are therefore more likely to employ traditional styles of teaching, concerned with surviving as a teacher. Furthermore, Siedentop (2002) has encouraged us not to worry about misapplications of SE or demand that SE is delivered in some perfect form, encouraging the gradual implementation of SE (Siedentop et al., 2004). While some PSTs have success teaching full versions of SE (Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a, 2009b, 2010), many beginning teachers are unable to teach ‘full versions’ of SE (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008).

Research has recently begun to examine the factors which influence teachers’ delivery of SE (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a, 2009b, 2010). From this research it has became apparent that value orientations, knowledge types and occupational socialisation all play a crucial role in teachers’ deliver of SE. Stran and Curtner-Smith (2009b) identified that PSTs’ initial value orientations
influenced their delivery of SE, reporting that in their study the disciplinary mastery focus of the two PSTs ensured they delivered a full, but conservative, version of SE. While initially the PSTs tended to use relatively direct teaching styles and were concerned with keeping pupils engaged and providing pupils with a great deal of feedback, as the season progressed they started to use more indirect teaching styles and broadened their scope of the SE season. Stran and Curtner-Smith (2010) similarly found that PST knowledge types influenced their delivery of SE, where PSTs’ knowledge of the structure and features of SE and their good pedagogical knowledge within three main areas (effective teaching, teaching styles and classroom ecology) all significantly influenced the PSTs’ delivery of SE.

Occupational socialisation has contributed to our understanding of how PSTs deliver SE (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a). It has become apparent from such research that teachers’ occupational socialisation plays a pivotal role in their subsequent delivery of SE. While SE may be attractive to most teachers due to their acculturation (Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004), their orientation to teaching can play a major influence on their delivery of SE (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a). In addition, the organisational socialisation teachers face in school has a similar influence on their delivery of SE (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a). It has been hypothesized that in order to teach SE in its ‘full version’ teachers must be teaching in an innovative school environment and possess a teaching orientation or moderate coaching orientation to teaching (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). The authors also hypothesise that teachers who possess a hard core coaching orientation will not teach SE. Other variations of the
teachers’ occupational socialisation will lead teachers to delivering ‘watered down’ or ‘cafeteria approaches’ to SE.

Unfortunately, the teachers identified in Curtner-Smith et al.’s (2008) and Stran and Curtner-Smith’s (2009a) studies were specifically selected as they were deemed to have a high aptitude for teaching, performed well in PETE and were likely candidates to use SE. Research needs to focus on the realities of teachers who have not shown such superior potential to deliver seasons of SE. There have also been calls for research to be conducted where SE is employed in less favourable and custodial teaching environments (Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a). It has been identified from many of these studies that PETE programmes, and the quality of SE learning experiences they provide, play a crucial role in teachers’ subsequent delivery of SE (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; McCaughtry et al., 2004; McMahon & MacPhail, 2007; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a, 2009b, 2010).

2.5 SE in PETE

With the importance of the teachers’ role in delivering SE clearly established in the literature along with the importance of high quality PETE in delivering SE effectively (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; McMahon & MacPhail, 2007), there is a recognised importance of research to be conducted on how to prepare PSTs to teach SE. This type of research has been identified as essential for the development of SE (McCaughtry et al., 2004). It has been identified that SE should be a core component of all PETE programmes (Alexander & Luckman, 2001; Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Dyson et al., 2004), with an analysis of PETE programmes in the United States suggesting this may already be the case (Ayers & Housner, 2008). It has however been acknowledged that there is a paucity of research regarding the inclusion of SE in PETE
programmes (Curtner-Smith, 2012; Kinchin, Penney, & Clarke, 2005). The research that has been conducted is collated in Table 2.2 illustrating the various SE experiences in PETE and recommendations for the inclusion of SE in PETE.

Oslin (2002) states that a “vast majority of PETE programmes in the US teach movement content through a series of traditionally taught activity courses, then teach curriculum as part of the methods course” (p. 424). To this extent, the PSTs experience the content and pedagogy in isolation of each other. Counteracting this, one of the primary recommendations for the effective inclusion of SE in PETE is participation in a practical SE season taught by a faculty member (Collier, 1998; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Gurvitch et al., 2008; Jenkins, 2004; Kinchin et al., 2005; Oslin, Collier, & Mitchell, 2001; Roberts & Fairclough, 2010). Within these seasons PSTs are to experience SE similar to a pupil in a school where they would affiliate to a team, adopt roles and participate in competition phases, experience record keeping and participate in a culminating event. It is suggested that these SE seasons should be preceded by an initial lecture on SE highlighting the characteristics and aims of the model (Gurvitch et al., 2008; Kinchin, 2003; Kinchin et al., 2005; Roberts & Fairclough, 2010). It is recommended that PSTs engage in classroom discussions and attend lectures on SE (Collier, 1998; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Jenkins, 2004; McCaughtry et al., 2004; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a) to further their understanding of the model and that such lectures are most beneficial when they are delivered in conjunction with teachers who have taught the model (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Kinchin et al., 2005). It is also recommended to observe SE being taught in schools and/or watch videos of SE being delivered in schools (Collier, 1998; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Kinchin, 2003; Kinchin et al., 2005), believing that these opportunities are critical in bridging the gap between
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collier, 1998</td>
<td><strong>Recommendations for SE-PETE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participate in a practical SE season taught by a faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Observe SE being delivered in a local school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Watch a video of SE being delivered in a local school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Read articles about SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Engage</strong> in class discussions about SE with a faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide workshops for PSTs and in-service teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teach SE to peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teach SE in early field experiences and student teaching practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oslin, Collier &amp; Mitchell, 2001</td>
<td><strong>Kent State SE-PETE Programme</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participate in a practical SE season taught by a faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinchin, 2003 and Kinchin, Penney &amp; Clarke, 2005</td>
<td><strong>University of Southampton SE-PETE Programme</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Initial lecture on SE (before practical SE season)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participate in a practical SE season taught by a faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Plan sample SE sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Team taught lecturer on SE from school teachers and faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Observe SE being delivered in a local school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Extend SE via continuing professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Link SE with University assignments, Thesis etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop school based research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop partnership between schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins, 2004</td>
<td><strong>University of Wyoming SE-PETE programme</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Engage in class discussions about SE with a faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Read Siedentop’s (1994) textbook on SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participate in a practical SE season taught by a faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Complete a reflection assignment on their experiences participating in a SE season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Complete group presentation on alternative SE seasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teach full SE seasons to university students enrolled on activity courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teach SE in early field experiences and student teaching practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCauhghtry, Sofo, Rovegno &amp; Curtner-Smith, 2004</td>
<td><strong>Southeastern US University SE-PETE Programme</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Read Siedentop’s (1994) textbook on SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Attend lecturers on SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Received handouts on SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Engage in class discussions about SE with a faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Team teach a faculty prescribed SE season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Implications for SE-PETE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty need to be aware of teachers’ tendency to retreat to tactical instruction when problems arise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty need to reinforce the similarities and differences between SE and traditional sport pedagogies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Need to teach and re-teach SE at multiple times in PETE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 2: Literature Review

- Need balance between helping teachers prepare for induction and enacting challenging curriculum
- Faculty need to highlight the importance of other types of learning involved in SE
- Faculty must be aware of teachers’ initial skepticism or defeating tendencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curtner-Smith, Hastie &amp; Kinchin, 2008</th>
<th>British University SE-PETE Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engage in class discussions about SE with a faculty member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read articles about SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch a video of SE being delivered in a local school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest lecturer by a teacher who used SE in a local school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe SE being delivered in a local school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in a practical SE season taught by a faculty member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American University SE-PETE Programme 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engage in class discussions about SE with a faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read articles about SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read sample SE lesson plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in sample lessons of SE taught by a faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach one full SE season on student teaching practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American University SE-PETE Programme 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engage in class discussions about SE with a faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read Siedentop’s (1994) textbook on SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach two 10 lesson mini seasons of SE on early field experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach three full seasons of SE during student teaching practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gurvitch et al, 2008</th>
<th>Georgia State University State MBI Programme – SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participate in a practical SE season taught by a faculty member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study the background and theory of SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading about SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting and discussing SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and implement a SE unit in a field-based practicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement SE in field based settings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan and teach SE in student teaching practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete SE project where they measure pupil learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stran &amp; Curtner-Smith, 2009a</th>
<th>Southeastern US University SE-PETE Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engage in class discussions about SE with a faculty member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided with an example of a SE season plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read Siedentop et al.’s (2004) textbook on SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach four 10 lesson mini seasons of SE on early field experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roberts &amp; Fairclough, 2010</th>
<th>British University SE-PETE Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial lecture on SE (before practical SE season)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in a practical SE season taught by a faculty member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received handouts on SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Recommendations for including SE in PETE
theory and reality. It has been identified, however, that such opportunities may be difficult for many PETE programmes to provide as schools who employ the SE model successfully are rare (Kinchin et al., 2005). Reading Siedentop’s (1994; Siedentop et al., 2004) guide books, articles on SE and reading and preparing sample SE unit plans are also commonly recommended (Collier, 1998; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Gurvitch et al., 2008; Jenkins, 2004; Kinchin et al., 2005; McCaughtry et al., 2004; Roberts & Fairclough, 2010; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a).

Being prepared to teach SE in disparate settings is also a strong feature of the SE literature. It is encouraged that PSTs initially teach SE to their peers (Collier, 1998) or to university students enrolled on activity courses (Jenkins, 2004), and then teach SE out on early field experiences and student teaching placements (Collier, 1998; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Gurvitch et al., 2008; McCaughtry et al., 2004; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a). It has been recommended that PSTs teach or team-teach faculty prescribed mini SE seasons on early field experiences before going on to designing and delivering their own SE seasons on student teaching placement (Collier, 1998; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a). By delivering faculty prescribed mini-seasons PSTs gain an opportunity to teach all aspects of SE while designing and delivering their own SE seasons gives PSTs an opportunity to develop their own adaptations and ideas of SE. Curtner-Smith (2012) recognised that a number of conditions are favourable to teaching SE, including teacher support and supervision, pupil behaviour and readiness for SE, supervision by faculty who are familiar with SE and holding PSTs accountable for delivering the model faithfully. However, it may be difficult to provide all of these conditions during teaching placements where cooperating teachers’ knowledge of SE is often limited (Meeteer et al., 2012). Kinchin
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et al. (2005) provided further recommendations for including SE in PETE, which include extending SE through continuing professional development and developing schools-based research and partnerships between schools. There is support for university assignments to be conducted on SE to develop the PSTs’ understanding further (Gurvitch et al., 2008; Jenkins, 2004; Kinchin, 2012, Kinchin et al., 2005).

After PSTs in McCaughtry et al.’s (2004) study encountered difficulties teaching SE, the authors provide a number of implications for PETE programmes regarding the inclusion of SE. They highlighted that PETE faculty need to be aware of teachers’ tendency to retreat to more traditional methods of instruction when problems arise in their SE season and that PETE faculty need to reinforce the similarities and differences between SE and traditional sport pedagogies. The authors encourage the need to teach and re-teach SE at multiple times in PETE and that PETE programmes need to find an appropriate balance between preparing PSTs for induction while enacting challenging and complex curriculum. Finally, they propose that it is vital for PETE faculty to help PSTs appreciate the different types of learning in SE and that they must be aware of PSTs’ initial scepticism and possible self-fulfilling, or defeating, tendencies. Stran and Curtner-Smith (2009a) believe that (i) faculty member credibility, (ii) their commitment to training teachers and their preparation to do so, (iii) their understanding and appreciation of the PST’s acculturation, (iv) their willingness to contrast good and poor pedagogies, (v) supervise early field experiences and student teaching placement closely, and their ability (vi) to develop a technical language through which they and PSTs can discuss teaching all play a significant part in winning PSTs over and facilitating their competence to use SE. Collier (1998) provided a sequence of components to assist PSTs delivering SE in schools, The first phase of the sequence
should focus on management issues including organising teams, encouraging festivity, initiating sport rituals and creating competition formats. The next phase should teach PSTs to develop content to increase pupil learning and skill development. The final phase is to teach PSTs how to assess pupil performance through keeping statistics and creating team portfolios.

It is understood that the more these recommendations are enacted the more powerful the learning experiences will be for the PSTs (Curtner-Smith, 2012). When PETE programmes adopt these recommendations and create high-quality SE in PETE experiences then PSTs and qualified teachers are understood to encounter success delivering SE (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Gurvitch, Blankenship, Metzler, & Lund, 2008; Jenkins, 2004; Kinchin, 2003; Oslin et al., 2001; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a). When less comprehensive SE-PETE programmes are provided then PSTs are likely to encounter difficulties teaching SE and deliver lesser versions of the model (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; McCaughtry et al., 2004; McMahon & MacPhail, 2007). There is little information provided in many of the studies regarding the success of such recommendations in relation to PSTs’ subsequent delivery of SE. It is imperative that PETE programmes understand what are the effective methods of preparing PSTs to teach SE in relation to their future delivery of SE. Therefore this research aimed to attend to this gap in the literature by providing a SE-PETE experience to PSTs and examined their perceptions of the experience and their subsequent delivery of SE. Chapter 3 shares with the reader the methodology and methods that informed the study with the intention of addressing such a gap in the literature.
Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter will provide an overview of the research methodology used in this study. It will share the case study research design, my personal positioning to the research and the research plan used. It will also discuss the PETE programme context, data collection and analysis methods and issues of ethics and validity.

3.2 Research design of case studies

The term ‘design’ is used in research to refer to the researcher’s plan of how to proceed (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992, p. 58), and in this study a case study framework was chosen as the research design. Case studies have been described as research that “involves the study of an issue explored through one or more cases within a bounded system” (Creswell, 2007; p. 73). In expanding on the concept, Creswell (2007) states;

Case study research is a qualitative approach in which the investigator explores a bounded system or multiple bounded systems over time, through detailed in depth data collection involving multiple sources of information and reports a description of case based themes” (p. 73)

The aim of case study research is to “get a rich detailed understanding of the case by examining aspects of it in detail” (Thomas, 1999, p. 115). These cases can be of a person, a group, an institution or a process (O’Rielly, 2009). Case studies can be an appropriate research design for individual researchers as it affords the researcher the “opportunity for one aspect of the problem to be studied in some depth” (Bell, 2005, p. 13). It has also been identified that good case study research is difficult to do (Yin,
1994) and that a “good case study is patient, reflective, willing to see another view of the case” (Stake, 1995, p. 12).

In the context of this research, one particular PETE programme was the case of my research. Within this PETE programme I aimed to examine the participants’ experiences of learning SE through a SE net-games module in the programme and the subsequent delivery by the PSTs of SE in post-primary schools during their teaching placement. This particular PETE programme was chosen as it was interested in introducing additional curriculum and instructional models into the programme. The programme was easily accessible for the researcher and at the time of entry was introducing net-games through SE for the first time. Bogdan and Biklen believe that a good setting for case study research is “one that the same people use in a recurring way” (1992, p. 63). To this end the programme was suitable as the opportunity arose to extend a reconfigured SE module to a second cohort of PSTs to further enhance PSTs’ experiences of SE. There are various types of case studies which can be distinguished in terms of their intent (Creswell, 2007). Stake (1995) identified ‘intrinsic’, ‘instrumental’ and ‘collective and comparative’ case studies. Intrinsic case studies can be classified as research conducted for its own sake which is interested only in the particular case. In intrinsic case studies “no attempt is made to generalize or to build theories beyond the case” (O’Rielly, 2009, p. 25). Stake explained that instrumental case study research refers to research carried out on a particular case in order to try to understand other similar cases that are not part of the research (1995). In instrumental case studies the issues are dominant from the start to finish, not the cases (Bassey, 1999). Collective and comparative case studies can be classified when multiple cases are investigated and compared (O’Rielly, 1999). This research can be classified as an instrumental case
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study as the aim of the research was to contribute to the current lack of exposure in the literature regarding PSTs’ experiences of learning and delivering SE. Although this research was situated in one PETE programme, every effort was made so that the research and its findings could be considered by other PETE programmes.

Concerns raised regarding using case studies include small sample size and the inability to generalise the results (Bell, 2005, Brewer, 2000). Stake also questions the ability to generalise results from case studies and believes that “the real business of a case study is particularisation” not generalisation (1995, p. 8). Similarly, Thomas (1999) believes that researchers “are not studying this case in order to understand others. You are studying it in order to understand it in itself” (p. 115). A number of authors provide methods to aid the generalisation of case study findings. Creswell (2007) believes that to best generalise their results researchers need to identify and select representative cases for inclusion in their research. Yin (1994) highlights the importance of theory in promoting generalisation of results in case studies. Yin encourages researchers to link their research to theory and believes that case studies are enhanced when “a previously developed theory is used as a template with which to compare the empirical results of the case study” (1994, p. 31). He believes that theory development as part of the design phase is essential regardless of whether the purpose was to develop or test the theory. Stake (1995) also believes that researchers need to exercise care when writing their results, being sure not to make too many generalisations about their findings so as to allow the reader to make their own generalisations.

This research addressed concerns of generalisation by using appropriate theoretical frameworks for each phase of the research. These theories were used to help
guide the phases of the research but also support and substantiate the findings. The findings and discussion from each phase are also presented in a manner that allows the reader to make their own generalisations while also providing my own opinions on the possibility for generalisation of results.

3.3 **Personal Positioning**

Bogdan and Biklen (1992) believe that people start on a research topic because of their own biography. Furthermore, Thomas (2009) believes that “because of the importance of the relation between the researcher and research participants, the researcher’s biography needs to be made explicit” (p. 110). Acknowledging the researcher’s positioning and potential bias increases the validity of the research (Creswell, 2009). A number of factors influenced my decision to pursue this research. Firstly, I received mixed experiences from physical education and childhood sport. Physical education was rarely taught in primary school. Most of the time, all the boys played soccer (similar to lunch breaks) and the girls played rounders or walked around the school. I still enjoyed these classes as it gave me an opportunity to leave the class and play games. I had an extensive involvement in organised sport. At a young age I participated quite extensively in football, hurling, rugby and judo, and to a lesser extent athletics, tennis, basketball and swimming. I still recall fantastic coaches who influenced me heavily during these sports.

Post-primary school physical education classes, albeit better than my primary physical education, still left a lot to be desired. I remember playing basketball and many games of indoor soccer with one random module of badminton. In general my physical education teachers used their lessons to identify pupils who would contribute to the school’s successful basketball and football teams. They rarely taught skills and when
they did they used very didactic practices. Additionally, I never experienced a physical education class that was longer than 40 minutes. Despite all this, physical education remained one of my favourite classes in the school day. Around this time I also competed internationally in judo and successfully in hurling, football and rugby.

It was a combination of my experiences of school physical education and external sport which developed my interest and passion to pursue a career as a physical education teacher. Having failed to attain the required academic points to attend the only physical education teacher education programme in the country (at the time), I enrolled on a similar course in a smaller Institute of Technology in my home town, with the understanding that this would lead to an opportunity to interview for a place on the PETE university I initially applied for. It was during my time in undergraduate education that I developed an appreciation for my lecturers and an admiration for their work and their relationships with their students. Towards the end of my undergraduate programme I had changed my goal of becoming a physical education teacher to becoming a lecturer at third level.

It was also at this time that I reduced the number of sports I competed in to judo only. The additional pressures of playing senior sport and managing injuries, coupled with my changing social structure of being a student, did not facilitate continued involvement in sports. In my penultimate year as an undergraduate student I experienced a SE workshop delivered by a lecturer in the PETE programme I had previously applied to. It really opened my eyes to what physical education teaching could be. The concept of teamwork and the increased responsibility of the pupils really appealed to me. It was also one of the first times I experienced physical education being taught well. This experience influenced my decision to choose SE as the topic for my
final year research thesis. On reflection I experienced aspects of SE during my primary and secondary school years. While not during physical education class time, on two occasions I was involved with being part of a team and competing in culminating events. I have extremely positive memories of both these experiences and felt that pupils exposed to a SE season would share my experiences.

During my final year research thesis I implemented an eight-week SE season in a local primary school, evaluating the pupils’ and teacher’s experiences of being involved in the season. Although most of the responses were positive I questioned the effectiveness of the module for use with primary pupils and struggled to deliver many aspects of SE. I also had little confidence that the teacher, even though he admitted he would use it again, would be able or even attempt, a season of SE. I knew I would have to complete some form of postgraduate research in order to pursue a career in lecturing. Having applied for, and being offered, a place on a year-long Graduate Diploma in Physical Education, I deferred the course to commence my postgraduate research on the PETE programme I had intended to attend all along. I was very keen to continue researching the SE model and through conversations with my supervisor and practicing physical education teachers we decided to focus on how PSTs learn to deliver SE seasons. During the four years of my research I have continued to coach and work as a teacher in adult education where I predominately teach health related fitness.

3.4 Research plan

The research was conducted over four consecutive phases (Figure 3.1). Each phase had a different focus which aimed to contribute to the overall case study of including SE in a PETE programme. It has been noted that qualitative researchers are often not aware of the specific plan their research will take (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992).
Therefore each phase of the research was informed by the reported experiences and findings of the previous phase. I will now discuss each of the four respective phases of research.

Figure 3.1: Phases of research

3.4.1 Phase One

The first phase of data collection was conducted from September 2008 until December 2008 and aimed to explore the PSTs’, lecturer’s and researcher’s perceptions of a SE net-games module in a PETE programme. During this phase the researcher and the lecturer devised a 12-week SE net-games module to be delivered to PSTs during the first semester of third year of their PETE programme. During this module the lecturer modeled SE so the PSTs experienced SE similar to how it was intended to be delivered in school. Data was gathered through researcher observations, and post-module
interviews and focus group interviews with the lecturer and PSTs. The data were analysed using coding, constant comparison and triangulation. This research is presented in Chapter 4.

3.4.2 Phase Two

At the end of phase one it was deemed appropriate to follow some PSTs onto their subsequent year teaching placement to examine the success of the SE net-games module in preparing PSTs to deliver SE on their teaching placements. Phase two data collection was conducted from September 2009 to December 2009. One PST was shadowed by the researcher during his teaching placement and was observed weekly delivering the SE lesson. This research is presented in Chapter 5. Concurrently, three other PSTs were tracked during their teaching placement and combined with phase four of the research, is presented further in Chapter 7. Various data collection methods were employed during phase two including focus groups with all PSTs, pre- and post-teaching placement interviews with the PSTs, researcher observations, post-lesson interviews and document analysis of the PSTs scheme of work, lesson plans and post-lesson reflections. Data were analysed using coding, constant comparison and triangulation.

3.4.3 Phase Three

Having received recommendations from the lecturer and PSTs for developing the PSTs’ experiences during the SE net-games module it was deemed appropriate to revisit the SE net-games module the following year. The data collection for phase three was conducted from September 2010 to December 2010, where the SE net-games module was observed. There was a recognised gap in the research on how to assess the
recommended SE-PETE experiences. Hence the research focused on considering authentic assessments in SE and this is the focus of Chapter 6. This phase examined the PSTs’ and lecturer’s feedback and experiences of the two assessment methods used during the SE net-games module. Data collection measures included interviews with PSTs and the lecturer, focus groups with PSTs and researcher observations. Data from this phase were again analysed using coding, constant comparison and triangulation.

3.4.4 Phase Four

This phase of research was similar to phase two as regards the compilation of data. The data collection for phase four was conducted during September 2009 to December 2009 and again from September 2011 to December 2011. In this phase seven PSTs were tracked during their teaching placement to explore their enactment of SE having experienced the SE net-games module in PETE. This is the focus of chapter 7. Each of the PSTs had differing acculturations to teaching and were placed in schools with various organisational socialisations. It was considered important to examine the experiences of various PSTs teaching SE in differing contexts to begin to appreciate the varying constraints to teaching SE. Data were collected in this phase through pre- and post-interviews and a mid-term focus group with all PSTs. Data were analysed using coding, constant comparison and triangulation.

An overview of the time frame for all data collection methods is illustrated in Table 3.1.
Table 3.1: Timeframe of data collection and analysis

3.5 PETE Programme Context

The research was conducted in a PETE programme in a University in Ireland. The four-year undergraduate programme enrols approximately 80 PSTs each academic year. During the four years PSTs are introduced to all seven strands of the Irish post-primary physical education curriculum; aquatics, adventure activities, athletics, dance, games, gymnastics, health related activity and other areas related to physical education and sport. The PSTs also undertake generic education modules and study a classroom
based subject in which they will also be qualified to teach upon completion of the programme.

Two formal teaching placements are completed during the PETE programme; the first in the second semester of second year (lasting six weeks) where PSTs are assigned in pairs to a school and the second in the first semester of the fourth year for ten weeks. During both teaching placements, PSTs teach a required number of classes of physical education and their chosen elective subject. The PSTs are encouraged to teach all seven strands of the Irish post-primary physical education curriculum during their teaching placement. PSTs are assigned a cooperating teacher within the school who observes their lessons and provides feedback and support for the PSTs. PSTs are visited during their teaching placements by a university tutor who formally assesses and grades the PSTs’ teaching.

Within the PETE programme, PSTs undertake a number of applied practical studies modules on each of the seven strands of the Irish post-primary physical education curriculum. These modules are delivered by lecturers who have previous physical education teaching experience and have considerable expertise in the activities. These modules are supported by additional modules in pedagogy, curriculum and assessment. Within these latter modules PSTs are given a concise, yet brief, introduction to the various physical education curriculum and instructional models.

3.5.1 SE net-games module

A SE net-games module was devised by the lecturer of the module and I, integrating the principles of SE into the content of a net-games module. This module was delivered during the first semester of the PSTs’ third year and included two one-hour practicals each week for 13 weeks. The module was divided into three short mini-
seasons of tennis, badminton and volleyball, each consisting of four weeks. It was anticipated that the PSTs would experience SE in a similar manner as to how it was envisaged SE would most effectively be delivered in schools. The PSTs selected teams and affiliated to their team through team affiliation sheets where they chose team names, colours and nicknames. They remained part of their team for the duration of the module and practiced within their teams where possible. PSTs also adopted various roles other than player during the module, including equipment officer, warm-up coach, skills coach, referee and official. The PSTs also participated in formal competition and culminating events within each of the mini-seasons. A concise account of how SE was integrated into the net-games module is provided in Table 3.2.

PSTs were assessed during the last two weeks of the module through two main methods, a SE portfolio and peer microteaching. The assessment methods were changed slightly between phases one and three and, as such, they will be presented separately here. In phase one PSTs were required to complete a SE unit plan in groups of five. Within this unit plan they were required to complete a rationale and description for using various aspects of SE in Irish post-primary schools along with task cards they would use during their SE season. Microteaching required PSTs to teach a 20 minute segment of a lesson on net-games to their peers. Both assessments carried an equal credit weighting of 50%. In phase three similar assessments were used except the SE portfolio was completed in pairs and carried 70% of the credit weighting. The microteaching assessment was reduced to 30% of the credit weighting and required the PSTs to deliver one of the task cards they had developed for their SE portfolio to a small group of their peers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Practical aspect</th>
<th>SE aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Introduction to basic racket skills through short-tennis/pickleball.</td>
<td>Introduction to SE, nomination of team coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Introduction to ground strokes. Basic tactics: utilising court space to best advantage</td>
<td>Team selection methods, team affiliation methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Development of attacking and defending principles. Doubles play – basics of playing with a partner. Evaluation and analysis of techniques</td>
<td>Introduction of roles, task card teaching methods, student led warm up and skill practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Adapting and modifying games Mini-tournaments – Singles and doubles.</td>
<td>Introduction to competition organization. Culminating event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>Transfer of learning, basic racket skills and underhand strokes. Forehand overhead clear and service. Court familiarisation</td>
<td>Continuation of SE from tennis to badminton, creation of task cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>Forehand overhead drop shot/smash. Backhand overhead drop and smash strokes. Attacking and defending principles.</td>
<td>Importance of festivity, student lead practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>Singles strategies, knowledge of rules and officiating. Doubles play – basics of playing with a partner. Evaluation and analysis of techniques.</td>
<td>Introduction of formal competition and culminating event organisation, students modified games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>Adapting and modifying games. Mini-tournaments – Singles and doubles</td>
<td>Culminating event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>Transfer of learning/skill transfer. The volley (setting)/dig (forearm pass), progressions.</td>
<td>Introduction of modified games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>The serve: Underarm and over arm serve. Development of game play – 2v2.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>Adapting and modifying games. Mini-tournaments</td>
<td>Culminating event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Structure of the SE net-games module
3.5.2 Participants

Several participants (and groups of participants) were involved in the research. The lecturer of the SE net-games module, the researcher and seven PSTs who were shadowed during their teaching placement were the main participants. During phase one of the research, the lecturer was in her first year lecturing in the University’s PETE programme. She had no previous lecturing experience but had taught school physical education for ten years in the United Kingdom and had just commenced postgraduate research in the same university. She was familiar with the SE model and possessed a keen interest in progressing PETE research. She was involved in the design of the SE net-games module and delivered the entire module. She participated in post-module interviews during phases one and three where her thoughts, observations and perceptions towards all aspects of the SE module were investigated.

The researcher was completing postgraduate research in the same university and was in his first year of research during phase one of the research. He had previously completed a physical education studies degree in another third level institution and investigated SE during his final year thesis research. The researcher assisted in the development of the SE net-games module with the lecturer and helped design some of the resources required for the module. During the module the researcher used observations to track the development of the module. During phase one he observed one class group for each of their twice weekly SE classes. In phase two he observed each of the three groups weekly for one of their two weekly classes. The researcher also observed the microteaching assessments and completion of SE portfolio assignments. The researcher conducted the interviews with the lecturer and all individual interviews and focus group interviews with the PSTs.
The PSTs observed in phases one and three were all in their third year of the PETE programme. The PSTs who were observed in class were invited to take part in focus groups regarding their experiences of the SE net-games module. In phase one, 10 PSTs volunteered to take part in focus group interviews and were randomly selected to form two focus groups of five PSTs. In phase three, one focus group from each of the three class groups being observed were formed to create three focus groups of five PSTs. Due to absences, one of these focus groups was reduced to three members.

