

ADVANCING SPORT EDUCATION: THE INFLUENCE OF NEGOTIATIONS PRIOR TO
SE, WITHIN SE, AND STUDENTS' AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL
MEMORIES OF MULTIPLE SEASONS

by

ZACHARY WAHL-ALEXANDER

MATTHEW CURTNER-SMITH, COMMITTEE CO-CHAIR

OLEG SINELNIKOV, COMMITTEE CO-CHAIR

MARK RICHARDSON

ELIZABETH WOODRUFF

ELIZABETH WILSON

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the
Department of Human Performance Studies
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2015

Copyright Zachary Wahl-Alexander 2015
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

All teaching includes a series of negotiations between teachers and student. Within traditional direct instruction, most negotiations are initiated by students. Such student-initiated negotiations tend to be negative in nature and aimed at changing or altering instructional tasks so that they are less demanding, reduce the performance standards for task completion, and modify the context in which the tasks are to be carried out. Furthermore, the pattern of student-initiated negotiations appears to vary within different curriculum models. Within Sport Education, a pedagogical model designed around “play education,” aimed at teaching sport, games, and physical education, there tend to be few negotiations based upon the indirect style of the model. This dissertation examined the influence of a training program on the ability of Pre-Service Teachers (PTs) to negotiate, the impact of one purposefully negotiated season of Sport Education on a teacher and his 18 students, and middle school students’ recollections of their participation in a significant number of Sport Education seasons over a period of 5 years. Data were collected by employing a wide variety of qualitative techniques including informal and formal interviews, focus group interviews, stimulated recall interviews, document analysis, reflective journaling, writing samples, and participant and non-participant observations. Data were analyzed using analytic induction and constant comparison. The major key findings were as follows: (a) the training program was effective in that it enhanced PTs’ ability to negotiate with their students, (b) a purposefully negotiated SE season was largely successful and the indications were that SE

provided an excellent framework on which to build such a unit, (c) adherence to the central features of Sport Education and meaningful participation in several iterations of quality Sport Education seasons may be required for students to move closer to achieving the lofty goals of the model for students to become competent, literate and enthusiastic sportspeople. All findings indicate the numerous benefits of the Sport Education model.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to extend my sincere appreciation to Dr. Matthew Curtner-Smith and Dr. Oleg Sinelnikov, co-chairs of my dissertation committee and academic advisors, whose direction served as an inspiration to me not only in this study but throughout my graduate career. I would also like to express my appreciation to Dr. Elizabeth Woodruff, Dr. Mark Richardson, and Dr. Elizabeth Wilson for the assistance they provided as members of my thesis committee. Also, I am grateful to all of the participants in my study. Most importantly, I would like to express my love and gratitude to my parents, Katherine and Brad, for their love, support, and encouragement through my college career. I am deeply grateful to them for everything they have done for me.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
1. INFLUENCE OF A PURPOSEFULLY NEGOTIATED SEASON OF SPORT EDUCATION ON ONE TEACHER AND HIS PUPILS.....	1
REFERENCES.....	23
2. INFLUENCE OF A TRAINING PROGRAM ON PRESERVICE TEACHERS’ ABILITY TO NEGOTIATE WITH STUDENTS.....	26
REFERENCES.....	46
3. A LONGITUDINAL ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS’ AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL MEMORIES OF PARTICIPATION IN MULTIPLE SPORT EDUCATION SEASONS.....	49
REFERENCES.....	71
APPENDIX.....	74

LIST OF TABLES

1. The SE Season	18
2. Strategies and Techniques to be Employed During the Training Program and by the PTs During the EFE	32
3. Sport Education Seasons' Fidelity	55

CHAPTER I

INFLUENCE OF A PURPOSEFULLY NEGOTIATED SEASON OF SPORT EDUCATION ON ONE TEACHER AND HIS PUPILS

Abstract

A small body of previous research suggested that teachers who purposefully negotiated the physical education curriculum empowered their pupils and enhanced the quality of their experience. The purpose of this study was to assess the impact of one purposefully negotiated season of sport education (SE) on one teacher and his 18 male 8th grade pupils. Data were collected by employing seven qualitative techniques. They were coded, categorized, and reduced to themes using standard interpretive techniques. The purposefully negotiated SE season was largely successful and the indications were that SE provided an excellent framework on which to build such a unit. Unlike more direct models of instruction in which teachers make most of the decisions, there was no contest, in the form of negative negotiation, between the teacher and his pupils. Rather, the main form of negotiation was positive and among and between pupils. Key pedagogies employed by the teacher were the indirect teaching styles of guided discovery and divergent production and the ability to avoid interfering with the pupils as they designed and implemented their SE season.

Influence of a Purposefully Negotiated Season of Sport Education on one Teacher and his Pupils

Teaching anything to anyone involves a series of negotiations between teacher and pupils (Doyle, 1992; Ennis, 1996). Most of the research that has focused on these negotiations in schools has been set within the “effectiveness” literature, the goal being to describe the negotiation process so as to make teachers aware of it and enable them to improve their negotiating skills. This research has revealed that both pupils and teachers initiate the negotiation process and that the purposes for initiating negotiations can be both negative and positive (Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, 2014, in press).

While occurring relatively infrequently in traditional models of instruction, student-initiated positive negotiations have the goal of making tasks more challenging so as to improve performance and increase learning (Tsangaridou & O'Sullivan, 2003; Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, 2014, in press). The more frequently occurring student-initiated negative negotiations, however, are aimed at changing tasks so that they are easier to accomplish, reducing the levels of performance expected for those tasks, and modifying the conditions in which the tasks take place (Woods, 1978). Negotiations for these changes are more likely to transpire when tasks are not well explained by the teacher, pupils believe that the teacher is being unreasonable, or tasks are viewed as irrelevant, too difficult, too easy, and humiliating (Ennis, 1995, Erickson & Shultz, 1992; Tousignant & Siedentop, 1983; Tsangaridou & O'Sullivan, 2003). In physical education, student-initiated negative negotiation is often aimed at reducing time spent on drills and practices in favor of game play (Ennis, 1995; Hastie & Siedentop, 1999). Common strategies by which pupils negotiate for these changes include giving less effort, refusing to participate, and arguing with and appealing to their teachers (Burbules, 1986; Supaporn, Dodds, & Griffin, 2003).

Not all pupils engage in the negotiation process in the same way and at the same rate. In physical education, evidence indicates that older pupils negotiate more than younger pupils and academically gifted pupils initiate more positive negotiations than less able pupils. Moreover, boys with more skill and aggression initiate more negative negotiations than other pupils. Furthermore, girls with relatively good physical skills initiate more negative and positive negotiations than their peers of the same sex who possess less skill (Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, 2014, in press).

Teachers who are poor negotiators fail to see the advantages in encouraging student-initiated positive negotiation or to deal effectively with student-initiated negative negotiation (Doyle, 1979; Doyle & Carter, 1984). The former error can lead to student resentment and apathy, the latter involves compromising in the face of incessant student pressure. Both can lead to a collapse in the instructional process (Hastie & Pickwell, 1996; Tsangaridou & O'Sullivan, 2003; Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, in press).

Negative negotiations are more likely to be initiated by inexperienced or less able teachers and aimed at insuring pupils follow managerial rules and routines and reduce conflict (Doyle, 1979, Doyle & Carter, 1984; O'Donovan & Kirk, 2007; Tsangaridou & O'Sullivan, 2003). Conversely, teacher-initiated positive negotiation occurring within traditional instruction is generally aimed at enhancing learning and often achieved by employing more indirect teaching styles which allow pupils to make more decisions about their own learning (Tsangaridou & O'Sullivan, 2003; Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, in press).

More recently, a few researchers with a critical focus have taken the concept of teacher-initiated positive negotiation a stage further. Rather than merely suggesting that teachers engage in this kind of activity within traditional models of instruction, they have argued that they

purposefully negotiate the entire curriculum by taking a more democratic approach to teaching and collaborating with their pupils (Boomer, Lester, Onore, & Cook, 1992; Brooker & MacDonald, 2010; Cook-Sather, 2002, 2006; Fisette, 2010a; Flutter & Ruddock, 2004; Glasby & MacDonald, 2004). To date within physical education, this strategy has been used mainly in an attempt to improve the experiences of pupils who appear disengaged with the subject (Oliver, Hamzeh, & McCaughtry, 2009; Oliver & Oesterreich, 2013). The overarching goal of this purposeful negotiation is to empower pupils by giving them greater voice so that they have more influence on what and how they learn (Boomer et al. 1992; Cook-Sather 2002; Glasby & MacDonald, 2004; Enright & O'Sullivan, 2013). Such action, it is thought, leads to pupils feeling safe and valued and improvements in their self-esteem, attitude, and learning (Cook-Sather, 2002; Fisette, 2010b; Enright & O'Sullivan, 2011). This is achieved when teachers value pupil input on curricular decisions and are open to sharing power and engaging in discussions with pupils (Brooker & MacDonald, 2010; Cook-Sather, 2009). It is also dependent on teachers having the skill to incorporate and include a wide range of ideas from different pupil groups and listening to pupil feedback, for the duration of instructional units (Cook-Sather & Alter, 2011, Fisette, 2010a; Glasby & MacDonald, 2004).

The few studies of purposefully negotiated curricula in physical education have yielded mainly positive results. For example, they have indicated that pupil learning is not compromised by the negotiation process as feared by some critics, that teachers pay more attention to the needs of individual pupils, and that pupils who are untouched by traditional offerings in the subject are engaged and interested (Enright & O'Sullivan, 2010; Fisette, 2010a, 2010b; Oliver et al., 2009; Oliver & Oesterreich, 2013). In addition, the relationship between pupils and teachers is much improved (Azarrito & Ennis, 2003; Enright & O'Sullivan, 2010).

Research of the negotiations that occur between teachers and pupils during traditional multi-activity units and sport education (SE) (Siedentop, Hastie, & van der Mars, 2011) seasons has suggested that the structure of SE provides teachers and pupils with an advantage. Specifically, during multi-activity teaching, pupil-initiated negative negotiation is more frequent and increases as a unit progresses. Moreover, the relatively direct nature of multi-activity teaching means that pupil-initiated positive negotiations are rare and that there are few opportunities for teachers to initiate positive negotiations with their pupils (Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, in press). Conversely, during SE, pupil-initiated negative negotiations are less frequent and decrease during the course of a season. Moreover, pupil-initiated positive negotiations are more frequent and increase as the season progresses. In addition, the more indirect teaching styles that teachers must employ if they deliver a pure version of SE means that the opportunities for teachers to initiate positive negotiations with their pupils are greater and increase during the course of a season (Hastie, 1996; Mowling, Brock, & Hastie, 2006; Sinelnikov & Hastie, 2008; Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, in press). Collectively, these findings suggest that SE might be a good framework within which teachers can purposefully negotiate the entire curriculum with their pupils. The purpose of this study, therefore, was to assess the impact of one purposefully negotiated season of SE on one teacher and his pupils. The specific sub-questions the study attempted to answer were as follows: (a) What strategies did the teacher and pupils employ when purposefully negotiating a season of SE? (b) What were the effects of purposefully negotiating an SE season on the teacher and pupils? (c) What were the effects of purposeful negotiation on the structure of the SE season?

Method

Participants

Participants in the study were Chris¹, an experienced physical education teacher, highly respected by the physical education teacher education faculty at the local university, and the 18 8th grade boys within one of his classes. In congruence with the university's policy on human participants in research, Chris and his pupils signed consent and assent forms and the pupils' parents also signed consent forms prior to the beginning of the study.

