PSTS’ USE OF MBI: A CASE STUDY OF SE
The influence of organizational socialization in pre-service teachers’ delivery of Sport
Education

Abstract
Research investigating teachers’ and pre-service teachers’ (PSTs) experiences delivering Sport Education (SE) necessitates further attention (Glotova & Hastie, 2014). Research that has been conducted to date has shared varied findings, with some teachers finding it difficult to teach SE in its entirety (Curtner-Smith, Hastie, & Kinchin, 2008). This study investigated seven PSTs’ delivery of SE during their teaching placement in the final year of their physical education teacher education (PETE) program. Data were gathered through pre- and post-teaching placement interviews and mid-teaching placement focus groups, which were analyzed using thematic coding and constant comparison (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Thomas, 2009). Occupational socialization (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b) was used as the framework to analyse the factors that influenced their learning and delivery of SE. Findings show that PSTs encountered specific difficulties related to teaching SE on teaching placement and that their cooperating teachers played a significant role in their delivery of SE.

Introduction
Models Based Practice (MBP) encourages the use of a variety of instructional models while teaching (Gurvitch, Lund, & Metzler, 2008) and is now recognized as an approach through which significant physical education reform can be made (Kirk, 2013). MBP allows for a broader and deeper scope of learning to be achieved than what one instructional model alone can offer (Lund & Tannehill, 2015). PSTs who used MBP effectively during their teaching placement appreciate and enjoy using it and could identify advantages to using MBP than traditional teaching approaches (Gurvitch,
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Blankenship, Metzler, & Lund, 2008). MBP is however recognized as a challenge for
teachers (Casey, 2014; Fletcher & Casey, 2014; Metzler, 2011). Teachers have admitted
lacking experience using MBP and hence returning to their traditional practices after
attempting to teach the pedagogical models within MBP (Casey, 2014; Gurvitch &
Blankenship, 2008). Teachers’ use of MBP can be supported when there is a partnership
between physical education teacher education (PETE) programs and schools (Casey,
2014) but is an area which has been underserved by the research conducted to date
(Fletcher & Casey, 2014). One of the most acknowledged instructional models within
MBP, and the most frequently taught in PETE programs (Ayers & Housner, 2008;
Kinchin, Penney, & Clarke, 2005), is Sport Education (SE). SE has received a wealth of
research attention and welcomed a plethora of positive findings (e.g., Hastie, de Ojeda
& Luquin, 2011), but teachers, in particular PSTs and beginning teachers, have
encountered some difficulties using SE (e.g., Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Stran &
Curtner-Smith, 2010).

Curtner-Smith (2012) compiled a list of recommendations on preparing PSTs to
teach SE. From the recommendations compiled by Curtner-Smith, the study reported
here supported the provision of a practical SE season for PSTs to participate in during
their PETE program, preceded by an initial lecture where PSTs learn about the
characteristics of the model and its implementation in practice. The recommendation to
teach the model during teaching placement, while supervised by a university tutor, was
pursued and is the primary focus of this research. Curtner-Smith (2012) believed that
the more experiences provided to PSTs, the more effective the learning experience will
be.

How qualified teachers and PSTs deliver SE is another area of the SE literature
that warrants further investigation (McMahon & MacPhail, 2007; Stran & Curtner-
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Smith, 2010) and has been described as ‘the missing link’ in the SE research (Glotova & Hastie, 2014). The research that has been conducted on teachers’ delivery of SE has provided mixed findings. Teachers have commented that students’ tactical awareness and teamwork improve (Carlson, 1995), along with giving the teacher more time to observe and assess students (Brunton, 2003; Clarke & Quill, 2003). Although teachers appreciate the benefits of SE, it has been noted that SE’s presence in physical education programs 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 (e.g., Hastie, Sinelnikov, Wallhead, & Layne, 2014). It has been reported that beginning teachers struggle to teach SE and often deliver it in 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 had misconceptions of the model, omit and struggle with features of SE and struggle with the increased workload required (McCaughtry, Sofo, Rovegno, & Curtner-Smith, 2004; McMahon & MacPhail, 2007). In some instances PSTs preferred delivering SE to other teaching methods and believed SE was more beneficial to their students (Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004). These difficulties that teachers and PSTs face when delivering SE are concerning and need to be investigated further if the widely reported benefits of Sport Education (Hastie et al., 2011) are to be successfully transferred to teaching in schools. One framework that has been used to analyse and understand teachers’ and PSTs’ use of SE is occupational socialization (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Stran & Curtner Smith, 2009).