In phase two of the research four PSTs who participated in the SE net-games module chose to complete their final year research project on their experiences teaching SE during teaching placement. These PSTs reflected on their delivery of SE and conducted focus groups with their pupils regarding their experiences of the SE season. One of these PSTs agreed to be observed weekly by the researcher, teaching SE during his teaching placement. He participated in a pre- and post-teaching placement interview and mid-focus group interview to engage with his occupational socialisation. He also participated in a post-lesson interview with the researcher, completed post-lesson reflections and had his scheme of work and lesson plans analysed by the researcher.

In phase four, experiences of seven PSTs (four PSTs from phase two and three PSTs from phase four) teaching SE during their teaching placement were explored. PSTs’ data were compiled as the focus for phase four. These PSTs volunteered to participate in this research and were interviewed pre- and post- their teaching placement and participated in a mid-teaching placement focus group interview with each other. These interviews explored PSTs’ occupational socialisation and their experiences of learning and delivering SE. A summary of all participants and data collection measures is illustrated in Table 3.3.
Table 3.3: Participants and data collection methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/ Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Phase 3</th>
<th>Phase 4</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Lecturer</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Researcher</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year three PSTs</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus groups, document analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews, focus groups, document analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciara</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews, focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conor</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews, focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews, focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemma</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews, focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews, focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews, focus groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 Data Collection

The data collection phase is the most prominent part of research (Flick, 2011). The term ‘data’ refers to the information that researchers collect from the context they are studying and “they are the particulars that form the basis of analysis” (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992, p.106). Creswell (2007) stated that “case study data collection involves an array of procedures as the researcher builds an in depth picture of the case” (p. 132). It is often the case with qualitative research that researchers “collect multiple forms of data and spend a considerable time in the natural setting gathering information” (Creswell, 2009, p.178). Qualitative data can be collected in a number of ways (Boeije,
2010, p.58), but are three popular methods of collecting data; observations, interviews and documents (Bassey, 1999; Angrosino, 2007). It is important to acknowledge that every data collection method carries its own limitation and therefore it can be useful to combine data collection methods (Flick, 2011). This research used a number of data collection measures to ensure the reliability of the data and results. Data was collected during extensive data collection periods spanning three and a half years. A full list of all the data collection procedures is illustrated in Table 3.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase One</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Observation of SE net-games module twice a week for 13 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interview with lecturer post-module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Two focus group interviews with five PSTs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase Two</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interview with PSTs pre- and post-teaching placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Weekly observation of SE lessons on teaching placements for nine weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Post-lesson interview with PSTs for nine weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mid-term focus group interview with four PSTs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Document analysis of scheme of work, lesson plans, postlesson reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase Three</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pre- and post-module interviews with three PSTs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Observation of SE net-games module once a week for 13 weeks for each of the three class groups of PSTs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Two interviews with lecturer pos-module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Three focus group interviews with PSTs (Two groups of five, one group of three)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase Four</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seven interviews with PSTs pre- and post-teaching placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Two mid-term focus group interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4: Phases and data collection methods

3.6.1 Observations

One of the primary data collection methods used in this research was observations. Observations are viewed as “one of the most important ways of collecting data in social research” (Thomas, 2009, p. 183). It is understood that observations in
qualitative research “are those in which the researcher takes field notes on the behaviour and activities of individuals at the research site…in these field notes the researcher records, in an unstructured or semi-structured way, activities at the research site” (Creswell, 2009, p. 181). Angrosino (2007) believes that observations are “the act of perceiving the activities and interrelationships of people in the field setting” (p. 37). Acknowledging that the “act of observation influences the observed in any case” (Flick, 2011, p. 225) and people act differently when they know they are being watched (Bassey, 1999), Flick (2011) encourages that an observer “maintains distance from the observed events in order to avoid influencing them” (p. 223). It is also important to consider how researchers will enter and leave the site so as to not disrupt the context (Boeije, 2010).

Observations were used during phases one, two and three of this research. In phases one and three lessons from the SE net-games module were observed weekly and in phase two one PST’s SE lessons were observed weekly. These observations took the form of non-participant observations, where “the researcher will observe the phenomena ‘from outside’ with no engagement with either the activity or the subjects” (Gratton & Jones, 2010, p. 177). Although some of the PSTs being observed were interviewed on various occasions, there was little researcher participation during the observations of phases one, two and three. The researcher used a log during the observations to note incidents which occurred during the lessons. The incident would be described and the researcher would give his perceptions of the incident.

There are a number of advantages to using observations, including having first hand experience with the participants, being able to record information as it happens, having incidents take place in their natural setting and enabling the researcher to
observe a wide variety of aspects (Gratton & Jones, 2010; Creswell, 2009). Disadvantages to using observations as a method of collecting data include remembering to take field notes and being required to record notes accurately for use in field notes (Creswell, 2007). It can also be an intrusive method, requiring the researcher to have the compulsory skills. The researcher may misunderstand what is going on, may affect the participants’ behaviour and sometimes private information may be observed that can not be recorded (Gratton & Jones, 2010; Creswell, 2009).

As “observation is generally more suitable for descriptive research than explanatory research” (Gratton & Jones, 2010, p.177), triangulation of observations with other data collection measures is used to increases the fluency of the data gathered (Flick, 2011). For this reason the observation data was supplemented with individual interviews, focus group interviews and document analysis.

### 3.6.2 Interviews

Interviews grow naturally out of observations to allow further understanding of participant’s behaviour (Angrosino, 2007). In research which employs researcher observations, the interview often acts as a conversation between friends (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). Interviews are used to “gather descriptive data in the subject’s own words so that the researcher can develop insights on how subjects interpret some piece of the world” (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992, p.96). Interviews have also been described as “a discussion with someone in which you try to get information from them” (Thomas, 2009, p.160).

Interviews are generally classified as structured, unstructured or semi-structured, and the interview method used in this research was semi-structured. In semi-structured interviews “some questions will demand fixed responses while others are presented as
themes to explore in depth” (O’Reilly, 2009, p. 126). Semi-structured interviews can provide the researcher with a deeper understanding of the participants’ experiences (Boeije, 2010). Thomas (2009) believes that “the semi-structured interview provides the best of both worlds as far as interviewing is concerned, combining the structure of a list of issues to be covered together with the freedom to follow up points as necessary” (p. 164). Semi-structured interviews were chosen for this research so that participants would respond to specific questions related to the research question whilst also being provided with an opportunity to gain insightful data on other areas not initially included in the interview script. Interviews were conducted on numerous occasions during this research. They were used to identify the lecturer’s experiences during phases one and three and the PSTs’ experiences during phases two and four.

There are a number of advantages with using interviews to collect data. Gratton and Jones (2010) believe;

Interviews can collect data concerned with concepts that are difficult or inappropriate to measure, tend to allow respondents much more freedom in terms of their answers, and tend to explore questions of ‘why’ and ‘how’ rather than the ‘how many’ and ‘when’” (p.155)

Interviews are useful when participants cannot easily be observed, and allows the researcher control over the line of questioning and participants to speak about previous experiences (Creswell, 2009). They also allow participants to talk in their own words, can be insightful and allow unexpected data to emerge and allow the researcher to develop relationships with participants (Gratton & Jones, 2010). There are some disadvantages to using interviews including requiring more resources and time, the researcher can add bias to results or dominate the interview, analysis can be difficult, information is provided in non-natural settings and some participants may provide
irrelevant information or be unable to articulate their perspectives (Creswell, 2009; Gratton & Jones, 2010). Creswell (2007) believes that “asking appropriate questions and relying on participants to discuss the meaning of their experiences require patience and skill on the part of the researcher” (p. 140). It is recommended that researchers choose participants who are not hesitant to speak and that interviews are conducted in a setting where they are comfortable (Creswell, 2007; Gratton & Jones, 2010). All the interviews in this research were conducted in settings in which participants were familiar. All interviews with the lecturer were conducted in the university, and the PSTs’ interviews were conducted either in the university or their teaching placement school.

3.6.3 Focus Groups

Focus groups are another form of interview and were used extensively in this research. Focus groups have been described as “an interview involving a group…interaction between members of the group is an important element in obtaining data” (Gratton & Jones, 2010, p. 156), believing that such interactions lead to a greater discussion and provide richer data. Flick (2011) believes that participants in a focus group are likely to provide more information than one-to-one interviews, Creswell (2007) agrees and believes that:

“Focus groups are advantageous when the interaction among interviewees will likely yield the best information, when interviewees are similar and cooperative with each other, when time to collect information is limited, and when individuals interviewed one-on-one may be hesitant to provide information” (p. 133)

During focus groups the aim is to get the group to take the lead of the discussion (Thomas, 2009). Focus groups are also low on cost and rich in data, help participants
remember specific events and are particularly useful when researchers wish to study opinions (Flick, 2011).

It is important that the group size for focus groups is considered to allow informative discussions while allowing everyone to participate (Boeije, 2010). Creswell (2007) further highlights that “care must be taken to encourage all participants to talk and to monitor individuals who may dominate the conversation” (p. 133). The focus groups in this research attempted to consist of five participants however, on some occasions, there were as little as three participants in the focus groups. In phases one and three of the research participants for the focus groups were casually selected after PSTs volunteered to take part. The focus groups used in phase two and four included the PSTs who were enacting SE during their teaching placement. It was intended that the nature of the focus group during these phases would encourage PSTs to discuss their experiences and provide insightful data. During all focus groups a semi-structured format of questioning was used.

It is recommended that researchers use an interview protocol to guide the interview questions (Creswell, 2007) and a protocol was used during both the one-to-one interviews and focus groups in this research. Interview protocols have been described as “a predesigned form used to record information collected during an observation or interview” (Creswell, 2007, p. 135) or “a list of issues which you want to cover” (Thomas, 2009, p. 164). The interview protocols used during this research were composed primarily of open-ended questions. Thomas (2009) believes that an open-ended question “is one that allows respondents to reply in whatever way they wish” (p. 162). On some occasions during the research an adapted version of an established interview protocol was used to determine PSTs’ occupational socialisation (Curtner-
Smith et al., 2008) (Appendix Five). On all other occasions an original interview protocol was developed which would address the specific research question and allowed for development of alternative areas (e.g. Appendix Three and Four). Focus group and interview protocols used throughout the research phases are referenced in the relevant phase chapters (Chapters 4-7)

3.6.4 Document Analysis

The types of documents analysed during the research included SE unit plan assignments in phases one and three, and lesson plans, scheme of works, and PST’s lesson reflections from phase two. It is believed that “gathering data from documents represents an entirely different proposition from gathering data from people” (Thomas, 2009, p. 170).

Advantages to using document analysis as a method of data collection include the ability to access these data at any time as it is a non-obtrusive method, data has been provided from participants in a thoughtful manner and it saves time of transcribing data (Creswell, 2009). However limitations to this method include the value of such documents if the creator was not articulate enough to transfer their perceptions to the document or the documents may have restricted permission access (Creswell, 2009). These documents should be used as a way of conceptualising already known information (Flick, 2011), and as such, the documents collected throughout this research were used to triangulate and support previously identified themes from the observations and interviews.
3.7 Data Analysis

Flick (2009) believes that the data analysis phase is the core of qualitative research (Flick, 2009). Data analysis is understood to be the process of “systematically searching and arranging the interview transcripts, fieldnotes, and other materials that you accumulate to increase your own understanding of them and to enable you to present what you have discovered to others” (Bilken, 1992, p. 153). Similarly, Creswell (2007) believes that “data analysis in qualitative research consists of preparing and organizing the data for analysis, then reducing the data into themes through a process of coding and condensing the codes, and finally representing the data in figures, tables, or a discussion” (p. 148). With regards to case studies, Yin (2009) believes that “data analysis consists of examining, categorizing, tabulating, testing, or otherwise recombing evidence, to draw empirically based conclusions” (p. 126). He also believes that analysing case study data is “one of the least developed and most difficult aspects of doing case studies” (p. 127). Data analysis can be pursued concurrently with the data collection or after the data has been collected. It is suggested that researchers do some analysis concurrently with the data collection in order to provide structure and direction to the data collection. However, the majority of the analysis should be left until after all the data has been gathered (Bilken, 1992). During this research some data analysis was conducted concurrently, guiding and enhancing future data collection methods.

There are a number of different procedures for data analysis. Miles and Huberman (1994) recommend three procedures for data analysis. Firstly, data reduction where data is reduced and organised through coding. Secondly, data display where data is illustrated on tables or charts. Finally, conclusion drawing/verification where you draw conclusions from the data collected. Creswell (2009) identifies six steps in data
analysis, (i) organise and prepare the data through transcribing etc, (ii) read all data to get a general sense of it, (iii) begin the coding process, (iv) use the codes to identify a number of themes, (v) consider how the themes will be presented in the results and (vi) make interpretations about the data. Bogdan and Biklen (1992) recommends similar procedures and suggests that “analysis involves working with data, organizing them, breaking them into manageable units, synthesizing them, searching for patterns, discovering what is important and what is to be learned, and deciding what you will tell others” (p. 153). Boeije (2010) provides a comprehensive description of the qualitative data analysis process and writes;

“qualitative analysis is the segmenting of data into relevant categories and the naming of these categories with codes while simultaneously generating the categories from the data. In the reassembling phase the categories are related to one another to generate theoretical understanding of the social phenomenon under study in terms of the research questions” (p. 76).

One method that is consistent across all these recommendations is the use of coding pieces of data to aid with the analysis.

3.7.1 Coding

Coding is “the most important tool for qualitative data analysis” (Boeije, 2010, p. 94). Coding as a data analysis technique “involves close exploration of collected data and assigning it codes, which may be names, categories, concepts, theoretical ideas or classes” (O’Rielly, 2009, p. 34). These codes can be defined as “tags or labels for assigning units of meaning to the descriptive or inferential information compiled during a study” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 56).
There have been numerous suggestions as to how the coding process should be conducted. Summarising the work of Gratton and Jones (2010) and Strauss and Corbin (1990) the following steps for coding data can be extrapolated. Firstly, read all data carefully and assign codes where necessary. Organise statements under their relevant codes, grouping similar codes together (especially those which relate to your research question). Finally, reread the data again to find cases that contradict or support your findings. The codes can be constructed beforehand from the literature or be developed ‘in vivo’ from the interview data or a combination of both (Flick, 2009; Creswell, 2009). The main goal of coding “is to break down and understand a text and to attach and develop categories and put them into an order” (Flick, 2009, p. 309).

Coding was used to analyse data across all four phases of this research. Although computerised data analysis programmes are considered to help with coding data, it was decided that the coding would be completed manually due to the distance programmes can put between the researcher and the data (Creswell, 2007).

3.7.2 Constant Comparison

Constant comparison was a second data analysis procedure employed during the research. It is acknowledged that the “constant comparative method involves going through your data again and again, comparing each element – phrase, sentence or paragraph – with all of the other elements” (Thomas, 2009, p. 198). Every time new data was gathered in this research, it was read to determine if new codes could be formulated and these codes were then tested against the previous data (Boeije, 2010). Constant comparison should be conducted in four phases. Firstly, ‘exploration’, where researchers explore the field and try to depict it accurately. Secondly, ‘specification’, where the researcher searches for similarities and differences. Thirdly, ‘reduction’,
where the core concept is described in relation to other concepts. Finally, ‘integration’, where a theory is developed and constant comparison is used to search for cases against which the theory is then tested (Wester, 1995). Boeije (2002) believes that although many researchers use constant comparison, few provide an account of how they use the method in their data analysis.

Identifying that the literature had not clarified how to analyse using constant comparison, Boeije (2002) provided a procedure for analysing interviews. Two of these steps were employed when analysing the interviews in this research. Firstly, comparison within a single interview was conducted where the codes attached to statements were compared against other statements within the interview, mirroring the steps of coding previously described. The second step involved analysing between interviews where “as soon as more than one interview has been conducted, the interviews are compared” (Boeije, 2002, p. 397). This step aims to further develop and support the themes from the previous interviews. Similar constant comparative analysis methods were used for the others sources of data collected. These data sources were analysed as one entity in the first instance and then between the other data sources. Data sources, such as a weekly observation, were analysed individually using constant comparison, then within other weekly observations. Once this comparison had been conducted they were then compared with the other data sources, e.g., interviews, focus groups and document analysis, to increase the credibility of the findings. The use of both coding and constant comparison during the data analysis phases enabled me to gain as much as possible from the data sources until saturation was achieved (Boeije, 2010).
Chapter 3: Methodology

3.8 Ethics

O’Rielly (2009) believes that “every social researcher must consider the ethical implications of conducting research which in myriad predictable and unpredictable ways may impact on the social world, on those involved in the research, as well as those not directly involved” (p. 57). Similarly, Gratton and Jones (2010) believe researchers “need to consider the ethical issues associated with the research, that is the question of whether your research design is socially and morally acceptable” (p. 121). Acknowledging these concerns, ethical approval was sought from the Physical Education and Sport Sciences Research Ethics Committee (PESSREC 74/08) prior to any data collection measures and subsequently approval was granted for all data collection methods. Prior to phase three of the research, additional data collection methods were to be employed, and a Chair’s decision research ethics form was completed and approval for additional data collection was granted. Three primary ethical procedures were employed during the research; voluntary participation, informed consent and confidentiality.

3.8.1 Voluntary participation

Gratton and Jones (2010) believe that the “obvious way to overcome ethical issues in terms of who participates may be that of asking for volunteers to take part” (p. 121). It is acknowledged that only those who are participating voluntarily and have been informed about the study should be involved in the data collection (Flick, 2011). All participants in this research voluntarily agreed to participate in the data collection methods. The lecturer volunteered to take part in all data collection and the PSTs who engaged in interviews and focus groups all volunteered after a call for participation was circulated. The class groups of PSTs who were observed during the SE net-games
module in phases one and three were not asked to volunteer. It is acknowledged that an involuntary sample may be accepted if the data collection method is unobtrusive (Gratton & Jones, 2010). In this case, ethical approval was granted for the class groups to be observed by the researcher during their SE net-games module.

3.8.2 Informed Consent

Gratton and Jones (2010) believe that after volunteering to partake in the data collection methods “each participant in the research should then be informed as to the nature of the study, and the use of the data supplied before data is collected from them” (p. 122). Requiring participants to sign informed consent forms is also viewed as ensuring ethical practice (Creswell, 2009, Flick 2011). Informed consent has been described as the researcher’s “obligation to outline fully the nature of the data collection and the purpose for which the data will be used to the people or community being studied in a style and language they can understand” (Boeije, 2010, p. 45). Flick (2009) believed that informed consent must be given by someone competent to do so, must adequately inform the participant of the research and ensure that the consent is voluntary. Each participant involved in the research read an information sheet (See Appendix One) outlining the purpose of the research and their involvement and signed an informed consent form (See Appendix Two).

3.8.3 Confidentiality

Confidentiality was the final ethical principle employed in the study. It is believed that “all participants should be informed as to who will have access to research data. Ideally this should be as few people as possible” (Gratton & Jones, 2010, p. 123). The participants in this research were all assured that only members of the research
team would have access to the data and that it would be kept secure at all times. Additionally it has been recommended that the identity of the participants be kept confidential (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Boeije, 2010; Gratton & Jones, 2010; Flick, 2011), and with this in mind all PSTs in this research were assigned pseudonyms for the presentation of findings.

3.9 Validity

Steps were taken throughout the data collection and analysis phases to ensure the validity of the findings. Validity is concerned with determining whether the research findings are accurate and honest from the viewpoint of the participants, researcher and reader (Creswell & Miller, 2000). Triangulation and member checking were used throughout this research to ensure the validity of the findings. Other validity steps were also followed, including using rich, thick descriptions to convey findings, clarifying the researcher bias at the start of the study, presenting the negative information that counters findings and spending a prolonged period in the field of study (Creswell, 2009).

3.9.1 Triangulation

Triangulation can be defined as “using several methods, or viewing things from several directions” (Thomas, 2009, p. 111) or “to view a research issue form at least two vantage points” (Flick, 2011, p. 186). Triangulation may involve using different participants or using the same participant but at different stages (Gratton & Jones, 2010). Triangulation is viewed as adding to the validity of the research if findings are consistent across data sources (Creswell, 2009). There are various types of triangulation and two types were employed in this research; data triangulation and methodological
triangulation. Data triangulation “combines data drawn from different sources and at different times, in different places or from different people” (Flick, 2011, p. 186). Flick (2009) clarifies that data triangulation is different from the use of different methods of collecting data. Thomas (2009) classifies methodological triangulation as “where more than one method would be used to collect data” (p. 111). Flick (2009) recommends that when addressing methodological triangulation, researchers “should try to combine methodological approaches which are rather clearly distinct in their focus and in the data they provide” (p. 448).

Data triangulation was used extensively within the research where more than one PST, or group of PSTs, was interviewed to explore their perceptions and experiences of SE. This type of triangulation is evident in phases one, three and four where a number of PSTs were involved in the data collection and the data from each PST were analysed across other PSTs in the same phase. Methodological triangulation was also frequently used throughout all phases of the research with different data sources being used to inform findings. An example of methodological triangulation in this research is evident in phase two where only one PST was the focus of the data collection but numerous data collection methods including interviews, focus groups, observations and document analysis were conducted with the PST.

There is contention regarding the effectiveness of triangulation, with some authors believing that not all data needs verification from other kinds of research and that it is significant by itself (Thomas, 2009). It is also possible that triangulation may increase the error in your conclusion if you are given dishonest information on more than one occasion (Gratton & Jones, 2010). Methodological triangulation is criticised on
the basis that each different approach to collecting data yields different data which may not easily be compared (Boeije, 2010).

3.9.2 Member Checking

Boeije (2010) affirms that if qualitative research provides accurate descriptions of participant experiences, then the participants should recognise these experiences as their own. The process of asking participants to confirm that data is their own is known as member checking and is widely acknowledged in the literature (Gratton & Jones, 2010; Creswell, 2009). Member checking is seen as “a direct test of the reliability of the observation” (Boeije, 2010, p. 177) and Creswell (2009) recommends that researchers to enhance and verify the accuracy of their findings. Member checking was completed at all phases of the research where participants were provided with a copy of their interview transcript and were asked to verify that the contents were correct.

3.10 Researcher bias and subjectivity

It was perhaps inevitable for the research findings to have been influenced by my own bias and subjectivity, be it unintentional or otherwise. However, I did take all reasonable steps to ensure that my influence would be minimal. During the observations reported in chapters 4, 5 and 6 the participants knew the purpose of data collection and I played no formal role in the lesson by sitting at the side of the class and taking notes of my observations. I was perhaps most influential when observing Barry’s teaching in chapter 5 as both he and I acknowledge that I had an influence on his teaching by debriefing at the end of every lesson. However, although I somewhat influenced Barry’s teaching it would have been no more influential than had Barry’s cooperating teacher had knowledge of SE. It is also likely that I may have influenced the responses
which I received during the interviews and focus groups which were conducted throughout all phases of the research. All efforts were made during the interviews and focus groups to assure the PSTs that the data would be kept confidential and that the purpose of the research was to improve practice within the PETE programme. Additionally the PSTs were familiar with me from my time spent observing the net games SE module. I believe I had built a relaxed relationship with them and, as participation in the data analysis was voluntary, I believe that the PSTs were comfortable talking openly and honestly about their experiences.

It is also possible that I influenced the data analysis. Every effort was made to be thorough during the data analysis process so that all themes arising from the data would be considered and data was reanalysed to identify additional data to support each theme. Additionally, triangulation was used extensively to strengthen and verify findings from other sources of data or from other participants. Although it is possible that bias was evident in analysing the data, my aim for the research project was to identify the realities of SE within an Irish context with minimal reference to a hypothesis of any kind. I agree with and conform to Hardy and Bryman’s (2004) belief that, although there are opportunities for researchers to “twist findings intentionally during data analysis”, the majority of researchers “are committed to presenting an analysis that is faithful to the data” (p. 7). I believe that although I may have unintentionally biased the data collection and analysis, the findings presented in this thesis are an honest and accurate account of the research to which they are attached.
Chapter 4: Perceptions of a SE season in PETE

‘Living the curriculum’: Integrating sport education into a physical education teacher education programme

Paper published in the European Physical Education Review

4.1 Abstract

This study recognises the paucity of research regarding how pre-service teachers learn to use Sport Education (SE) in their physical education teacher education (PETE) programmes (Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2010). This study provides an experience in PETE where pre-service teachers ‘live the curriculum’ (Oslin, Collier & Mitchell, 2001) and experienced a SE season (Siedentop, 1994) as participants. Data was collected through weekly observations, researcher and lecturer reflections and interviews and focus groups with the lecturer and pre-service teachers. The results provide support for the ‘live the curriculum’ experience from the perspective of the pre-service teachers. It was indicated however that there were occasions when the lecturer was compromised between teaching through SE while teaching pre-service teachers how to teach SE in schools. It was also observed that there was a diminishing awareness of SE towards the end of the module. Recommendations for the inclusion of SE in PETE are also provided.

4.2 Introduction

With the effectiveness of Sport Education (SE) clearly fore grounded in the literature (Wallhead & O'Sullivan, 2005; Kinchin, 2006), researchers have started to call for research to be conducted on how pre-service teachers (PSTs) learn to use SE (McCaughtry, Sofo, Rovegno & Curtner-Smith, 2004; McMahon & MacPhail, 2007).
One recommendation that arose in the literature is for PETE programmes to offer PSTs an opportunity to experience a SE season in which they are a participant (Collier, 1998; Kinchin, Penney & Clarke, 2005). However, few studies have provided an analysis of these experiences and have instead given a description of the methods used with limited or no presentation of the findings of the experience (Osli, Collier & Mitchell, 2001; Jenkins, 2004; Kinchin, Penney & Clarke, 2005).

This study provides PSTs with an experience similar to those recommended in the research, and attempts to determine the effectiveness of the experience. The findings will help support the recommendations provided in the literature and identify potential problems which may arise as a result of PSTs experiencing SE through a ‘living the curriculum’ approach.

4.2.1 Model-based instruction

PETE programmes have started to encourage their PSTs to use a variety of curriculum and instructional models (IMs) while teaching (Gurvitch, Lund & Metzler, 2008) an approach that has been identified as Model Based Instruction (MBI). Gurvitch et al. (2008) believe that having knowledge of a variety of IMs will improve teacher effectiveness. MBI presents teachers with a range of IMs, including SE, Tactical Games and Cooperative Learning, from which to guide their instruction. The selection of the IM they use is determined by a number of factors including the class group, content and goals of the module (Gurvitch et al., 2008).

The application of MBI in one particular PETE programme is examined in detail in the Journal of Teaching Physical Education 2008 Monograph edited by Gurvitch et al (2008). The editors stress that the development of MBI should be viewed as “new and different” rather than “new and better” as there is limited evidence to suggest the
effectiveness of such an approach over other approaches. In light of such an admission, findings presented in the monograph need to be identified as early small-scale findings rather than significant concrete conclusions. The monograph has provided a starting point in which to pursue the concept of MBI further and initiated a number of encouraging findings.

The special edition provided initial evidence in support of MBI’s use from the perspective of both PST and their students. It was identified that the PSTs used MBI effectively on their teaching practice, that they appreciated and enjoyed using it, and that they saw the advantages to using MBI as opposed to traditional approaches (Gurvitch, Blankenship, Metzler & Lund, 2008). Research following these PSTs into their careers as initial teachers identified that direct instruction strategies were still favoured however. The majority of initial teachers admitted they would only sometimes use the more student centred and indirect IMs (Gurvitch & Blankenship, 2008). Gurvitch et al., (2008) proposed that research needs to be conducted to qualify the claim that PSTs who learn one IM well in PETE will be more likely to implement it in the future. One of the most acknowledged IMs within MBI, and the most frequently taught in PETE programmes (Ayers & Housner, 2008) is SE. In the context of this study SE will be used to examine how one IM within MBI can be included into a PETE programme.

4.2.2 Sport Education

SE is an IM that provides students with positive and authentic sport experiences while developing students as “competent, literate and enthusiastic sportspeople” (Siedentop, 1994; pg 4). Students are encouraged to be (a) competent in that they are able to play the game with a required level of sport specific skill and tactical awareness,
(b) literate in that they recognize and value the rules and traditions associated with the sport and, (c) enthusiastic in that they wish to develop and preserve the sporting culture through their participation. SE is defined by six key characteristics, (1) Sports are organised into seasons that are generally longer than traditional sporting units taught as part of a PE programme, (2) all students are members of a team and remain on that team for the duration of the season, (3) sport seasons are defined by practice and formal competition where the emphasis on affiliation and competition make the sport seasons more meaningful, (4) sport seasons usually end with a culminating event, which provides goals for the player to work toward throughout the season, (5) records are kept throughout the season and provide feedback for individuals and teams and, (6) festivity is encouraged and enhances the meaning for participants and adds an important social element to the experience (Siedentop, 1994).

Research has provided strong support for the SE model, with positive findings being observed in the areas of gender inclusion (MacPhail, Gorely, Kirk & Kinchin, 2008), student enjoyment of the model (MacPhail, Kinchin & Kirk, 2003), enjoyment of roles (Hastie & Sinelnikov, 2006), teamwork (Hastie & Curtner-Smith, 2006) game performance (Wallhead & Ntoumanis, 2004), the inclusion of lower skilled students (Pill, 2008) and fair play (Sinelnikov & Hastie, 2008). Research has examined the differing perceptions of boys (Kinchin, Wardle, Roderick & Sprosen, 2004), and girls (Hastie, 1998 a) to the model. A variety of sports have been taught through the model including netball, gymnastics, athletics (Clarke & Quill, 2003), rugby (Kinchin et al., 2004), badminton (Brunton, 2003) and ultimate Frisbee (Hastie 1998 b). SE has also been implemented among a range of age groups including primary (MacPhail, Kirk &
Kinchin, 2004), secondary (Clarke & Quill, 2003), and collegiate physical activity
courses (Bennett & Hastie, 1997).

The primarily positive outcomes of SE identified in the literature, encourages
teachers and PSTs to use the model. The importance of teachers in the effective delivery
of SE cannot be underestimated (Hastie, 1998 b, Kinchin, 2003, Kim, Penney, Cho &
Choi, 2006) and teachers’ perceptions and uses of SE have received much attention in
the literature (e.g. McMahon & MacPhail, 2007; Curtner-Smith, Hastie & Kinchin,
2008; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009). There is a shortfall however of research regarding
PSTs’ experiences of learning and using SE.