Chris, a 36-year-old Caucasian with a masters' degree, had taught through the SE model at his academically selective public middle school for 12 years. He was comfortable and well-versed in its structure and pedagogies. Similarly, his pupils, who were a mixture of African Americans (7), Caucasians (9), Hispanic (1), and Asian (1) were from a variety of economic backgrounds, and were used to being taught through conventional SE.

Setting

Chris was asked to purposefully negotiate all aspects of one entire SE season with the boys in his class including specific goals and methods of evaluation. He received no training on how to do so. The only constraints on Chris and his pupils were that the season had to be broadly focused on *enthusiastic*, *competent*, and *literate* participation and that the major components of SE had to be included. Following Siedentop et al. (2011), these included developing a sense of *affiliation*, performing a number of *roles* other than player, creating a *festive atmosphere*, keeping *records*, and participating in *formal competition* that led to a *culminating* event.

Data Collection

Data were collected with seven qualitative techniques. *Non-participant observation* involved the researcher watching all the lessons in the SE season and making notes on what he

¹ The names of all participants in this paper are fictitious.

saw with particular focus on the negotiating process. All written materials produced by the teacher and pupils were collected and subjected to a *document analysis*. Whenever the opportunity presented itself during the season, both Chris and his pupils were *informally interviewed*. The contents of these interviews were recorded as soon after the interviews had been completed as possible. The pupils also participated in *focus group interviews* directly following the conclusion of the SE season during which groups of three pupils were asked about the SE season in general and the negotiating process in particular. Focus group interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim. Chris participated in *formal interviews* immediately prior to and following the conclusion of the SE season. The focus of the first interview was on Chris's plans for purposefully negotiating the SE season and the focus of the second interview was on Chris's reflections of the season in general and the negotiation process in particular. These formal interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim. Chris also completed two *stimulated recall interviews* during which he was shown film of himself and his pupils negotiating different components of the SE season and was asked to describe the thought processes behind his actions. Finally, Chris was asked to make one entry into a *reflective journal* following each SE lesson with the focus being on the negotiation process.

Data Analysis

Data from all sources were sorted into the following sets: (a) those that described the strategies that Chris and his pupils employed when purposefully negotiating the SE season, (b) those that described the effects of purposefully negotiating the SE season on Chris and his pupils, and (c) those that described the effects of purposeful negotiation on the structure of the SE season. Each data set was then coded and categorized using analytic induction and constant comparison (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). Categories within each data set were then collapsed in

general themes. Trustworthiness and credibility were established through the triangulation of different data sources, member checks, and a thorough search for negative and discrepant cases (Goetz & Lecompte, 1984).

Results and Discussion

Negotiation Strategies

Strategies employed by Chris. At the beginning of the initial lesson, Chris explained that the pupils would be designing and making virtually all the decisions about “their SE season” and that his interventions would be rare unless practices were “unsafe.” For the remainder of the season, Chris employed two main strategies when negotiating with his pupils. These were *questioning* and *maintaining silence*.

Questioning. Chris’s main negotiating strategy was to ask questions of the pupils with the goal of focusing their decision-making as they set about designing and engaging in their own SE season. Most of his questions were asked during whole group discussions at the beginning and ends of lessons and during natural breaks within lessons when all 18 pupils came together. In addition, he pulled individual pupils out of game play and other active tasks in order to ask questions. Chris understood that the purpose of the season was to allow his pupils to “take charge” and “be creative” with as little interference from him as possible. He realized, however, that he still needed to facilitate the process that allowed them to do so:

Since this was a student-run SE season, I felt it was my job to sit back and observe, to see the decisions that they were making. I didn’t ever talk about or offer up advice on big stuff like gameplay or the sport they chose. At times, I would hear them thinking of something and . . . I would use a question to try to get them to think about what I was seeing that was going wrong, or not as smooth as it could be going. (Chris, formal interview 2)

Chris’s goal was to “guide [his pupils] toward better ways to do certain things.” To this end, he employed Mosston and Ashworth’s (2008) guided discovery and divergent production styles of

teaching. As illustrated in the data extract below, during which pupils were deciding on how to select teams, sometimes Chris asked questions designed to elicit a specific answer or action:

John (pupil): We need to make sure that we split up the best players.

Marc (pupil): Right, we don't need to stack any one team. Let's just pick out of a hat.

Chad (pupil): No. Let's all vote on who all should be picked first, then second like that.

Chris (teacher): Well now think, why or how did you split up the captains? What was the point for all that?

Jason (pupil): We voted on who the four most athletic in the class were and split them up, so why don't we have them just choose who they play with, and make a choice one at a time? (Field notes, lesson 2)

On other occasions, Chris asked open-ended questions to which there were multiple answers, responses, and actions possible:

Chris (teacher): I saw a lot of flags just flopping onto the ground during that game. What rules do you have in place for that?

Pupils: No answer.

Chris (teacher): Alright, well what options do you have? How do you want to handle it from now on? Does it even need a rule? (Field notes, lesson 6)

Maintaining silence. The second main strategy employed by Chris during the season was to “stay quiet” as his pupils deliberated in order to make decisions. Even if he “knew of a better alternative” to the solution to the particular issue the pupils were discussing, his goal was “to let [them] . . . try things out themselves:”

I found that they would do things differently or wrong but I knew the point was to see how they would work together, and make these decisions, so I felt I needed to step back and let them make those mistakes. . . . things I didn't think would be successful. I didn't find it hard to stay silent, as long as they were safe. (Chris, formal interview 2)

A specific example of Chris maintaining silence occurred during the initial lesson devoted to competitive game play in flag football. The pupils had decided to mark the line of scrimmage with a cone during an earlier lesson, but failed to do so when the action started. Although he was “irritated by this, no end,” Chris did not intervene. When asked why, he

explained that, “I didn’t want to say anything because it’s not my season, it’s theirs. Obviously, that is not important to them, or they would fix the problem.”

Strategies employed by the pupils. Of key importance is that the pupils did not initiate any negative negotiations with Chris as witnessed in traditional multi-activity teaching or at the beginning of teacher-led SE (Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, in press). Moreover, the pupils did not initiate positive negotiations with Chris either since they were empowered to make virtually all the decisions or did not need to seek his support. Instead, the pupils negotiated with each other, mostly in a positive fashion, by employing two main strategies. These were to *deliberate and vote* and engage in *grievance sessions*. Both these strategies were similar in nature although the former was used when setting up the season and the latter was used during the course of the season.

Deliberate and vote. When asked to make key decisions about setting up the season in the initial lessons, the main strategy employed by the pupils was to engage in group discussions in order to come up with several alternative solutions to a particular issue, to deliberate “the alternatives, and then take it to a vote” in order to “get a feel for how the class was siding.” On occasions when the votes on which solution to adopt were not unanimous, the pupils would engage in further deliberation, “let people explain their positions, then re-vote.” The second vote would end the deliberation with the majority winning the argument. This process occurred at both the class and team level. An example of this deliberate and vote strategy is depicted in the following field note extract which describes pupils trying to decide whether the competitive part of their SE season will be officiated by a duty team for each day or whether they will “self-referee” and not have a “duty team.”

Phil (pupil): The thing is, if we do think that we’re honest enough to self-referee, as players, and we would hold each other accountable we wouldn’t need referees.

Tim (pupil): How about we just try self-refereeing in the pre-season and if it doesn't work out we can change it and have a team referee?

Randy (pupil): Yeah, that's smart, Jason what you got?

Jason (pupil): Another idea is . . . the other team would rate how well you referee and then you rate how well they referee so that will help so you don't make any biased calls, but you would have to hope that the other team didn't give you a bad score just because they wanted to.

Randy (pupil): Ok, anyone else have anything to add? Ok, if you want to vote for the four teams, with self-refereeing raise your hands now.

15 vote for four teams

Phil (pupil): What about having five teams? [so one team can officiate and there is no need to self-referee]

3 vote for five teams

Randy (pupil): Ok, looks like majority rules, we're going with four teams and the self-refereeing.

Scott (pupil): That don't make sense though, I think that we are going to have so many issues with this that it's going to be a disaster and people will be arguing all game long.

Phil (pupil): Anyone else want to speak again about it, before we vote again?

Randy (pupil): Ok, two teams of 5 and two teams of four with self-refereeing who votes for that?

16 vote for four teams

Randy (pupil): Now the other way, five teams with one officiating every time. Who wants that?

2 vote for five teams

Hunter: Looks like we are officiating while playing. (Field Notes, lesson 1)

When questioned about the deliberate and vote strategy, the overwhelming feeling among the pupils was that it worked well because it was "fair . . . we got to speak our mind" and "anyone who had an idea on how something should be done or handled had the time and freedom to say it." Donovan spoke for most of the pupils when he explained that

I think this is the only way we can do it. We live in a democracy, so we vote like that, too. Everyone has a say when we do it this way. Everyone may not get their way, but at least you get a chance to speak your mind and explain why you want something done a certain way. I think it's fair because we're all free to choose whichever way we want. (Donovan, informal interview)

Grievance sessions. The second main strategy the pupils employed was to ensure that there was an opportunity for anyone in the class to note concerns about "how things were going" and make suggestions for further changes once the season had started. Two boys, Phil and

Randy, usually initiated and led these kinds of discussion. For example they asked their peers if they thought “[they needed] to make any changes,” “how the season [was] going so far,” and if they [needed] to adjust the rules, or field size or something.” Typically, these sessions took place in the locker room when “Phil would call on someone, to stand, [voice a grievance], and explain the idea [i.e., solution], then [pupils] voted.” This continued until everyone who wanted to speak “got the opportunity.” As noted by the class and Chris, the solutions to grievances were most often produced by one boy, Jason:

Well if it was something that was common sense, Jason would usually pipe up and say that there needs to be a change. . . . Then normally a bunch of the kids would jump on with Jason and say that’s a good idea. Then they would always go to a vote, and most of the time it would be unanimous or close to because he didn’t really ever have a crazy idea, more just common sense stuff that would make everything better or get to playing quicker or something like that. Jason definitely made the most changes, and was the rational one in the group. (Chris, formal interview 2)

The four main grievances voiced during these sessions were concerned with “unfair” and “uneven” teams, rule changes or modifications, field dimensions, and the game play schedule.

For example, Phil and Randy recalled the session during which field dimensions were changed:

Phil (pupil): I think it was the first pre-season game I noticed that the end zones were way too small for the field. And after the game in the locker room I brought it up.

Randy (pupil): Yeah, I remember that. You were like, I think we need to make a change, and said what it was. The whole class was like, “Yeah! That’s true, we should make it longer.”

Phil (pupil): We voted . . . and everyone agreed, so from then on we changed it and extended the end zones like 10 more feet. (Focus group interview)

As recalled by other pupils in the class, as well as Chris, these opportunities to voice grievances led to the SE season being refined and improved:

David (pupil): Phil especially helped the season go. He made sure to ask us a lot like, if anything went bad, or if we needed new rules.

Ben (pupil): He would do that junk all the time. It was annoying sometimes cos I just wanted to go play, but sometimes we would change rules up some and that was helpful. (Focus group interview)

One thing that surprised me was Randy and Phil. I was not really expecting them to play such a big role. There were plenty of times that I saw something that I thought needed to change . . . and one of them would ask the group if they noticed anything from the games that needed changing. (Chris, informal interview)

Effects of the Negotiated SE Season on Chris and his Pupils

As in other documented attempts at purposefully negotiated physical education (e.g., Oliver et al., 2009; Oliver & Oesterreich, 2013), the effects of the negotiated SE season on both Chris and his pupils were overwhelmingly positive. This was manifested in terms of the *seamless transition* to this form of SE, improved *democracy*, and *pupil engagement and learning*.