Theoretical Framework and Purpose

Occupational socialization can be defined as “all kinds of socialization that initially influence persons to enter the field of physical education and that later are
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responsible for their perceptions and actions as teacher educators and teachers” (Lawson 1986, p. 107). When preparing PSTs to teach SE it is important that teacher educators understand and appreciate the socialization of teachers and challenge the experiences PSTs have encountered, and will encounter, in their careers as teachers (Schempp & Graber, 1992). Teachers encounter three stages of socialization; acculturation, professional socialization and organizational socialization (Lawson, 1983a).

‘Acculturation’ is the first phase of socialization and begins from birth and continues through PSTs’ school years (Lawson, 1983a). Here PSTs develop a ‘subjective warrant’ on what they believe the teaching profession to be and these experiences are very powerful in constructing their beliefs about teaching (Curtner-Smith, 1999; Lortie, 1975). Lawson (1983a, 1983b) believes two types of recruits emerge from this phase to pursue a career in teaching; those with a ‘teaching orientation’, who have a high commitment to teaching, and those with a ‘coaching orientation’, who favor coaching and have a lower commitment to teaching. PSTs then encounter ‘professional socialization’ when they enter their PETE programme where teacher educators 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), resulting in the possibility that PSTs may apply covert behaviours in order to progress through teacher education (Graber, 1991; Schempp & Graber, 1992).

A crucial influence in PSTs’ development is the ‘organizational socialization’ they encounter when they begin to teach in schools (Curtner-Smith, 1999; Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011). Lawson (1983a) describes this 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 organisation” (p. 4). On entry
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to schools, PSTs encounter a ‘landscape of teaching’ (Schempp & Graber, 1992) which
may conform to, or oppose, their subjective warrant and knowledge acquired in PETE
(Lawson, 1983b). The schools in which they teach may force them to ‘strategically
redefine’ their environment where they employ their new ideas in the program.
Alternatively, they may ‘strategically comply’ with their program 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 &

An important phase of the socialization of PSTs occurs during their teaching
placement (Curtner-Smith, 1999; Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011) where the stages of
‘professional socialization’ and ‘organizational socialization’ overlap (Schempp &
Graber, 1992). This short phase of teaching placement is extremely significant to PSTs
as they face a wide array of socialization processes, all of which may affect their
teaching of physical education. During teaching placement, the PSTs’ cooperating
teachers can be influential (Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009), although this influence can
restrict learning 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 undertaking a teacher education program, PSTs
develop a particular view of teaching that is challenged when PSTs teach on teaching
placement. Hence, PSTs adopt more custodial practices during their teaching placement
(Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990). As teachers progress to their first year teaching as a qualified
teacher, they face similar influences, where organizational constraints such as
perceptions of colleagues, class size, student behavior and scheduling can have a
negative (Curtner-Smith, 1998) and positive (Curtner-Smith, 2001) effect on teachers’
PSTS’ USE OF MBI: A CASE STUDY OF SE delivery of physical education. The organizational socialization within schools may even have the power to force teachers to consider alternative careers (Curtner-Smith, 2001). Interestingly occupational socialization has become more common in determining the process of learning and delivering the SE instructional model (e.g., Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009).

Occupational socialization research has helped to recognize that teachers’ and PSTs’ occupational socialization 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, Hastie, & Van Der Mars, 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 particular facets of SE’s framework. In order for teachers to teach SE in its ‘full version’, they must have either a teaching or moderate coaching orientation to teaching, must work in an innovative school environment and must receive high quality SE learning experiences in their PETE program (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008).