4.2.3 Teachers’ and pre-service teachers experiences of SE

Teachers have commented that using SE provided them with more time to
observe, correct and praise students (Brunton 2003), it made assessment easier (Clarke
& Quill, 2003), and it resulted in students having a better understanding of the game,
teamwork and tactics (Carlson, 1995). Some of the inhibitors to using SE have been
found to be time (Clarke & Quill 2003), and students’ maturity levels to perform roles
effectively (Curnrow & Macdonald, 1995). It is informative to examine these inhibitors
in a PETE programme context, expecting maturity levels of PSTs to be higher than
those of school students and hence an ability to perform roles related to SE more
effectively.

There have been numerous attempts to analyse teachers’ uses of SE and
understand further their perceptions of using SE. Curtner-Smith et al., (2008) observed
ten beginning physical education teachers who were teaching SE. The authors found
that the teachers delivered SE in one of three ways; ‘full version’, ‘cafeteria style’ or
‘watered down version’. Using SE in its ‘full version’ results in the user delivering
seasons that are congruent with Siedentop’s (1994) characteristics, noted above. The ‘watered down version’ denotes that the user implements some elements of SE but omits many elements that transform traditional sporting units into SE, while the ‘cafeteria style’ incorporates ‘only parts of SE’ within traditional sporting units. They concluded that in order for teachers to teach SE in its ‘full version’, teachers must have a supportive working environment and a high quality introduction to SE in their PETE programme. When these factors were not present SE was delivered in either a ‘watered down’ or ‘cafeteria style’ approach, and in one case it was not possible to identify any aspects of SE in the delivery of physical education. This study aims to attend to the requirement of high quality SE in PETE by providing a PETE experience similar to those recommended in the literature (e.g. Collier, 1998).

Some authors have noted the gap in the research literature regarding how teachers learn to teach and use the SE model and have conducted research to eliminate these omissions (e.g. McMahon & MacPhail, 2007; McCaughtry et al., 2004). McCaughtry and his colleagues (2004) reported findings from two groups of PSTs using SE for the first time. It was noticed that the PSTs left out vital aspects of the SE model, did not appreciate the model and they thought it was too much work. The authors reported that the majority of PSTs expressed that they would not use the model again. The authors believe that it was as a result of the PSTs’ initial misunderstanding of the SE model that hindered their learning most.

McMahon and MacPhail (2007) also reported negative experiences of one PST using the SE model. The PST struggled to teach tactical game play and struggled to create situations where students learned from each other. The PST reflects that the reasons for not delivering the SE model in its entirety was a result of not receiving
Effective SE-PETE and her lack of experience of SE in turn having to rely on her own sporting experiences to teach it. The PST had only attended a lecture and a workshop on the model as well as readings she had undertaken independently.

Contrastingly more recently a study completed by Stran and Curtner-Smith (2009) observed two PSTs who attempted to use SE for the first time. Both teachers taught SE using the model in its ‘full version’ (Curtner-Smith et al, 2008). This was attributed not only to their orientation to teaching but to the high quality SE-PETE in which they received opportunities to experience and teach using SE. Similar results attributing the importance of high quality PETE and supportive working environments to the effective delivery of SE have been observed by Curtner-Smith and his colleagues (2008). However these PSTs were selected for observation as they had showed ‘superior potential’ in their PETE programme and it was believed that they would be likely candidates to use SE, it would be interesting to understand if other PSTs who had not shown ‘superior potential’ would have used SE to the same extent.

With evidence of teachers and PSTs using SE to varying extents, along with the importance of high quality PETE for the effective delivery of the model, it seems pertinent that research be conducted on the inclusion of SE in a PETE programme. This is one area of SE research that has received limited attention (McCaughtry et al., 2004; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2010) and McCaughtry et al. (2004) believe such research offers fruitful extensions of, and a missing companion to, SE’s development.

4.2.4 SE and PETE programmes

It has been suggested that SE should be included as a principle component of any PETE programme (Alexander & Luckman, 2001; Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Dyson, Griffin
(Ayers & Housner, 2008) SE was the most popular curricular model being taught, although corresponding research sharing the experiences gained in SE on such programmes is missing.

A number of researchers have attempted to provide recommendations as how to teach SE in a PETE programme. Collier (1998) provided suggestions in which SE could be introduced to PETE. Firstly, she proposed to include SE through faculty modeling, where faculty would teach a performance/practical course through SE while PSTs experience the course as participants (supported by Kinchin, 2003). Secondly, she encouraged the use of focused observations, where PSTs would be provided with an opportunity to observe SE being done well in practice. And finally, she advised PSTs to teach in clinical and field settings, allowing the PSTs the opportunity to teach using the model to their classmates and eventually in their teaching practice placements.

Stran and Curtner-Smith (2009) similarly believe that the core of any PETE programme where SE is included should adhere to a number of recommendations. They believe programmes should promote the teaching of a series of faculty-presented mini seasons within early field experiences as well as PST designed seasons on teaching practice. They believe that faculty member credibility, their commitment to training teachers and their preparation to do so, and their understanding and appreciation of the PSTs’ acculturation, are significant factors in preparing PSTs to use SE. They further believe that their willingness to contrast effective and ineffective pedagogies, supervise early field experiences and teaching practice closely and their ability to develop a technical language through which they and PSTs can discuss teaching also play a
considerable role in encouraging PSTs to use SE and facilitating their competence to do so.

Some authors have identified a number of pertinent implications for the effective inclusion of SE in PETE. McCaughtry et al. (2004) outlines some of these after experiencing failings of SE in their study. First, they emphasise that teacher educators have to be aware of the possible tendency for PSTs to retreat from tactical instruction when problems arise; such a retreat may be avoided by showing PSTs adaptations of SE or alerting them to the need to re-teach something. Second, teacher educators must reinforce the similarities, and most important the contrasts, between SE and traditional sport pedagogies. Third, this study highlights the relatively short retention of learning and the need to re-teach or reinforce SE at multiple times during the PSTs’ development. Fourth, there must be a balance between helping beginning teachers prepare for the realities of induction to new schools and enacting challenging and complex curriculum. Fifth, it is critical that teacher educators help PSTs to see the importance of the other types of learning involved in SE. Finally, teacher educators must be aware of PSTs’ initial scepticism and possible self-fulfilling, or rather defeating, tendencies. Such implications were recognised by the authors when the SE experience in PETE used for this study was being developed.

Few studies have provided a detailed insight into how SE has been included in PETE programmes. Kinchin et al., (2005) address this gap in the literature where they reflect on examples of SE in PETE and describe how they include SE in their PETE programme. They recognise that many studies reporting the positive findings of SE are delivered by experienced teachers, suggesting that these successes highlight the importance of quality programmes in PETE. They recommend that PETE programmes
include the following experiences within their programme. Firstly an initial lecture outlining the main aims and features of SE should be provided followed by an opportunity for PSTs to experience the module as a participant. They further recommend that lecturers planning and teaching in partnership with secondary teachers using SE, and observing SE being taught in schools, would give PSTs a sense of the reality of using SE in a school.

It has been identified that the majority of PETE programmes teach content and pedagogy in isolation of each other (Oslin, 2002). Oslin (2002) believes that such PETE programmes should allow their students to experience the curriculum firsthand, supporting Kinchin’s (2003) recommendation of delivering practical subject matter knowledge components using SE. Oslin et al., (2001) identify such experience as ‘living the curriculum’, advocating for the link to be made between pedagogical knowledge and subject matter knowledge (SMK) by delivering the two together in a PETE programme. In light of these recommendations the activity courses described by Oslin et al. (2001), Kinchin (2003) and Jenkins (2004) were taught through instructional models such as SE. Such courses allowed the PSTs to experience the curriculum as students and gain an enhanced appreciation and understanding for the model. Each study reported that the PSTs were successful at teaching SE during their field experiences and student teaching as a result of their SE experiences in their PETE programme.

While PETE SE research has focused on various methods and recommendations for including SE in PETE programmes, few studies have presented findings of the effectiveness of these recommendations. Further research is needed to provide support for the findings of Oslin et al. (2001), Kinchin (2003) and Jenkins (2004) that were among the few researchers who provided a description of how SE was included in
PETE and the findings of such approaches. Further research is also needed to determine the effectiveness of the recommendations related to the delivery of SE in PETE programmes outlined in the research. This paper aims to examine the effectiveness of popular recommendations made for SE’s inclusion in PETE by practically including SE in a PETE programme.

4.3 Theoretical Framework and Purpose

Along with MBI (Gurvitch et al., 2008), ‘living the curriculum’ as described by Oslin et al. (2001) provides a theoretical framework for the study. Oslin and her colleagues identify the importance of research focusing on enhancing pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) by integrating instructional models into the PETE programme. They endeavoured to enhance the PCK of their PSTs by integrating IMs into their physical activity courses, encouraging students to ‘live the curriculum’. PSTs need to be aware that teaching is more than knowing the subject matter and that it is essential to understand how students learn and what IMs would achieve their desired goals. It is anticipated that this can be addressed through allowing PSTs to ‘live the curriculum’.

The purpose of this study was to implement the recommendations in the literature and examine PSTs’ experiences of ‘living the curriculum’ in their PETE programme through SE. The research questions were, (i) Does a ‘living the curriculum’ focus provide PSTs with enhanced learning experiences? (ii) What future intentions do the PSTs have for using SE? (iii) What recommendations do the PSTs provide on how SE could be more effectively delivered through a PETE programme?
4.4 Methodology

4.4.1 PETE programme context

This study was conducted in a four-year undergraduate PETE programme in Ireland, which enrols approximately 80 students each academic year. During the four years PSTs are introduced to all areas of the Irish post-primary PE curriculum which are Aquatics, Adventure Activities, Athletics, Dance, Games, Gymnastics, Health Related Activity and related areas such as sociology, psychology, youth sport, teaching and learning, curriculum and assessment, inclusive practice and philosophy and aesthetics. PSTs also complete generic education modules undertaken by all the university’s PSTs across all teacher education programmes, and have a choice of an elective subject area that qualifies them to teach PE and one classroom based subject. Two formalised teaching practice placements reside in the programme with the first in the second semester of the second year being six weeks long and the second placement in the first semester of the final year being ten weeks long. During both placements the PSTs teach a required number of classes of PE and their chosen elective subject.

4.4.2 Participants

The first author was a graduate student in the same university the PETE programme resides. The first author worked with the second and third author to devise a SE net-games module and assisted in the delivery of the module, developing additional handouts and resources for the PSTs. The third author was in her first year of university lecturing. She was a qualified PE teacher and had taught PE for ten years prior to taking the position in the university. She was familiar with the SE model from her own practice and had a strong interest in contributing to research in PETE practices.
The 20 PSTs followed throughout this study were one group among 75 year 3 PSTs. The group consisted of seven males and thirteen females with an age range from 19 to 30 years. This group of PSTs was randomly selected and observed by the first author during a practical module of net-games that was a mandatory part of the PETE programme.

4.4.3 Structure of the SE net-games module

SE was incorporated into a 12-week net-games module that focused on tennis, badminton and volleyball. The module included two 1-hour practical classes a week. The module was purposely structured to include all key aspects of SE and inform the PSTs of SE-related effective teaching practices to be used in school. The lecturer taught the PSTs through SE similar to how a teacher in a school would teach SE. For the purpose of “living the curriculum” the PSTs were required to select teams and remain on that team for the entire module. They also completed team sheets, picked team colours and names and participated in practices and competitions as part of their team. Consistent with SE, within their team the PSTs were required to take roles such as warm-up officer, coach, equipment manager, and referee, further roles of statistician, timekeeper etc. were not emphasised within the season due to time constrictions. Throughout the module, practices were organised in such a way that allowed the coach of each team to deliver the lecturer’s content to the rest of their team. The season consisted of 3 mini seasons of Tennis, Badminton and Volleyball, in an attempt to incorporate an adequate number of sports to compliment the net-games focus of the module. The PSTs stayed within their team throughout the three mini seasons and completed in culminating events for the Tennis and Badminton seasons, each of these culminating events were preceded by a pre-season and season phase. For the purpose of
assessment PSTs were required to teach their peers for a short lesson and each team were required to design a SE season which they would be able to use on their future teaching practice placement. The structure of the module is outlined in Table 4.1.

4.4.4 Data Collection

Multiple methods of data collection were employed throughout the module. The researcher conducted independent observations of the PSTs and the lecturer, focusing particularly on critical incidents, the reactions of students to the teaching style and the lecturer’s use of the model. From these observations he also kept reflective log diaries (Bell, 1993) of each of the classes. The lecturer of the module also kept reflective log diaries on her perceptions of the module, including her thoughts on what worked effectively/ineffectively and the PSTs’ reactions to the content.

On completion of the module, focus groups (Rubin & Rubin, 1995) were conducted with ten of the PSTs. The participants volunteered to take part in the focus groups after an expression of interest was offered to all PSTs in the class group, all participants read participant information sheets outlining the purpose of the focus groups and signed informed consent forms. The 10 PSTs were randomly selected to form two groups of 5 PSTs each. These focus groups followed a semi-structured format, which granted freedom for the participants and the interviewer to follow other lines of discussion if relevant. The focus groups were aimed at evaluating the PSTs’ experiences of the module and how they perceived the value of the learning experiences they received. They were also encouraged to express their future intentions for using SE. The lecturer was also interviewed (Greenfield, 2002) in order to gather her reflections of how she evaluated the PSTs’ learning experiences through “living the curriculum” and her own experiences of delivering a SE net-games module.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Practical aspect</th>
<th>SE aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Introduction to basic racket skills through short-tennis/pickleball.</td>
<td>Introduction to SE, nomination of team coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Introduction to groundstrokes. Basic tactics: utilising court space to best advantage</td>
<td>Team selection methods, team affiliation methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Development of attacking and defending principles. Doubles play – basics of playing with a partner. Evaluation and analysis of techniques</td>
<td>Introduction of roles, task card teaching methods, student led warm up and skill practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Adapting and modifying games Mini-tournaments – Singles and doubles.</td>
<td>Introduction to competition organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>Transfer of learning, basic racket skills and underhand strokes. Forehand overhead clear and service. Court familiarisation: singles and doubles.</td>
<td>Continuation of SE from tennis to badminton, creation of task cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>Forehand overhead drop shot/smash. Backhand overhead drop and smash strokes. Attacking and defending principles.</td>
<td>Importance of festivity, student lead practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>Singles strategies, knowledge of rules and officiating. Doubles play – basics of playing with a partner. Evaluation and analysis of techniques.</td>
<td>Introduction of formal competition and culminating event organisation, students modified games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>Adapting and modifying games. Mini-tournaments – Singles and doubles</td>
<td>Competition day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>Transfer of learning/skill transfer. The volley (setting)/dig (forearm pass), progressions.</td>
<td>Introduction of modified games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>The serve: Underarm and over arm serve. Development of game play – 2v2.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>Adapting and modifying games. Mini-tournaments – 2v2 and 6v6.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Structure of the module
PSTs’ peer teaching assessments were observed to determine the aspects of SE that they favoured in their pedagogy. The PSTs’ SE seasons that they designed in teams as an assessment requirement were also gathered and analysed with a view to inform the researcher of their depth of understanding and potential application of SE.

4.4.5 Data Analysis

All recordings from the interview and focus groups were transcribed and analysed using thematic coding (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). The data was analysed to identify any reoccurring themes or themes which were consistent or conflicting with the literature on PSTs’ experiences with SE. The reflective log diaries from both the researcher and the lecturer were also analysed using thematic coding where comparing or contrasting themes where identified. Peer teaching assessments and PSTs’ SE season plans were analysed in a similar manner.

4.5 Results

Two main themes, (1) the delivery of a net-games module through SE and (2) recommendations for the inclusion of SE in PETE programmes, were identified from analysis of the data. Those themes and the accompanying sub-themes will be presented herein.

4.5.1 (1) Delivery of a net-games module through SE

4.5.1.1 Diminishing awareness of SE

One of the most noticeable features from the observations of the module and analysis of the PSTs’ focus groups was that the SE theme faded as the weeks went on;

“I don’t know did the whole Sport Education team role kind of go out the window in volleyball a bit, do you know and a little bit towards the end of
badminton whereas the other weeks we were all working in our groups all the time and then I didn’t really find in volleyball that Sport Education was really in it so much it was more like getting the drills done and stuff” (Ciara, Focus Group #2).

Other PSTs noticed similar trends when asked to describe the module;

“It was tennis and badminton and volleyball and then we were taught it through Sport Education … for tennis and badminton we were, and volleyball just kind of dropped off to the more traditional” (Sarah, Focus Group #1).

One PST reported enjoying the tennis section of the module more as it was delivered through SE, “I thought tennis was good as well because we were really in our teams for that so we were working with the same people all this time and amm it was just good fun that way” (Cathy, Focus Group #1).

On numerous occasions during the middle and latter stages of the module, the SE theme was noted by the researcher to have been omitted. Extracts from the researchers observations include “the class were not in their SE teams at all” (Researcher’s Log: Week 5, Session 2) “this lesson contained little emphasis on the teams or their roles” (Researcher’s Log: Week 9, Session 1), “throughout the session they were in groups but these were not their SE groups. The SE atmosphere also seems to have been lost slightly” (Researcher’s Log: Week 9, Session 2) and “this session again failed to implement SE in a few occasions when it would have been appropriate, however the students enjoyed the session greatly and learned a lot” (Researcher’s Log: Week 10, Session 2).

Aware of this diminishing awareness of SE one of the PSTs recommended to “keep it going the whole way through so you get the full experience of it and get the three competitions and see how they work (Sarah, Focus Group #1). In response to
PSTs’ diminishing awareness of SE as the module progressed the lecturer commented that “I felt that after 8 weeks of 2 lessons a week so that’s 16 hours …. I felt that was appropriate enough to develop for them to understand the Sport Education model” (Lecturer, Interview).

The lecturer expressed concerns about the effectiveness of the PSTs’ student coaches (Lecturer’s Log: Week 2, Session 1 & 2; Week 4, Session 1 & 2; Week 5, Session 1) and this may have lead to her not prioritising SE towards the end of the module. In later sessions she decided to deliver some of the lesson content herself as opposed to the student coaches (Lecturer’s Log: Week 7, session 2). She also “noticed that the enthusiasm of the group [towards the SE concept] decreased significantly” (Lecturer’s Log: Week 8, Session 2) where she identified that SE worked really well at the start of the module but she believed their interest for SE reduced towards the end of the module. The lecturer appeared to consciously move away from the SE model believing the PSTs “did understand the concept fully and I just felt that I was repeating myself because we had already done two sports and to do another sport through it might have been overkill” (Lecturer, Interview). McCaughtry et al., (2004) conversely believe that there is a need to re-teach or reinforce SE at multiple occasions during the PSTs PETE programme. This recommendation is consistent with the PSTs’ desires for other modules and activities to be delivered through SE. The lecturer’s opinion in this study questions whether there is a conflict between including SE while maintaining a teacher education focus.

4.5.1.2 Conflict between teacher education and SE

There were some instances where the inclusion of SE in the module appeared to have a negative effect on the PSTs’ teacher education. The lecturer believed “what
Sport Education lacks is the skill development aspect” (Lecturer, Interview) and experienced “from having taught it myself in a school situation I found the skill levels have dropped significantly by using a full Sport Education model delivery” (Lecturer, Interview).

The researcher had observed during one session that the SE focus was lost due to a stronger focus towards teacher education. The researcher wrote that he “felt that this session was orientated towards teacher education much more than usual. Because of this the SE aspect was lost slightly” (Researchers Log: Week 5, Session 2). It was evident that the lecturer had spent additional time improving their ability to teach the skills rather than participating in a SE season where they would be taught by their peers. A similar situation occurred later in the module where the researcher observed that the “lesson contained little emphasis on the teams or their roles but this was a result of [the name of lecturer] introducing volleyball for the first time” (Researchers Log: Week 9, Session 1).

The lecturer also expressed a conflict between her efforts to educate the PSTs as effective teachers while also integrating SE to the extent intended;

“it was hard in a way sometimes delivering it to [PSTs] because they weren’t buying into it all the time and it was hard to keep the momentum going because I was trying to teach them so many different things, I couldn’t do that just through Sport Education because then it would have been a disservice to them so sometimes I found myself coming away from Sport Education to be able to deliver it effectively” (Lecturer, Interview)

The lecturer appeared over-critical with respect to the effect her staying true to the teaching of SE was having on the PSTs’ ability to deliver SE in schools, perhaps finding it difficult to have faith in the learning that PSTs would encounter from their peers rather than from her instruction.
4.5.2 (2) Recommendations for SE in PETE

4.5.2.1 Do more sports within a SE season / do a SE unit for longer

The most common suggestion made by the PSTs was for the module to have lasted for longer and incorporate other sports in a similar manner. One of the PSTs was keen for the module to be run for longer to get the full benefit of the experience;

“[Do it for] a longer time, don’t include as many activities into the one module like kind of split it up over the two semesters you can have 2 activities in one semester and 2 activities the next semester so you won’t be rushing everything into say two or three weeks the way we did volleyball” (Martin, Focus Group #2)

Additionally, Martin suggested that in an effort to maximise the benefits of the module to “keep on doing it throughout the 4 years”. He was concerned that if it was only done once for one semester PSTs would forget it and that if it were done throughout the four years of the programme that “it will be on the top of your head straight away” (Martin, Focus Group #2). Ciara similarly suggested doing “another net-games module like…have more time to expand maybe more time to spend on Sport Education” (Focus Group #2).

Another PST suggested if she could change the module she would “have more sports in it…I would have loved to have seen it done like through basketball or a sport I wouldn’t be confident” (Emma, Focus Group #1). Other PSTs echoed this preference and it was suggested to “do it with all the sports we did like instead of just doing it through net-games do it in soccer do it in rugby do it in Gaelic football” (Martin, Focus Group #2).
4.5.2.2 *Do the module earlier in the programme*

This module was the PSTs’ first significant exposure to the SE model. Many of the PSTs believed that the module should have been run earlier in their PETE programme rather than in their third year, “we are in third year now it’s a bit late, to be honest, should have kicked off straight away in first year” (Tim, Focus Group #1). Sarah suggested “to have it in second year in the first semester of second year so then you have it ready for your second year [teaching practice]” (Focus Group #1). Supporting Sarah’s comment another PST suggested that “it would have been nice if we had that before going on teaching practice last year we could have actually gone out and tried it for the 6 weeks” (Jacob, Focus Group #2).

Another benefit of an earlier exposure to SE was that they “would have time in second year to try it out and then fourth year refine it see what works and what doesn’t work” (Eve, Focus Group #1) with a concern that;

“When you have never tried something in a school before or you have never seen it been done in a school before you’re kind of a little bit more apprehensive about it, but if you [could use it] in second year where [the accumulated grades] didn’t count towards [the final degree classification]” (Sarah, Focus Group #1)

Using SE in a teaching practice placement is a recommendation shared by other researchers (e.g. Collier, 1998; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009). Many studies have offered similar opportunities for their PSTs and it has been observed that these PSTs use SE positively in their future practice (e.g. Kinchin, 2003; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009). Such opportunities give the PSTs a valuable opportunity to practice SE in a context where they have support and feedback from their university supervisors and co-operating teachers in the school.
4.5.2.3 University supervisors’ and co-operating teachers’ understanding and appreciation of SE

One concern that the PSTs had about using the SE model was the perception their allocated university supervisor would have if they used it on their future final year teaching practice placement. A number of PSTs expressed that their use of the SE model would depend on the supervisor that they have, expressing that “it really does depend on the tutor” (Emma, Focus Group #1). Tim felt that the university supervisor might be sceptical about the SE model;

“If the tutor is going to call on the third week and you have only had one week to set it up the second week problems are going to arise he is going to arrive on the third week you’re going to say hold on a minute cut the power with this a minute get the tutor out of the way and I’ll go back to it” (Focus Group #1)

The PSTs felt that the university supervisor and cooperating teachers may not appreciate and understand the SE model. Martin was concerned with this possibility and wondered would “all tutors and lecturers 100% understand what Sport Education is” (Focus Group #2). In an attempt to resolve this issue it was suggested that the university supervisor would not call out to observe or assess the classes where SE was being used. Additionally the PSTs suggested to “give the tutor … a presentation on Sport Education” (Emma, Focus Group #1) so they would understand the SE concept.

4.5.2.4 Provide similar modules for other instructional models

The lecturer responsible for delivering this module suggested that other IMs should be taught in a similar way to teaching net-games through SE, allowing PSTs to “live the curriculum” (Oslin et al, 2001) of other models;

“[PSTs] need to be taught a range of teaching strategies…they need to be aware of the different teaching methods available to them whether it is Teaching
Games for Understanding or Sport Education it should be done they should have the opportunity to live the actual teaching method” (Lecturer, Interview).

She further recommended “they [PSTs] do a number of [activity] modules throughout the course so the other teaching models can be addressed the way that Sport Education was addressed through net-games” (Lecturer, Interview). She also identifies this in her reflective log, “it is beneficial to use a range of strategies” (Lecturer’s Log: Week 8, Session 2).

This recommendation is consistent with Dyson et al., (2004) who have suggested that SE, tactical games and cooperative learning should be mandatory models in any PETE programme. Furthermore, it has been suggested that PSTs learn by doing (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008) and Oslin (2002) cites the work of Graham (1995) who suggests that teacher education programmes should model the characteristics and qualities of the programmes we hope to see implemented in schools. PETE programmes are effective for preparing teachers to use curriculum and instructional models and PSTs should be given the opportunity to experience the model as both students and teachers (Gurvitch, Blankenship, Metzler & Lund, 2008; Metzler et al., 2008).

4.6 Discussion

Consistent with recommendations provided by Darling-Hammond (2000) this study supports the notion that subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge being taught together can provide positive learning experiences for PSTs. It also supports the recommendation to provide a practical SE experience in PETE programmes (Collier, 1998; Kinchin et al., 2005), as the PSTs made reference to the effectiveness of the experience on numerous occasions.
Using Oslin et al’s (2001) concept to “live the curriculum” provided a useful framework in which to structure the experience, within this framework a number of implications were identified which should be addressed when developing similar experiences in the future. Firstly it is imperative that the SE experience is as similar as possible to what is to be expected in schools, while highlighting practices including various aspects of SE in disparate settings. The SE theme should be present throughout the module and efforts should be made not to let its focus diminish during the duration of the module. Secondly it should be ensured that all areas of a particular curriculum model are taught in detail so that PSTs have the required understanding of the model. And thirdly, participating in a SE season should provide the PSTs with a vital opportunity to observe SE being taught well, appreciate the pedagogical difficulties associated with using SE and understand methods of overcoming these difficulties.

It became evident that there was a conflict on some occasions between the inclusion of SE and the effectiveness of the PSTs’ teacher education. This conflict led the lecturer to retreat from teaching through SE towards the end of the module, believing she was unable to complement both. Alexander and Penney (2005) shared this concern believing that SE restricts the ability of the teacher to introduce their expertise to the session. It is interesting that the lecturer was not confident in the PSTs’ ability to teach each other the skills they would need for their future profession. While similar concerns regarding the effectiveness of the student coaches has been recognised in the literature (Carlson & Hastie, 1997; Alexander & Luckman, 2001; Alexander & Penney, 2005), it would have been expected that PSTs would have had the required pedagogical and subject matter knowledge required to perform the role of student coach. The reality of preparing PSTs to effectively deliver SE in a school setting is a difficult process for a
teacher educators and may not necessary be conducive in all contexts to producing effective teachers.

There was also a difference of perspectives over the appropriate length of the SE season. The lecturer believed that by eight weeks of SE the PSTs had received sufficient experience and she worried that there was a lack of enthusiasm from the PSTs. The PSTs however recommended that the SE theme should have been continued through to the end of the module (12 weeks). Perhaps this diminishing awareness of SE led one of the groups to omit the SE characteristics of record keeping from their SE unit plan, as it was not covered during the module. There are a number of reasons as to why the lecturer may have felt it was time to move away from SE. Firstly, she believed it was too difficult to convey content knowledge while maintaining a SE emphasis in her lesson. She believed the PSTs’ knowledge of volleyball was low and perhaps believed she needed to dedicate more time to develop their content knowledge of the basic skills of volleyball. Secondly, the lecturer acknowledged using SE previously during her teaching career and admitted being sceptical of the proposed benefits of SE. Perhaps this scepticism led to her never being fully confident of the benefit of the SE model to PSTs. However she later admitted a change in her opinion of the effectiveness of SE as an IM on completion of teaching the module. Thirdly, there could have also been a novelty factor for the PSTs associated with being part of a SE season for the first time.

It is possible that the lecturer’s previous experiences teaching SE and her perceptions of the effectiveness of student coaches led her to retreat to her ‘curricular zone of safety’ (Rovegno, 1994). Although the lecture would not have shared the same concerns of pedagogical content knowledge and capabilities as the teachers in Rovegno’s (1994) study, it is likely that her responsibility to develop the PSTs as
Chapter 4: Perceptions of a SE season in PETE

effective teachers encouraged her to retreat from SE to teach in a style she was familiar with.

The study identified a number of recommendations as to how SE could be included in a PETE programme. First, and foremost, the study qualified the inclusion of SE in PETE programmes as a worthwhile venture, qualifying the effectiveness of PSTs experiencing SE as intended to be delivered in schools. This provides support for the recommendations to allow PSTs to become participants in a SE season similar to one that would be delivered in a school context (Collier, 1998; Oslin et al., 2001; Kinchin et al., 2005).

It was recommended from this study that if the module was being offered again that it would be available in the first or second year of the PETE programme. This would provide the PSTs with the opportunity to use the SE model on their first teaching practice where they could use SE with the aid of prescribed lessons provided by the PETE faculty, similar to a recommendation provided by Kinchin et al. (2005). Delivering SE during teaching practice placement is a recommendation shared by other researchers (e.g. Collier, 1998; Kinchin et al., 2005; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009). Many studies have offered similar opportunities for their PSTs and it has been observed that these PSTs use SE positively in future practice (Kinchin, 2003; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009). However, it is not clear that if this approach was adopted the extent to which the PSTs would be able to contextualise a curriculum model which is new to them without having been on teaching practice and experienced the reality of teaching PE. The lecturer was concerned regarding the lack of content knowledge that the year 3 PSTs had. If this module was delivered earlier in the PETE
programme PSTs may have less content knowledge, perhaps compromising their development of SE.