Seamless transition. Both Chris and pupils appeared to move from the more traditional form of SE to the purposefully negotiated version fairly easily. Specifically, from the outset the pupils were ready and able to negotiate among themselves and Chris was able to use the indirect teaching styles which facilitated the pupils' empowerment:

The students, they did a good job jumping into the season. I was nervous at first how they would react to having all the power and the decision-making abilities because they aren't used to that. But once it started they didn't waste much time. (Chris, formal interview 2)

Phil (pupil): I think we started to run the season on the first day. Voting and everything.
Ben (pupil): Yeah, we didn't play or anything but that's when we decided to play football, and voted on all the roles and rules. It wasn't too hard. (Focus group interview)

As recognized by Chris and the pupils, this was because they were "SE veterans" and already understood the model very well. In addition, the particular form of SE normally delivered by Chris already involved him using indirect teaching styles and allowing the pupils to make many of the decisions about their own learning. Purposefully negotiating the entire season, then, was just moving one stage further:

You know, I have done so many seasons of Sport Ed. for so many years that it is all second nature. Many different parts of the season, roles, coming up with the rules, normally I let the kids have a lot of insight into these decisions. Obviously, these have to be wise decisions but I let them have a say normally in some of my season. (Chris, formal interview 1)

Jon (pupil): What was similar to the other seasons? Well, for me at least, I feel like Coach lets us make some decisions, and have some say in stuff. It's not like we come to class and he is a dictator. This season coach gave us the choice to make all decisions, not just a say sometimes, so I guess that was similar between seasons. (Focus group interview)

Democracy. Relations between Chris and his pupils were already excellent prior to the study. Both he and his charges, however, believed that allowing the pupils even more input into their own learning than usual improved this relationship:

As a teacher, I think you really need to listen to your students, and get their input in how things run in your gym. I had most of these students in class for years, but the relationship we have now is because I listen to things they value and want included during class time. (Chris, informal interview)

Jason (pupil): I am not the biggest fan of team sports, I enjoy running and endurance activities. I like that coach will ask us how we liked activities, and different sports.

Scott (pupil): Yes, I agree, and he tries hard to switch things up on a regular basis, where we do health-related fitness twice a week, and team sports other days. (Focus group interview)

Importantly, the relationships between pupils of various skill levels within the class also appeared to improve. This was because the success of the negotiated SE season was dependent on skills other than physical prowess and so boys of lower skill level, adept at organization and leading or solving problems (e.g., Phil, Randy, and Jason during grievance sessions), were valued. In short, the negotiation process allowed the higher skilled pupils to see their lower skilled peers in a more positive light:

Donavon (high-skilled pupil): I really just wanted to play, I didn't care too much about the rules and stuff. But you know, I think Jason [low-skilled pupil] made the most helpful changes which is funny because he probably knows the least about football, but is the smartest one in here.

Charlie (high-skilled pupil): Yeah. Jason was really good at that. I remember when we had problems setting the fields up like during practice or maybe it was pre-season, and Jason figured out some weird solution to make it so we can put half the cones down, and get to playing quicker. He always has good ideas like that. (Focus group interview)

This finding is particularly salient as previous research of more traditional SE had shown that low-skilled pupils rarely had the confidence to make suggestions in team meetings and believed that even if they did their views were not accepted by their higher-skilled classmates (Brock, Rovegno, & Oliver, 2009).

Pupil engagement and learning. Having invested so much time and energy in designing and refining their SE season, the pupils engaged in every aspect of it with great enthusiasm:

Everyone was excited for the all-star game. Maybe even more than the super bowl. While only some got to play, others decided they would rather announce the game, some played music. It was awesome. We also had like five referees, and we made the field bigger. It was so cool. (Larry, informal interview)

You got to keep up with your stats man. It just proves how well you are doing or how much you gotta step your game up to catch other people in the class. Like me . . . I make the insane one-hand grabs, but before each gameday I always look to see who is catching up to me in total touchdowns, I wanna be first in that, see. (Randy, informal interview)

Charlie (pupil): The whole class was talking about [the super bowl] all week before we played.

Matt (pupil): We weren't supposed to win [the super bowl], but we ended up coming back and winning it on the last second play. The whole class went crazy. (Focus group interview)

Chad (pupil): The best part of the last day was the party before the game [i.e., the super bowl]. We all made a list of things to bring, and we all brought stuff. I got to eat, and then we watched the game and ate too.

Alex (pupil): The people who were playing didn't eat as much because they were nervous. (Focus group interview)

Prior to the study, Chris had expressed some concern that asking the pupils to organize and run the SE season would detract, significantly, from the amount of physical activity in which they were engaged. Following the season's conclusion, however, he noted that this had not been the case:

This being a student-run season, I wanted them to do it all. I had the class before them bring in all the cones, equipment, everything. It was this class's job to mark the field, bring out all the necessary equipment. It must have been the second or third day three students asked for spray paint. They measured the field, put "Xs" where cones would go,

and every day after that it took them no time to set up the fields, I thought this would be one area I would have to step in because they were wasting so much time, but not at all it was quite the opposite actually. (Chris, formal interview 2)

Chris's thoughts on engagement were supported by the pupils who described ways in which they increased participation and decreased "standing around":

The two teams that didn't make it [to the super bowl] got to choose what role they would do for the game. I think we had the two game managers who didn't make it referee, and we had line spotters and stuff for the cones. It was really cold out, but it was fun. I think Ben and Michael made a big sign for their team to run through. (Marc, informal interview)

Moreover, both Chris and his pupils recognized that improvements had been made in terms of enhanced sporting enthusiasm, literacy, and competency:

To be honest, knowing that coach wasn't going to be there stepping in and running it, I thought people would be talking a lot more trash, and just overall being poor sports. But I was surprised at how much people were fair during the games. Of course, we had times when people got angry or talked some trash but it was usually in good fun, and no one got back to the locker room ever upset with each other. (Pete, informal interview)

Going into this season, I wanted to see how they would run certain things so I could also grow as a teacher. There was some trash talking, little tempers flaring up, but it wasn't something that happened often. I thought they were really sportsmanlike the whole time and that's something that's important to me. (Chris, formal interview 2)

Some of the students . . . came into the season not knowing a thing about football. They didn't have a clue about rules, running routes, any strategies, but I can honestly say now they all have learned so much about the sport from how to play strategy wise to being able to officiate on their own. (Chris, formal interview 2)

Effects of Purposeful Negotiation on the Structure of the SE Season

The SE season designed by the pupils was influenced by a blend of two sources. These were the *pupils' prior experience and knowledge of SE* and the *negotiation process*.

Pupils' prior experience and knowledge of SE. The season plan developed by the pupils', shown in Table 1, was strongly influenced by teacher-led seasons in which they had

participated in the past. For example, the season was lengthy (24 45-minute lessons over 8 weeks) and it included “pre-season, “regular season,” and “post-season” game play. Also

Table 1

The SE Season Plan

Class Period	Description
1-3	Select sport, create teams, select team colors, allocate roles, decide on rules and field dimensions, create posters and fair play/statistics sheets
4-5	Practice
6-8	Pre-season games
9	Student meeting to discuss season to date, possible trades, and rule changes
10-16	Regular season games
17	Discussion of playoff format, super bowl, and party/awards ceremony
18	Skills challenge
19-22	Playoffs
23	All star game
24	Super bowl and party/awards ceremony

borrowed from their previous SE seasons was the idea of having a “practice period” prior to competition, an “allstar game,” the “super bowl . . . to ‘finish the season strong,’” and a celebratory “party/awards ceremony.” In addition, “most of the roles that [they] had used in the past,” including “captain,” “coach,” “equipment manager,” “statistician,” and “equity officer,” were also familiar to them having been included in their previous seasons. Furthermore, the pupils used the methods for initial team selection (a “blind ballot” to select coaches for each team who “drafted players”); publicizing team news, schedules, results, and standings (“league and team posters”); scorekeeping; collecting statistics (“thrown” and “caught” touchdowns); and

allocating “fair play points” (“cheering for their own team” and not “trash-talking”) to which they were used.

Negotiation process. Various additions were made to the SE season’s structure as a direct consequence of the negotiation process in which the pupils engaged. To begin with, the organizing phase was extended from the “normal” one lesson to three lessons to give the pupils enough time to “research” the sport of their choice (“flag football”) online and to deliberate and vote on every aspect of the coming action including “team colors,” “team selection,” modification of rules, and playing dimensions. In addition, the pupils built discussion breaks into their season (lessons 9 and 17) to allow themselves the opportunity to “talk about how it was all going,” and discuss, and if necessary make changes to, the plans for the rest of the season. Furthermore, the decision was taken to use the data from the “skills challenge” (lesson 18) as a way of assigning grades for the class because it was “like the real NFL combine.” It consisted of the “good hands [catching] station,” the “accuracy [passing] station,” “speed [and agility] drills through cones,” and the “workout [strength] station” at which the pupils performed as many pushups and jumping jacks as they could.

Two of the changes the pupils made to the “usual way” of implementing SE were less successful. The teacher-led SE seasons in which the pupils had engaged had usually consisted of an odd number of teams so that on each game play day a duty team was scheduled to set up equipment, officiate, keep score, and keep statistics. During their own season, however, the pupils elected to have four teams so that they could “play every time they came to PE.” As alluded to in the first sub-section of results, this meant that the pupils also voted to “self-referee.” Just in case this arrangement led to disputes, however, they also created the new role of “game manager.” Essentially, each team’s game manager had the task of entering into negotiations with

his counterparts in other teams to solve these kinds of disputes when they occurred.

Consequently, the role was crucial to the success of the season and went to the most “honest” pupils. After the season concluded, the general opinion was that this change had not worked:

Self-refereeing was not good at all. How we did it was on the field whenever someone saw something that was wrong during the game they would call it. If the other team refuted it, the game managers would come together and make a decision. It sounded like a good idea but didn't work. We should have just made a fifth team and had them ref both games. (Brent, focus group interview)

Another less successful change, that of adding a “trading day” to make the teams “fairer,” was implemented by the pupils in lesson 9 having discussed it immediately after lesson 8:

After the game, in the locker room Phil asks, “Do we need to make any more changes before we start the season?” After some rumblings, a few pupils mention possible trades. Tim comes up with an idea on how to rate players: “How about we give each teammate a score of 1 to 5 based on game play ability and 1 to 5 rating on effort and fair play. Everyone will have a score out of 10. Then we can only trade someone within 2 points of that. So like a 4 can't be traded for a 7, or a 9.” Marc chimes in, “Also, I think no-one can be traded unless both people being traded agree to it.” The rest of the class unanimously accepts this idea. (Field notes, lesson 8)

Unfortunately, and as noted by Chris and one of his pupils, this trading day was a dismal failure:

I think they did a terrible job of making [the teams] fair. You had the best athletes on two teams. When they came up with the idea which gave them an opportunity to make them fairer, the trading day, they actually skewed them even a little bit more. (Stimulated recall interview with Chris)

I wish that more trades would have happened. We . . . came up with this whole system for fair trades, but our team won every game almost, and lost one, and we didn't want to trade because we wouldn't win as much. But looking back, it would have been more fair for everyone. I think there was one team that didn't want to keep playing because they just kept losing every game. If they got a better player it would have been more fun for everyone. (Justin, focus group interview)

Conclusions

This study provided more evidence indicating that purposeful negotiation of the physical education curriculum can lead to positive changes and enhanced experiences for the pupils and teachers involved. It also suggested that SE provides an excellent framework on which to build a purposefully negotiated unit of instruction as the components of this curriculum model give pupils direction and focus.