This study acknowledges the reported benefits of using MBP (e.g., Kirk, 2013) and SE (e.g., Hastie et al., 2011), but also recognizes the difficulties that have been encountered by PSTs when teaching MBP (e.g., Casey, 2014) and in particular SE (e.g., McMahon & MacPhail, 2007). Considering the significant impact of the organizational socialization phase on PSTs’ development (Curtner-Smith, 1999; Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011), it is imperative that research investigates PSTs’ use of SE at this point of their career. Therefore the purpose of this study was to examine the influence of
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organizational socialization on seven PSTs’ delivery of SE and contribute to the current paucity of research in this area (Glotova & Hastie, 2014).

Methodology

Participants

All seven PSTs (five male, two female) were in their final year of a four-year undergraduate PETE program in a university in Ireland. Pseudonyms are used throughout the paper to denote individual PSTs. The first group of PSTs (Barry, Ciara, Conor and Jamie) were all members of the same year group. The second group of PSTs (Frank, Gina and Paul) were all members of another year group and undertook their SE-PETE experience and teaching placement two years after the first group. All PSTs had entered the PETE program directly from completing their post-primary education, except for Jamie who had worked for a number of years before returning to education as a mature student. A new senior cycle physical education framework based on MBI has been introduced to post-primary schools since the time the PSTs had graduated from post-primary school. While the PSTs had not had an opportunity to experience such a framework during their school physical education experience, their PETE programme was heavily committed to introducing them to the six curriculum and instructional models.

SE-PETE Experience

All PSTs experienced the modelling of SE in a practical net-games module in the third year of their PETE program. 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 (weeks 1-4), badminton (weeks 5-8) and volleyball (weeks 9-11). The PSTs were formally assessed in week 12, where they were required to
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complete SE portfolios in groups and deliver a microteaching lesson to their peers.

Minor changes in the assessments occurred between the first and second group completing the module. The module was found to be effective in enhancing PSTs’ knowledge of SE (Authors, 2011).

Teaching Placement

In the final year of the PETE program, all PSTs completed a nine-week teaching placement in an assigned post-primary school. PSTs are required to teach a minimum of five double-classes (approximately 80 minutes) of physical education a week, as well as five single-classes of their elective classroom-based subject. Each PST is assigned a cooperating teacher who provides guidance for the PST throughout the teaching placement observes the PST’s teaching and encourages the PST’s socialization into the school. A university tutor, who is informed by visits to observe the PST teaching as well as an on-going inspection of the PST’s teaching placement file, formally assesses the teaching placement. Neither of the authors were formally involved in the PSTs’ teaching placement. The PSTs were familiar with the first author’s role as a doctoral researcher in the PETE department. PSTs appeared comfortable in sharing their experiences, assured that anonymity would be upheld and no power issues between the first author and PSTs were overly evident.

Data Collection

PSTs from the first group were interviewed at two stages of their teaching placement. Interviews and focus groups were conducted by the lead author who was a researcher in the university. As a group, both group one and group two PSTs participated in a mid-teaching placement focus group (five weeks into their teaching placement) to investigate the organizational socialization in the school they were teaching, their experiences to date in delivering SE, and their intentions in delivering SE
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for the remainder of their teaching placement. At the end of their placement, each PST was interviewed individually to investigate their experiences delivering SE, including what influenced their delivery of SE, their organizational socialization and their intentions for future delivery of SE as qualified teachers. The interviews used an adapted version of an interview script used previously to investigate teachers’ delivery of SE (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). The relevant University’s Research Ethics Committee granted ethical approval for data collection.

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

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 delivery of the model and remain honest about their experiences and delivery of SE.

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 sub-theme across all interviews and
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focus groups were collated. Sub-themes were then grouped where appropriate to form main themes to facilitate interpretation of results.

Results

A number of specific organizational constraints that influenced the PSTs’ delivery of SE emerged from the data analysis sub-themes and are now presented in turn. These are cooperating teachers’ support for PSTs’ delivery of SE, increased workload in planning and preparation, and difficulties teaching SE during a teaching placement.

Cooperating teachers’ support for PSTs’ delivery of SE.