It is also recommended that the PSTs’ university supervisors and co-operating teachers have a knowledge and understanding of the SE model so they are equipped to offer support and feedback to PSTs using the SE model. It may be unrealistic to presume that all university supervisors and co-operating teachers will have an appropriate level of understanding and appreciation for the model. Similar findings were observed by Lund, Gurvitch and Metzler (2008) who while examining the influences of cooperating teachers adoption of MBI, found that some cooperating teachers confused MBI and the spectrum of teaching styles. Similarly it was noted that cooperating teacher’s lack of knowledge of MBI acted as an inhibitor to the PSTs using MBI (Gurvitch, Blankenship, Metzler & Lund, 2008). Methods of overcoming this obstacle must be explored and in-service training could be offered to all university supervisors and cooperating teachers on various curriculum models and IMs. While on teaching practice PSTs could be granted one or two classes which, while still observed by the university supervisor, are exempt from formal/external assessment where the PSTs could use them as an opportunity to gain experience using curriculum and instructional models. These opportunities would potentially encourage PSTs to try new and innovative teaching strategies and IMs with an increased confidence that such trials would not necessarily have a detrimental effect to the physical education lesson.

It has also been recommended that other curricular activities or IMs should be presented in a similar manner during the PSTs’ PETE programme. This recommendation mirrors efforts made by Georgia State University, where PSTs are exposed to a variety of Instructional Models during their PETE programme through
‘immersion’ (Gurvitch et al., 2008), similar to the ‘live the curriculum’ approach in this study. Teacher educators would be required to possess considerable expertise in both the areas of the content they are teaching and the curriculum or instructional model that they are teaching through. Such expertise may not be a reality among many teacher educators who have knowledge in a particular subject area.

Worryingly there was little reference to the aims of SE at developing competent, literate and enthusiastic sportspeople during the focus groups with the PSTs. They did not appear to appreciate these three factors as being SE’s foundational aims.

While the research on the area of living the curriculum and the inclusion of SE within PETE programmes is at an early stage, the findings presented here support further investigation into this area. A number of areas for further research have been identified through the process of this research. Research where PSTs have the opportunity to use the SE model on their teaching practice placement and where opportunities have been offered allowing the PSTs to refine their use of the SE model would offer an extension to the discussion on how best to include the model in a PETE programme. Longitudinal studies, which examine the PSTs use of the SE model as beginning and experienced teachers, would provide valuable feedback on the supports and constraints within contexts that impact on the extent to which SE is a permanent feature of the school PE programme, and how teachers pursue and promote the SE model in their practice.

**Link to Chapter 5:**

It was appreciated that to fully understand the effectiveness of the SE net-games module PSTs would need to be observed teaching SE in schools. This application of
knowledge from a PETE programme to the application of teaching in a school on teaching placement is the focus of Chapter 5.
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A Pre-service Teacher’s Delivery of Sport Education: Influences, Difficulties and Continued use

This paper has been recommended for publication in the Journal for Teaching in Physical Education

5.1 Abstract

How pre-service teachers (PSTs) learn and deliver Sport Education (SE) (Siedentop, 1994) is an area researchers believe warrants further investigation (Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a). This study explores one PST’s experiences delivering SE during a school teaching placement after undertaking a practical SE module in his Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) programme. Data were collected through pre-, mid- and post-teaching placement interviews, along with weekly visits by the first author where observation reflections and interviews were used to investigate his experiences delivering SE. Data were triangulated and analyzed using thematic coding. Occupational socialization (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b) was used to determine the factors which influenced his delivery of SE. Results showed his SE season was influenced by his teaching orientation, sporting experiences, PETE programme and school context where he was teaching. Although he encountered difficulties, he valued SE’s benefits and continued to use it during his subsequent career as a qualified teacher.

5.2 Introduction

Sport Education (SE) is a curriculum and instructional model for physical education which aims to develop students as competent, literate and enthusiastic
sportspeople through experiencing sport authentically (Siedentop, 1994, p. 3-4). SE differs from traditional sporting units as sports are delivered in extended seasons, students affiliate to a team for the duration of the season, and adopt roles and responsibilities within their team. The season is organized around a formal competition phase and ends with a culminating event. Concepts such as record keeping and festivity are continually encouraged throughout the season to make the experience more meaningful and enjoyable for the participants (Siedentop, Hastie, & van der Mars, 2011). To date there have been three comprehensive reviews of literature on SE (Hastie et al., 2011; Kinchin, 2006; Wallhead & O'Sullivan, 2005), highlighting the overwhelming successes of the module in a variety of settings. It has been identified that there is a lack of research concerning how pre-service or in-service teachers learn and use SE (McMahon & MacPhail, 2007; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2010), with some researchers suggesting that this type of research is vital for the effective development of SE (McCaughtry, Sofo, Rovegno, & Curtner-Smith, 2004).

There are varied findings in the literature regarding pre-service and beginning teacher’s experiences teaching SE for the first time. Pre-service teachers (PSTs) have been observed omitting vital aspects of the model and struggling with the increased workload required (McCaughtry et al., 2004), as well as struggling to embed tactical game play in a SE season and encouraging students to work with each other (McMahon & MacPhail, 2007). The PST in McMahon and MacPhail’s (2007) study admitted to not having sufficient opportunities to learn SE in her Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) programme, while McCaughtry et al. (2004) believed that the PSTs’ initial misunderstandings of SE resulted in them never appreciating and learning the SE model effectively. Curtner-Smith, Hastie and Kinchin (2008) also reported that some
beginning teachers had difficulty maintaining the fidelity to the model. Conversely, Curtner-Smith and Sofo (2004) observed that PSTs preferred SE to multi-activity teaching (Siedentop, Mand, & Taggart, 1986) and that SE’s structure facilitated smoother lessons, which were more beneficial to their students. Sinelnikov (2009) observed similar positive findings with two teachers who took part in SE in-service training. These teachers taught SE effectively but had some difficulties of initially relinquishing control and sought confirmation of the appropriateness of their teaching of SE, with such worries easing as the season progressed. Stran and Curtner-Smith (2009a, 2009b, 2010) have since observed two PSTs teaching SE successfully, believing one of the primary reasons being the quality of their PETE programme in offering effective experiences to learn SE. There is, however little evidence of teachers’ continuing use of SE after its initial introduction to their physical education programs (Alexander & Luckman, 2001).

The inclusion and effectiveness of SE in PETE programs is another area that has received limited attention in the research studies on SE (Kinchin, Penney, & Clarke, 2005). It has been suggested that SE should be a primary component of PETE programs (Alexander & Luckman, 2001; Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Dyson, Griffin, & Hastie, 2004) and descriptive analysis of PETE programs show that it is the most popular curricular model being taught in PETE in the United States (Ayers & Housner, 2008). Kinchin, Penney and Clarke (2005) have recognized that many of the SE seasons reported in the literature were delivered by experienced teachers, highlighting the importance of PETE programs to develop teachers with such expertise.

Curtner-Smith (2012) reviewed the literature on SE in PETE and has complied recommendations for PETE programs to train their PSTs to use SE effectively. One of
the most common of these recommendations is for PETE programs to provide PSTs with the opportunity to experience SE as a participant, where subject matter knowledge is delivered through a SE season, enhancing the PSTs’ understanding and appreciation of SE (Collier, 1998; Gurvitch, Lund & Metzler, 2008; Jenkins, 2004; Kinchin, 2003; Kinchin et al., 2005; Oslin, Collier, & Mitchell, 2001). Kinchin et al. (2005) believed such an experience should be preceded by an initial lecture on SE and encompass lectures developed by both PETE faculty and teachers who have taught SE. It has been recommended that PSTs should have an opportunity to observe SE being taught successfully in schools (Collier, 1998; Kinchin, 2003; Kinchin et al., 2005) and to teach SE on early field experiences and final year teaching placements in schools with both faculty and self-designed seasons (Collier, 1998; Kinchin, 2003; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a). Curtner-Smith (2012) believed that a number of conditions are favorable for PSTs teaching SE for the first time, including being supervised by faculty familiar with SE, dispositions of students to be involved in SE and holding PSTs accountable for effectively implementing the model. PSTs are encouraged to teach faculty designed seasons ensuring they teach all aspects of the model and experience the model’s advantages (Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a). Future seasons may be designed by the PSTs, allowing them to experiment with their own versions and visions of SE. Partnerships between schools, and school-based research on SE, is also encouraged and have been observed to aid PSTs’ learning of SE (Kinchin, 2012; Kinchin et al., 2005). Curtner-Smith (2012) believes that the more these strategies are provided in PETE, the more beneficial the learning experience will be, and PSTs’ learning, and possibility of using SE, will be increased.
Minimal PETE research provides an insight into the effectiveness of the above recommendations. Oslin et al.’s (2001) PETE programme offered an experience of a SE season similar to what school students were likely to experience, where PSTs would ‘Live the Curriculum’. Oslin et al. (2001) commented that the PSTs used SE with ease during their teaching placements and had improved their understanding of the concepts of SE. Jenkins (2004) and Kinchin (2003) provided comparable experiences to PSTs with similar consequences in their implementation of SE. The construction of such experiences require considerable time and effort (Kinchin, 2003) and require PETE faculty to possess adequate knowledge in both the content to be taught and SE (Oslin et al., 2001).

5.3 Theoretical Framework and Purpose

Occupational socialization has emerged as a framework to understand how PSTs learn and practice SE during and after their PETE programs (e.g., Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Curtner-Smith, 2001; Hutchinson, 1993). Occupational socialization has been defined as “all kinds of socialization that initially influence persons to enter the field of physical education and that later are responsible for their perceptions and actions as teacher educators and teachers” (Lawson, 1986, p. 107). Lawson (1983a) proposed that three kinds of socialization are possible for teachers: (a) ‘acculturation’, (b) ‘professional socialization’ and (c) ‘organizational socialization’.

‘Acculturation’ refers to any experience that influences teachers to pursue their future profession. Acculturation begins at birth and these experiences are more influential at shaping PSTs attitudes towards teaching than teacher education (Lortie, 1975). From a young age, students are exposed to teachers and sport in school and from
this exposure they comprehend the role of a teacher and develop opinions on how to teach (Schempp & Graber, 1992). These experiences are called the ‘apprenticeship of observation’ (Lortie, 1975), and act as the first introduction to the teaching profession. Each person develops a subjective warrant, which consists of their perceptions of the requirements for teacher education and for teaching in schools (Lawson 1983a). Lawson, (1983a) hypothesized that from the acculturation phase: two types of recruits pursue a career in physical education teaching, (a) those with a more prominent coaching orientation and (b) those who favor a teaching orientation. Lawson (1983a; 1983b) suggests that teachers with a coaching orientation will view teaching as a career contingency and will possess custodial orientations and have a low commitment to teaching. On the other hand teachers with a teaching orientation will view coaching as a career contingency and will be more likely to possess innovative orientations and have a higher commitment to teaching. It has since been acknowledged that recruits may possess a moderate coaching orientation, Curtner-Smith et al. (2008) describe this as recruits who are not adverse to teaching physical education, but are more attracted to the role of physical education teaching by the prospect of working with extracurricular sports teams within the school.

‘Professional socialization’ refers to the process where “would be and experienced teachers acquire and maintain the values, sensitivities, skills, and knowledge that are deemed ideal for teaching physical education” (Lawson 1983a, p. 4), and is expected to occur in teacher education programs. Lawson (1983a) suggests that recruits’ previously acquired subjective warrant can act as a resistance to efforts made by teacher educators to challenge them. It is imperative that teacher educators do all
they can to structure PETE programs in such a way that is beneficial to PSTs’
development and the production of effective physical education teachers.

‘Organizational socialization’ refers to “the process by means of which
prospective and experienced teachers acquire and maintain custodial ideology and the
knowledge and skills that are valued and rewarded by the organization” (Lawson,
1983a, p. 4). Teachers are introduced to a “landscape of teaching” (which varies in
school) (Schempp & Graber, 1992) and often face a dialectical process where their
subjective warrant and orientation to teaching, along with knowledge acquired in their
PETE programme, may be challenged within the school they are teaching (Lawson,
341), where teachers with orientations opposed to those of the school will adapt their
practices to fit in or continue with their orientations and fight back against the
socialization of the school. Lawson (1983b) believes that induction to teaching for some
begins in their teacher education programme while induction for others begins when
they enter schools as beginning teachers.

Occupational socialization has been used to analyse how pre- and in-service
teachers learn, interpret and deliver SE (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Curtner-Smith &
Sofo, 2004; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a). Researchers using occupational
socialization to examine teachers’ use of SE have identified that teachers can teach SE
in one of three ways (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). Firstly, in its ‘full version’, where a
season consistent with all of Siedentop’s (Siedentop et al., 2011) recommendations is
delivered. Secondly, in a ‘watered down version’, where parts of SE’s framework are
omitted from the season. And thirdly, in a ‘cafeteria style’, where only parts of SE
would be taught within traditional sporting units. It was concluded that for teachers to
teach SE in its ‘full version’, they would need to experience high quality SE-PETE with opportunities to teach SE whilst being supervised (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). There appears to be some discrepancy regarding the impact of coaching orientations to teaching on teachers’ delivery of SE. Curtner-Smith et al. (2008) found that teachers with a moderate or hard core teaching orientation were less likely to deliver the ‘full version’ of SE. It has been noted that high quality sporting experiences are associated with SE’s pedagogy, that SE appealed to PSTs as it was congruent with their previous sporting experiences and that it provided a working environment that replicated the world of extracurricular sport (Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004). It is questionable, however, how much emphasis we should place on teachers delivering SE in its ‘full version’, in particular for PSTs who are likely to be attempting to teach SE for the first time. It has been recommended that teachers using SE for the first time “do a very basic form of the model and then gradually add to its complexity” (Siedentop, Hastie, & van der Mars, 2004).

The occupational socialization research on SE suggests that high-quality SE-PETE experiences are vital for the successful delivery of the model, which includes multiple opportunities to experience, teach and critique SE (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a). However, it is also acknowledged that these experiences require considerable time and faculty expertise (Kinchin, 2003; Oslin et al., 2001). It has also been suggested that ideal scenarios for teaching SE on PSTs’ teaching placement would involve PSTs being supervised by cooperating teachers with knowledge of SE (Curtner-Smith, 2012) and it has been acknowledged that cooperating teachers with such knowledge may be limited (Meeteer, Housner, Bulger, Hawkins, & Weigand, 2012). Additionally, the teachers observed in many of the studies on SE were
selected as they were considered to be high quality teachers who were likely to use SE. Even when this selection process was applied, many teachers were unable to teach SE in its ‘full version’, with some choosing not to deliver it with particular student groups or, in one case, not teach SE at all (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a).

The SE research needs to continue to address the dearth of research regarding PSTs’ experiences of learning and delivering the model. Specifically, it needs to determine PSTs’ delivery of SE when they encounter differing SE-PETE experiences and teach in disparate school contexts. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the transition made by one PST from experiencing a SE season of net-games taught during a year three undergraduate module in a four-year PETE programme (Authors, 2011), to delivering a SE season on his subsequent year four teaching placement in schools and after his first year teaching as a qualified physical education teacher. Occupational socialization was a functional framework by which to understand the factors which influenced his interpretation and delivery of SE.

5.4 Method

In a bid to offer a rich insight into the realities of teaching SE in a school as a PST, the study followed a case study approach (Yin, 2009). Yin has defined case studies as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used” (1984). The PST was the sole participant in the study and an in-depth investigation was used in order to portray an accurate account of his experiences transitioning from learning SE in his PETE programme to delivering a season on his teaching placement. In order to do this,
multiple sources of evidence were collected and triangulated. The case study design has previously been used to examine SE seasons delivered by both pre-service and in-service teachers (McMahon & MacPhail, 2007; Sinelnikov, 2009).

5.4.1 Participant and PETE programme

Barry (pseudonym) was a 21 year-old male PST who was in his final year of study in a four-year PETE programme in Ireland. Barry had completed a practical SE experience during the previous year of his PETE programme. The module was designed by the first and second author along with the lecturer of the module, to be educative and prepare PSTs to teach SE in an Irish post-primary school setting. The lecturer of the module was an experienced teacher in her first year teaching in the PETE programme and was familiar with the SE model as a school physical education teacher. The module was delivered over thirteen weeks with hour-long practical sessions twice each week. During this experience, the lecturer modeled SE allowing the PSTs to ‘live the curriculum’ (Oslyn et al., 2001), where they experienced a SE season similar to how SE would be delivered in a school context. Disparate aspects of SE were introduced gradually over the SE season (Table 5.1), including team selection and affiliation (week 2), roles (week 3), formal competition and culminating event (week 4), record keeping (week 5), importance of festivity (week 6), refereeing (week 7) and the use of modified games (week 9). The SE season was divided into three mini seasons (three to four weeks each) of tennis, badminton and volleyball, respectively, in order to simulate teaching blocks in Irish post-primary schools, where sports are generally taught over
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approximately six weeks. The teams remained consistent throughout the three mini seasons and a culminating event was held at the end of each mini season. PSTs affiliated to a team, adopted various roles, and kept records of performance scores. Barry was formally assessed during the latter stages of the module, where he was required to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week / Activity</th>
<th>Activity Focus</th>
<th>Sport Education Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Week 1 - Basketball | Ball Handling skills  
Introduce rules of Basketball  
Participation in a small sided games of Basketball | Introduction to Sport Education  
Selection of captains  
Team selection using blind draft |
| Week 2 - Basketball | Introduction of lay up  
Introduction of set shot  
Play competitive game that addressed these skills | Announcement of teams  
Delegation of roles  
Introduction of warm-up coach  
Complete team affiliation sheet |
| Week 3 - Basketball | Introduction of dribbling  
Modified relay game to demonstrate shooting and dribbling skills | Introduction of equipment coach  
Introduction of skills coach |
| Week 4 - Basketball | Introduce chest pass and bounce pass  
Play full game incorporating the skills learned previously | Pre-competition games for ranking  
Discussion of culminating event;  
competition format, uniforms, festivities and awards |
| Week 5 - Basketball | Four teams played in two separate finals based on the rankings, top two teams played against each other as did the bottom two teams | Culminating Event  
National anthem, team colors, competitive games, awards for MVP and winning team, prizes for all students |
| Week 6 - Volleyball | Introduce volleyball  
Ball control skills  
Court familiarization  
Introduction of volley/ set | Change of team captains  
Revisit the focus of Sport Education and student roles  
Discuss how to improve season |
| Week 7 - Volleyball | Introduction of J4 Volleyball  
Progressions of volley/set  
Friendly team game | Introduce point scoring system  
Introduction of modified game |
| Week 8 - Volleyball | Introduce forearm pass  
Introduce responsibilities of referee  
Friendly team game | Introduction of role of referee  
Pre-competition games for ranking position  
Discussion of culminating event;  
competition format, uniforms, festivities and awards |
| Week 9 - Volleyball | Team with the highest points gets to pick their opponents in the semi final. The other two teams play in the other semi final. Winning teams play in the Grand Final. | Culminating Event  
National anthem, team colors, competitive games, awards for MVP and winning team, prizes for all students |

Table 5.1: Barry’s Sport Education season
micro-teach a group of his peers for 15 minutes while delivering either a warm-up, skill development or modified game phase of a SE lesson. Barry was also assessed through his SE portfolio, for which a group of five PSTs had to develop a sample season plan for a particular sport, including task cards and a discussion on how they would adapt SE to an Irish post-primary school context.

It was not possible to implement all the recommendations for SE-PETE (Curtner-Smith, 2012) within the PETE programme due to staffing expertise, time constraints and organizational constraints. It was not feasible to provide PSTs with an opportunity to see SE being taught in a school setting as there was no teacher in the local area using SE in their school physical education curriculum. Similarly, as physical education in Ireland was generally taught through direct teaching styles (MacPhail & Halbert, 2005; Sugrue, 2004), it was difficult to arrange university-school partnerships to show the reality of teaching SE in Irish post-primary schools. It was also not possible to allow PSTs a chance to teach SE during their early field experience during their second year of the PETE programme as there was no SE-PETE experience provided until their third year of the programme.

Subsequent to his participation in the module, Barry volunteered to continue his involvement in contributing to studying the SE experience by agreeing, in completing his final year project assignment, to reflect on his experiences of delivering SE in his year four teaching placement. During this period, Barry’s SE season was observed weekly by the first author. Barry was not supervised by the first author and these observations had no bearing on his grade and were solely for the purpose of data collection. The first author did, however, provide informal feedback and advice on some occasions during Barry’s teaching placement.
5.4.2 Setting

St John’s (pseudonym) was a co-educational post-primary school in a rural town in the east of Ireland. The school had an attendance of approximately 370 post-primary level students and an additional 42 students took part in an adult education course. The school was the only post primary school in its catchment area and there were single-sex post primary schools in adjoining towns and villages. The school had a gymnasium the size of a basketball court, two all-weather playing areas and one grass playing pitch. The school also had ample equipment to teach physical education and had a strong sporting ethos, particularly in the Gaelic games of hurling and football. The school had two full-time physical education teachers, a male and female, with one and three years of experience respectively. The female teacher was assigned as Barry’s cooperating teacher, observing some of Barry’s lessons and providing feedback and support. The school management also provided support to Barry during his teaching placement. There was not a predominant use of any curriculum models in the physical education programme at the particular school and none of the students in the school had experienced SE prior to Barry’s teaching placement. Barry’s cooperating teacher and the other physical education teacher both had limited knowledge of SE and were unable to provide feedback or advice specific to SE during Barry’s teaching placement.

Barry chose to introduce SE to one group, a Transition Year group of 19 students (aged 15-17 years). This decision was due to the group’s weekly time allocation for physical education being 70 minutes, implying there would be sufficient time to cover aspects of SE and the related content. In the Irish school system, Transition Year is a voluntary school year between the junior and senior cycle years, tending to focus on exploratory learning and work experience. The time allocated to
physical education in Transition Year tends to be higher than other years of post primary schooling. During Barry’s other weekly allocated classes, he taught through more traditional teaching styles, not relying on any curriculum or instructional models in particular. During his SE season, Barry introduced the concept of SE, identified captains, asked the captains to select teams, completed team affiliation processes and introduced various roles such as equipment coach, warm-up coach, skills coach and referee. The students adopted these roles during two mini seasons of basketball and volleyball (durations of five weeks and four weeks respectively) with culminating events at the end of each mini season. This design was congruent with his SE-PETE experience and also suited the school physical education programme, where individual sporting activities were generally taught over a period of five to six weeks. The students remained on the same team throughout the two mini seasons and roles were rotated on a weekly or bi-weekly basis.

5.4.3 Data Collection

A number of data collection techniques were employed to increase the reliability and triangulation of the data (Table 5.2). Barry participated in a pre-teaching placement interview, which investigated his acculturation to teaching, experiences of learning SE in PETE and his intentions to use SE during his teaching placement. Barry’s SE class was observed weekly for each of the nine weeks by the first author who kept a reflective journal (Bell, 1993) of incidents that occurred within the class. After each of the nine lessons, the first author conducted a post-lesson reflection interview with Barry that explored his perceptions of how effective the class had been and discussion on incidents
in the class. Barry also completed a written post-lesson reflection with reference to the same. Informal conversations about the previous and next lesson usually followed these interviews, where the first author would answer any queries Barry had concerning the sequencing of the SE season. Barry’s weekly lesson plan and his scheme of work for the SE season were also collected to cross reference Barry’s intentional and actual delivery of the lesson. In week five of the nine-week teaching placement, Barry participated in a focus groups with other PSTs who were also delivering SE during their teaching placement. 

Table 5.2: Data collection measures
placement, which investigated their initial experiences delivering SE. At the end of the season, a post-teaching placement interview was conducted with Barry, investigating the organizational socialization encouraged by the school culture he was teaching in, his perceptions of the SE season and any recommendations to enhance the inclusion of SE in the PETE programme. The final interview with Barry was conducted once he had completed eight months of his first year teaching as a qualified teacher. From the perspective of being a newly qualified teacher, this interview aimed to establish Barry’s continued (or discontinued) use of SE and his perceptions of his SE experiences he received through the PETE programme. Ethical approval was granted by the relevant University’s Research Ethics Committee.

5.4.4 Data Analysis

All interviews and focus groups were transcribed verbatim. Lesson observations were typed weekly and Barry’s lesson plans and post-lesson reflections were collected weekly. Each week, the lesson plan, lesson observation, post-lesson interview and post-lesson reflection, were all compiled onto a word processing document so all data relevant to each lesson were together. All data sources were analyzed using thematic coding (Rubin & Rubin, 1995), where the data were read and re-read to identify themes. Evidence supporting the respective themes for each lesson was compiled on one document for each week of the SE unit. On completion of the SE unit, each theme and respective evidence arising from the nine week SE unit were collated for analysis. The pre-, mid- and post- interviews were analyzed in a similar way and appropriate evidence to support themes was merged with the data arising over the nine week SE unit. The noted themes were then collapsed into main themes to facilitate analysis and presentation of the findings. Barry’s acculturation was primarily determined from
analysis of his previous school and sporting experiences and his reasons for becoming a physical education teacher, collected through his pre-teaching placement interview, which used an adapted interview script previously used by Curtner-Smith et al. (2008). His professional socialization was determined to some extent from analysis of previous research on the SE experience he received in PETE (Authors, 2011). This was supported by data from Barry’s pre- and post-teaching placement interviews, where he discussed his PETE experiences and how they subsequently aided his teaching of SE. Understanding Barry’s organizational socialization was aided through analyzing the first author’s weekly observations of SE in the school as well as the postteaching placement interview and informal conversations between the first author and Barry throughout the teaching placement.

5.4.5 Reliability and Trustworthiness

Data from interviews were transcribed verbatim by the first author to eliminate errors and ensure reliability. Member checking was conducted with Barry, during which he read a copy of the transcripts and verified their content. Data (from Barry and the first author) were triangulated to ensure a variety of data sources were used to support each theme.

5.5 Results

Three main themes were identified through analysis of all the data sources. The first main theme of ‘Influence of occupational socialization’ relied heavily on specific questions in his pre-, mid- and post-teaching placement interviews, which explored his acculturation to teaching, the influence of his PETE programme and the organizational socialization he experienced during his teaching placement. These questions, along with
subthemes, such as references to external sport, using a facilitator style approach, similar season to PETE, presence of cooperating teacher and influence of first author, helped to consolidate this theme. The second main theme of ‘Difficulties encountered while delivering SE’ was developed through the collapsing of subthemes such as amount of planning, disruptions in the timetable and the lack of effectiveness of student coaches. Finally, the third main theme of ‘The enduring enjoyment of SE’ was developed from the subthemes including student and teacher enthusiasm, positive student teacher relationship, using SE in other classes and the teacher’s continued use of SE.

5.5.1 Influence of Occupational Socialization

5.5.1.1 Acculturation – influence of a teaching orientation with a coaching disposition.

Barry appeared to possess a teaching orientation but had a strong disposition to coaching as well. Barry spoke about the significant role of sport in his life as a result of his family, “My father and brother would be very active... there is a big history of [traditional Gaelic games] so ah so that’s where it kind of funneled into me” (Pre-teaching placement interview). He was a successful athlete and played sport at the regional level (Pre-teaching placement interview). He spoke about influential coaches, in particular a, “county minor coach, he was I felt he was excellent he kind of respected you...he valued your opinion and he kind of did like to delegate responsibility...he was friendly” (Pre-teaching placement interview). When asked why he pursued a career in teaching, Barry illustrated his teaching orientation and influence of his disposition to coaching, “I suppose I would have been influenced a lot from my own PE teacher...I felt that also my high interest in sport I would be suitable for the job” (Pre-teaching
placement interview). Barry’s PETE programme appeared to have offered him an opportunity to challenge some misconceptions he had towards teaching, which could perhaps be attributed to his involvement in organized sport, “I was always of the view that it was all towards competition that was the way I was kind of brought up … whereas now I see participation as a huge factor, participation at any level” (Pre-teaching placement interview). Barry also expressed that he was strongly influenced by PETE faculty who promoted participation in physical education, “I think I was most kind of influenced by teachers who focused on, or lecturers who focused on, participation” (Pre-teaching placement interview).

Barry’s teaching orientation and disposition to coaching were clearly evident during the SE season. He rarely taught didactically and often asked the students for feedback on practices (Lesson observations 2, 8), adopted a facilitator style approach (Lesson observations 3, 6, 8), asked the students what changes they would like to make to the season (Lesson observation 6), and used the captains to resolve issues in the team (Lesson observations 6, 8). He also repeatedly related practices to his own personal sporting experiences and, on numerous occasions he related class situations to the Irish Gaelic games (Lesson observations 5, 6, 9), which had influenced Barry strongly during his childhood (Pre-teaching placement interview). He also made efforts to connect his basketball season to the National Basketball Association (Lesson observations 2, 5) and other national/international events with the use of national anthems during culminating events (Lesson observations 5, 9).
5.5.1.2 Professional socialization – reproducing and critiquing the SE-PETE experience.

Barry’s delivery of SE was visibly influenced by the PETE programme, with the first author observing on numerous occasions that Barry delivered a SE season similar to the one he had experienced in the PETE programme. Similarities in the design of the SE season Barry experienced as part of the PETE programme, and what he chose to deliver in the school SE season, included participation in basketball from weeks 1-5 and volleyball from weeks 6-9, with a culminating event at the end of each mini season.