Moreover, crucial to the success of the unit featured in the current study was the fact that the pupils had engaged in many more orthodox SE seasons prior to being asked to design and implement their own season. Participation in these orthodox seasons allowed them to become accustomed to and comfortable with the model. In addition, orthodox SE's relatively indirect nature, in that teachers use more discovery and problem-solving styles of teaching as seasons progress and pupils make more decisions than they do in most other models, served as a stepping stone between engaging in units of direct instruction and purposeful negotiation.

The results of the study also provided a close examination of the ecology of a season of purposefully negotiated SE and indicated that it was markedly different from those of multi-activity and early orthodox SE teaching (Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, in press).

Specifically, in the purposefully negotiated season there was no contest (negotiating) between the pupils and the teacher as there generally is in multi-activity teaching and early orthodox SE teaching. Rather, the contests were among and between the pupils. Furthermore, the study suggested that the key teaching styles teachers need to master to be successful in this kind of unit are Mosston and Ashworth's (2008) guided discovery and divergent production and the patience to keep quiet and avoid interfering. These findings should prove useful for those attempting to train teachers to purposefully negotiate the curriculum with their pupils.

Obviously, the conclusions to this study are made cautiously given that it was of a relatively small group of eighth grade boys taught by a highly skilled, experienced, and motivated teacher. More studies are needed to see if the results of the current research transfer to other pupils and teachers and to see whether it is possible to improve this kind of instruction by training teachers in what the research indicates are the key pedagogies.

REFERENCES

- Azarrito L., & Ennis C. (2003) A sense of connection: toward social constructivist physical education. *Sport Education and Society* 8(2), 179-198.
- Boomer, G., Lester, N., Onore, C., & Cook, J. (1992) *Negotiating the curriculum: Educating for the 21st century*. London: Falmer Press.
- Brock, S.J., Rovegno, I., & Oliver, K. L. (2009). The influence of student status on student interactions and experiences during a sport education unit. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 14(4), 355-375.
- Brooker, R., & MacDonald, D. (2010). Did we hear you? Issues of student voice in curriculum innovation. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 31(2), 83-97.
- Burbules, N.C. (1986). A theory of power in education. *Educational Theory*, 36(2), 95-114.
- Cook-Sather, A. (2002). Authorizing students' perspectives: Toward trust, dialogue, and change in education. *Educational Researcher*, 3(4), 3-14.
- Cook-Sather, A. (2006). 'Change based on what students say': Preparing teachers for a paradoxical model of leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 9(4), 345-358.
- Cook-Sather, A. (2009). *Learning from the student's perspective: A sourcebook for effective teaching*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Cook-Sather, A., & Alter, Z. (2011). What is and what can be: How a liminal position can change learning and teaching in higher education. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 42(1), 37-53.
- Doyle, W. (1979). The complex classrooms: A research focus. *Theory into Practice*, 18(3), 138-144.
- Doyle, W. (1992). Curriculum and pedagogy. In P.W. Philips (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 486-516). New York: Macmillan.
- Doyle, W., & Carter, K. (1984). Academic tasks in classrooms. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 14(2), 129-149.
- Ennis, C.D. (1995). Teachers' responses to noncompliant students: The realities and consequences of a negotiated curriculum. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 11(5), 445-460.

- Ennis, C.D. (1996). When avoiding confrontation leads to avoiding content: Disruptive students' impact on curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 11(2), 145-162.
- Enright, E., & O'Sullivan, M. (2010). 'Can I do it in my pyjamas? Negotiating a physical education curriculum with teenage girls. *European Physical Education Review*, 16(3), 203-222.
- Enright, E., & O'Sullivan, M. (2011). 'Producing different knowledge and producing knowledge differently': Rethinking physical education research and practice through participatory visual methods. *Sport, Education and Society*, 17, 2-19.
- Enright, E., & O'Sullivan, M. (2013). "Now, I'm magazine detective the whole time." Listening and responding to young people's complex experiences of popular physical culture. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 32, 394-418.
- Erickson, F., & Schultz, J. (1992). Students' experience of the curriculum. In P. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 465-485). New York: Macmillan.
- Fisette, J. (2010a). Getting to know your students: The importance of learning students' thoughts and feelings in physical education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 81(7), 42-49.
- Fisette, J. (2010b). Power of voice and action: Girls' experience with exploratory projects. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 81(1), 49.
- Flutter, J., & Ruddock., J. (2004) *Consulting pupils: What's in it for schools?* London: Routledge Falmer.
- Glasby, T., & MacDonald, D. (2004). Negotiating the curriculum: Challenging the social relationships in teaching. In Wright, J. (Ed.), *Critical inquiry and problem-solving in physical education* (pp. 132-144). London: Routledge.
- Goetz, J.P., & LeCompte, M.D. (1984). *Ethnography and qualitative design in education research*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press, Inc.
- Hastie, P.A. (1996). Student role involvement during a unit of sport education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 16, 88-103.
- Hastie, P.A., & Pickwell, A. (1996). A description of a student social system in a secondary school dance class. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 15, 171-187.
- Hastie, P.A., & Siedentop, D. (1999). An ecological perspective on physical education. *European Physical Education Review*, 5(1), 9-29.
- Mosston, M., & Ashworth, S. (2008). *Teaching physical education* (1st online ed.). Retrieved from <http://www.spectrumofteachingstyles.org/ebook>
- Mowling, C.M., Brock, S.J., & Hastie, P.A. (2006). Fourth grade students' drawing

- interpretations of a sport education soccer unit. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education* 25(1), 9-35.
- O'Donovan, T.M., & Kirk, D. (2007). Managing classroom entry: An ecological analysis of ritual and interaction and negotiation in the changing room. *Sport, Education and Society*, 12(4), 399-413.
- Oliver, K. L., Hamzeh, M., & McCaughtry, N. (2009). Girly girls can play games/Las niñas pueden jugar tambien: Co-creating a curriculum of possibilities with fifth-grade girls. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 28(1), 90-110.
- Oliver, K. L., & Oesterreich, H. A. (2013). Student-centered inquiry as curriculum as a model for field-based teacher education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 45(3), 394-417.
- Siedentop, D., Hastie, P.A., & Van Der Mars, H. (2011). *Complete guide to sport education* (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Sinelnikov, O., & Hastie, P. (2008). Teaching sport education to Russian students: An ecological analysis. *European Physical Education Review*, 14, 203–222.
- Supaporn, S., Dodds, P., & Griffin, L. (2003). An ecological analysis on middle school misbehavior through student and teacher perspectives. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 22(3), 328-349.
- Tousignant, M., & Siedentop, D. (1983). A qualitative analysis of task structures in required secondary physical education classes. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 3(1), 47-57.
- Tsangaridou, N., & O'Sullivan, M. (2003). Physical education teachers' theories of action and theories in use. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 22(2), 132-152.
- Wahl-Alexander, Z., & Curtner-Smith, M. D. (in press). Influence of negotiations between preservice teachers and pupils on instruction within multi-activity and sport education units. *Sport, Education and Society*.
- Wahl-Alexander, Z., & Curtner-Smith, M.D. (2014, April). Effect of negotiations on instruction during a movement concepts unit. National AAHPERD convention, St. Louis, MO.
- Woods, P. (1978). Negotiating the demands of school work. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 10(4), 309-327.

CHAPTER II

INFLUENCE OF A TRAINING PROGRAM ON PRESERVICE TEACHERS' ABILITY TO NEGOTIATE WITH STUDENTS

Abstract

Previous research has indicated that preservice teachers (PTs) and students take part in negotiations during the instructional process which can significantly impact the nature and quality of instruction. The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of a training program on the ability of PTs to negotiate while teaching multi-activity (MA) and sport education (SE) units. Participants were 13 PTs enrolled in a middle school early field experience (EFE). They taught 13-lesson MA and SE soccer units to 94 students aged 10 to 13 years. The training program included two session workshops prior to the EFE and multiple follow-up observations with feedback throughout the EFE. Data were collected by utilizing six qualitative techniques and analyzed using analytic induction and constant comparison. The key finding was that the training program was effective in that it enhanced PTs ability to negotiate with their students. In addition, the study provided more evidence indicating that different patterns of negotiations take place within the MA and SE units and that generally negotiating within SE is more positive experience for teachers and students.

Influence of a Training Program on Preservice Teachers' Ability to Negotiate With Students

All teaching includes a series of negotiations between teachers and students (Doyle, 1992; Ennis, 1996). Within traditional direct instruction, most negotiations are initiated by

students (Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, in press). Such student initiated negotiations tend to be negative in nature and aimed at changing or altering instructional tasks so that they are less demanding, reduce the performance standards for task completion, and modify the context in which the tasks are to be carried out (Woods, 1978).

Strategies and tactics employed by students when they initiate negotiations with their teachers include providing excuse notes written by their parents, being less energetic when performing tasks, modifying tasks without being given permission to do so, and deliberately not taking part in tasks (Doyle, 1983; Ennis, 1995; Jones, 1992; O'Donovan & Kirk, 2007, Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, in press). Most often, however, students wanting change appeal to **or** argue with their teachers (Burbles, 1986).

Students initiate negotiations with their teachers when the directions for carrying out tasks are vague and allow them space to ask for changes. In addition, they engage in this kind of activity when they believe that they are being treated unfairly and that tasks are not interesting, too difficult, too easy, or may result in their public humiliation (Ennis, 1995; Erickson & Shultz, 1992; Supaporn, Dodds, & Griffin, 2003; Tousignant & Siedentop, 1983; Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, in press). During physical education lessons, common catalysts for student initiated negotiation are the perception that drills and practices are irrelevant and the desire to engage in game play (Ennis, 1995, Hastie & Siedentop, 1999; Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, in press).

Some student initiated negotiations are more positive in nature and aimed at improving instruction. Students may, for example, ask for tasks to be modified so that they are more difficult and challenging (Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, 2014). Experienced and expert

teachers are more likely to recognize this kind of negotiation for what it is and encourage it (Tsangaridou & O'Sullivan, 2003).

There is also some evidence indicating that aggressive and high skilled boys are more likely to initiate negotiations than other students (Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, in press), that high skilled girls are more likely to initiate negotiations than girls with less skill, and that elementary students are less likely to negotiate than those in middle school (Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, 2014). Moreover, more academically able students are more likely to initiate positive negotiations than their less gifted peers (Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, 2014).

Furthermore, the pattern of student initiated negotiations appears to vary within different curriculum models. Specifically, negotiations within traditionally taught multi-activity (MA) sport and games units appear to be more frequent and negative and increase in volume as the unit progresses. In contrast, negotiations during sport education (SE) appear to be relatively infrequent and positive and the volume of negative negotiations decreases as the unit moves forward (Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, in press). Moreover, student initiated negotiations within movement concepts units are more likely to be aimed at making tasks more challenging (Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, 2014).

Within more progressive indirect instruction, positive negotiations are often teacher initiated and designed to give students more choice, voice, and power, again with the overall goal of improving the learning experience (Enright & O'Sullivan, 2010). In contrast, negotiations initiated by inexperienced and less skilled teachers are more likely to be part of an attempt to secure compliance with their managerial and instructional systems (Tousignant & Siedentop, 1983; Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, 2014).