The most influential factor the PSTs faced in terms of delivering SE was their cooperating teachers. It became evident that most of the PSTs’ cooperating teachers were not familiar with SE. In Barry’s, Ciara’s and Conor’s contexts, their respective cooperating teachers, while not having much exposure to SE, encouraged them to deliver SE and provided assistance where possible. While each of these PSTs appreciated the support received from their cooperating teachers, they recognized that it would have been beneficial if their cooperating teacher had some experience with SE. Conor noted receiving positive feedback from his cooperating teacher and support for teaching SE, ‘[the cooperating teacher] showed no resistance in regards using a different [instructional] 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 general classroom management and that he would have appreciated feedback with regards to his delivery of SE, “it may have been more effective if obviously [the cooperating teacher] 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
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did not receive much feedback on her SE teaching. She commented “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’s, Frank’s, Gina’s 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 deliver SE,

I talked with [the cooperating teacher] 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, “[the cooperating teacher] 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). He 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). Gina was influenced by
a cooperating teacher who did not appreciate SE, “[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 SE
classes. Jamie reflected “his 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).

**Increased workload in planning and preparation.**

There was a strong agreement across the PSTs that teaching a SE season required considerable planning. The PSTs were conscious of this increased workload before beginning their teaching placement, believing that there was a lot more to plan for when transferring responsibility to students. Frank believed that it was “more work than a regular lesson plan” (Pre-interview) and Conor was conscious of the time needed to create student 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). Gina felt that there was a lot to plan for when creating her SE scheme of work,

I actually found it harder [than other physical education classes] because you are trying to incorporate the roles and you have to explain to [the students] 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. (Gina, Post-interview)

At the mid-point of their teaching placement, the PSTs still felt that their SE class required a lot of planning, “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” (Ciara, 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 [students] a lot of kind of authority and ownership over the lesson” (Mid-focus group).

The workload forced Gina to reconsider 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 completed a number of SE seasons. Barry reported, “one problem I probably encountered was there was a lot of preparation for the class more so than other classes” although he did agree that, “you will build up kind of a stockpile of resources, so I think initially getting over that hill would definitely lessen the workload in the future” (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 believed the workload was reduced as the SE season progressed, commenting 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 Gina believing that her SE season was unsuccessful, she felt it was not worth all the additional planning, “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).

**Difficulties teaching SE during a teaching placement.**

Many of the PSTs were in agreement that there were additional restrictions to them teaching SE as a PST during their teaching placement. Paul expressed his frustrations with not entering the school at the beginning of the school academic year and how this inhibited his use of SE, believing it would have been easier if he had “started it from the start of the term, rather than coming in and changing the whole thing” (Paul, Mid-focus group). There was also a belief that being a PST in a school did not command as much respect as a qualified teacher. Frank believed that to teach SE teachers need to have good authority as a teacher and effective management of students,
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stating “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, Gina 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 [teaching placement] 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 additional paperwork required to be completed during teaching placement, “when I am a [qualified teacher] I won’t have to do as much paperwork as I had to do on teaching placement” (Post-interview).

Discussion

The impact of organizational socialization on teachers’ delivery of SE has previously been recognized (Curtner-Smith, 1999; Lee & Curtner-Smith, 2011), and it was further supported in our research. It is evident from this study that PSTs who were teaching in a custodial environment were inhibited in their delivery of SE. It is important therefore that we understand what these organizational restraints are and strive to place PST in schools that support the delivery of innovative instructional models (Curtner-Smith, 2001).

As has already been acknowledged, the PSTs’ cooperating teachers play an integral role in their use of SE (McNeill et al., 2004; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009), and this was further supported in our findings. For some PSTs, their cooperating teachers
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were supportive and provided feedback on their teaching. These cooperating teachers had a large role to play in creating an innovative school environment for 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 to deliver SE when there was only one or two physical education teachers in the physical education department. They commented that when there were additional physical education teachers they felt that they 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, Housner, Bulger, Hawkins, & Weigland, 2012), few of the cooperating teachers had knowledge of SE or experience in delivering it in their schools. Considering MBP’s relatively recent introduction to Irish post-primary school physical education programs (i.e., the senior cycle physical education framework alluded to earlier in the paper), it is likely that many cooperating teachers will be unfamiliar with the concept and will similarly be unable to provide support for PSTs using MBP. PSTs conveyed that while it would have been beneficial if their cooperating teachers did have knowledge of SE, they believed they were not constrained to deliver SE as long as they were encouraged to do so by the cooperating teacher.