In addition, Barry used the same team selection methods (Lesson plan and Lesson observation 1), similar team affiliation procedures (Lesson plan and Lesson observation 2) and similar practices for preparing skills coaches to perform their role (Lesson plan and Lesson observation 3). There were a number of occasions where the first author observed that Barry used games and practices that were similar to those shared in his SE-PETE module (e.g., Lesson observations 3, 6, 7). Barry commented on the influence of his SE-PETE experience:

Well I suppose I based a lot of what I did, on the Sport Education model that I did [in PETE] …most of the features that [the lecturer] included in hers I definitely replicated in mine, I kind of picked and chose what were going to work the best. (Post-teaching placement interview)

Barry was also constructively critical of the SE-PETE module he had experienced, believing that the module was compromised in attempting to introduce and assess three sports along with SE in 12 weeks. Prior to beginning his teaching placement, he commented:

I felt maybe we could have had more time actually experiencing Sport Education. It was 12 weeks of maybe an hour or two a week which to go
through a Sport Education season plus learn how to teach three different games was very intense. (Pre-teaching placement interview)

A feature that was absent from his SE-PETE experience was the opportunity to observe SE being delivered in a school physical education context. Barry believed that “even if you got a class or a [post-primary] class in for a few weeks it would be helpful just to observe the class as [the lecturer] teaches it” (Post-teaching placement interview). Barry expanded:

Sport Education…it looked so perfect when teaching with [the lecturer] because she had the control of PE students. In real life it’s a whole different kind of ball game…going to a school and observing Sport Education would be a great asset to the module itself. (Post-teaching placement interview)

5.5.1.3 Organizational socialization – extent of support structures in the school context.

The organizational socialization Barry encountered within his school affected his delivery of SE. Prior to beginning his teaching placement, Barry had met his cooperating teachers and received positive feedback regarding his proposed use of SE, “They are very positive towards it…one of the teachers have asked could they perform the Sport Education model with another class while I was there” (Pre-teaching placement interview). Barry frequently commented on the supportive structures in the physical education department and in the wider school community. He spoke about the school having a unified approach to teaching and how it was easy to ask for help and support from other members of staff (Post-teaching placement interview). Barry also spoke about the flexibility of the physical education programme in the school and how he was not restricted in his use of teaching styles or class content:
[The content of the physical education classes] is left up to the teacher themselves. There is no kind of conversation or discussion about the teaching or learning strategies that you do use in your class…I was free to teach whatever teaching or learning strategies I did want to use. (Pre-teaching placement interview)

However, neither of Barry’s cooperating teachers had used SE previously in the school and their only exposure had been during short introductions to the model in their teacher education programme and in-service training (Pre-teaching placement interview). The first author also observed little or no supervision of Barry’s SE lessons during his teaching placement placements (Lesson observations 1-9). Additionally, Barry’s university supervisor was also unfamiliar with the model:

She didn’t know too much basically about Sport Education. She was very new to that particular teaching model…it may have been more effective if obviously if she had some experience or knowledge of Sport Education to give me appropriate or really direct concise feedback. (Post-teaching placement interview)

The only source of direct SE feedback Barry received came from the first author during informal conversations before and after lessons. It was evident on a number of occasions that Barry had implemented some of the recommendations given to him by the first author. The first author had suggested Barry to consult the cooperating teacher to ensure teams were fair (Lesson observation 2), prepare a task card portfolio to aid the warm up coaches to perform their role (Lesson observation 4), use a point reward system rather than a point deduction system (Lesson observation 6), and promote the culminating event in his other non-PE class with the group (Lesson observation 8). At the end of his teaching placement, Barry spoke about the influence of the first author’s support on his SE season:

It was a definite help to again kind of have somebody else looking into your lesson in a different perspective to you…I think [it would have been difficult to
teach Sport Education without this support] because it was my first experience. It’s always nice to get some feedback from someone who has experience. (Post-teaching placement interview)

5.5.2 Difficulties Encountered while Delivering SE

Barry encountered some difficulties as he strived to deliver SE. One of the primary concerns Barry had was the effectiveness of his student coaches. Before his teaching placement commenced, Barry expressed concern that the student coaches may not be capable of performing their role, “You have the risk of maybe if the skills coach is maybe not competent enough to show a particular skill” (Pre-teaching placement interview), and again early in the SE season, “One thing that may not be as good is the quality of the coaching” (Post-lesson interview 3). During the early part of the SE season, the first author noted, “I am concerned with the ability of the warm-up coaches in delivering an effective warm-up” (Lesson observation 4). To counteract this, Barry used task cards to help aid the skills coaches (Lesson plans 3-8) and warm-up coaches (Lesson plans 5-8) and these additions helped the student coaches perform their role more effectively (Lesson observation 5, 6, 7, 8). Even as a qualified teacher, Barry was still unsure of the effectiveness of the student coaches, stating, “maybe the demonstration of the skills by some of the pupils who wouldn’t have a high ability, that would kind of be a [deterrent to using SE]” (Interview as qualified teacher).

Barry also admitted that planning his SE classes took a considerable amount of time, “there is definitely a bit more work in SE than in other classes” (Mid-term focus group). Similarly, he reflected after one session, “I had put a serious amount of preparation in before the class in terms of planning and making task cards” (Post-lesson reflection 6). The first author had also observed the considerable planning that Barry had spent on lessons (Lesson observations 4, 7). Barry reflected at the end of the season,
“One problem I probably encountered was there was a lot of preparation for the class more so than other classes” (Post-teaching placement interview). However, Barry believed that the additional workload was necessary for his first time using SE and did not believe that he would be less likely to use SE as a result of the additional workload required:

[after using SE a few times] you will build up kind of a stockpile if you like of resources so I think initially getting over that hill would definitely lessen the work load... I don’t think it would be a deterrent [to using SE] this extra work. (Post-teaching placement interview)

Teaching through SE also required a significant amount of structure and did not allow much room for absences and changes in class schedule. During a rescheduled class many of the students were absent and some did not have their physical education gear (Lesson observation 8). Barry reflected after the lesson, “I was slightly disappointed with the way the lesson went...there were a lot of distractions and disruptions to the [planned] lesson” (Post-lesson reflection 8). Subsequently, this lesson had an effect on the following week’s culminating event, which was also changed from the scheduled, “a few of the students did not have their gear as the class was changed from their original timetable. There was little evidence of team colors, another implication of the change in class time” (Lesson observation 9).

5.5.3 The Enduring Enjoyment of Delivering SE

It was clear throughout Barry’s teaching placement that he enjoyed teaching SE and appreciated its benefits. Even after only a few weeks of his teaching placement, Barry expressed how he enjoyed using SE, “it’s kind of one of the classes I look forward going in to teach...it’s a better atmosphere...it’s much more positive” (Mid-term focus group). Barry made references during the season to how he was enjoying the
season, commenting that in the lessons, “there was a very productive and positive environment” (Post-lesson reflection 2) and that he “was very happy with the lesson” (Post-lesson interview 7). Barry also appreciated the student teacher relationship commenting that “there are never any negative comment [from the students]” (Post-lesson interview 7) and talked about how he favored the change in student-teacher relationship, “yeah it’s not really a student-teacher relationship anymore it’s just nearly a facilitator, maybe someone in your club like an older player says to a younger player like ‘try this next time’” (Mid-term focus group).

At the end of the teaching placement, Barry was confident that he would like to deliver SE again. Reflecting on how he had incorporated SE into other physical education classes, he said, “I have blended it in to other classes in terms of I’ve used teams, I’ve used roles because it does alleviate a lot of the pressure on you” (Post-lesson interview 9). When reflecting back to his teaching placement, Barry spoke about his enjoyment of SE and his intentions to deliver SE again:

I definitely would use it again, I suppose starting off there is a lot of preparation that goes into it but then that class kind of runs more smoothly for you. So in that regard I would have been happy to use it again after teaching placement. (Interview as qualified teacher)

As a result of his positive experiences of SE during the PETE module and teaching placement, Barry was keen to attempt SE during his first year of teaching as a newly qualified teacher. Within his first year, he made a conscious choice to deliver it, believing SE would suit a particular student group:

I thought it might be beneficial with one particular group who are very happy very cooperative kind of group and they have a great attitude to PE and I thought that this might kind of promote their PE class...there is a wide range of abilities so like I said again this might level out the playing field making pupils more aware of the other students in their class. (Interview as qualified teacher)
Despite his enthusiasm to use SE, this was the only class that Barry used SE with, as he did not believe SE would work with some of his other class groups. Barry taught three different year groups but opted to deliver SE to only one second year class. He believed that the other groups were either too immature or disruptive to be given the increased freedom and responsibility of SE, “I felt that first years were a slight bit immature for it…my third years they are a troublesome group…so I have to use a very direct kind of teaching” (Interview as qualified teacher).

5.6 Discussion

Barry’s occupational socialization had a substantial influence on his experiences learning and delivering SE. Barry’s teaching orientation allowed him to easily adopt a facilitator style approach and relinquish control to his students, a practice encouraged by SE. In addition, his strong coaching disposition and sporting background encouraged him to promote authenticity by relating practices back to his personal sporting experiences. This somewhat contradicts the notion that teachers who possess a coaching orientation to teaching will deliver SE to lesser extents (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). Although Barry did convey a teaching orientation, his SE season was significantly enhanced due to the close link to external sport. As SE attempts to provide students with authentic sporting experiences (Siedentop, 1994), it would seem favourable that those delivering SE would have an experience of sport and coaching. It is also interesting to observe that Barry’s acculturation was further influenced during his time in the PETE programme, believing that his teaching orientation was strengthened by having experienced PETE faculty who focused on participation and innovative teaching styles.

The SE-PETE Barry experienced influenced the SE season he delivered during his teaching placement, admitting to building most of his school physical education SE
season around the SE-PETE season. This study supports the importance of PETE programs providing PSTs with an opportunity to experience the SE curriculum first hand as a participant (Jenkins, 2004; Kinchin, 2003; Oslin et al., 2001). Barry did admit that his exposure to SE in his PETE programme could have been enhanced. Specifically Barry would have appreciated the opportunity to observe SE being taught in a school setting. The PETE programme in this study was unable to provide Barry with this opportunity and some of the other opportunities recommended in the literature, such as teaching faculty designed SE seasons on early field experiences (Curtner-Smith, 2012). Such opportunities were not possible due to staffing and time constraints, along with a limited pool of physical education teachers practicing SE in post-primary schools in Ireland.

The organizational socialization Barry experienced within his school impacted his use of SE both positively and negatively. As Curtner-Smith et al. (2008) suggested the lack of custodial nature in the physical education department facilitated Barry’s delivery of SE. However, Barry had no formal support structures in the school as regards teaching SE as neither cooperating teacher had experience of SE. In this instance, the void was filled by the first author who provided weekly informal feedback and advice to Barry. This raises the issue of the currency in providing similar support structures during the planning and delivery phases of SE in schools as cooperating teachers with a knowledge of SE are limited (Meeteer et al., 2012). It is also unrealistic to expect all cooperating teachers to possess a sufficient level of knowledge in SE to provide feedback for PSTs attempting to deliver SE. Lund, Gurvitch and Metzler (2008) highlight the importance of cooperating teachers facilitating PSTs’ learning but found that only a small minority of cooperating teachers used SE in their physical education
programs. Future research needs to focus on practices that PETE programs can offer to facilitate the PSTs’ delivery of SE during their teaching placement in schools where appropriate support structures are limited. Barry’s university supervisor also had no experience of SE and, as a result, Barry chose not to have his university tutor visit the SE class as one of his official school visits. This may be another concern PSTs could have in attempting to deliver SE or other new teaching strategies during their final year teaching placement, where their teaching performance may have a relationship with grading and final certification.

The difficulties experienced by Barry while delivering SE are congruent with the findings of other researchers. Barry questioned whether student coaches possessed the necessary expertise required to teach their peers. Similar concerns regarding the effectiveness of student coaches have been shared in the literature (Alexander & Luckman, 2001; Brunton, 2003; Carlson & Hastie, 1997; Curnrow & Macdonald, 1995; McMahon & MacPhail, 2007; Wallhead & O'Sullivan, 2007). Consideration needs to be paid to the detriment of skill acquisition in physical education, which may arise when introducing students to the role of coach. Barry’s concern with the amount of planning required for the SE season is also acknowledged elsewhere (Pill, 2008). PETE programs need to be aware of these potential challenges that arise when PSTs attempt to introduce SE to K-12 physical education programs, and develop SE experiences in the PETE programme that allow PSTs to be aware of, and address, such challenges.

It was promising that Barry had chosen to deliver SE in his first year of teaching as a qualified teacher. There was no requirement for Barry to teach SE in his school but he continued to believe it would benefit his students, and delivered SE in a school where neither the students nor teachers had experience of SE. As minimal research has focused
on the longevity of SE in schools and it has been noted that SE’s presence in a school physical education curriculum can diminish after time (Alexander & Luckman, 2001), it is promising that Barry continues to implement SE as a qualified teacher. Barry was deliberately selective with his use of SE with one particular class, believing that it would not be suitable for some of his more disruptive class groups (Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a).

The authors chose not to place an emphasis on Barry implementing SE in its ‘full version’. Cognizant of the recommendations to implement SE gradually (Siedentop et al., 2004) and the difficulties many teachers face when delivering SE for the first time (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; McCaughtry et al., 2004; McMahon & MacPhail, 2007), it was deemed inappropriate to expect and require Barry to deliver a ‘full’ SE season. As SE is not yet commonplace in Irish post primary schools, it is difficult to provide Irish PSTs with opportunities to observe SE being taught well in practice and similarly difficult for PSTs to receive appropriate supervision and feedback from cooperating teachers who may not have a knowledge of SE. It is likely that some PETE programs face similar difficulties and that many schools may be unable to provide authentic and meaningful experiences deemed ideal for teaching SE. In addition, limited research has attempted to align the extent to which the SE model is used to the effectiveness of the related SE season. We should instead encourage the introduction of components of SE and gradually increase the content of the SE season, in a manner which reflects the teacher’s confidence delivering SE, students’ readiness for the model and the school context in which the model is to be delivered.

This study has aimed to contribute to the current paucity of literature regarding the inclusion of SE in PETE programs. Specifically, the study used occupational
socialization to understand Barry’s interpretation and delivery of SE, having experienced a faculty modeled SE season in his PETE programme. This study offers insights into how such an experience can help PSTs learn SE and deliver it effectively on their subsequent teaching placement and careers as a qualified teachers. It also highlights how Barry’s sporting background aided his SE season and helped to make it more authentic. The authors did have some difficulty in determining Barry’s orientation to teaching and felt that the occupational socialization framework did little to acknowledge that a teacher could possess a teaching orientation while also involved heavily in extracurricular sport. Based on Barry’s pre-teaching placement interview, the framework may have determined that he possessed a moderate coaching orientation. However, however it became evident to the first author from his prolonged exposure to Barry that he possessed a teaching orientation. It seems unreasonable to place teachers on either end of a spectrum based on limited knowledge gathered from interviews or questionnaires. Future research is encouraged to examine the fidelity of Lawson’s (1983a, 1983b) hypotheses and whether additional orientations to teaching should be acknowledged. For those of us interested in pursuing SE as a common practice in PETE programs and school physical education, we need to continue to examine the effectiveness and practicalities of the various recommendations provided in the SE-PETE literature (Collier, 1998; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Kinchin et al., 2005) and how PETE programs can overcome staffing, time and financial barriers to provide these experiences. A limitation of the study was that the PETE programme did not offer many of the methods noted in the literature (Curtner-Smith, 2012) regarding the inclusion of SE in PETE, as well as that only one PST was observed during his teaching placement. Further studies need to identify how teachers with differing acculturations to teaching, and working in disparate contexts from each other, experience learning and delivering
SE. It is important to acknowledge that the SE research has made efforts to address the shortfalls in the research regarding how teachers learn and use SE. Further research that explores the realities, not ideals, of SE in practice, and explores scenarios that can be reproduced in other schools and PETE programs is to be welcomed.

**Link to Chapter 6:**

Having an understanding of how phase one and two influenced the PSTs’ perceptions and delivery of SE, it was decided to revisit the SE net-games module to adopt some of the recommendations provided in the previous two phases. We also wanted to assess the PSTs’ learning during the module and as a result it was decided to examine the assessment methods used during the SE net-games. This research would not only provide an insight into the PSTs’ learning experiences but the area of assessment in SE-PETE is an under-researched area of SE.
Chapter 6: Perceptions of assessment methods in SE-PETE

Considering Authentic Assessments in a Sport Education Physical Education Teacher Education Context

This paper has been submitted for review in Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport.

6.1 Abstract

Purpose: Authentic assessments (Wiggins 1989a; 1989b; 1990) are believed to be effective assessment methods as they bridge the gap between the learning context and real life application (Lund, 1997). Although there is some research investigating how Sport Education (SE) should be included in Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) programs (Curtner-Smith, 2012), there is little known about how PETE programs should assess their pre-service teachers (PSTs) during these experiences. The purpose of the research was to investigate the effectiveness, of assessing and improving PSTs’ learning, of two authentic assessment methods, portfolios and microteaching episodes, used during an undergraduate SE-PETE experience.

Method: The perceptions of PSTs, lecturer and researcher were used to determine the effectiveness of the two assessment methods. Data were gathered through interviews, focus groups and researcher observations and were analyzed using thematic coding and constant comparison.

Results: Results indicated that PSTs appreciated the benefit of completing the portfolio assessment, believing it enhanced their knowledge of SE and developed an understanding of using SE in schools. The PSTs, lecturer and researcher believed the
microteaching assessment was ineffective as it did not replicate the reality of teaching SE in schools as PSTs were teaching small groups of peers for short durations.

Conclusions: The two assessment methods failed in their intention to be authentic assessments. It was noted that the characteristics of SE make it difficult to be used in a one-off microteaching episode. Recommendations for the use of the two assessment methods other and assessment methods for SE-PETE programs are provided.

6.2 Introduction

Sport Education (SE) is a curriculum model for physical education which aims to provide authentic sporting experiences for students (Siedentop, Hastie & van der Mars, 2011). SE has received significant research attention in the last two decades (Hastie, de Ojeda & Luquin, 2011; Wallhead & O'Sullivan, 2005), providing support for the model in areas such as skill and tactical development, pupil enjoyment, teamwork and gender equality (e.g. Hastie, 1998; MacPhail, Gorely, Kirk & Kinchin, 2008). Less is known about how pre-service teachers (PSTs) learn to use SE in their physical education teacher education (PETE) programs (Curtner-Smith, 2012; McMahon & MacPhail, 2007). Of the recommendations which are provided in for including SE in PETE (Curtner-Smith, 2012) there has been little investment made to date in attempting to explore the extent to which PSTs are formally assessed through experiencing SE and how this, in turn, conveys their understanding of SE.

It is widely accepted that assessment is connected with, and used to improve, student learning. Durden and Hunt (1998) believe that assessment should not only measure and increase students’ understanding but also increase their understanding of assessment. It has been observed that teacher educators do not always use the most effective assessment strategies with their students Faculty members also have some
difficulties implementing assessment as many have little training in assessment methods (Hargreaves, Earl, & Schmidt, 2002; Rieg & Wilson, 2009), while time restrictions and increasing class sizes make it difficult to implement some forms of assessment (Bond, 1995; Goc Karp & Woods, 2008; Rieg & Wilson, 2009). Teachers in schools have little knowledge of assessment or struggle to implement assessment effectively (Goc Karp & Woods, 2008; Hargreaves et al., 2002), and are struggling to keep abreast of developments in assessment practices (Wood, 2003). Goc Karp and Woods (2008) believe we need to examine what learning practices are most beneficial for PSTs to extend their knowledge of assessment in PETE. It is now believed that teacher educators should model effective assessment practices in their programs and consequently PSTs will learn and value the role of assessment (Criswell & Criswell, 1995; Durden & Hunt, 1998; Goc Karp & Woods, 2008). Goc Karp and Woods (2008) believe that adding assessment practices to existing PETE courses “may strengthen PSTs understanding of assessment by providing earlier and multiple exposures to assessment strategies and concepts” (p. 343), requiring teacher educators to have a considerable understanding and experience of multiple assessments. Hammerness et al. (2005) is critical of modeling as an effective practice for teaching assessment and believes that observing practice alone will not create understanding about assessment, and may lead to PSTs being able to only assimilate what they have experienced.

6.3 Theoretical Framework and Purpose

There has been a shift in the view of the purpose of assessment with researchers questioning whether traditional assessments are the best way to assess performance of learning (Bond, 1995; Durden & Hunt, 1998). It is now believed that traditional assessments, e.g. written tests, are not effective (Wiggins, 1989a, 1989b) and Wiggins
(1993) believes that these tests do not tell us if the students have the capacity to use the knowledge they have gained. Wiggins (1993) suggests that we need to ask ourselves “How can our tests better replicate authentic challenges and constraints?” (p. 202) similar to situations that students will encounter in real life settings, believing that “the criterion for good assessment is its congruence with reality” (p. 206). Shepard (2000) believes that learning in school needs to be made more authentic to keep students interested and motivated, while developing their ability to use their knowledge in ‘real world’ settings. Acknowledging this, researchers are advocating for a push towards ‘authentic’ assessments (Darling-Hammond, Ancess, & Falk, 1995; Hay, 2006; Wiggins, 1989a, 1989b, 1990, 1993).

Wiggins (1989a) provided a number of characteristics of authentic assessment which included, (1) the need to be designed to be truly representative of performance in the field, (2) greater attention to be paid to teaching and learning the criteria to be used in the assessment, (3) self assessment to play a greater role than traditional testing, and (4) students expected to present and defend their work publicly and orally to ensure mastery has been achieved. Wiggins (1990) further acknowledged that assessment is authentic when “we directly examine student performance on worthy intellectual tasks” (p. 2). As the assessment is conducted in meaningful contexts the gap between real life application and school based learning is narrowed (Lund, 1997). Authentic assessment has started to feature prominently in schools and in particular within school physical education programs, with research literature providing some guidelines for the inclusion of authentic assessment in physical education (Lund, 1997; Melograno, 2000; Mohensen & Thompson, 1995). It is assumed that for teachers to assess effectively in their future practice they must experience authentic assessment in their teacher
education programme (Durden and Hunt, 1998). Lombardi (2008) believes that authentic assessment remains under-researched and that research needs to focus on methods of delivering authentic assessment rather than reiterating the generic advantages or disadvantages of authentic assessment. This study investigates the use of two authentic assessments, a portfolio assessment and a microteaching assessment, within a PETE programme.

Melograno (2000) believes that portfolio assessments are gaining attention in assessment reform, and there is evidence that portfolios are now widely used in higher education (Dysthe, Engelsen, & Lima, 2007; Gikandi, Morrow, & Davis, 2011). Portfolios are also becoming very popular for assessing PSTs in teacher education programs (Darling-Hammond, 2001; Diez, 1998). Although the use of portfolios is widespread, there is some conflicting research suggesting that some teacher educators believe it is one of the least effective and least used assessment methods in teacher education programs (Rieg & Wilson, 2009). Conversely, Darling-Hammond (2001) reported findings that PSTs believed their learning was increased when portfolios were used as assessment tools. Meeus, Van Petegem and Engels (2009) established that portfolios, while effective at assessing PSTs’ ability to execute self-regulated learning processes, were ineffective at assessing PSTs’ teaching competencies.

Another form of authentic assessment for use in teacher education programs is ‘microteaching’. Sahu (1985) describes microteaching as a “scaled down realistic classroom situation. Factors such as class size, lesson time, feedback (with or without video) etc., can be manipulated such that the classroom situations facilitate the occurrence of the desired change in the teaching act” (p. 26). The benefits of microteaching include increased self-confidence (Benton-Kupper, 2001), heightened
concern for performance evaluation (Farris, 1991), increased teacher efficacy (Mergler & Tangen, 2010), and increased opportunities for PSTs to recognize the complexities of teaching and to connect theory to authentic practice (Golightly, 2010). Microteaching allows PSTs to practice the implementation of, and subsequently change their opinion of, different instructional strategies and skills (Golightly, 2010). It has been observed however that, while PSTs appreciated the benefits for their professional development, the artificiality of the microteaching experience appeared to limit their development of real life teaching competencies (He & Yan, 2011).

There are some challenges in delivering authentic assessments and Wiggins (1989b) admits that authentic assessment is time consuming and labor intensive on the assessor. Similarly increased skills and abilities may be required by teachers to use authentic assessment methods (Wiggins, 1989b; Wood 2003). Darling-Hammond and Snyder (2000) believe that for authentic assessment to become sustainable it must be embedded in a programme of study. They advise that further research needs to determine how well different types of assessment measure the ability to teach and what the effects on teacher learning as a result of using these assessments are. Rieg and Wilson (2009) believe that what constitutes best practice in the areas of teaching and assessment is unknown and warrants further investigation, along with the assessment practices of teacher educators. Much of the current research on assessment in teacher education focuses on the practices of assessment and not the impact of assessment on students (Hay, 2006). One of the ways to assess the effectiveness of teacher education is to examine PSTs’ learning, acknowledging that there is a recognized correlation between PSTs’ perception of, and actual, learning when their own feedback is used to determine the effectiveness of educational experiences (Darling-Hammond, 2006).
Chapter 6: Perceptions of assessment methods in SE-PETE

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of authentic assessments to assess and improve PSTs’ knowledge of SE gained from participation in a PETE programme. The effectiveness of the assessment methods will be determined through the PSTs’ perceived learning throughout the module, their perceptions of the assessment methods used and the researcher’s and lecturer’s perceptions on the same assessment methods. This research will help identify what effective assessment strategies in SE in PETE programs are. It will further qualify the effectiveness of portfolios and microteaching as methods of authentic assessment and contribute to examining the effectiveness of particular assessment methods in teacher education.

6.4 Method

6.4.1 Context

The study was conducted in the third year of a four year undergraduate PETE programme in a university in Ireland. A net-games module (including tennis, badminton and volleyball) was taught through SE and was taught over 12 weeks with PSTs attending two one-hour classes each week. The module was designed in such a way that would allow PSTs to experience SE as a participant where they would select and affiliate to a team, adopt roles and responsibilities, undertake record keeping, be exposed to competition and festivity and participate in a culminating event. Each of the sports was delivered for four weeks allowing PSTs to experience three mini seasons of SE. The PSTs remained in the same teams for the duration of the module. A full description of the SE in PETE module and its outcomes has been provided in an earlier publication (Deenihan, MacPhail, & Young, 2011).
6.4.2 Participants

The lecturer of the module was in her third year of lecturing in the department and had taught the SE net-games module on two previous occasions. Prior to beginning lecturing in the university she had taught physical education for 10 years, was familiar with the SE model and had a strong interest in contributing to research in PETE. The lecturer of the module conducted all classes during the 12 week duration of the module. The lecturer analyzed all the PSTs’ portfolios which were completed as a component of the PSTs’ assessment for the SE module. With another lecturer in the department, the same lecturer observed and graded the microteaching assessments. The researcher aided with the planning of the module and was completing graduate research in SE in the same university.

Sixty-seven PSTs were in their third year of the PETE programme in the university and were allocated into one of three class groups (approx 24 in each) for teaching purposes. The participation of those PSTs involved in the interviews and focus groups was voluntary, having read subject information sheets and signed informed consent forms prior to any participation in the data collection. Data from completion of the two compulsory assessments, a SE portfolio and microteaching episode, was also collected and analyzed.

6.4.3 Assessments

The SE portfolio was to be completed in pairs and required PSTs to complete a sample SE season plan and resources for that season, including a total of eight task cards. The portfolio was weighted at 70% of the total module assessment. The portfolio assignment was distributed and explained to PSTs in week four of the module and was
required to be completed in week ten. The PSTs were encouraged to apply the
principles of SE and provide a rationale for using SE with a specified sport in an Irish
post-primary school. The overall grade was achieved through completion of the
rationale for using SE (5%), team selection and affiliation methods and selection of
roles and role descriptor sheets (10%), designing a SE block schedule based on five
double classes and a culminating event with competition format and awards and
certificates (15%). The majority of the weighting (40%) was for the creation of task
cards which would be used when teaching SE in a school. PSTs were required to
complete two warm-up task cards, four skill development task cards, two modified
games task cards, and a sheet of basic rules of the sport.

The PSTs were also required to complete a microteaching assessment during
weeks eleven, twelve and thirteen of the module. During the microteaching task, PSTs
were randomly given one of the task cards which they had completed for their SE
portfolio to deliver to a group, ranging from eight to twenty, of their peers. PSTs were
required to teach to either a warm-up, skill development or modified game task card.
The microteaching assessment was weighted at 30% of the total module assessment,
focusing on aspects such as appropriate selection and set up of equipment/ teaching
tools (5%), clear and concise explanation and demonstration (5%), appropriateness of
the activities used (5%), constant use of prompts / teaching cues to all students (5%),
use of effective active supervision (5%), originality of the activities used (2.5%) and
constantly ensuring the safety of activities (2.5%).

6.4.4 Data Collection

A number of data collection procedures were applied during and after the SE
module. The researcher conducted weekly observations of the three class groups during
one of their two weekly classes. During these observations the researcher kept reflective logs (Rubin & Rubin, 1995) of critical incidents which occurred in the class and his initial response to those incidents. In weeks 11, 12 and 13 of the module all of PSTs’ microteaching assessments were observed by the researcher who, directed by the associated scoring rubric discussed above, informally assessed their teaching. Their microteaching assessment was formally assessed by the lecturer of the module or another member of the PETE faculty who completed the scoring rubric and provided feedback to the PSTs after their assessment.

On completion of the module the researcher conducted focus groups from each of the three class groups, with two focus groups consisting of five PSTs and one consisting of three PSTs. These focus groups investigated the PSTs’ opinion of the SE module, their perceptions of their learning, their perceptions of the assessment methods used and recommendations for improving the module. A post-module interview was conducted with three PSTs, who were not part of the focus groups, to understand their perceptions of the module and the assessment methods used. Two post-module interviews with the lecturer were conducted, the first directly after the microteaching assessments and the second after the lecturer had analyzed the SE portfolio assessments. An overview of all data collection measures and the data collected is presented in Table 6.1.

6.4.5 Data Analysis

All interview and focus group recordings were transcribed verbatim along with each of the weekly observations by the researcher. These data sources were then analyzed using thematic coding (Rubin & Rubin, 1995) and constant comparison where data were read and re-read to identify themes across each of the data sources. When common and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection method</th>
<th>Data collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Post-module interview with three PSTs                      | • Effectiveness of the SE module in increasing their knowledge of SE and net games  
• Recommendations for the SE module  
• Perceptions of the effectiveness of the portfolio assessment in assessing and increasing their knowledge of SE and net games  
• Perceptions of the effectiveness of the microteaching assessment in assessing and increasing their knowledge of SE and net games  
• Recommendations for future assessment methods  
• Intentions for future use of SE  |
| Post-module focus group with three groups of PSTs           | • Effectiveness of the SE module in increasing their knowledge of SE and net games  
• Recommendations for the SE module  
• Perceptions of the effectiveness of the portfolio assessment in assessing and increasing their knowledge of SE and net games  
• Perceptions of the effectiveness of the microteaching assessment in assessing and increasing their knowledge of SE and net games  
• Recommendations for future assessment methods  
• Intentions for future use of SE  |
| Post-module interview #1 with lecturer (after the microteaching assessments were completed) | • Perceptions of the SE module  
• Perceptions of the effectiveness of the microteaching assessment in assessing and increasing the PSTs knowledge of SE and net games  
• Recommendations for change of the microteaching assessments  
• Difficulties encountered whilst teaching the SE module  
• Recommendation for change of the SE module  |
| Post-module interview #1 with lecturer (after the portfolio assessments were reviewed and graded) | • Perceptions of the effectiveness of the portfolio assessment in assessing and increasing the PSTs knowledge of SE and net games  
• Recommendations for change of the microteaching assessments  
• Recommendations for future assessment methods of the SE module  |
| Researcher reflections                                     | • Perceptions of the effectiveness of the portfolio and microteaching assessment in assessing and increasing their knowledge of SE and net games  
• Critical incidents which occurred during the microteaching assessments  |

Table 6.1: Data collection measures and data collected
prominent themes were identified all data relating to that theme from the data source was compiled onto a word processing document. The data were then triangulated to identify where themes were consistent across all data sources. A word processing document for each theme was then created where data relevant to that theme across all data sources was housed.