In addition, inexperienced teachers often make the mistake of compromising with students when faced with persistent negative negotiations (Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, in press). Specifically, they succumb to the pressure exerted by students and do indeed modify tasks, standards of performance required, and conditions in which tasks are performed. The hope of these teachers is that they will avoid confrontation and that students will desist from further negotiation, be well behaved, and follow rules and directions in exchange for this reduction in standards (Doyle & Carter, 1984; Hastie & Pickwell, 1996; O'Donovan & Kirk, 2007; Tsangaridou & O'Sullivan, 2003). Unfortunately, teachers who do not deal well with negative student-initiated negotiation tend to encourage it and their instructional and managerial systems can be altered beyond recognition or collapse completely into non-teaching (Doyle, 1979; Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, in press).

To date, there have been few attempts to train preservice physical education teachers (PTs) to negotiate more effectively with students within mainstream curricular models. The purpose of this study, therefore, was to examine the influence of such a training program on the ability of PTs to negotiate while teaching MA and SE units. The three sub-questions the study looked to answer were as follows: (a) How did students and PTs negotiate with each other during MA and SE units? (b) To what degree did students and PTs engage in negotiations during MA and SE units? (c) Which elements of the training program were most and least effective?

Method

Participants

Thirteen PTs from one American university were the primary participants in the study. The PTs were enrolled in a 6-week early field experience (EFE) at a middle school attended predominantly by 10- to 13-year-old African American and Caucasian students from both low

and middle income families. In congruence with the university's policy on human participants, PTs, their 94 students, and the parents of students completed consent and assent forms.

Setting

The EFE was virtually identical in design to the one in which the PTs studied by Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith (in press) engaged. It was supervised by one professor and occurred twice per week. PTs team-taught two 13-lesson mini units of soccer to mixed-gender classes of 7-13 students. Lessons were 50 minutes in duration.

PTs taught the first unit using the SE model. The first four lessons of the season they taught focused on students learning roles, bonding with teammates, and acquiring skills. The next four lessons were allocated for pre-season game play, followed by five lessons during which the regular season competition and play-offs took place and the awards ceremony was conducted. PTs were responsible for planning the tasks in which their students engaged. SE class sizes ranged from 8 to 13. The PTs taught the second unit using the MA model. Thus, they used a range of direct and indirect teaching styles to teach the skills, strategies, and tactics of soccer by requiring their students to participate in a series of progressive practices, drills, and small-sided and conditioned games which they designed and sequenced. MA class sizes ranged from 7 to 11.

Training Program

The training program that the PTs followed included a two-session workshop prior to and multiple follow-up observations with feedback during the EFE. Each session was approximately 4 hours in duration. The author delivered the program. Strategies that were employed during the training program were drawn from the literature on effective professional development (Armour & Yelling, 2004; Guskey, 2002; Joyce & Showers, 1982, 2002; Showers & Joyce, 1996;

Sinelnikov, 2009) (see Table 2). These included stressing the need for a good managerial foundation and understanding of the school culture, providing a rationale for why negotiating skills are important for physical education teachers, emphasizing that learning good negotiating skills is not easy and takes time, discussing the previous research and theory on negotiation during physical education and other subjects, providing PTs with written summaries of this research and theory, watching film of negative and positive student- and teacher-initiated negotiation, watching live teaching, author modeling of effective and ineffective negotiating, and engaging in role-playing, and engaging in peer coaching once the EFE commenced. PTs were also asked to reflect on their negotiating prowess in two ways. First, they made entries in a journal specifically for this purpose following each lesson. Second, they engaged in stimulated recall interviews within which they observed film of themselves and students negotiating and recorded the thought processes that led to their actions.

The specific negotiating tactics and strategies that the PTs were asked to employ during their teaching of the MA and SE units are also shown in Table 2. These were also drawn from previous research. They included designing tasks that deter students from engaging in negative negotiation, recognizing and dealing with negative negotiation effectively, creating an environment that encouraged positive student initiated negotiation, using indirect teaching styles which enabled positive student and teacher initiated negotiation. They also included altering movement and feedback patterns, closely monitoring students more likely to negotiate, planning potential modifications for each lesson task, and being able to explain the rationale behind each of these tasks.

Table 2

Strategies and Tactics to be Employed During the Training Program and by the PTs During the EFE

During the Workshop	During the EFE	Strategies and Tactics to be Employed by the PTs during the EFE
Rationale for acquiring good negotiating skills (Joyce & Showers, 2002)	Observation and feedback (Little & Houston, 2003; O'Sullivan & Deglau, 2006)	Designing tasks that deter negative negotiation
Study previous research and theory (Joyce & Showers, 1982)	Stress the need for a good managerial foundation (Joyce & Showers, 1982)	Recognizing and dealing with negative negotiation
Provide written overviews of research and theory (Alexander & Taggart, 1995)	Stress the need to understand the school culture (Joyce & Showers, 1982)	Creating an environment that encourages positive student initiated negotiation (Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, in press)
Discussion (Joyce & Showers, 1982)	Stress that acquiring new pedagogical skills is difficult and takes time (Joyce & Showers, 1982)	Use of indirect teaching styles (Mosston & Ashworth, 2008)
Watching film (Joyce & Showers, 1982)	Peer coaching (Joyce & Showers, 1982)	Altering movement and feedback patterns
Watching live teaching (Dickey, 1991; Haston, 2007)	Reflective journals (Bell, 1993)	Focus of monitoring on students more likely to negotiate
Modeling and role play (Joyce & Showers, 2002; Ward, 2009)	Stimulated recall (deMarrais, 2004)	Planning modifications for and explaining tasks (Loughran, 2006)

Data Collection

Data were collected with six qualitative techniques. Fieldwork included *participant* and *non-participant observation* of PTs as they completed the workshop and taught during the EFE during which copious notes were taken. *Formal interviews* were completed with all PTs during which they were asked questions based upon the three sub-questions the study was attempting to answer and multiple follow-up questions were permitted. These interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. At every opportunity, PTs were also *informally interviewed* with notes on contents being made as soon after each interview as possible. *Document analysis* involved examining PTs' unit and lesson plans for material directly describing or related to negotiation. Finally, the *stimulated recall interviews* and *reflective journals* PTs completed as part of the training program were also data sources.

Data Analysis

The initial phase of the analysis involved identifying data that explained (a) how students and PTs negotiated with each other during MA and SE units, (b) the degree to which students and PTs engaged in negotiations during MA and SE units, and (c) the elements of the training program that were most and least effective. Analytic induction and constant comparison (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984) were used to sort the data into categories and these categories were collapsed or expanded within key themes that emerged. Credibility and trustworthiness was established through triangulation, an exhaustive search for negative cases, and member checking (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

Results and Discussion

Methods and Goals of Negotiations

Student-initiated negotiations. In congruence with previous research (e.g., Ennis, 1995; Tousignant & Siedentop, 1983; Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, in press), students in this study attempted to negotiate both overtly and subtly. These negotiations had two main goals: to alter instructional tasks within lessons and to reduce the standards of performance by which they were held accountable.

Overt negotiations. In line with Burbles (1986), overt negotiations initiated by the students were usually verbal and involved pleading with PTs, or being more aggressive and confronting, badgering, and arguing with them in an attempt to wear them down:

The students were always asking for something, always trying to get out of doing something, or telling you they needed something from you. There isn't a lesson where this doesn't happen. These are easy to deal with because mostly the students are up front about what they wanted. (Ann², informal interview lesson following lesson 9)

That right there was another time a student asked for something. After watching this again it's like they ask for something every 30 seconds, I can't even give them any directions without having them try to change whatever it is I am saying. (Marc, stimulated recall interview)

Subtle negotiations. More subtle forms of student initiated negotiation included deliberating giving less effort, making small changes to tasks without asking, or only engaging in tasks when in view of the PT. While these attempts occurred less frequently than overt negotiations, the PTs described these as more difficult to handle:

I would tell them to jog or run and they would walk. Also, sometimes its partners, I would tell them which partners to go with, but they would end up changing them or switching when I wasn't looking. These are much harder to work with than when they ask for certain things. I felt like I had to be on the lookout the entire time looking for these small changes. (James, formal interview)

² The names of all participants in this paper are fictitious.

Matt (PT): What I want everyone to do is working with the same partner, I want one person to practice the scissor move, while the other just stands in front pretending to guard. Do that three times then switch.

Matt gives feedback to two students at one corner of his grid. While his back is turned, two groups stand still and talk. Once Matt turns around, both groups continue to slowly work on the skill. (Field notes, SE lesson 5)

Negotiating to alter instructional tasks. Student initiated negotiations aimed at changing instructional tasks were mostly negative and often aimed at decreasing the intensity of the physical activity in which they engaged:

The students did not want to increase their speed during dribbling practices. They wanted to walk instead of increasing their speed. I responded to this by telling them they could go slow now, and work up to going fast, but they stayed going slow. (Mark, reflective journal, lesson 5)

Mary (PT): Come on Trish, give some more effort here!

Trish (student): I'm tired; I don't want to.

Mary (PT): I have seen you do this before, you can do it.

Trish (student): It's too hard, I don't think so today.

Mary (PT): Fine, just walk then for the rest of this drill, and come back in hard for the next one. (Field notes, MA lesson 7)

Negative negotiations initiated by students were also aimed at decreasing the amount of time they spent practicing skills and increasing the time spent involved in game play:

Brian (PT): Next we are going to work on passing back and forth with a partner.

Lenny (student): We want to play a real game, not none of this passing stuff.

Brian (PT): Let's try this first.

Lenny (student): We know how to pass. Come on now. Let's get going here. (Field notes, MA lesson 2)

My students wanted to not do any of the dribbling or juggling drills that I had planned for that day. They wanted to just skip right to the gameplay. I told them the passing drills would help them when they played, but they didn't really listen. (Ann, formal interview)

Lastly, student-initiated negative negotiations were aimed at increasing opportunities to socialize with peers:

When splitting up the teams today for the multi-activity game, I had a few students who kept asking to play with certain people. They went as far as to tell me they wouldn't play

unless they were with certain people, so I ended up just letting them pick teams. I know I shouldn't have done this, but I wanted to make sure they actually played. (Ben, reflective journal, lesson 6)

This was a perfect example of what would happen every time my coach would try to split up the teams. He would split them up fairly . . . and kids would go crazy complaining to me. I tried to lay down the law and tell them it was the coach's decision, and that it was final. Sometimes it worked, other times like this one I just let them choose who they played with. (Tonya, stimulated recall interview)

There were, however, also situations in which the students initiated positive negotiations aimed at making tasks more difficult and interesting:

I remember early on in the SE season, when we played the stuck-in-the-mud tag game, I had a student ask if he could get a ball while being the tagger. He wanted to do this because he was catching everyone and it was far too easy for him. (Henry, formal interview)

Yes, that happened a few times with Tim. He was really skilled and played a lot of soccer so he was always asking to make things harder. Right there he just asked me if it was alright if he used all the skill moves he knew and changed the dribbling pattern to make this specific drill harder. (Lamar, stimulated recall interview)

Negotiating to reduce standards of performance. Also consistent with previous research (e.g., Erickson & Shultz, 1992; Supaporn et al., 2003; Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, in press) were students' attempts to negotiate with the goal of reducing standards of performance expected of them. One goal of these negotiations was to reduce physical stress. Another was to reduce emotional stress:

Chuck (PT): To start off, dribble the soccer ball using small taps around the outside of the four cones right there.

Latoya (student): That's a long way, how many times we going to be doing that?

Chuck (PT): Depends on how slow you go, start with three.

Natalie (student): That's too many! Come on now, cut that in half.