PSTs felt that there was additional pressure to delivering SE as a PST during their teaching placement. It has been noted in the literature that PSTs experience difficulties teaching SE (McCaughtry et al., 2004; McMahon & MacPhail, 2007) and some of the PSTs in this study encountered similar difficulties. They felt the structure of their nine-week teaching placement made SE more challenging to implement and not
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having a high level of authority over, or knowledge of, the students inhibited the potential enactment of SE. In addition, the fact that PSTs were being assessed on their teaching placement led to a concern for grades along with increased paperwork requirements. There was also a recognized increased workload for delivering SE seasons in comparison to other physical education lessons, a trend that has been illustrated previously in respect to both SE (McMahon & MacPhail, 2007; Pill, 2008) and other instructional models within MBP (Casey, 2014). PSTs’ teaching placement is potentially a very difficult environment to deliver SE and, with this in mind, PETE programs should consider how to be more supportive of PSTs’ delivery of SE on teaching placement.

Conclusion

A plethora of challenges that face PSTs (and potentially teachers) teaching SE in schools were highlighted within this study. This study, like others (Casey, 2014), highlighted the importance of professional learning practices to support teachers’ use of SE and other instructional models. For PSTs to deliver SE successfully, their cooperating teachers need to appreciate their efforts and not inhibit their delivery of the model. PETE programs need to be mindful of where they place their PSTs during teaching placement and identify schools with innovative physical education programs where PSTs’ delivery of SE and other instructional models will be supported and encouraged. In addition, they should attempt to provide additional supports for PSTs delivering 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 related concerns and difficulties they are experiencing in their delivery of SE.

Recognising the difficulties PSTs encounter teaching SE (McCaughtry et al., 2004; McMahon & MacPhail, 2007), the host of inhibitors to delivering SE in schools
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during teaching placement and the lack of cooperating teachers with sufficient
knowledge to supervise PSTs’ use of SE (Meeteer et al., 2012), it seems unreasonable to
expect PSTs to teach SE in its ‘full version’. It has in fact been recommended to start
teaching SE gradually, increasing aspects as one progresses from season to season
(McMahon & MacPhail, 2007; Siedentop et al., 2011). It has also been recognized that
the teaching of any new pedagogical approach is a time consuming and labour intensive
task (Metzler, 2011; Casey & Dyson, 2009). Accepting these challenges, and the fact
that PETE programs are limited in their efforts to influence PSTs’ practices (Placek et
al., 1995), teacher educators need to acknowledge and understand these difficulties and
adapt their teaching practices and expectations accordingly (Fletcher & Casey, 2014),
and place PSTs in schools that will provide innovative environments in which PSTs can
flourish (Curtner-Smith, 2001).

Although this study uses SE as an example of one instructional model within
MBP, it is reasonable to generalize these findings as other researchers have found
similar challenges when using numerous instructional models (Fletcher & Casey, 2014).
If we are to work towards MBP becoming common practice in physical education
teaching, then there is a need for research identifying the authenticity of PSTs teaching
through MBP. This then calls for further exploration of how PETE programs can
effectively prepare and support PSTs for the reality of enacting MBP in challenging and
diverse school contexts.
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Table 1

PSTs’ occupational socialization and use of SE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version of SE</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Acculturation</th>
<th>Professional Socialization</th>
<th>Organizational Socialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Teaching with Coaching</td>
<td>Practical SE Module</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Ciara</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Practical SE Module</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watered-Down</td>
<td>Conor</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>Practical SE Module</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watered-Down</td>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Practical SE Module</td>
<td>Custodial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watered-Down</td>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Practical SE Module</td>
<td>Custodial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria Style</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Teaching with Coaching</td>
<td>Practical SE Module</td>
<td>Custodial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria Style</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>Practical SE Module</td>
<td>Custodial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>