Ethical approval for the data collection was granted by the relevant University’s Research Ethics Committee. Each participant signed an informed consent form and was assigned a pseudonym for the purpose of anonymity. Interviews and focus groups followed a semi-structured format with a majority of open questions encouraging unprompted responses from participants. Member checking was completed for all participants with each receiving a transcript of the interviews they completed and being asked to verify its contents and make edits where necessary.

6.5 Results

For the purpose of presenting our findings, the themes relating to each assessment methods will be presented individually before a shared discussion.

6.5.1 Portfolio assessments

PSTs strongly acknowledged the educational value of the portfolio assessments. Frank believed that the portfolio assessment was “very effective because it is us thinking about Sport Education and how we would use it in a school…we didn’t mind doing this assignment compared to others because it was relevant and we saw how it could be used” (Post-module Interview). Gemma similarly commented, “I thought [the portfolio assessment] was quite good…we got to look [Sport Education] up and discover what it was all about and we actually came up with our own ideas” (Post-
module Interview). Adam believed the portfolio was effective because it encouraged him to invest more in the assessment than other assessments, resulting in identifying external resources and aides for teaching SE:

“You just go a lot more in depth into all aspects of Sport Education so it just gives you a fuller knowledge and then also it lets you know that if you are to do it there are places that you can go to find out actually how to run a full season of Sport Education so that even if you didn’t quite grasp it fully here that there still is resources out there that you can go to that have it pre-prepared” (Focus Group B).

Most of the PSTs appreciated that they were required to contextualize SE within an Irish post-primary school setting. Adam commented, “Most of the text I was reading on it was Americanised…[the portfolio] made you think a lot of translating that back down into an Irish context so it got you thinking more about how you could actually do that” (Focus Group B). Mary appreciated the authentic nature of the portfolio assessment stating, “You kind of have to put [Sport Education] into your own context and how you would apply it if you were doing it in a school as opposed to literally just reading it and summarising” (Focus Group B). The PSTs also appreciated that it was effective in assessing their knowledge of SE, with Gemma commenting that the portfolio, “was good for assessment because as I said there was marks going for originality and not copying things that we done in class so therefore we actually had to go and look up different ideas” (Post-module Interview). The lecturer echoed the PSTs’ sentiments believing that the portfolio was effective as it gave the PSTs an overview of SE and an opportunity to plan a season. The researcher also believed the portfolio was an effective way in which to prepare PSTs for the reality of planning a season of SE, “I think it is good for the PSTs to appreciate the work required in planning a season of
Sport Education, sometimes in the module it is presented to them and they have to think very little about it” (Post-assessment Reflection).

There appeared to be a disparity between PSTs about the workload required for the portfolios. Paul felt that the portfolios should have been completed individually, “[The portfolio] is quite limited and it was in pairs. It wasn’t a huge assignment. I think it could feasibly have been done individually which possibly would have been a better assessment” (Post-module Interview). Meanwhile Jamie believed that there was an increased workload for this year’s assessment than what was required in previous years, “There was an awful lot of work in [the portfolio assessment]…there was four or five in the group [completing the portfolio] last year and this year it went down to two” (Focus Group B). The lecturer of the module believed the portfolio did not require a significant amount of work stating, “it was too easy for them because they were given each section on what Sport Education is and they just then had to kind of develop it…I wasn’t happy with the amount of work that they put in and the standard of the work that they put in and I think they could have done a lot more” (Lecturer Post-module Interview #2). The researcher similarly reflected that the assessment could have been expanded, “It was good to see that they completed the portfolio in pairs rather than in groups of five which was the case in previous years. I think the portfolio should even have been done individually to give all pre-service teachers a chance to experience planning a Sport Education season” (Post-assessment Reflection).

The lecturer believed the portfolio assessment would have been more beneficial for the PSTs to complete throughout the weeks than only at the end of the module, “I think the staggered assessment would be a lot more effective, rather than everything at the end” (Lecturer Post-module Interview #2), believing that submitting elements of the
portfolio assessment would keep the PSTs engaged and increase the quality of work. The PSTs agreed with this and Alan believed, “You would actually be studying [Sport Education] while you’re doing it…it would be good because then you’re actually doing the readings to back up what you’re doing [in class]” (Focus Group B). Paul similarly felt that this process would be preferable to completing the portfolio at the end of the module, “I don’t think people would have minded if we had to do stuff like that more often” (Post-module Interview).

There were suggestions from the PSTs that the portfolio should have been expanded to include a scheme of work and lesson plans, “You could do worse than having a lesson plan in it…a Sport Education lesson plan in that you have to give time for your Sport Education elements of it as well and what you would do” (Paul, Post-module Interview). Aidan felt that lesson plans would improve the purpose of the portfolio, “I’m kind of thinking that you’re doing a six lesson block and all you’re doing is a task card for not even every lesson so its kind of in that sense the task cards aren’t as relevant as to what your trying to do as what they could be…you could make six lesson plans each one with a task card to go in with” (Focus Group A). The lecturer also considered this for future assessments stating “I would just replace [the portfolio] with something more applicable to them, something that they are going to use teaching, so an idea would be that they would have to create a scheme of work, based on the delivery through Sport Education” (Lecturer Post-assessment Reflection). The researcher reflected that an assessment including a scheme of work and lesson plans would be more beneficial to the PSTs and would aid them in teaching SE on their subsequent teaching practice;

“The assessment could have required the pre-service teachers to complete a detailed scheme of work together with lesson plans for the assessment. If these
pre-service teachers want to learn Sport Education effectively then they should use it on their teaching practice next year and by having a scheme of work and lesson plans completed this would make it a lot easier to try it in schools” (Post-assessment Reflection).

6.5.2 Microteaching assessment

Perceptions of the microteaching assessment were less favorable. Frank believed the microteaching episode was too short, “it is just such a short period of time and you’re graded on that in fifteen minutes and then it is over” (Post-module Interview). Similarly Martin stated, “I would like it more realistic to a proper lesson…I’d make it about 25 minutes to half an hour” (Focus Group A). Paul believed that teaching your peers does not accurately reflect teaching students in a school, “You are teaching mature people who know how to play a game after thirty seconds of introduction” (Post-module Interview). Brendan similarly spoke about teaching his peers, “You know they are going to listen to you and you know they are going to do everything you tell them to do and they will be nice, whereas if you are teaching kids it would just be a way different experience” (Focus Group A). The lecturer agreed with the PSTs’ sentiments stating, “[The microteaching episode] wasn’t effective as a form of assessment because they are teaching smaller groups, they are teaching their peers, they are teaching a real staged skill” (Lecturer Post-module Interview #1). Additionally, the lecturer admitted that the microteaching assessment did not ensure the PSTs taught through SE, “It doesn’t give them an opportunity to teach Sport Education really, I think the way we did [the assessments] this year really didn’t because we determined what they taught and they couldn’t pre-plan it” (Lecturer Post-module Interview #1). The researcher reflected, “I feel that these assessments were not fit for purpose” believing that the assessments neither accurately portrayed their knowledge of SE nor increased their knowledge and understanding of SE (Post-assessment Reflection).
There was also confusion about the purpose of the task card as part of the microteaching assessment. Brendan spoke about how the task card was compromised as it was not clear if it was designed for the students or for the teacher, “You knew that you were going teaching it and you knew that you weren’t going to give the task card, like if I was going giving the task card to students and let them do it like I would have had a lot simpler diagram and what to do on it” (Focus Group A). Martin agreed, “We were teaching on our task card, whereas the reason we gave a task card in the lesson is to get the students to attempt the task so they kind of weren’t in sync with each other” (Focus Group A). Sarah shared this opinion and succinctly stated, “Just make it clear if it’s a resource for the teacher or a resource for the students” (Focus Group C). Brendan believed that the task cards should have been assessed in terms of how others could interpret that card, “A task card is for the students so they can organise themselves, so I think it would have to be given to them and see how they get on rather than us teach it” (Focus Group A). However, Sarah did admit that being required to teach one of their task cards that they had completed for their portfolio ensured they put more time and effort into the creation of the task cards. The lecturer believed that the task cards were, “the most successful part of the [SE portfolio assessment]” praising the detail and pupil-friendly nature of the task cards, while acknowledging that “some of them contained too much text which would have made it confusing for students” (Lecturer Post-module Interview #1).

The most common recommendation from PSTs to improve the microteaching assessment was to teach groups of school students rather than their peers. Brendan spoke about his thoughts on improving the assessment, “I would bring children in like you know rather you wouldn’t even have to go to a school you could get a class in you
know for like a day” (Focus Group A). Sinead similarly stated, “I think teaching your peers is very unrealistic, it’s very hard for us… if we could get links with [a local school] to bring in students [it would be beneficial]” (Focus Group C). Marie was more realistic about the future of assessment and suggested teaching another group from their PETE programme, “I know they can’t get the school kids because it’s not feasible but even to teach another PE group…it might just be a small bit more realistic I think” (Focus Group B). Sarah also felt teaching a different group would have helped, “If you had to teach a different group rather than teach your own that you’re with the whole time like, that might be more realistic” (Focus Group C). The lecturer agreed that ideally PSTs should teach school-aged children but felt it would be unfeasible stating, “They definitely need an opportunity to teach, it would be ideal if you could bring in groups from outside classes but it’s not possible so it’s difficult finding what’s the right way to do it” (Lecturer Post-module Interview #1).

There was a perception that the microteaching assessment wasted time in the latter weeks of the module. Cian questioned the significance of the microteaching assessment, “What is the value when it comes to microteaching at that stage when you’re going to be tested for teaching in Teaching Practice in second and fourth year?” (Focus Group A). Alan agreed the time could be spent more effectively, “It could be used for like actually teaching us more, I think it’s pretty much a waste of time” (Focus Group A). The researcher agreed, “The microteaching assessment also takes two to three weeks of vital class time, more time would be gained and additional content in both SE and net-games would be gained if it were removed” (Post-assessment Reflection). The lecturer believed that time constraints was an issue commenting, “I feel compromised in how much [time] I can give over to sport education in terms of, I am
just trying to get the pedagogy right”. When asked what the major issue with the module was the lecturer noted “time, lack of time, to really emphasize certain points and go through everything that I want to go through” (Post-module Interview #1).

6.6 Discussion

There was a mixed reaction to the assessments used from the PSTs, the lecturer and the researcher. Strong concerns were raised about the effectiveness of the microteaching assessments and, while perceptions of the SE portfolio assessment were generally positive, a number of recommendations were made to improve them. It should be noted that efforts were made, prior to the commencement of the module, to make the two assessments more effective and minor changes were made since previous delivery of the module. The credit weighting was changed from 50% portfolio/ 50% microteaching in previous years to 70% portfolio/ 30% microteaching. The portfolio was completed in pairs rather than groups of five in previous years. In an attempt to emphasize the creation of task cards, the PSTs were required to teach a specific task card from their SE portfolio rather than a pre-designed short lesson as in previous years.

It was clear that despite the changes made to assessment practices, there were still a number of problematic issues arising from the implementation of the assessment tools. Although efforts were made to ensure the assessments used were ‘authentic’, there was a strong sense that the two assessments failed to replicate the reality of planning and delivering SE in a school. The SE portfolio was limited as it required PSTs to outline rather than fully plan a SE scheme of work, and was completed in pairs which may have reduced the workload if PSTs were not involved in the completion of all sections. Additionally, the microteaching assessment failed to replicate the reality of teaching SE in a school. There was no requirement for PST to use SE during their
lesson and, as they were teaching for such a short period of time, it did little to simulate teaching SE in a school. There also appeared to be little workload required in completing the assessments. The PSTs believed the microteaching assessment did not require a lot of work as they have performed microteaching episodes many times in the past. This reduction in workload was reinforced with the PSTs delivering one of their designed task cards for their portfolio assessment, thus requiring no additional work for the microteaching assessment.

Some meaningful educational value arising from using the SE portfolio and microteaching assessments was noted. Many PSTs appreciated the SE portfolio assessment believing it was relevant to what they would have to do when they were teaching as qualified teachers, allowing them to introduce their own ideas and initiative to SE. The PSTs also admitted that through completing the portfolio their knowledge and understanding of SE benefited significantly. Although the microteaching assessment received very little positive feedback, it was conceded that it was perhaps the only effective way of assessing over 70 PSTs’ teaching. There was also a feeling that the lecturer’s decision to require PSTs to teach one of their portfolio’s task cards ensured they dedicated extra time and effort into the design of task cards.

A number of recommendations were provided and can be drawn from the interpretation of the findings. The most frequent recommendation was to produce authentic assessments that would match more closely with the realities of teaching SE in a school. It was frequently recommended to adapt the SE portfolio to include a full scheme of work complete with lesson plans and resources which could be used on the PSTs’ subsequent years teaching practice placement. It was also recommended that the SE portfolio should be completed individually over the course of the module giving
PSTs an opportunity to research aspects of SE while experiencing them in class. In relation to the microteaching assessments there were recommendations to teach school groups of students either through visiting local schools or inviting schools into the university. It was also recommended to teach for an extended duration or a full lesson. However both of these latter recommendations were unfeasible for the PETE programme considering the large amount of PSTs to be assessed and the limited time available to assess them. It was further recommended by the lecturer and researcher to introduce video analysis into the assessment allowing PSTs to observe SE being taught and to analyze its delivery.

A number of characteristics of SE would suggest that a single microteaching assessment is not the most suitable method to assess PSTs’ teaching of SE. This contradicts Golightly’s (2010) suggestion that microteaching would facilitate PSTs’ implementation of new instructional strategies. Firstly, SE shifts much of the teaching responsibilities to the students where the teacher adopts more of a facilitator role. Therefore, during a teaching episode, the PST should be assessed on their facilitation of learning. This may not always complement the purpose of assessment which is often to assess PSTs’ teaching skills. Secondly, SE is generally taught over extended durations allowing time for the season to progress, where teams affiliate and students adopt and learn roles gradually. Requiring a PST to teach SE in a single microteaching assessment may prove problematic as the students the PST is teaching may not have learned the required roles in order to participate in the microteaching lesson. Additionally, if school groups were to be used then considerable time would have to be spent assigning them to teams and preparing them to fulfill the roles required of them during the microteaching assessment lesson.
Darling-Hammond and Snyder (2000) called for more research to assess how authentic assessments measure PSTs’ ability to teach and what the effects on PSTs’ learning is having used these assessments. We also appreciate Durden and Hunt’s (1998) belief that assessment should measure and increase students’ understanding of the subject. If we use ‘measuring student understanding’ as an interpretive lens then it would appear that our assessment could have been improved in this area. The two assessments did not accurately assess the realities of teaching SE in a school. Although the portfolio was relevant and allowed PSTs to use their own initiative when planning a season, it was not sufficiently detailed to be used as an effective resource in future teaching. In addition, as the portfolio was completed in pairs it was difficult to identify the learning achieved for each PST if they completed sections of the portfolio individually. The microteaching assessment did not measure PSTs’ understanding of SE. In terms of increasing student knowledge the assessments were successful to some extent. The PSTs recognised that the portfolio increased their understanding of SE as it required them to research SE and apply it to various sports. They also were required to apply SE to an Irish post-primary setting and create original team selection and team affiliation methods. Unfortunately, as there was no requirement to teach SE on the microteaching assessment, there was no evidence that PSTs’ knowledge of SE increased. Even if there was a requirement for PSTs to teach SE, it remains doubtful that the microteaching assessment would have helped measure or increase their knowledge of SE effectively due to the time constraints and difficulties with teaching microteaching episodes through SE noted earlier.

It is important that we practice effective assessment practices in our PETE programs, allowing PSTs an opportunity to experience and appreciate how to assess
effectively. Much of the research on SE in PETE recommends the modeling of SE on PETE programs (Curtner-Smith, 2012), to the extent that these PETE programs should be modeling effective SE assessment practices to their PSTs also. Modeling assessment practices in PETE will provide an opportunity to learn the role of assessment as PSTs will be provided with earlier multiple exposures to the assessment strategies (Criswell & Criswell, 1995; Goc Karp & Woods, 2008). Modeling authentic assessment in PETE also helps to integrate assessment further into the teaching and learning process, alleviating some of the time and resource demands of doing authentic assessment separately (Darling-Hammond & Snyder, 2000). This may not be an easy process however as it would require lecturers to possess considerable knowledge in both SE and assessment concepts. There is no guarantee that observing practice alone will create understanding about assessment and may lead to PSTs being able to only assimilate what they have experienced (Hammerness, 2005). Goc Karp and Woods (2008) believe that if PSTs’ existing beliefs about assessment are not challenged and found unsatisfactory before new assessment practices are learned, then mere assimilation or resistance of these assessment practices will occur (p. 344).

There is little known on how PSTs learn to teach SE and it is an area that has only recently been subject to research attention (e.g. Curtner-Smith, Hastie & Kinchin, 2008; Kinchin, Penney & Clarke, 2005). In addition to the recommendations for PETE provided recently (Curtner-Smith, 2012), PETE programs need to acknowledge the importance of assessment and adopt effective assessment practices in their SE PETE programs. It has been observed that high quality PETE programs are essential for the effective delivery of SE (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008) and these PETE programs should also adopt assessment practices that further enhance and accurately measure PSTs’
knowledge of SE. This study has generated a number of implications for SE in PETE programs when assessing PSTs’ learning.

PETE programs should ensure their assessments match as closely as possible to the realities of teaching SE in a school. PSTs should complete a comprehensive portfolio of their learning which they contribute to at various stages of being involved in a SE season. While participating in the season, the PSTs could research various aspects of SE which are the focus of that lesson. These portfolios could also contain a scheme of work and lesson plans which the PSTs could use on their future teaching practice. Caution should be taken when using microteaching assessments to assess PSTs’ knowledge of SE. Such assessments have difficulty replicating the reality of teaching SE in a school. Furthermore, SE’s characteristics do not lend themselves to being assessed through a single short microteaching assessment. One possibility to assess student teaching could occur during the SE season of which the PSTs are participants, where PSTs are assessed on their teaching ability while performing their roles of student coaches or other roles. Video analysis of a SE lesson could also be used to enhance PSTs’ appreciation for SE while encouraging them to become critical reflectors of practice. Assessments within SE in PETE programs should be consciously designed to both measure and enhance PSTs’ learning.

The study aimed to contribute to the lack of literature on the use of authentic assessment in PETE and address the gap in the literature regarding how to assess PSTs’ learning within SE in PETE experiences. The research is limited as only two authentic assessment methods were investigated in the study. In addition, the effectiveness of the assessment was based solely on perceptions of the PSTs, the lecturer and the researcher, making it difficult to accurately measure the pre- and post-knowledge levels of the PSTs.
which would be a more accurate measure of learning achieved. The authors appreciate Darling-Hammond’s (2006) finding that there is a recognized correlation between PSTs’ perception of, and actual learning, acknowledging this we are confident that the findings presented in the paper are significant. Future research is encouraged to verify these assessment methods and other assessment methods further. We need to become critical of our assessment practices within PETE and always construct our programs in ways which are most beneficial to PSTs. If high-quality PETE programme are to continue, then the PSTs they prepare, and the students which they teach, will all benefit from more meaningful educational experiences.

**Link to Chapter 7**

It was acknowledged that to obtain more general occurrences in PSTs’ delivery of SE on teaching placement that a number of PSTs have their experiences delivering SE examined. Chapter 7 investigates seven PSTs teaching in varying school contexts.
Chapter 7: PSTs’ delivery of SE on teaching placement

Pre-service Teachers’ Delivery of Sport Education: Enablers and Challenges

This paper is currently being prepared for review in Sport, Education and Society

7.1 Abstract

Pre-service teachers (PSTs) have encountered difficulties teaching Sport Education (SE) (McCaughtry, Sofo, Rovegno & Curtner-Smith, 2004; McMahon & MacPhail, 2007). Occupational socialisation (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b) has been viewed as providing a useful framework in understanding the influences which affect teachers’ delivery of SE. However, much of the research has been conducted on qualified teachers and/or teachers who have shown a recognised expertise to teach SE (Curtner-Smith, Hastie & Kinchin, 2008; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a). This study aimed to investigate the extent of influence of occupational socialisation on seven PSTs’ delivery of SE during their teaching placement. The study also aimed to specifically address the inhibitors PSTs experienced in attempting to deliver SE in schools. All PSTs in the study had completed a SE net-games module in their PETE programme (Deenihan, MacPhail, & Young, 2011). Data were gathered through pre- and post-teaching placement interviews and mid-teaching placement focus groups. All interviews and focus groups were transcribed verbatim and data were analysed using thematic coding and constant comparison (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). Findings convey that the PSTs’ occupational socialisation played a significant role in determining their delivery of SE. The PSTs noted their organisational socialisation within the school to be particularly influential with the most inhibiting factors being attributed to (i) the cooperating teachers, (ii) the increased workload, (iii) the ability of their pupils and (iv) specific
difficulties relating to being a PST on teaching placement. The authors proposed that an additional orientation to teaching, ‘teaching with a coaching disposition’, should be recognized. The authors also question the expectation for PSTs to teach the ‘full version’ of SE on their first attempt of teaching SE. Recommendations for overcoming some of the barriers and further research are provided.

7.2 Introduction

Sport Education (SE) is a curriculum model for physical education that aims to enhance learning experiences for pupils through experiencing sport authentically (Siedentop, 1994; Siedentop, Hastie, & van der Mars, 2004, 2011). Siedentop believes that through experiencing physical education in such a manner pupils will develop as ‘competent, literate and enthusiastic sportspeople’ (Siedentop, 1994). Players will be competent in the skills required to play the game, literate in their knowledge of the sports rules and traditions and enthusiastic in the manner in which they participate in the sport, both within the classroom and external to the school curriculum. These attributes are achieved through the assimilation of physical education to experiences found in external sport settings. Specifically, the sports are run over extended seasons where pupils affiliate to a team and adopt sport specific roles such as player, coach and official. The season encompasses a lengthy competition phase and concludes with a culminating event where the skills and competencies learned from the previous weeks are displayed. Records are kept on various aspects of game results and team performance and festivity is encouraged to create an enjoyable and engaging season for all participants.

Much attention has been afforded to the SE model since its introduction in the late 1980s (Siedentop, 2002). Along with the extensive implementation of SE it has also
become a prominent feature of the research literature on physical education, with a critical mass of SE-related articles and books being published. To date three extensive reviews of SE have been conducted (Hastie, de Ojeda & Luquin, 2011; Kinchin, 2006; Wallhead & O'Sullivan, 2005) each identifying the success of SE in a variety of settings and in a variety of domains. SE has successfully been used with all age groups from primary (Pill, 2008) to collegiate level participants (Meeteer, Housner, Bulger, Hawkins, & Weigand, 2012), and with both males and females (Hastie, 1998a; Kinchin, 2004). It has been positively received from both pupils (Hastie & Sinelnikov, 2006) and teachers (Alexander & Luckman, 2001) and has been shown to increase participation, enjoyment, skill levels and tactical awareness (e.g. Brunton, 2003; MacPhail, Gorely, Kirk & Kinchin, 2008). While the area of teachers’ experiences learning and delivering SE has been identified as essential for the development of SE (McCaughtry et al., 2004), until recently there has been little reported about how to prepare PSTs to deliver SE effectively (Kinchin, Penney, & Clarke, 2005).

Curtner-Smith (2012) compiled a list of previously shared recommendations on preparing PSTs to teach SE. These included;

i. To provide a practical experience for PSTs to participate in a SE season as a participant, where they would assume the roles and responsibilities of SE similar to pupils in a school (Collier, 1998; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Jenkins, 2004; Kinchin et al., 2005; Oslin, Collier, & Mitchell, 2001).

ii. This experience should be preceded by an initial lecture on SE where PSTs learn about the characteristics of the model and the potential effectiveness of its implementation in a variety of settings (Collier, 1998; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Jenkins, 2004; Kinchin et al., 2005).
iii. To allow PSTs an opportunity to observe the model being taught in schools or watch a video of SE’s implementation in schools (Collier, 1998; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Kinchin et al., 2005).

iv. PSTs should teach SE to their peers and attempt to teach the model on early field experiences and teaching placement (Collier, 1998; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Jenkins, 2004).

v. During such experiences, PSTs should be supervised by a faculty member familiar with SE while pupil behaviour and readiness to be taught through SE is also important (Curtner-Smith, 2012).

vi. PSTs should initially deliver faculty prescribed seasons and gradually develop their own seasons, ensuring that PSTs experience delivering all aspects of SE while later developing their own versions and adaptations of SE (Curtner-Smith, 2012).

vii. Practitioners of SE delivering lectures on their experiences of teaching SE (Kinchin et al., 2005).

viii. Reading sample SE season plans and SE books and research papers (Collier, 1998; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Jenkins, 2004; Kinchin et al., 2005).

Curtner-Smith (2012) believes that the more experiences provided, the more effective the learning experience will be. Little investment has been made to date in attempting to explore the effectiveness of these recommendations in relation to PSTs subsequent delivery of SE having participated in these SE-PETE experiences.

How qualified teachers and PSTs deliver SE is another area of the SE literature that warrants further investigation (McMahon & MacPhail, 2007; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2010). The research that has been conducted on teachers’ delivery of SE has provided mixed findings. Teachers have commented that pupils’ tactical awareness and teamwork
improve (Carlson, 1995), along with giving the teacher more time to observe and assess pupils (Brunton, 2003; Clarke & Quill, 2003). Although teachers appreciate the benefits of SE, it has been noted that SE’s presence in physical education programmes diminishes over time (Alexander & Luckman, 2001). In addition, much of the research on SE has provided findings from SE seasons delivered by teachers with considerable expertise in SE (Bennett & Hastie, 1997; Hastie, 1998a, 2000; Hastie & Curtner-Smith, 2006; Hastie & Sinelnikov, 2006; Hastie & Trost, 2002; Wallhead & O'Sullivan, 2007). It has been reported that beginning teachers also struggle to teach SE and often deliver it as compromised versions or not at all (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008).

PSTs’ delivery of SE has more recently begun to gather momentum in the research, and again varied findings have been presented. Some PSTs have misconceptions of the model, omit and struggle with features of SE and struggle with the increased workload required (McCaughtry et al., 2004; McMahon & MacPhail, 2007). In some instances PSTs prefer using SE to other teaching methods and believed SE was more beneficial to their pupils (Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004). More recently, researchers observing teachers’ and PSTs’ delivery of SE have used occupational socialisation (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b) to understand how they learn, interpret and use SE (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Deenihan & MacPhail, In Press; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a).

This research aimed to investigate seven PSTs’ delivery of SE during their teaching placement. All PSTs have experienced SE within a SE net-games module in their PETE programme where SE was modeled by the lecturer. In an attempt to understand the PSTs’ delivery of SE, occupational socialisation (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b, 1986) was used as a theoretical framework to guide data collection and analysis.
7.3 Theoretical Framework

Occupational socialisation (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b, 1986) can be defined as all “kinds of socialization that initially influence persons to enter the field of physical education and that later are responsible for their perceptions and actions as teacher educators and teachers” (Lawson 1986, pg. 107). It is important to understand and appreciate the socialisation of teachers and teacher educators will be aided if they can appreciate and challenge the experiences PSTs have already encountered, and will encounter, in their careers as teachers (Schempp & Graber, 1992). Throughout their lives teachers encounter three stages of socialisation: acculturation, professional socialisation and organisational socialisation (Lawson, 1983a).

Teachers begin their ‘acculturation’ phase from birth and it continues throughout their school years (Lawson, 1983a). These experiences act as an ‘apprenticeship of observation’ phase where students develop a ‘subjective warrant’ on what they believe the teaching profession to be (Lortie, 1975). These experiences are very powerful in constructing teachers’ beliefs about teaching (Curtner-Smith, 1999; Lortie, 1975) and may resist the acquisition of future knowledge in teacher education (Lawson, 1983a). Lawson (1983a, 1983b) believes that two types of recruit emerge from this phase of acculturation to pursue a career in teaching; those with a ‘teaching orientation’ and those with a ‘coaching orientation’. Teachers who possess a teaching orientation will view coaching as a career contingency, have innovative orientations to teaching, are likely to be fully inducted into their PETE programme, have a high commitment to teaching and teach classes high in learning time. Teachers with coaching orientations will view teaching, and not coaching, as a career contingency, are unlikely to be inducted by their PETE programme, have a low commitment to teaching and teach in a
custodial manner where class learning time is low. Researchers have acknowledged that teachers may possess weak or moderate coaching orientations to teaching (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011). It is acknowledged that the majority of teachers enter PETE with a coaching orientation (Curtner-Smith, 1997; Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Hutchinson, 1993; Zmudy, Curtner-Smith, & Steffen, 2009).