Chuck (PT): Quit your complaining, let's go! And no cutting corners either. (Field notes, SE lesson 3)

In my lesson today when I was trying to get all my kids to juggle they just weren't having it. I had this one boy in particular who didn't want to get his shoes dirty, and kept asking if he could stop after he got three consecutive juggles. I wanted everyone to keep

working, and I thought if I let him stop early everyone else would, too. (James, reflective journal lesson 3)

PT-initiated negotiations. As in previous research (Tsangaridou & O’Sullivan, 2003; Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, in press), PTs also initiated both negative and positive negotiations with their students.

Negative negotiations. Negative negotiations were generally initiated by PTs in order to manage their students and keep control. Typically, they involved offering concessions in terms of the type of tasks in which they asked students to engage and the level of accountability for which they held students performing those tasks:

Henry (PT): Let’s go, let’s go. Keep working hard today. I want to see all of you dribbling for the next 3 minutes inside the cones.

Larry (student): Ugh. Man, I don’t want to do this.

Henry (PT): Keep it up, if you keep going for the next minute we can move on. (Field notes, MA lesson 9)

This happened to me a lot while I taught. I had something in my lesson plan, and they clearly wouldn’t want to do what it was that I had down. I said if they would bust it, and work hard for shorter period of time we could rest some, go easy then work really hard. (Jen, stimulated recall interview)

Positive negotiations. Positive negotiations initiated by the PT were typically aimed at getting more from the students in terms of performance and effort. Two main strategies were used by PTs within these positive negotiations. Students were challenged to “test themselves” and given more opportunities to make decisions about modifying tasks or changing the accountability system as long as they were in a positive direction:

James (PT): Ok, good work with the dribbling that time. Let’s try it again now, how can we make it more tough this time?

Alice (student): I don’t know.

Brad (student): Go faster?

James (PT): Yes, that’s one way, you can go faster. Or you can use your non-dominant foot. The one you feel less comfortable with. If that was too easy for you, you can either go faster through the cones, or try to use your non-dominant foot only. Or to make it

really tough, try using your non-dominant with the inside, then outside of the foot. (Field notes, SE lesson 3)

Sometimes in my teaching I like asking the students how they could think of making a drill more difficult. You never know what they'll say. Some of their answers are awful, but some are good, and a lot of the times, they would push themselves harder if they thought they came up with their own idea for a drill. (Chuck, informal interview following MA lesson 6)

Patterns of Negotiations Within MA and SE Units

The general patterns of negotiations in MA and SE units during this study were slightly different to those observed in the one previous study that also examined negotiations in these two curriculum models (Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, in press). During the current study, the students initiated mostly negative forms of negotiation throughout the MA unit. The volume of this type of negotiation was, however, relatively low and did not grow as the unit proceeded. In addition, and although rare, there were relatively more student initiated positive negotiations in the MA unit. Furthermore, there were comparatively more PT-initiated positive negotiations and relatively less PT-initiated negative negotiations than observed by Wahl-Alexander and Curtner-Smith (in press). Importantly, this meant that none of the PTs' MA units collapsed into a non-teaching self-preservation exercise as some had done in the Wahl-Alexander and Curtner-Smith (in press) study.

Within the SE season in the current study, the vast majority of student initiated negotiations of a negative form took place in the early lessons. These were more intense and difficult to handle than the same kind of negotiations that occurred at the beginning of the MA unit. As had been observed by Wahl-Alexander and Curtner-Smith (in press), the longer the season went on, the less this type of negotiation occurred. The main difference between the current study and the original, however, was that the volume of negative negotiations initiated by students in the current study was relatively low in the first place and slowed to a trickle much

more quickly than in the Wahl-Alexander and Curtner-Smith study. Moreover, there were comparatively few negative negotiations and relatively more positive negotiations initiated by the PTs in the SE season observed in the current study.

As in previous studies (Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, 2014, in press), highly skilled aggressive boys were more likely to initiate negotiations than other students. Additionally, highly skilled girls were more likely to initiate negotiations than those of a lower skill level.

The comparative success of the PTs in the current study while employing both curriculum models when compared with the PTs in the Wahl-Alexander and Curtner-Smith (in press) study appeared to be due to their enhanced pedagogical skill. Specifically, the current group of PTs were better at dealing with the negotiations initiated by students and initiating positive negotiations of their own.

Dealing with student-initiated negotiations. Crucially, while they struggled to combat some of the early efforts of their students to negotiate with them, the PTs in the study were aware of their initial shortcomings:

I feel like I negotiated a lot in the negative negotiations early on in my teaching. I would have students complaining and wanting something else, so I would switch the drill and have them do something I thought they would like more. I tried to make sure it still aligned with whatever objectives I was focused on, but I would definitely negotiate in this way, especially early on. (Brian, formal interview)

I know that I shouldn't have switched up like that. You told us not to [when] you taught us about negotiating. I remember that, but it's hard when you're out there and they aren't listening to you. I kind of just panicked and moved on. (Henry, informal interview following SE lesson 2)

As their confidence grew, however, they started to employ some of the strategies and tactics they had learned to combat negative negotiations initiated by students. Chief among these was recognizing both overt and subtle negotiations aimed at task modification and a reduction in accountability and being more assertive:

Chuck has his group warming up by dribbling . . . around the field. Two girls try to cut the corner. Chuck yells, “Run on the other side of the cones girls. No taking the easy road.” The girls say, “Sorry”, and continue the task properly. (Field notes, SE lesson 2)

The students wanted to jump right into the pre-season games. One wanted to be a goalie, and the others didn’t want to do the drills. I responded by telling them that they first needed to practice before playing. They didn’t like it, but they stopped talking about it. (Mary, reflective journal SE lesson 1)

As both units progressed, the PTs were able to distinguish between negotiations that were potentially problematic and “challenging” and those that “usually didn’t hurt the lesson much.” Moreover, they also started to recognize and deal with student negotiations aimed at increasing their opportunities to socialize which would have a negative impact on participation and learning. Sometimes being more assertive in these situations and “saying no” was effective and at other times the strategy employed was to “explain the rationale behind a decision”:

Something that worked for me a lot was when I would flat out tell my students why they couldn’t partner together. I’d say something like, “Look, you know if I pair you up y’all will talk the whole time and not do the drills.” That gets some push back at first for me, but they would laugh, agree, and just move on. (Tim, formal interview)

Brian (PT): I want Matt and Jackie together and let’s put Tonya and Lenny over there.
Jackie (student): Ughh! Come on now, let me be over there with Tonya.
Brian (PT): Nope, not today, let’s hustle a bit.
Jackie (student): Why? Come on.
Brian (PT): No, keep your partner.
Jackie (student): Shrugs and walks off to work with Matt. (Field notes, MA lesson 2)

Finally, as both units advanced, the PTs found it easier to recognize when student initiated opportunities were more positive in nature and were more confident in encouraging this type of activity:

Jen (PT): Ok, let’s work on dribbling now inside of the cones.
Justin (student): We are always doing this.
Jen (PT): Just keep up the good work, let’s start.
Trisha (student): It’s just easy, we hate it. Can we do the special moves or go around the cones?
Jen (PT): Yes that’s fine, dribbling between all of the cones, or go different speeds and practice your specialty moves if you want. (Field notes, MA lesson 10)

Initiating positive negotiations. Attempts to initiate positive negotiations were non-existent in early MA lessons and rare in early SE lessons. Again, however, as the PTs gained more confidence they engaged in more of this kind of activity. The curricula scaffolding of the SE season, however, together with its progressive reliance on indirect teaching styles, and the more teacher-centered and direct nature of the MA model, ensured that more PT-initiated positive negotiation was carried out during the SE season than the MA unit:

Brian (PT): You know the next drill, push-up position, try to win the ball from your partner. I want everyone to make a few decisions. How far apart do you want to stand from your partner? What direction do you want to face? Maybe, start from different positions? Those choices are all up to you. (Field notes, SE lesson 6)

Effectiveness of the Training Program

As alluded to in the previous section, the training program was effective to the extent that it did, as intended, improve the PTs' ability to negotiate with their students. Moreover, the PTs recognized this fact:

I really think that the [training] program helped because the whole time the students want to or try to negotiate with you. I liked that [we learned] how to defend against it. I used a lot of the strategies all the time while I taught. A lot of what I used I learned from the videos and the lectures, and would never have been as successful without these examples. (Henry, formal interview)

All the things [we learned] gave us more of a feel for what to expect and it really helped us be better prepared when faced with those negotiating situations. It would have been more difficult facing those situations without [the program] because it's better to go in knowing a little background about it, and how to deal with it, strategies to use. (Mark, formal interview)

Most effective elements of the training program. There were several components of the program on which the PTs focused and that they believed had been key to their success. These included being made “aware” of and “understanding” the negotiation process and being provided with “examples” of the negotiating process in action:

I think it was real good . . . It just hit every direction that they came at you. All the different ways the students try to come at you, [were] covered and showed me how I could get around them and give good answers to oppose the students' efforts [at negative negotiation]. (Ben, formal interview)

[The program] showed us a lot of different examples of situations and it made me be more prepared to give an answer as soon as they said something. If I waited to respond and thought about what I had to do, the students will be like, "Oh yeah, I got you." (Henry, informal interview following MA lesson 11)

Particularly valued by the PTs were viewing film clips, and engaging in role play because these were "what made it real" because the PTs were able to "witness firsthand how teachers with similar experience [reacted] to similar students like the ones we will teach":

The videos were the most meaningful part to me because it showed real life scenarios . . . and it was similar kids in similar situations to who we would be working with. Those are images that I have not forgotten and think about all the time when certain situations come up in my lessons. (Ann, formal interview)

During the lesson [the students] always come up with crazy excuses like they did in the video you showed us of the PTs negotiating. I am really glad you showed us that especially when some of the really bad students keep pushing and how the teachers hold their ground. I have been able to just kind of copy and say what they said and I knew if it worked with those kids it would work with mine. (Tim, formal interview)

One thing that stuck with me and helped me learn was acting as the student when you gave us the scripts in class. I kept pestering I think it was Chuck, and it got old quick. But it showed me how much time was actually wasted. So when I am out on the fields I try my best not to let the kids do to me what I did to Chuck. (formal interview)

The PTs also noted how useful the follow-up "feedback" was that they received specifically on negotiation once they started the EFE. This helped in terms of recognizing subtle negative negotiations and providing PTs with solutions on how to deal with overt and subtle negative negotiations:

It was helpful after some of the lessons when [I was told] how I negotiated during that lesson, and how to avoid it for the next time. There were some times I had no clue I was negotiating or the students were with me. (Matt, formal interview)

Mary (PT): See I was not really sure what to do there. Those two girls just stopped moving mid-drill. I know I froze up at first, but then I just let it go.

Zach (Author): Well, why do you think they acted that way?

Mary (PT): I don't know really?

Zach (Author): You did similar drills that entire lesson, and they most likely got bored because they were too easy. How can you do better with this next time?

Mary (PT): Change up the drills we do more?

Zach (Author): Maybe not just change up the drills, but give the students more choice in the activities. Provide modifications to make it easier or more challenging if needed.

(Mary, informal interview following MA lesson 7)

Finally, the PTs also noted that learning all about the school culture prior to beginning the EFE had been invaluable:

I got the most out of learning about the typical PE lesson at this school and how the teachers normally instruct here. Knowing the kids aren't held to a high standard and also what they are used to in PE helped prepare me. (James, formal interview)

I just liked hearing about the typical PE at that school. It really got me thinking of what they would want to do, and [negotiate] about. It is obvious really that if the students aren't used to doing something they are going to act way different than students who are taught great PE every day. (Tonya, informal interview following SE lesson 4).