When PSTs enter a PETE programme this is recognised as their ‘professional socialisation’. Lawson (1983a) defines this stage as the process where “would be and experienced teachers acquire and maintain the values, sensitivities, skills, and knowledge that are deemed ideal for teaching physical education” (p. 4). Teacher educators need to challenge PSTs’ previously acquired ‘subjective warrants’ (Lortie, 1975). If this does not occur then PSTs’ negative ‘subjective warrants’ will be reinforced (Lawson, 1983a; Schempp & Graber, 1992), with the possibility that PSTs apply covert behaviours in order to progress through teacher education (Graber, 1991; Schempp & Graber, 1992). Even though teacher education is not the most important or effective step in the preparation of teachers (Curtner-Smith, 1999; Placek et al., 1995), it is the most necessary one (Lawson, 1983a). Acknowledging this, Lawson (1983a) provided a number of implications for successful PETE programmes. Lawson believes that PETE programmes need to agree on a shared, technical culture and professional ideology, and have pedagogy focused faculty where “recruit’s inaccurate subjective warrant is replaced by a new self-image forged out of new ideological commitments and newly-acquired knowledge and skill” (Lawson, 1983a, p. 13). When Lawson’s (1983a) implications are adhered to it is possible to successfully induct recruits with varying orientation to teaching physical education (Curtner-Smith, 1997, 1998, 2001; Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990; Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011).
Teachers encounter ‘organisational socialisation’ when they begin to teach in schools, and Lawson (1983a) describes it as “the process by means of which prospective and experienced teachers acquire and maintain custodial ideology and the knowledge and skills that are valued and rewarded by the organization” (p. 4). On entry to schools teachers encounter a ‘landscape of teaching’ (Schempp & Graber, 1992) which may conform to, or oppose, the teachers’ subjective warrant and knowledge acquired in PETE (Lawson, 1983b). The schools in which teachers teach may force them to ‘strategically redefine’ their environment where they employ their new ideas in the programme (Lacey, 1977). Alternatively they may ‘strategically comply’ with their programme and colleagues’ traditional methods of teaching. This lowering of standards to fit in (Etheridge, 1989) may lead to a ‘wash out’ of the knowledge gained in teacher education (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981). Lawson (1983b) built on the thinking of Van Maanen and Schein (1979) by theorizing that teachers who possessed innovative orientations to teaching and were teaching in schools, whose socialisation tactics were collective (with others), sequential (planned order), variable (no fixed time frame), serial (assigned mentors) and involve divestiture (ideas were rejected) would develop ‘custodial orientations’. However, if innovative teachers were teaching in schools whose socialisation tactics were individual (alone), informal, random (no particular order), disjunctive (no mentor assigned) and involved divestiture (new ideas encouraged) then ‘innovative orientations’ would be developed.

An important phase of the socialisation of teachers may occur in the teaching placement (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990), where the stages of ‘professional socialisation’ and ‘organisational socialisation’ overlap (Schempp & Graber, 1992). This short phase of teaching placement is extremely significant to PSTs as they are facing a wide array of
socialisation processes, all of which may affect their teaching of physical education. During teaching placement the PSTs’ cooperating teachers can be influential (Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a), although this influence can often be negative when coaching-orientated PSTs mimic the practices of their cooperating teachers with the same orientation (Smith, 1993). PSTs are also open to the ideas of their cooperating teachers whilst on teaching placement (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990). It has been noted that whilst in teacher education programmes PSTs develop an idealistic view of teaching which is challenged when PSTs teach on teaching placement. Hence, PSTs adopt more custodial practices during their teaching placement (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990). As teachers progress onto their first year teaching as a qualified teacher, they face similar influences in their school, where organisational constraints such as perceptions of colleagues, class size, pupil behaviour and scheduling can have a negative (Curtner-Smith, 1997, 1998) or positive (Curtner-Smith, 2001) effect on teachers delivery of physical education. The organisational socialisation within schools may even have the power to force teachers to consider alternative careers (Curtner-Smith, 2001).

Occupational socialisation has become more common in determining the process of learning and delivering the SE curriculum and instructional model (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Deenihan & MacPhail, In Press; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a). This research has helped to recognize that teachers’ and PSTs’ occupational socialisation has a strong influence on how they teach SE and that they deliver SE in one of three ways (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). They may deliver SE in its ‘full version’, meaning that they deliver seasons which are consistent with the recommendations and guidelines provided by Siedentop (1994) and his colleagues (Siedentop et al., 2004, 2011). In some cases they may deliver SE in a ‘watered down’
version where some parts of the ‘full version’ are omitted. In some cases they may take a ‘cafeteria approach’ to SE where they teach traditional sporting units and include only facets of the SE framework. In order for teachers to teach SE in its ‘full version’ they must have either a teaching or moderate coaching orientation to teaching, work in an innovative school environment and receive high quality SE learning experiences in their PETE programme (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Deenihan & MacPhail, In Press; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a). When teachers possess coaching orientations or work in custodial school environments it is likely that it will be extremely difficult to teach SE. It has been acknowledged that there can be a difficulty in using Lawson’s (1983a) classification of a coaching or teaching orientated teachers, believing that it is possible for teachers to possess a teaching orientation whilst also having a strong engagement in high level sport and an interest in coaching (Deenihan & MacPhail, In Press). Deenihan and MacPhail believe that such recruits should be recognised as a teaching recruit with a coaching disposition to acknowledge both influences in the teacher’s orientation to teaching. They also believe that it was difficult to determine a teacher’s orientation from limited interview or questionnaire data and that a teacher’s orientation often becomes more apparent after prolonged exposure to the PST.

PSTs enjoy using SE as it is closely aligned to their previous sporting experiences (Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004), and these sporting experiences help them deliver authentic SE seasons (Deenihan & MacPhail, In Press). The influence of a PST’s cooperating teacher and university supervisor can greatly aid their delivery of SE, along with the nature of the pupils taught (Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a). Pupils’ behavioural difficulties make it difficult to teach SE, and in some cases teachers were advised not to attempt to teach SE with particular pupil groups (Curtner-Smith et al.,
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2008; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a). The majority of research studies using occupational socialisation to determine how teachers deliver SE have selected teachers who possess superior academic standings and have a high likelihood of teaching SE (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a). Even when such selection criteria were employed, some of these teachers still struggled to teach SE, and in one case did not attempt to teach it at all (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). Research needs to focus on a variety of teachers’ uses of SE and continue to identify SE’s use in a variety of school settings (Deenihan & MacPhail, In Press).

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of occupation socialisation on seven PSTs delivery of SE and contribute to the current paucity of research on this area. It aimed to investigate the fidelity of Lawson’s (1983a) acculturation of teaching hypothesis. This study also aimed to identify the organisational socialisation factors which inhibit PSTs’ teaching of SE and to identify methods of overcoming challenges which may arise in introducing SE while on teaching placement.

7.4 Methodology

7.4.1 Participants

All seven PSTs were in their fourth (and final) year in their undergraduate PETE programme in a university in Ireland. The first group of PSTs, Barry, Ciara, Conor and Jamie were all members of the same year group. The second group of PSTs, Frank, Gemma and Paul were all members of the same year group and undertook their SE-PETE experience and teaching placement two years after the first group. All PSTs volunteered to participate in the data collection. While the first group of PSTs agreed to
complete their final year research project on their experiences of delivering SE on their teaching placement, the second group of PSTs did not conduct research on their experiences delivering SE. All PSTs enrolled onto the PETE programme on completion of their post-primary education, except for Jamie, who had worked for a number of years before returning to education.

7.4.2 SE-PETE experience

All PSTs experienced the modeling of SE in a net-games module in the third year of their PETE programme. During the SE net-games module PSTs experienced a SE season as a participant, selected and affiliated to teams, adopted roles and experienced formal competition and culminating events. The module consisted of three mini seasons of tennis, badminton and volleyball over a 12 week period. The PSTs were formally assessed during weeks 11, 12 and 13 where they were required to complete SE portfolios in groups and deliver a microteaching lesson to their peers. Minor changes, particularly in the assessments, occurred between the first and second group completing the module. As part of the second group, PSTs completed the SE portfolio in pairs rather than groups of five and the credit weighting for the assessments changed from 50% for the portfolio and 50% for the microteaching to 70% for the portfolio and 30% for the microteaching. The module was perceived to be effective in enhancing PSTs’ knowledge of SE (Deenihan, MacPhail, & Young, 2011)

7.4.3 Teaching placement

In the final year of their PETE programme all PSTs completed their ten-week teaching placement in an assigned post-primary school. During this ten-week teaching placement, PSTs are required to teach a minimum of five double classes (approximately
80 minutes) of physical education a week. They also teach five to six single classes of their elective classroom-based subject. Within their placement school each PST is assigned a cooperating teacher who provides guidance for the PST throughout the school placement, observes the PST’s teaching and encourages the PST’s socialisation into the school. The teaching placement is assessed by a university tutor on two occasions which, along with the teaching placement file including schemes of work, lesson plans and reflections, contributes to the finalised assigned teaching practice grade.

7.4.4 Data collection

PSTs from the first group were interviewed at three stages of their teaching placement. They were interviewed prior to beginning their placement to identify their acculturation to teaching, their experiences learning SE in PETE and their intentions to deliver SE on their teaching placement, including any perceived difficulties in delivering it. As a group, the four PSTs participated in a mid-teaching placement focus group, five weeks into their teaching placement, to investigate the organisational socialisation within the school they were teaching, their experiences delivering SE up to that point, and their intentions in delivering SE for the remainder of their teaching placement. At the end of their placement each PST was interviewed again to investigate their experiences delivering SE including the enablers and challenges in doing so, their organisational socialisation and their intentions for future delivery of SE as qualified teachers. All interviews were conducted by the first author and took place within the university setting.

The second group of PSTs participated in similar data collection measures, with the addition of two interviews (one at the beginning and one at the end of the previous
year’s SE net-games module) investigating their experiences of the net-games module and their acculturation to teaching. For the facilitation of results both these interviews and their pre-teaching placement interview will be identified with the tag ‘pre-interviews’ as they contain similar information to the first group’s pre-interviews. The interviews used an adapted version of an interview script used previously to investigate teachers’ delivery of SE (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). Ethical approval for these data collection measures was granted by the relevant University’s Research Ethics Committee.

7.4.5 Data analysis

Each interview and focus group were analysed using coding (Miles & Huberman, 1994) and constant comparison (Thomas, 2009). During this process all data was read and extracts from the interviews and focus groups were assigned codes relevant to their meanings. Each data source was read repeatedly to identify where new codes would relate to other data. Once all interviews and focus groups had been analysed in this manner, extracts relating to each category across all were collated into a word processing document. Categories were then grouped where appropriate to form main themes to facilitate interpretation of results.

The PSTs’ acculturation to teaching was informed through analysis of their previous school and sport experience and their reasons for becoming a teacher. Their professional socialisation was informed from their perceptions of their SE-PETE experience and previous research findings relating to their net-games module (Deenihan & MacPhail, In Press; Deenihan et al., 2011). Their organisational socialisation was informed from analysis of their teaching placement school’s physical education programme and influence of the cooperating teachers on their ability to teach through
curriculum and instructional models. The extent to which the PSTs used the SE model was determined from their mid- and post-teaching placement interviews.

7.4.6 Reliability and Trustworthiness

All PSTs were ensured that their involvement in data collection was voluntary and each read participant information sheets and signed informed consent forms. Each PST was assigned a pseudonym for the presentation of findings. Data from all interviews and focus groups were transcribed verbatim and proofread to eliminate any errors in the transcription process. Each PST was e-mailed a copy of their transcripts and encouraged to verify their contents and make revisions where necessary, allowing for member checking. An attempt has been made to triangulate data across the PSTs’ interviews and focus groups and across the stages of data collection.

It should be noted however that while the first group of PSTs were completing their final year research project on their experiences teaching SE, they were encouraged not to let this bias their use of the model and remain honest about their delivery of SE. Additionally, one of the PSTs from the first group, Barry, was part of a previous phase of research where he was observed weekly teaching SE by the first author (Deenihan & MacPhail, In Press). Although additional data collection measures were conducted with Barry during this research, only data collection measures that were completed with all seven PSTs were used to inform this study. As Curtner-Smith (2001) previously acknowledged in his research, the PSTs in this study viewed the first author as a researcher and friend. The first author had no role in assessing the PSTs at any stage of their PETE programme, and the PSTs were familiar with the first author due to his presence as a researcher in the department in which the PETE programme resided. As a
result this lead to a situation where the PSTs felt comfortable to share their experiences with him and were assured that their data would be kept confidential.

7.5 Results

To aid the presentation of results the authors will briefly discuss how the PSTs’ occupational socialisation influenced their delivery of SE. We then focus particularly on the specific factors which inhibited the PSTs’ delivery of SE.

7.5.1 PSTs’ occupational socialisation and delivery of SE

Table 7.1 illustrates the PSTs’ occupational socialisation and a sample of interview extracts to support their socialisation and delivery of SE. From the PSTs’ pre-teaching placement interviews it was determined that PSTs possessed one of three orientations to teaching; teaching orientations, coaching orientations or teaching orientations with a disposition to coaching. Ciara, Gemma, and Jamie, maintained teaching orientations. These PSTs spoke clearly about the reasons they wanted to become a teacher including enjoying working with young people, admiring their previous teachers and wanting to teach any subject. Conor and Paul, possessed a coaching orientation. These teachers were clearly attracted to physical education teaching because of the opportunities to coach and be involved with extra curricular sports. Barry and Frank, appeared to possess a teaching orientation while also having considerable experience in sports coaching. It was felt it would be inaccurate to classify these teachers as either moderate or fully coaching orientated as they had a genuine interest in teaching.

All PSTs participated in the same SE net-games module in the third year of their PETE programmeme. The PSTs were complimentary of the experiences they received
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Acculturation</th>
<th>Professional Socialisation</th>
<th>Organisational Socialisation</th>
<th>Version of SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Teaching with Coaching</td>
<td>SE net-games module</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“[my decision to become a teacher] would have been influenced a lot from my own PE teacher, I felt I had a very similar personality to him…I felt that also my high interest in sport I would be suitable for the job”</td>
<td>“I based a lot of what I did on the Sport Education model that I did here [in PETE]…most of the features that [the lecturer] included in hers I definitely replicated in mine”</td>
<td>“[the content to be taught in class] is left up to the teacher themselves…I was free to teach whatever teaching or learning strategies I did want to use”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I based a lot of what I did on the Sport Education model that I did here [in PETE]…most of the features that [the lecturer] included in hers I definitely replicated in mine”</td>
<td>“the PE department is very good in the school…there is a really good sport ethos in the school and there is a good attitude towards PE by the students and the teachers”</td>
<td>“I took on a lot of the features of Sport Ed and the degree of success was very good from a lot from the feedback” and “I felt I was pretty consistent in terms of each lesson had a definite structure and there was definite roles in each of the…I even introduced some more features in terms of the referee near the end”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciara</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>SE net-games module</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I like young people, I like being involved and talking, to actually have contact and make a difference to people you are working with”</td>
<td>“it really implemented what we needed to know and how to teach it to students…I am definitely going to take what I have learned in those classes and teach it on my fourth year [teaching placement]”</td>
<td>“the PE department is very good in the school…I was free to teach whatever teaching or learning strategies I did want to use”</td>
<td>“I think that I used everything I set out to implement” and “I did improve week by week because I never taught sport education before…as each week went along I felt more comfortable and the kids knew the roles and what to expect”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conor</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>SE net-games module</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>Watered Down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“the opportunities from [PETE] to go into kind of more coaching jobs if you are outside [in other countries], PE is a good background if you are trying to get into coaching”</td>
<td>“[the class group] found it interesting and perfectly found it useful, the idea of how to conceive it and how it would work”</td>
<td>“[physical education] is held in high regard by all the teachers” and “they give each teacher their own leeway to decide how they’d like to approach [the class content]”</td>
<td>“I had to take a step in a nd take a more direct role in the class” and “if I did it again would adapt it maybe where the statistics would be on each team rather than each individual player”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>SE net-games module</td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>Watered Down Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I was interested in it and I always wanted to teach anyway… in school like, if you had asked me what I wanted to do [I would have wanted to be a teacher]”</td>
<td>“if we hadn’t done the module we wouldn’t have had a clue [how to teach SE]” and “I based [my SE season] on the volleyball module we did as in the sequence of events every week”</td>
<td>“the [national curriculum for physical education] isn’t really followed” and “[the physical education teacher takes volleyball very seriously] and he thinks I’m having volleyball as kind of a guinea pig of a project so he’s not happy about it”</td>
<td>“[because my classes were disrupted] I’m going to have to jigger things up a bit but they are not going to get [a full season], I’m going to have to rush things now more than I wanted to”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7.1: PSTs’ occupational socialisation and delivery of SE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gemma</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>SE net-games module</th>
<th>Custodial</th>
<th>Watered Down</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“my [physical education] teacher in school was a really nice lady and I just could see myself being a teacher like her”</td>
<td>“[the SE module] was effective because if I hadn’t done it I would have been a lot more reluctant to [teach SE], I don’t think I would have gotten the same experience from a book”</td>
<td>“the students themselves and the PE teachers commented on how there wasn’t much enthusiasm for sports within the school” and “the kids come in and say ‘can we do this?’ and a lot of the time [the teachers] just give in because they say they want to enjoy teaching”</td>
<td>“I implemented what I planned to but I didn’t implement it as well as I hoped for some aspects” and “I felt like the roles were a bit too much, because [the pupils] weren’t really mature enough to listen to each other”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frank</th>
<th>Teaching with Coaching</th>
<th>SE net-games module</th>
<th>Custodial</th>
<th>Cafeteria Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“sport would have been my main love so I wanted to do that, but I do [a classroom based subject] as well as the PE, so I like that as well…I wouldn’t mind teaching other subjects”</td>
<td>“everything we know we learned it from that module…I think it’s the best way of doing it by practicing it and actually being part of a class”</td>
<td>“its an all boys school you know, they are ‘messers’, they are wild” and “I’m nearly more informed [than my cooperating teacher] I know more about the sport and the teaching methods than he does so he is not able to help me”</td>
<td>“I decided not to do it, just because I didn’t really know the classes either…I only got one shot at [teaching placement] so I wanted to do things the way I knew best” and “I would have often got some of them to take the stretches some days, or to take the warm up, just small things like that, but then the main body of the class I generally tended to take myself”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paul</th>
<th>Coaching</th>
<th>SE net-games module</th>
<th>Custodial</th>
<th>Cafeteria Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“You have got a load of scope to sort of help out in the school with extracurricular activities”</td>
<td>“[the SE module was] very effective because I learned it off for an exam beforehand in the summer but I wouldn’t have had a clue how to implement it in the class. This really kind of brought it to life”</td>
<td>“[the physical education teachers] would have been quite didactic in their approach” and “I only had half the hall for the class and we wouldn’t have a huge amount of space and we didn’t have a huge amount of equipment”</td>
<td>“no I haven’t [taught SE yet], I was planning on doing it but then the space I had available I couldn’t” and “It was interesting in that my class has moved away from games based learning stuff and more into drills”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
during the SE net-games module and believed that being a participant in a SE season helped them understand SE better and feel confident to teach it on their teaching placement. The PSTs’ organisational socialisation they faced within their teaching placement school could be classified as innovative or custodial. Barry, Ciara and Conor taught in an innovative environment and spoke about how they were encouraged to use SE, having a good physical education ethos and the freedom to teach how they wanted. Conversely, Jamie, Gemma, Frank and Paul were teaching in schools which portrayed custodial teaching environments, resulting in the teaching of SE being more challenging. These four PSTs spoke about their schools not having a structured physical education curriculum, having to deal with many behavioural issues and teaching with limited facilities and resources.

The three processes of occupational socialisation had a significant influence on PSTs’ ability to teach SE and, as a result, the PSTs delivered one of three versions of SE; full versions, watered down or cafeteria versions. Table 7.1 illustrates how PSTs’ occupational socialisation contributed to the PSTs’ delivery of SE. Barry and Ciara, considered to be teaching the ‘full version’ of SE, delivered seasons consistent with Siedentop’s (1994) recommendations where they used teams, included various roles and incorporated competition and culminating events and remained faithful to SE throughout the season. Conor, Jamie and Gemma were unable to teach full versions of SE and consequently delivered SE in ‘watered-down’ version. Although they set out to teach SE fully they were inhibited due to scheduling problems where their season was cut short, experienced difficulties with pupils performing the roles and pupils struggling with record keeping. Frank and Paul delivered SE in a cafeteria style where they incorporated parts of SE into their lessons. Although both decided at the start they
would not teach a SE season per-se, they began to introduce aspects such as teams, responsibility and the culminating event.

7.5.2 Specific organisational socialisation constraints faced by the PSTs

A number of specific organisational constraints inhibited the PSTs’ delivery of SE and included cooperating teachers, increased workload, pupils’ ability and difficulties teaching SE as a PST. Each of these are presented in turn.

7.5.2.1 Cooperating teachers

Undoubtedly, the factor which influenced the PSTs’ delivery of SE most was their cooperating teachers. None of the PSTs’ cooperating teachers used SE in their school physical education curriculum and most were not familiar with the concept. In Barry, Ciara and Conor’s contexts their cooperating teachers, while not having much exposure to SE, encouraged them to use SE and provided assistance where possible. Each of these PSTs appreciated the support received from their cooperating teachers while also recognising that it would have been more beneficial if their cooperating teacher had some experience with SE. Conor noted receiving positive feedback from his cooperating teacher and that they were in favour of him teaching SE, and that they “showed no resistance in regards using a different curriculum model, they felt it was worth the try” (Conor, Post-interview). Barry commented that the majority of his cooperating teacher’s feedback was in relation to classroom management and that he would have appreciated feedback with regards to his delivery of SE, believing “it may have been more effective if obviously if she had some experience or knowledge of sport education to give me kind of appropriate or really direct concise feedback” (Post-interview). Ciara received positive support from her cooperating teacher in relation to
her teaching. Although she did not receive much specific feedback on her SE teaching she felt she learned a lot about SE regardless, “it would have been good to get a bit of feedback…it would have been good for my learning knowledge as well but I think that I learned myself as I went along” (Ciara, Post-interview).

Jamie, Frank, Gemma and Paul’s cooperating teachers were less supportive and had a direct influence on their delivery of SE. From the beginning of Frank’s teaching placement he was encouraged not to use SE. Frank spoke about his discussion with the cooperating teacher to use SE;

“I talked with him about it a small bit and he didn't seem too keen on it. Just talking about the classes I had, he didn't think it would work too well. He thought you would need a small bit more control. That would have been his philosophy” (Post-interview)

Paul was encouraged to teach more didactically when his cooperating teacher observed his SE classes, “She thought that it was quite unruly and hard to manage… She was giving me feedback and she was saying I was doing this and that wrong” (Paul, Post-interview). Gemma was influenced to retreat from using SE by a cooperating teacher who did not appreciate SE, “[my cooperating teacher] was kind of looking down on stuff I was doing and thinking ‘That’s silly, the kids won’t do that, the kids are stupid, the kids they won’t be able to do that, they’re too lazy’” (Post-interview). Even though Jamie’s cooperating teacher was initially positive regarding his delivery of SE, he began to disapprove of the lack of direct teaching time in the classes. Jamie reflected that “[his cooperating teacher’s] whole thing was that I should be teaching the class… he doesn’t ask me about it anymore” (Mid-focus group). Jamie’s cooperating teacher objected to the structure of a SE class to the extent that he used to interfere during the classes, interrupting the culminating tournament games, “He’s like stopping the game
and goes – ‘No, that’s not a spike, a spike is like’, you know, it just sucked the life out of it!” (Jamie, Post-interview). Paul felt that for SE to be implemented effectively in a school that “the cooperating teacher would have to be cooperative and have knowledgeable of sport education as well” (Mid-focus Group)

7.5.2.2 Increased workload

There was a strong agreement between the PSTs that teaching a SE season required considerably more planning than a traditional physical education lesson. The PSTs were conscious of this increased workload even before beginning their teaching placement, believing that there was a lot more to plan for when transferring responsibility to pupils. Frank believed that it was “more work than a regular lesson plan” (Pre-interview). Conor was conscious of the time needed to create pupil friendly resources, “You have to go away and make task cards and make them easy to understand and have people check them. So, it is a lot more time consuming I think” (Pre-interview). Gemma felt that there was a lot to plan for when creating her SE scheme of work;

I actually found it harder [than traditional units] because you are trying to incorporate the roles and you have to explain to [the pupils] what you are doing and get them to pick out the teams. It is just a lot of thought has to go into how you are going to do it” (Gemma, Post-interview)

At the mid-point of their teaching placement the PSTs still felt that their SE class required a lot of planning. Ciara commented, “It’s an awful lot more work before you go in, even the first few weeks even getting resources and putting them into teams it was an awful lot of work” (Mid-focus group). Barry agreed and felt that “there is definitely a bit more work in sport education than in other classes I think because you
want to give them a lot of kind of authority and ownership over the lesson” (Mid-focus group). The workload forced Gemma to reconsider the reality of teaching SE in the future, “a lot more work now than the other classes I think I’d rather not teach it again in the future again for that reason” (Mid-focus group). Similar feelings were expressed at the conclusion of the teaching placement although the PSTs did appreciate that it was worth the extra effort and that the workload was likely to reduce as they became more experienced and completed a number of seasons, “One problem I probably encountered was there was a lot of preparation for the class more so than other classes…you will build up kind of a stockpile of resources, so I think initially getting over that hill would definitely lessen the work load in the future” (Barry, Post-interview). Conor expressed similar sentiments, “All you have to do is do it well once, and once it is done, all the resources are there and they are available to you. So, I wouldn’t see [the additional workload] in that regard as a hindrance” (Post-interview). Ciara even believed the workload was reduced as the season progressed, saying that after a few weeks “it wasn’t as much work because the students knew what they had to do” (Ciara, Post-interview). Due to Gemma believing that her SE season was unsuccessful, she felt it was not worth all the additional planning she devoted, “I don’t think [the additional planning] was worth it for me, just in the sense that it didn’t really work, whereas if it had have worked I would have got a great lot out of it” (Post-interview).

7.5.2.3 Pupils’ ability to adopt roles and responsibility

There was a strong concern amongst the PSTs of the pupils’ ability to complete the roles and responsibilities within SE. Again, this was a concern that the PST raised during their pre-teaching placement interviews. When asked what he felt would be the potential difficulties teaching SE, Barry responded, “I think there may be a risk putting
responsibility on the student…will they want the roles first of all or will they want the responsibility and will they perform them to a certain standard” (Pre-interview). Ciara was worried that her pupils may not enjoy the pressure of responsibility, “it might be putting them into a situation where they don’t know what to do. I don’t know would it be stressful, would they be confused?” (Pre-interview). There was a concern of pupils not possessing the required ability to perform the roles. Gemma posed the question, “Will the students really listen to their classmates or not or will the teacher have to step in?” (Pre-interview), and Barry worried that “you have the risk of maybe if the skills coach is not competent enough to show a particular skill maybe students might be losing out or maybe they might be shown incorrectly” (Pre-interview).

These concerns were magnified as the PSTs experienced delivering SE. Some PSTs were worried about giving their pupils responsibility and found that their pupils did not respond well to increased responsibility. Frank doubted the pupils’ ability to accept responsibility, stating, “I don’t think they would take responsibility like we would have done [in PETE]…I think it’s very rare that you would have a group that would take it seriously and who would take the roles on board properly” (Mid-focus group). Paul agreed and thought that the pupils would not enjoy the responsibility, commenting, “Some of them probably wouldn’t have been comfortable with it at all” (Mid-focus group). Gemma reported that when she did try to transfer responsibility that her pupils were not adopting the responsibility as she had expected, “the warm-up and skills coach roles they worked, but just they weren’t working as well as I was hoping, they weren’t really taking responsibility on board” (Gemma, Mid-focus group). Gemma believed that it was due to her pupils’ inexperience of taking on responsibility that led to them being unable to perform their roles successfully.
When pupils did accept the responsibility of the roles, the PSTs were concerned about the pupils’ ability to conduct valuable learning experiences. Barry identified that some of the warm-ups were at times poor and that “there would be times where you would kind of have to go to that specific group because you knew the skills coach wouldn’t be up to it and wouldn’t give the best I suppose explanation and demonstration” (Mid-focus group). Paul worried that without a substantial knowledge base in what the pupil coach was teaching may not be successful,

“you would probably need a very high skill level in some of the kids as well to teach the skills, like some of the coaches just pure can’t do the skill, it can be difficult for them to teach it or to get respected as a skills coach” (Mid-focus group)

Jamie acknowledged that his skill coaches were not successful in completing their role, claiming that his pupil coaches “were shocking in some cases, and some of them actually froze when they tried to, you know they couldn’t” (Jamie, Post-interview). Jamie noted that as a result he often had to interrupt group practices to provide teaching points and assist the skills coach, “The essence of sport education is being lost because I was getting more involved” (Post-interview). Ciara was also anxious over the effectiveness of her coaches and feared that the coaches’ team mates did not pay much attention during their instruction, “I wouldn’t say any of them were excellent, I’d say some of them were good, some of them were poor enough. I kind of felt that as I said their team mates wouldn’t be listening to them” (Post-interview).

7.5.2.4 Difficulties teaching SE on a teaching placement

Many of the PSTs were in agreement that there were additional restrictions to them teaching SE as a PST on teaching placement. Paul expressed his frustrations with not entering the school at the beginning of the academic calendar and how this inhibited
his delivery of SE, believing it would have been easier if he had “started [SE] from the start of the term, rather than coming in and being changing the whole thing” (Paul, Mid-focus group). There was also a belief that a PST in a school did not command as much respect as a qualified teacher. Frank believed that SE required good discipline from the class to work stating that “if you were an established teacher and you knew the class and they knew you well, and your rules were well set out, they knew not to cross you like, I think it could work much better” (Mid-focus group). Similarly Gemma remarked, “You’re still a student teacher your still only there for a few weeks so I think you will lose that whole classroom management if you do [SE]” (Mid-focus group). Frank was also conscious of the importance of the teaching placement experience towards achieving a reasonable grade, admitting that PSTs “are just trying to keep our heads above water really for our ten-weeks TP to get through it” (Mid-focus Group) and “I had to make sure [teaching placement] went as smoothly as possible for when the tutor came around, because the grade was fairly important” (Frank, Post-interview). Ciara believed it would have been easier to deliver SE as a qualified teacher due to the required additional work required to be completed on teaching placement, “When I am a [qualified teacher] I won’t have to do as much paper work as I had to do on teaching placement” (Post-interview).