Least effective elements of the trainign program. One component of the training program was singled out by the PTs as being relatively ineffective. This was the handout in which the results of previous research on teacher-student negotiations were summarized. PTs noted that it was rarely referred to and had "very little impact."

I don't want to say that any portion of the program was not helpful, but to pinpoint one thing that I didn't really get much help out of was the handout. It was a little confusing understanding exactly which type of negotiations were which. I looked at it some early on, but then when I had a question or needed help I would just ask. (Lamar, formal interview)

The handout you gave us . . . didn't help me much. It was like information overload with all the stuff you wanted us to think about. It's just hard. (Matt, reflective journal lesson 11)

In addition, the majority of PTs noted that more help with an emphasis on recognizing and dealing with subtle and negative negotiations initiated by students, particularly at the beginning of the EFE would have been beneficial:

The subtle negotiations. I didn't realize . . . that not giving effort was a negotiation, and that it would occur so frequently. I never caught on to it before [it was] mentioned. But it was happening a lot with them just not doing what they were told, or giving little effort when they knew I wasn't looking. (Ann, informal interview following MA lesson 5).

Most of the negotiations that you don't notice are subtle. . . . But early on it was hard for me to notice them and pick them out. Maybe if we had more examples of those it would be easier to go right into the teaching and be able to notice when kids would do the subtle stuff. (James, formal interview)

Conclusions

The main conclusion to be drawn from this study is that the training program was effective in terms of enhancing PTs' ability to negotiate with their students. A second important finding was that, in congruence with previous work (Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, 2014, in press), the study indicated that there are different patterns of negotiations within different curriculum models. Specifically, this was the second study to show that negotiating within SE seasons is generally an easier prospect and more positive experience for teachers and students than within MA units. In addition, this study provided more evidence indicating that high skilled and aggressive boys do most negotiating in mixed-gender classes, and that high skilled girls do more negotiating than girls with less skill.

The study's results, particularly the testimony of the PTs as to the utility of the training program, suggest that PETE faculty strongly consider devoting time to teaching their charges how to negotiate successfully. In order to be of optimal effectiveness, such work should bridge classroom methods courses, early field experiences, and the culminating internship. Moreover, logic suggests that this material initially be taught alongside other foundational pedagogies, such as effective instruction and management and Mosston and Ashworth's (2008) spectrum of teaching styles, but also be included during coursework on specific curriculum models.

On the downside, and perhaps understandably given their inexperience and concerns about management, the PTs in the current study tended to focus much more on combatting negative negotiations initiated by students rather than positive ones initiated by either the students or themselves. Future research of programs designed to help PTs might put more emphasis on encouraging positive negotiation so as to rectify this state of affairs.

Future research should also examine whether or not the results of the current study transfer to other groups of PTs, schools, and grade levels. Finally, work investigating the patterns of negotiations that take place in other curriculum models such as teaching games for understanding, teaching self-responsibility, and health-related fitness would also be of use.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, K., & Taggart, A. (1995) *Sport education in physical education (SEPEP)*. Belconnen, AU: Australian Sport Commission.
- Armour, K. M., & Yelling, M. R. (2004) Professional development for physical education teachers: The role of informal, collaborative learning. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 26, 177-200.
- Bell, J. (1993). *Doing your research project* (2nd ed.). Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Burbules, N.C. (1986). A theory of power in education. *Educational Theory*, 36(2), 95-114.
- DeMarrais, E. 2004. The materialization of culture. In E. DeMarrais, C. Gosden, & C. Renfrew (Eds.), *Rethinking materiality: The engagement of mind with the material world* (pp. 11-12). Oxford, UK: Oxbow Books.
- Dickey, M.R. (1991). A comparison of verbal instruction and nonverbal teacher-student modeling in instrumental ensembles a comparison of verbal instruction and nonverbal teacher student modeling in instrumental ensembles. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 39(2), 132-42.
- Doyle, W. (1979). The complex classrooms: A research focus. *Theory into Practice*, 18(3), 138-144.
- Doyle, W. (1983). Academic work. *Review of Educational Research*, 53(2), 159-199.
- Doyle, W. (1992). Curriculum and pedagogy. In P.W. Philips (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 486-516). New York: Macmillan.
- Doyle, W., & Carter, K. (1984). Academic tasks in classrooms. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 14(2), 129-149.
- Ennis, C.D. (1995). Teachers' responses to noncompliant students: The realities and consequences of a negotiated curriculum. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 11(5), 445-460.
- Ennis, C.D. (1996). When avoiding confrontation leads to avoiding content: Disruptive students' impact on curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 11(2), 145-162.
- Enright, E., & O'Sullivan, M. (2010). 'Can I do it in my pyjamas?' Negotiating a physical education curriculum with teenage girls. *European Physical Education Review*, 16(203), 203-220.

- Erickson, F., & Schultz, J. (1992). Students' experience of the curriculum. In P. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 465-485). New York: Macmillan.
- Goetz, J.P., & LeCompte, M.D. (1984). *Ethnography and qualitative design in education research*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Guskey, T.R. (2002). Does it make a difference: Evaluating professional development. *Educational Leadership*, 59(6), 45-51.
- Hastie, P.A., & Pickwell, A. (1996). A description of a student social system in a secondary school dance class. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 15, 171-187.
- Hastie, P.A., & Siedentop, D. (1999). An ecological perspective on physical education. *European Physical Education Review*, 5(1), 9-29.
- Haston, W. (2007). Teacher modeling as an effective teaching strategy. *Music Educators Journal*, 93(4), 26-30.
- Jones, D.L. (1992). Analysis of task systems in elementary physical education classes. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 11, 411-425.
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1982). The coaching of teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 40(1), 4.
- Joyce, B.R., & Showers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Lawson, H.A. (1983). Toward a model of teacher socialization in physical education: the subjective warrant, recruitment, and teacher education (part 1). *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 2, 3-16.
- Little, M. E., & Houston, D. (2003). Research into practice through professional development. *Remedial and Special Education*, 24(2), 75-87.
- Loughran, J.J. (2006). *Developing a pedagogy of teacher education*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Mosston, M., & Ashworth, S. (2008). *Teaching physical education*. (1st online ed.). Retrieved from <http://www.spectrumofteachingstyles.org/ebook>
- O'Donovan, T.M., & Kirk, D. (2007). Managing classroom entry: An ecological analysis of ritual and interaction and negotiation in the changing room. *Sport, Education and Society*, 12(4), 399-413.
- O'Sullivan, M., & Deglau, D. (2006). Chapter 7: Principles of professional development. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 25, 441-449.
- Showers, B., & Joyce, B. (1996). The evolution of peer coaching. *Educational Leadership*, 53(6), 12-16.

- Sinelnikov, O.A. (2009). Sport education for teachers: Professional development when introducing a novel curriculum model. *European Physical Education Review*, 15(1), 91-114.
- Supaporn, S., Dodds, P., & Griffin, L. (2003). An ecological analysis on middle school misbehavior through student and teacher perspectives. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 22(3), 328-349.
- Tousignant, M., & Siedentop, D. (1983). A qualitative analysis of task structures in required secondary physical education classes. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 3(1), 47-57.
- Tsangaridou, N., & O'Sullivan, M. (2003). Physical education teachers' theories of action and theories in use. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 22(2), 132-152.
- Wahl-Alexander, Z., & Curtner-Smith, M. D. (in press). Influence of negotiations between preservice teachers and pupils on instruction within multi-activity and sport education units. *Sport, Education and Society*.
- Wahl-Alexander, Z., & Curtner-Smith, M.D. (2014, April). Effect of negotiations on instruction during a movement concepts unit. National AAHPERD convention, St. Louis, MO.
- Ward, P. (2009). Content matters: Knowledge that alters teaching. In L.D. Housner, M. Metzler, P. Schempp, & T. Templin (Eds). *Historic traditions and future directions of research on teaching and teacher education in physical education* (pp. 345-356). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- Woods, P. (1978). Negotiating the demands of school work. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 10(4), 309-327.

CHAPTER III

A LONGITUDINAL ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL MEMORIES OF PARTICIPATION IN MULTIPLE SPORT EDUCATION SEASONS

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine middle school students' recollections of their participation in a significant number of Sport Education seasons over a period of 5 years. Thirty-one (18 boys and 13 girls) 8th grade students (average age at data collection = 13 years) who had all participated in at least 17 Sport Education seasons served as the participants in this study. Autobiographical memory theory (Conway & Rubin, 1993) guided qualitative data collection that included surveys, formal interviews, focus group interviews, and an autobiographical critical reflection. Student responses were categorized into general events, which had a focus on evaluating, preparation, first season, integrity, competition, and gamesmanship. Descriptive event-specific memories included authenticity and gameplay as most memorable aspects of students' experiences within multiple Sport Education seasons. The findings suggested that participating in multiple Sport Education seasons leads to better developed student roles and a stronger sense of fair play. More importantly, adherence to the central features of Sport Education and meaningful participation in several iterations of quality Sport Education seasons may be required for students to move closer to achieving the lofty goals of the model for students to become competent, literate and enthusiastic sportspeople.

A Longitudinal Analysis of Students' Autobiographical Memories of Participation in Multiple Sport Education Seasons

Sport Education is a pedagogical model designed around “play education” (Siedentop, 1968), aimed at teaching sport, games, and physical education (Siedentop, Hastie, & van der Mars, 2011). The overriding objective of Sport Education is to create an authentic sporting experience for students within physical education. The main goals of Sport Education are to effectively enhance students' competency, literacy, and enthusiasm surrounding sport or activity. In order to reach these objectives, students who participate in Sport Education should not only be competent performers, but they should be able to demonstrate sporting literacy by showing that they value, understand, and appreciate sport. Lastly, students participating in Sport Education should be able to display their enthusiasm for sport by promoting a positive sporting culture (Siedentop et al., 2011).

The objectives and goals of Sport Education are accomplished within the framework of appropriate sporting experiences and with students participating in modified sport seasons, which last longer than traditional physical education units (Hastie, 2000). Formal competition, which typically requires teams to compete in modified games or events, serve as the foundation of such seasons. To ensure a strong sense of team affiliation, students remain on set teams for the duration of the season. In order to make each season authentic and festive, students keep and publicize team and individual statistics, participate in a culminating event, and perform specific roles other than a player (e.g., coach, official, reporter, manager) (Siedentop et al., 2011).

Sport Education has been heavily researched since its inception, with two comprehensive literature reviews on the model identifying at least 66 data-driven empirical studies as of 2011 (Hastie, de Ojeda, & Calderon-Luquin, 2011; Wallhead & O'Sullivan, 2005). Additionally, there have been a number of further studies published since Hastie and colleagues' (2011) latest

review of research on Sport Education (e.g., Hastie, Sinelnikov, Wallhead, & Layne, 2014; Pereira et al., 2015; Wahl-Alexander & Curtner-Smith, 2013). Overall, Sport Education researchers investigated variables related to motor skills competencies and development, tactical knowledge and performance, fitness, personal/social development, student attitudes, values, student motivational responses, and learning how to teach the model.

However, the criticism of Sport Education research has been that most of the findings are reported based on the initial experiences of students or teachers with the model (typically during the course of one or two seasons). This has resulted in a continued call for the use of longitudinal data when investigating variables within Sport Education (Hastie et al, 2011; Siedentop, 1998; Wallhead & O'Sullivan, 2005). In fact, there have been only two studies that employed longer data collection protocols (Perlman, 2012; Sinelnikov & Hastie, 2010a). Specifically, Perlman (2012) examined 33 amotivated students who participated in four consecutive Sport Education seasons in one semester long class. Each of the four seasons in this study lasted for 14 lessons with students meeting 3-4 times per week for 60-minute lessons. Results of this study demonstrated that amotivated students' perceptions of a sport-based physical education class could be changed by creating educational and inclusive learning experiences which were enhanced by Sport Education's features of team affiliation and holistic game play evaluation.