7.6 Discussion

Table 7.1 illustrates an overview of the PSTs’ individual occupational socialisation and their eventual delivery of SE. It was encouraging to find that despite varying occupational socialisation influences, all PSTs were successful in teaching some form of SE. The table is somewhat consistent with what Curtner-Smith and his colleagues (2008) previously noted. That is, for teachers to deliver SE in its full version
they have to possess a teaching orientation, experience high quality SE-PETE learning experiences and be teaching in an innovative school. Table 7.1 also illustrates that when the same type of recruit is teaching in a custodial environment that they teach in a watered-down version. The study did provide new insight into teachers with coaching orientations uses of the SE model, with the previously held assumption that all coaching orientated teacher were likely to not deliver SE in any form. However, the authors identified that when placed in an innovative school culture the PST taught a ‘watered-down’ version of SE and when teaching in a custodial school the PST managed to deliver a ‘cafeteria version’ of SE. This trend has previously been hypothesised by Lawson (1983b), where teachers teaching in schools that provide positive socialisation tactics will encourage innovative practices in teachers, while schools with negative socialisation tactics will promote more custodial practices amongst teachers. Organisational socialisation has previously been identified in the research as a powerful influence on teachers’ practice (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990; Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011), and was further supported here. It is evident from Table 7.1 that PSTs who were teaching in a custodial environment that restricted their delivery of SE, all delivered lesser forms of SE than their peers in innovative schools. It is important therefore that we understand what these organisational restraints are and strive to place PSTs in schools which support the use of innovative curriculum models (Curtner-Smith, 2001).

As has already been acknowledged, the PSTs’ cooperating teacher plays an integral role in their delivery of SE (Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a), and this was further supported in the findings of this study. For some PSTs, their cooperating teachers were supportive and provided feedback on their teaching. These teachers had a large role to play in creating an innovative school environment for their PSTs. Other PSTs were met
with ‘old school’ cooperating teachers who did not appreciate the benefits of SE and provided a custodial school environment. These cooperating teachers had an active role in discouraging the PSTs from attempting to, or continuing to, deliver SE. It was interesting that PSTs found it most difficult when there was only one or two physical education teachers in the department, explaining that when there was additional physical education teachers the PSTs could ignore some of the more custodial teachers and request support and feedback from the (younger) more innovative teachers. Similar to previous acknowledgments (McMahon & MacPhail, 2007; Meeteer et al., 2012) few of the cooperating teachers had a knowledge of SE or used it in their schools. However, for some PSTs, although it would have been beneficial, they did not identify it as crucial and were able to teach SE as long as they were encouraged to do so.

Another concern PSTs were in agreement of was the ability of their pupils to adopt responsibility and perform the roles of pupil coaches. As SE is a pupil-centred model of physical education that provides a high level of autonomy to the pupils, it is crucial that PSTs appreciate that their pupils can accept an increase in responsibility. The ability of pupils to perform roles has been a reoccurring issue in the research literature and teachers particularly have been concerned over the effectiveness of their pupil coaches (Brunton, 2003; Carlson, 1995; Carlson & Hastie, 1997; Curnrow & Macdonald, 1995). Surprisingly, from Alexander and Luckman’s (2001) questionnaires conducted with 377 teachers who had used SE, only 48% of primary and 18% of secondary teachers felt that the pupil coaches were effective in their role. It has been acknowledged that engagement was lowered and off task behaviour increased during pupil-led practices (Sinelnikov & Hastie, 2008; Wallhead & O'Sullivan, 2007) that pupil-coaches are ill equipped for their roles and that no curriculum model should
sideline the expertise of the teacher (Alexander & Penney, 2005). However, there has been some research claiming the contrary, believing pupils to be successful in completing their roles resulting in an increase in pupils’ skill and competence (Hastie, 1996, 1998b; Hastie & Trost, 2002; Kinchin, 2003). There is encouragement that for roles to be effectively engaged in by the pupils they need to be taught comprehensively and on numerous occasions at the start of the season (McMahon & MacPhail, 2007; Taggart et al., 1995). Furthermore, the use of ‘guided practice’ for pupil coaches (Wallhead & O’Sullivan, 2007) and role descriptor sheets, handouts for practices and weekly meetings with coaches (Kim et al., 2006) will help pupils perform their role more successfully.

PSTs felt that there was additional pressure to using SE as a PST on teaching placement. It has already been noted in the literature that PSTs experience difficulties teaching SE (McCaughrty et al., 2004; McMahon & MacPhail, 2007), and some of our PSTs encountered similar difficulties. They felt the structure of their ten-week teaching placement made SE more challenging to implement and that not having a high level of authority or knowledge of the pupils also inhibited their delivery of SE. In addition, being assessed on teaching placement led to a concern of assessment and grading and increased paperwork requirements. There was also a recognised increased workload for delivering SE seasons in comparison to other physical education lessons, a trend that has been illustrated elsewhere (McMahon & MacPhail, 2007; Pill, 2008). PSTs’ teaching placement is potentially a very difficult environment to deliver SE seasons and some qualified teachers who have been identified as likely to deliver SE experience difficulties teaching SE (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). Perhaps with this in mind PETE
programmes should be more supportive and appreciative of PSTs’ uses of SE during their teaching placement.

This study supports the the value of a practical SE season experience in providing a worthwhile grounding for PSTs to teach SE (Deenihan et al., 2011; Jenkins, 2004; Kinchin, 2003; Oslin et al., 2001). The PETE programme was unable to provide further SE-PETE experiences noted elsewhere (Curtner-Smith, 2012) due to various constraints. Specifically, the PETE programme was unable to provide experiences for the PSTs to observe SE being taught in schools, the teaching of mini seasons on early field experiences or the creation of partnerships between schools who have used SE. This was primarily due to SE not yet being a prominent feature of Irish physical education (MacPhail & Halbert, 2005; Sugrue, 2004). While other PETE programmes may encounter similar difficulties to these noted here, it is suspected that most could integrate a practical SE season into one of their existing applied practical studies modules.

The authors deemed that in this instance, it was inappropriate to classify physical education teachers as either ‘teaching orientated’ or ‘coaching orientated’ (Lawson, 1983a). Although additional orientations have been used (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011), the authors felt that those orientations did little to acknowledge that a teacher may possess a true teaching orientation to teaching whilst also possessing considerable expertise and experience in coaching. As a result we identified two PSTs in this study as ‘teaching with a coaching disposition’ recruits and it emerged that they taught SE similar to their teaching orientated peers. It has also been suggested that experiences among sport and coaching aid the delivery of an ‘authentic’ SE season (Deenihan & MacPhail, In Press). Recognising the difficulties PSTs
encounter teaching SE (McCaughtry et al., 2004; McMahon & MacPhail, 2007), the host of inhibitors to delivering SE in schools during teaching placement and the lack of cooperating teachers with sufficient knowledge to appropriately supervise PSTs teaching SE (Meeteer et al., 2012), it seems unreasonable to expect PSTs to teach SE in its ‘full version’. It has been recommended elsewhere to gradually introduce the teaching SE, increasing aspects as you progress from season to season (McMahon & MacPhail, 2007; Siedentop et al., 2004).

The study provided an additional insight into the research regarding the influence of occupational socialisation on PSTs’ delivery of SE. It highlighted, and intended to bridge, gaps in the occupational socialisation theory (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b) by identifying that additional orientation to teaching needs to be acknowledged. It also highlighted the plethora of challenges that face both teachers and PSTs teaching SE in schools, the most dominant being the influence of the cooperating teacher. For PSTs to use SE successfully on teaching placement, cooperating teachers need to appreciate their efforts and not inhibit their delivery of SE. PETE programmes should attempt to provide additional supports for PSTs using SE for the first time, including sample schemes of work and lesson plans and a point of contact within the university in which PSTs can ask questions, gain feedback and share concerns and difficulties they are experiencing in the SE season. Accepting that PETE programmes are limited in their efforts to influence PSTs’ practices (Placek et al., 1995), they need to identify methods of overcoming difficulties PSTs encounter on teaching placement and place PSTs in schools that will provide innovative environments in which PSTs can flourish (Curtner-Smith, 2001). Further research would help support the findings in the study. In particular, research is needed to validate the reliability of teachers possessing a
‘teaching with a coaching disposition’ orientation. It may also become evident from future research that further orientations to teaching need to be recognised. Research which further examines the influences PSTs face when teaching SE, and methods of overcoming these, influence is also welcomed.
Chapter 8: Conclusions and Recommendations

In concluding the findings from this study conclusions are drawn across all the four phases. The research questions which formed this research were:

i. What are the perceptions of those involved in a SE-PETE experience where SE in modeled to PSTs?

ii. To what extent does the SE-PETE experience inform a PST’s delivery of SE on teaching placement?

iii. What are the perceptions towards the enactment of assessment methods of those involved in a SE-PETE experience?

iv. How do a group of PSTs, teaching in varying school environments on the teaching placement, deliver SE having participated in a SE-PETE experience?

8.1 Integrating SE in PETE

Particularly relevant to research question one, the research provided considerable support for the integration of SE into applied practical studies modules in a PETE programme. This support was provided by the PSTs, who expressed the effectiveness of the module in terms of providing a worthwhile experience that informed their teaching of SE during their teaching placement as well as entering the teaching profession as a qualified teacher. The PSTs believed that the opportunity to experience SE first hand as a participant was considerably more effective at increasing their knowledge of SE than learning through a lecture or from a book. Some PSTs admitted building the SE seasons they delivered in schools from the SE net-games module they experienced in PETE. However, the prevalence of this admittance may
raise an issue of PSTs being able to only assimilate what they have experienced (Hammerness et al., 2005), perhaps being unable to design and implement another SE season. Another concern with the SE net-games was raised by the lecturer of the module who was concerned with the effectiveness of SE as a method for preparing PSTs to teach SE and the labour intensiveness of the module. The lecturer’s concerns led to her reducing the focus of SE towards the latter weeks of the module in an attempt to cover more of the content knowledge of net-games. Considerable expertise is required of lecturers to deliver both the concepts of SE and net-games in tandem.

8.2 Assessing SE-PETE experiences

Methods of assessing PETE students’ experiences of SE provision within the PETE programme have remained deficient in the SE research. This research provided a valuable insight into the development and use of two authentic assessment methods, this information addresses research question three. The portfolio assessments were considered to be effective in enhancing and assessing PSTs’ knowledge of net-games and SE. The microteaching assessment was judged to have poor replication to the reality of teaching in schools and did little to enhance or assess the PSTs’ understanding of net-games and SE. It was interesting that, despite the belief that microteaching would extend PSTs’ ability to deliver new instructional strategies (Golightly, 2010), SE’s characteristics challenged the compatibility with microteaching assessments. Specifically, the shift of responsibility from teacher to pupils, the extended nature of a SE season and the time required to allocate teams and use roles made it difficult to assess SE using a one-off short microteaching assessment.
8.3 Recommendations for SE-PETE

Several recommendations were generated across all phases of the research to improve the SE net-games module, these recommendations similarly attend to research questions one and three. It was believed that the SE net-games module needs to (i) replicate the reality of teaching SE in schools closely so the PSTs can appreciate the authentic nature of the learning, (ii) continue integrating SE for the duration of the module and include all of SE’s characteristics so PSTs experience a full season and appreciate the benefit of a prolonged SE season and (iii) it should be introduced in the first or second year of their PETE programme therefore allowing the PSTs an opportunity to teach it on early teaching placements and refining their delivery on subsequent teaching placements. It was also recommended that the module should allow PSTs an opportunity to observe SE being taught well, with the opportunity to appreciate and overcome difficulties teaching SE. Several recommendations were provided in relation to the use of the assessment methods used also. It was acknowledged that assessments need to be constructed with care to ensure they are as authentic to the reality of teaching SE in schools as possible. Recognising this, it was recommended that PSTs should design a comprehensive portfolio, complete with a scheme of work and lesson plans. It was suggested that PSTs should teach extended lessons to school-aged children, instead of their peers, during their microteaching assessments. Video analysis of a SE lesson could be used as a form of assessment. It was acknowledged that if PSTs experienced effective assessment strategies within the module they would be likely to practice those assessments when teaching. Although it was not part of the SE net-games module, a number of PSTs expressed that they would have appreciated the opportunity to observe SE being taught in a school setting. Logistical difficulties such as scheduling
and transporting of pupils resulted in it not being possible to provide this opportunity to the PSTs.

8.4 PSTs’ delivery of SE

Research questions two and four were addressed through the PSTs’ delivery of SE. It was promising that all PSTs delivered SE to some extent during teaching placement. The PSTs’ occupational socialisation somewhat influenced their delivery of SE. Perhaps the most significant influence was the PSTs’ organisational socialisation which they faced within their teaching placement school and, more specifically, their cooperating teacher. All PSTs who were teaching in custodial school environments were unable to teach SE in its ‘full version’, regardless of their orientation to teaching. All of the PSTs’ cooperating teachers had limited knowledge of SE. Although this was not an issue for some PSTs, others recalled being encouraged not to use SE by their cooperating teacher. The PSTs also questioned their university tutors’ knowledge of SE and, due to the importance of their teaching placement grade for their final certification, all PSTs elected not to have their SE class formally assessed by their university tutor. The PSTs also questioned their pupils’ ability to perform the allotted SE roles effectively and were, at times, uncomfortable transferring responsibility to their pupils. It was interesting that the lecturer shared this same concern but with respect to the PSTs’ own ability to perform the role of coach within the SE net-games module in phase one.

8.5 Difficulties teaching SE on teaching placement

The PSTs encountered numerous difficulties teaching SE whilst on teaching placement. The PSTs believed that there was an increased workload required to deliver
SE and this was magnified by the requirement of additional paperwork and lesson reflections on teaching placement. Other reasons for noting a difficulty in teaching SE on teaching placement included not beginning their teaching placement at the start of school term, a lack of familiarity with pupils and the level of authority they could exercise over pupils. Similar to previous research (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009a), many of the PSTs were selective with their delivery of SE with particular pupil groups due to concerns with behaviour and ability. It is imperative that PETE programmes acknowledge the difficulties that PSTs face when teaching SE. Appreciating these difficulties and the difficulties reported in the literature on PSTs’ and beginning teachers’ uses of SE (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; McCaughtry et al., 2004; McMahon & MacPhail, 2007), along with Siedentop’s own recommendation to start delivering SE gradually (Siedentop, Hastie, & van der Mars, 2004), it would appear unrealistic to expect all PSTs to deliver ‘full versions’ of SE on their first attempt. Instead, PETE programmes should encourage a delivery of SE which is suitable for the PST’s context. These difficulties delivering SE further attend to research questions two and four.

8.6 Recommendations for PETE programmes to aid PSTs delivery of SE

Acknowledging that it may be unlikely that PSTs’ cooperating teachers will have sufficient knowledge of SE to encourage teaching it (Meeteer et al., 2012), PETE programmes should have support structures in place that encourage and facilitate PSTs’ delivery of SE. These support structures could include PSTs being afforded the opportunity to converse with a PETE faculty member familiar with SE, where they can discuss ideas and difficulties in the planning or delivery of a SE season. Although it has been recommended that PETE programmes should place their PSTs within school
contexts where the use of innovative teaching methodologies such as SE would be encouraged (Curtner-Smith, 2001), it was appreciated that there are difficulties with this approach and inconsistencies between schools are to be expected. These recommendations further address research questions two and four.

8.7 Development of occupational socialisation theory

The occupational socialisation theory was also significantly developed in this research. While many of the PSTs in the study conformed to Lawson’s (1983a) hypotheses, two PSTs challenged his orientations to teaching. Two of the PSTs in this research displayed characteristics of both teaching and coaching orientations. These teachers possessed a true passion to become a teacher but were considerably influenced by their extensive sporting and coaching involvements. It was concluded that it would be remiss to identify these PSTs as either possessing a teaching or coaching orientation. Similarly, Curtner-Smith et al.’s (2008) identification of a moderate coaching orientation did little to acknowledge these PSTs’ passion for teaching. It was also acknowledged that it is difficult to classify teachers with either teaching or coaching orientation from limited interview or questionnaire data. In this research the prolonged exposure with the PSTs provided a more detailed insight into their teaching orientation. It was concluded that an additional orientation to teaching should be recognised, i.e. ‘teaching with a coaching disposition’. This orientation recognised that a PSTs may be positively influenced by both teaching and coaching orientations. It was observed that these recruits (those recognised as ‘teaching with a coaching disposition’) delivered SE in similar approach to the PSTs with teaching orientation. Interestingly, the two PSTs’ coaching and sporting experiences helped to authenticate their SE seasons as they recalled many experiences from their own sporting background. This challenges the
notion that those with coaching orientations will be more likely to deliver SE in lesser versions (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008).

8.8 General recommendations for PETE programmes

A number of recommendations were provided for PETE programmes in general throughout the research. One of the most pertinent recommendations is that PETE programmes offer similar opportunities to learn other curriculum and instructional models. It was recommended that each applied practical studies module should be delivered through a different curriculum and/or instructional model so that PSTs experience each model as a participant and appreciate how it can be applied in practice. Although the PETE programme in this study was unable to provide many of the SE-PETE recommendations from the literature (Curtner-Smith, 2012), modeling SE within an existing applied practical studies module to create a practical SE experience was feasible. This recommendation carries significance with the emergence of models based instruction (Gurvitch et al., 2008), where PSTs are encouraged to teach physical education using one of a number of curriculum and instructional models. This practice of physical education delivery is similar to the Irish post-primary senior cycle physical education draft curriculum framework (NCCA, 2011). Within these curricula, Irish physical education teachers are encouraged to structure their classes and schemes of work around curriculum and instructional models as opposed to the content areas which are traditionally delivered e.g. athletics, dance, games etc. This research has provided an insight into how PETE programmes can integrate such models into their programmes in a manner which is effective and time efficient.
8.9 Recommendations for future research

A number of recommendations for future research to contribute to an understanding of how PSTs’ experience learning and delivering SE were extrapolated from the research phases;

- It would be interesting to examine the delivery of other curriculum and instructional models into PETE applied practical studies modules. This practice would require a shared understanding among PETE faculty regarding the focus of each module and increased knowledge and determination from the lecturers delivering the modules.

- It is worth examining the practicality of including all the SE-PETE recommendations in the literature (Curtner-Smith, 2012). It is suspected that other PETE programmes would face similar difficulties when attempting to implement all the recommendations. It was noted that PSTs may only be able to assimilate the SE season they experienced in PETE. It would be valuable to investigate the reliability if of this concern methods of overcoming this.

- Continued research needs to examine PSTs’ delivery of SE on their teaching placements, specifically the influences (and methods of overcoming these) which PSTs face when delivering SE in a variety of settings. It is pertinent to continue to examine the reality of PSTs being able to teach SE in its ‘full version’ on their teaching placement. Research could also investigate the effectiveness, with respect to pupil enjoyment, skill acquisition etc., of the SE seasons which are delivered in their ‘watered down’ or ‘cafeteria styles’.

- It is important to examine the reliability of Lawson’s (1983a) orientations to teaching and whether there is support for additional orientations to be
acknowledged. Future research also needs to examine the fidelity of the teaching orientation ‘teaching with a coaching disposition’, to understand how it may influence PSTs’ delivery of SE and other curriculum and instructional models.

- Research is needed to further understand how PETE programmes should assess their SE-PETE experiences. Research needs to examine further the use of authentic assessment and whether it is feasible to authentically assess SE in a PETE context.

As I am currently undertaking a professional diploma in physical education, this research has heightened the necessity to not only understand my own perceptions and experiences of delivering SE but also an awareness of how PETE programmes construct such experiences. As a future physical education teacher, I endeavour to contribute to the enrichment of SE experiences within schools and through research.

8.10 Proposed inclusion of SE in UL’s PETE programme

Table 8.1 illustrates how the university on which this study was conducted could include SE over the course of their PETE programme. Building on the findings of this research and the literature review, it is imperative that PSTs experience SE on numerous occasions during their PETE programme and that they receive opportunities to experience, observe and teach SE. The PSTs would experience their first exposure to SE in Semester 1 where they would be presented with the Irish junior cycle and senior cycle physical education syllabi. Linked with the senior cycle physical education syllabus the PSTs could be presented with each of the six curriculum and instructional models they would be required to teach as physical education teachers in Ireland. The PSTs would experience their first practical exposure to SE in their second semester
where SE would be modelled by a faculty member in an Invasion Games module. This would allow the PST to experience SE in a similar manner to the experience described in Chapters 4 and 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 1</th>
<th>Semester 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to JCPE and SCPE and Curriculum and Instructional Models</td>
<td>Invasion Games through SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 3</td>
<td>Semester 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe SE being taught in schools</td>
<td>Teach faculty-designed SE Schemes of Work on Teaching Placement 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 5</td>
<td>Semester 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance through SE</td>
<td>Research Project with optional topic of SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 7</td>
<td>Semester 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Project with optional topic of SE (continued)</td>
<td>Research Project with optional topic of SE (continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach SE on Teaching Placement 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8.1: Proposed inclusion of SE in University of Limerick’s PETE programme**

The PSTs would be provided the opportunity to observe SE being taught in schools during their third semester of the PETE programme. Here PSTs would visit local schools who are employing SE successfully and observe SE lessons to appreciate its application in school settings. The PSTs would also attend a lecture presented by teachers who use SE and engage in a question and answer session. In the following semester, semester 4, PSTs would be encouraged to teach SE on their first teaching placement. To facilitate the PSTs’ use of SE on this placement they would be assigned a university tutor who is familiar with the SE model and have the option of using a faculty-designed scheme of work to guide their delivery of SE. The PSTs would also have the opportunity to engage in pre- and mid-teaching placement planning sessions.
with faculty with expertise in SE to help plan their SE seasons and also discuss any issues they are encountering in the delivery of SE.

In semester 5 PSTs would experience SE as a participant, with a faculty member modelling SE in a dance applied practical studies module. This would allow PSTs to experience and appreciate the flexibility of SE’s use in areas other than games. This experience would again be similar to that described in chapters 4 and 6 and in addition would provide PSTs more autonomy into the design of the SE season. It would also require more advanced assessment procedures where they would develop a comprehensive scheme of work for their future teaching placement 2 and also deliver a SE lesson to first-year PSTs who are completing the SE Invasion Games module. The PSTs would also have the opportunity to use SE as a topic for their research project, encouraging them to read the SE literature and develop an enhanced insight into the model. This research project commences in semester 6 and culminates in semester 7 and would be supervised by a faculty member familiar with SE. Additionally in semester 7, the PSTs would teach SE on their second teaching placement, designing their own SE scheme of work to encourage their interpretations and use of the model. To facilitate their delivery of SE the PSTs would be assigned a university supervisor familiar with SE and have to opportunity to engage in pre- and mid-teaching placement planning sessions with PETE faculty.

Through the collection of these experiences it is anticipated that the PSTs would develop an enhanced understanding and appreciation of SE and be more likely to use it in future. The experiences proposed are realistic and feasible options for the PETE programme as they build upon existing modules and practices in the PETE programme. The endeavours to integrate SE to this extent in the PETE programme would be labour
and expertise intensive but would serve to significantly develop the PSTs’ understanding and future delivery of SE. All faculty members involved in promoting SE would need to appreciate the importance of integrating SE into the PETE programme. It would also be beneficial if faculty could participate in a professional development workshop on SE to gain an enhanced understand of the model and be better qualified to support PSTs’ delivery of SE.
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Appendix One: Subject Information Sheet
Title of project: Pre-service Physical Education teachers’ implementation of Sport Education: the reality and practice of delivery

This study aims to examine how UL B.Sc. Physical Education pre-service teachers experience learning and using the Sport Education (SE) curriculum model. The study aims to provide recommendations for Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) programmes on how to effectively incorporate the SE model into their curriculum.

As a participant of this study you will have completed a games module of net games and Sport Education delivered by Ann Marie Young and will be asked to take part in focus groups. These focus groups will be aiming to gather your experiences of the Sport Education model within the Net Games Module and your intentions on using it in the future. They will take approximately 60 minutes to be completed.

All the details collected from the focus groups will be kept confidential and stored in a locked filing cabinet and electronic files will be stored on a password protected external hard-drive. All of your personal details will be kept confidential and only Ann MacPhail and J.T. Deenihan will have access to any of the data. Ann MacPhail is the Principle Investigator of the study and J.T. Deenihan is completing a PhD through research on this area with Ann.

Participation in this study is not compulsory but is highly valuable and appreciated as it will aid in informing your own practice and in PETE programme development. The study’s findings may be used in publishing articles in the area of Physical Education, Physical Education Teacher Education and Sport Education.

This study has been approved by the Physical Education and Sport Sciences Research Ethics Committee. If you have any further questions or comments regarding this study you are welcome to address them to either of the following contacts;

Ann MacPhail  
ann.macphail@ul.ie  
061 234155

J.T. Deenihan  
j.t.deenihan@ul.ie  
087 6177488

If you have concerns about this study and wish to contact someone independent, you may contact;

The Chairman of the University of Limerick Research Ethics Committee,  
c/o Vice President Academic and Registrar's Office,  
University of Limerick, Limerick, Tel: (061) 202022
Appendix Two: Informed Consent Form
PESREC 74/08
Informed Consent Form
Pre Service Teachers, Qualified PE teachers & Lecturer

Title of project:
Pre-Service Physical Education Teachers’ Implementation of Sport Education: The Reality And Practice Of Delivery

This form is to be signed by all individuals who are interested in taking part in the study. Please make sure you have read the Subject Information Sheet carefully and have asked any questions you deem relevant before signing.

Note:
Participation in this study is voluntary, you may decline to take part, or withdraw at any time with no consequence to yourself.

Please sign below, subject to agreeing with the following:

I have read and understood the subject information sheet.
I understand what the project is about, and what the results will be used for.
I am fully aware of all of the procedures involving myself, and of any risks and benefits associated with the study.
I know that my participation is voluntary and that I can withdraw from the project at any stage without giving any reason.
I am aware that my results will be kept confidential.

Print Name: ______________________
Sign: ______________________
Date: ______________________
Focus Group Questions
For pre-service teachers after Year 3 Semester 1 Module

• What are your experiences of involvement with module PY4045?
• In what ways was the module effectively/ineffectively delivered?
• What would you change about the way the module was delivered to you?
• What aspects of the way the module was delivered did you find effective for enhancing your understanding of Sport Education?
• What aspects of the way the module was delivered did you find less effective in enhancing your understanding of Sport Education?
• How was your content knowledge of net games contextualised in this SE-informed module?
• What do you like about the SE model?
• What do you dislike or would change about the SE model?
• To what extent do you feel confident to use the model in practice?
• How do you think your prospective students would react to the model?
• Are there any aspects of the model that you would or would not use? Why?
• What would encourage you to use the model in a school?
• What would deter you from using the model in a school?
• To what extent would you recommend the model to others?
• How would you explain Sport Education to student teachers on other P.E. programmes that have not had the opportunity to experience it?
Appendix Four: Interview script – Lecturer Phase One
Interview Questions
Lecturers Experiences of SE

- What are your experiences from teaching the Sport Education informed net games module?

- To what extent did you find it a positive or negative learning experience for your students?

- To what extent do you feel confident that your students will use Sport Education in the future?

- To what extent would you continue to include Sport Education in teaching a Physical Education Teacher Education Programme?

- Are there any aspects of the model that you feel are less important for students to experience in a PETE course?

- Does Sport Education encourage instructional strategies that you may not regularly use or does Sport Education enforce your favoured instructional strategies?

- How does the SE model compare to other P.E. teaching models you are aware of?
Appendix Five: Occupational Socialisation Interview Script
Curtner-Smith et al., (2008) Occupational Socialisation interview script

1. Background Information
   a. How old are you?
   b. Where were you born?
   c. What is your race?
   d. What is your gender?
   e. What is your ethnic origin?

2. Acculturation
   a. Would you describe your parents/guardians, siblings or any close relatives as being active or inactive in sport or physical activity? Please elaborate.
   b. During your own childhood and adolescence, would you describe yourself as active or inactive? Please elaborate.
   c. If you were active, in which sports or physical activities did you participate during your childhood and adolescence? At what level did you participate in organized sport?
   d. Describe your school PE programmes at primary and secondary levels.
   e. Describe the provision of extra curricular sport and physical activity at the schools you attended.
   f. Describe your PE teachers and other teachers/coaches who worked which you participated.
   g. Describe any coaches who taught or coached you sport or physical activity outside the school setting during your childhood and adolescence.
   h. Describe any participation in sport and physical activity during your years in higher education
   i. Do you currently participate in sport and physical activity? If yes please elaborate.
   j. Why did you decide to become a PE teacher

3. Professional Socialization
   a. Describe the lecturers who taught you to teach PE during your PETE programme
   b. Were you taught by lectures who specialised in teacher education
   c. To your knowledge, did any of these lecturers coach university sports teams? If yes please elaborate.
   d. Describe any methods which you took during your PETE programme.
   e. Describe any methods classes which you took during your PETE programme
   f. Describe any teaching practices in which you participated during your PETE programme. Were these supervised by the lecturer that taught you methods?
   g. Describe how you were trained to employ the SE model? Did you discuss the model in the class room? Were you given written material to read including books, articles, internet sites or example units and lesson plans? Did you get any/many opportunities to practice the model in practice prior to teaching practice? If yes, did PE lecturers supervise you
and provide feedback during these experiences? Did you get an opportunity to use the model during teaching practice? If yes please describe.

4. General Organisational Socialisation
   a. Describe the school in which you teach. How many pupils attend the school and what are their backgrounds? What type of catchment area does the school have?
   b. Describe the school’s PE department. How many teachers are there in the department? What are their approximate ages? Approximately how long have they been in the school? What kind of facilities and equipment do you have? What are the department’s main goals?
   c. Are there other newly qualified teachers or teachers of other subjects employed at your school? If yes how much contact do you have with them
   d. Have you been assigned an official mentor or do you have an unofficial mentor within the school? If yes please describe his. Her influence on your teaching
   e. Have you been given specific objectives to achieve as a pre-service teacher?
   f. Describe your school’s PE curriculum and extracurricular sports programme.
   g. Who makes the decisions on what is taught in the PE department?
   h. Who makes the decisions on how content is taught in the PE department?
   i. How much input have you had on content taught and curriculum models employed? Have your colleagues embraced any new ideas you have brought to the department?

5. Intentions for use of the SE model
   a. How do you intend to use SE in the school?
   b. Can you outline your scheme of work in relation to the inclusion of SE
   c. Did you encounter any problems in planning your SE schemes of work?
   d. What potential difficulties do you predict may arise when you are using SE?
   e. How has what you have learned in your PETE programme on SE influenced your decision to use it on your teaching practice?
   f. Do you think that you will teach SE effectively, why?
   g. Do you think your students will enjoy SE?
   h. What do you think are the benefits of teaching using SE?
   i. What do you think are the disadvantages of teaching using SE?
   j. How do you think your cooperating teacher will react to you using SE?

6. Other
   a. Is there anything else you would like to add