Sinelnikov and Hastie (2010a) investigated memories of Russian middle school aged students who had previously participated in three Sport Education seasons over a 3-year span. This longitudinal study employed an autobiographical memory theoretical framework that allowed researchers to investigate students' memories of past experiences during physical education. The results of the study revealed that students, recalling mostly from general and event-specific memories, were able to remember their authentic Sport Education experiences and

claimed deeper understanding of a given sport. Moreover, based on the findings of the study, Sinelnikov and Hastie suggested that strong team affiliation, authentic competition, and higher levels of perceived learning lasted beyond the duration of each Sport Education season.

The high levels of interest in Sport Education, evidenced by a large number of research and practitioner articles (Hastie et al., 2011), is also manifested in a number of PE teachers in the US and abroad using the model almost exclusively as the *modus operandi* of teaching (Peter Hastie, personal communication, October 1, 2014; Oleg Sinelnikov, personal communication, September 27, 2014). Nonetheless, questions about the experiences of students who participated in a significant number of Sport Education seasons over multiple years still remain unanswered.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine middle school students' recollections of their participation in a significant number of Sport Education seasons as a part of physical education program over a 5-year period. These recollections might enhance our ability to examine whether students, through participation in a substantial number of Sport Education seasons over a prolonged period of time, have developed a sense of themselves as competent, literate, and enthusiastic sports people.

Sport pedagogy scholars interested in students' memories of their experiences in physical education and physical activity settings have just recently begun using the autobiographical memory theory (Casey & Quennerstedt, 2015; Sinelnikov & Hastie, 2010a). While Sinelnikov and Hastie (2010a) were the first scholars to employ the autobiographical memory framework to examine students' recollections of Sport Education, more recently Casey and Quennerstedt (2015) reported how boys communicated their previous experiences of cultural norms in physical education. Findings of the latter study indicated that a majority of the boys constructed their memories of physical education through participation in sport. Both studies confirmed the

usefulness of an autobiographical memory theory framework when investigating episodic memories of students in physical education setting.

Thus, autobiographical memory theory served as the theoretical framework for this study (Conway & Rubin, 1993). Autobiographical memory is defined as the memory for all of the events that occur in one's life (Conway & Rubin, 1993). The major difference between autobiographical memory and other kinds of memories is the tenet that autobiographical memories are connected to specific places and times in a person's life (Tulving, 2002). Subsequently, these types of memories have immense personal significance (Burt, 2008).

According to Cohen (1996), there are six primary functions of autobiographical memory. The six functions are as follows: (a) the construction and maintenance of self-concept or what shapes your identity, (b) regulation of moods, (c) making friends and maintaining those relationships through shared experiences, (d) problem-solving based upon past life experiences, (e) shaping likes, dislikes, beliefs, and prejudices based on remembered experiences, and (f) helping to predict the future based upon past memories.

Autobiographical memory functions on three different levels of specificity that fluctuate based on duration and specific type of event (Conway & Pleydell-Pearce, 2000). The first level is termed "lifetime periods." Lifetime periods consist of temporal knowledge about a certain length of time or common features of a specific duration of time. These periods often are grouped together and can last for several years. The second level is "general events," which can last between a few days to several months. Finally, the "event-specific knowledge" level of autobiographical memory details information that is unique to one specific event or instance in time. These specific events are critical because they aid in providing specific concrete details,

which are used to convince that the event described did actually occur (van der Hoven & Eggen, 2008).

Method

Participants and Setting

The participants in this study were purposefully chosen based on their prior experiences of participation in Sport Education. In line with this study's longitudinal and autobiographical research question, only those students who had participated in a minimum of 17 seasons of Sport Education over the last 5 years were selected as participants. The majority of students who took part in the study completed 18-21 Sport Education seasons. The participants were 31 students (18 boys, 13 girls) from a school in the southeastern portion of the United States. This public school is attended by predominantly African American (49%) and Caucasian (45%), Asian (3%), Hispanic (2%), and other (1%) students. These students are from both low to middle income families. At the time of data collection, the students were in the 8th grade (average age = 13 years).

All students in this study attended the same elementary and middle school in which Sport Education is used as the main pedagogical model. Between 4th and 6th grade, all students participated in five co-ed Sport Education seasons a year. Students were separated by gender for their 7th and 8th grade physical education. To ensure the fidelity of each season, Table 3 includes each season's descriptors according to Hastie's (2012) recommendations of the five key aspects that cannot be compromised in order for a unit to be classified as Sport Education.

Each season had been taught by one of the two PE teachers at the school, Amanda³ or John, both of whom use Sport Education as their primary pedagogical model. Several Sport

³ The names of all participants in this paper are fictitious.

Table 3

Sport Education Seasons' Fidelity

Grade	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th
<i>Season length</i>	18 lessons	20 lessons	18 lessons	22 lessons	25 lessons
<i>Class time</i>	45 min.	45 min.	45 min.	45 min.	45 min.
<i>Constant Teams</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Season Phases</i>	Pre-Season Regular Season Post Season	Pre-Season Regular Season Post Season	Pre-Season Regular Season Post Season	Pre-Season Regular Season Post Season	Pre-Season Regular Season Post Season
<i>Roles</i>	Coach Captain Equity Officer Board Members Manager Head Referee	Coach Captain Equity Officer Board Members Manager Head Referee	Coach Captain Equity Officer Board Members Manager Head Referee	Coach Captain Equity Officer Manager Warm Up Leader	Coach Captain Equity Officer Manager Warm Up Leader
<i>Festivity</i>	Team Names Team Jerseys Team Posters Schedules Posted Public League Standings Public Rule Poster	Team Names Team Jerseys Team Posters Schedules Posted Public League Standings Public Rule Poster	Team Names Team Jerseys Team Posters Schedules Posted Public League Standings Public Rule Poster	Team Names Team Jerseys Team Posters Schedules Posted Public League Standings Public Rule Poster	Team Names Team Jerseys Team Posters Schedules Posted Public League Standings Public Rule Poster
<i>Co-Ed Seasons</i>	Ultimate Speedball Lacrosse Tchoukball Floor Hockey	Fitness Badminton Flag Football Rugby Softball	Basketball Handball Soccer Volleyball Track & Field		
<i>Boys Seasons</i>				Golf Tchoukball Floor Hockey Lacrosse	Flag Football Softball
<i>Girls Seasons</i>				Dance Fitness Fencing Track & Field	Cheer Volleyball

Education seasons were co-taught by these teachers. Amanda was a 29-year-old Caucasian female who had a master's degree in health and physical education. She was a highly respected teacher who held leadership roles in the state professional organization, and had been teaching using Sport Education model at the same school for the past 7 years. John was 36, Caucasian, and also held a master's degree in the field. He had taught physical education for 12 years and used Sport Education for the last 9 years, teaching over 100 Sport Education seasons.

Data Collection

The data regarding the students' responses to and recollections of Sport Education were collected through surveys, focus group interviews, individual interviews, and autobiographical reflection. Tulving (1983) suggested that memories are easier to retrieve if the physical context during retrieval is identical to the physical context during encoding, which is referred to as the encoding-specific principle. Therefore, following Sinelnikov and Hastie's (2010a) recommendation of using the encoding-specific principle, data collection took place in the gymnasium where each Sport Education season was conducted. In order to trigger specific memories from the seasons, a combination of cues were used to increase the chance of retrieving a memory (Baddeley, 1999; Engelkamp, 1998). Students were shown a series of pictures and artifacts prior to focus group interviews. Statistical sheets, previous team posters, fair play sheets, equity board member information, and equipment were demonstrated, all of which provided opportunities for students to enhance memories and trigger personal recollections from previous seasons.

All focus and individual interviews were recorded and transcribed immediately following the interviews. The researcher's Institutional Review Board approved this study and participant, parental, and guardian approval was secured. The school administration also approved this study,

allowing for research to be conducted on the school's premises. A more detailed description of each method of data collection follows.

Survey. The students were asked to complete a questionnaire about their experiences of participating in Sport Education over the past 5 school years. Following the protocol of Sinelnikov and Hastie (2010a), two memory cues were used to assist in memory recollection. Each student (a) wrote down everything s/he can remember about Sport Education seasons, and (b) listed five items that s/he remembers the most about Sport Education. Aside from these general directions, students were not given any other prompts or directions to ensure unbiased students' recollections. This survey took approximately 30 minutes to finish and all students handed in their papers upon completion. To ensure that students were not concerned with privacy, the researcher explained that pseudonyms would be provided to assure confidentiality.

Focus group interviews. Student interactions during focus group interviews may stimulate discussion and provide additional information that would not be available during individual interviews. Additionally, group interviews may pose a less threatening environment for some students (McQuarrie & McIntyre, 1990). Since group interviews are preferable when the focus is centered on commonly held beliefs, attitudes, interest, and behaviors (McQuarrie & McIntyre, 1990), focus group interviews were deemed an appropriate method of data collection for the study.

Focus group interviews were conducted 3-5 days following the completion of the surveys in groups of three. Each focus group interview lasted between 30 and 40 minutes. This data collection procedure allowed for all participants to be interviewed in a group setting. The interview questions focused on students' experiences, memories, attitudes, beliefs, and history in physical education in general and in Sport Education specifically. The format of the focus group

interview allowed the researcher to present open-ended questions to the group with the particular goal of stimulating recollections of students' memories and experiences during Sport Education.

Formal interviews. Using a semi-structured protocol (Patton, 1990), all of the students were formally interviewed. The research question served as the basis for the interviews with the interviewer using multiple follow-up prompts and questions to ensure that optimal responses were obtained from the participants (Miles & Huberman, 1984). The initial line of questions focused on basic background information, and general physical education and Sport Education experiences. Then, more specific questions regarding students' memories of particular Sport Education seasons, season phases, features of Sport Education seasons, and interactions with other team members were asked. Formal interviews lasted approximately 35-60 minutes and were audio taped and transcribed verbatim.

Autobiographical critical reflection. Each student was asked to submit an autobiographical critical reflection paper in which students responded to the following: "Describe a physical education lesson that was particularly memorable. Explain in detail the events of that lesson, what you did, what you enjoyed or did not enjoy, and what exactly occurred." Participants prepared at their convenience, outside of school time, a written essay following this prompt, which was then submitted to the researcher.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed inductively using constant comparisons (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) with the purpose of extracting common categories and themes. Additionally, analytic induction methods were utilized to identify commonalities (Patton, 1990). The data analysis procedures followed three specific phases. During Phase I all interview transcripts, surveys, and writing samples were read, re-read, and coded. Phase II included categorization of all data into specific

levels according to the autobiographical memory theory. During this phase of data analysis each data point was assigned a specific memory recollection level (level 1—lifetime, level 2—general event, level 3—event specific knowledge). Phase III consisted of grouping quotes or phrases from all transcripts, surveys, or writing samples from each level to form a specific theme. If data did not fit into an existing theme, a new theme was created. Trustworthiness and credibility were verified through a search for negative and discrepant cases (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984) and by triangulating findings from each of the data collection sources.

Results

Students Levels of Recollection Within Multiple Sport Education Seasons

Students' memories from their previous experiences within Sport Education have been organized and categorized into each particular level of specificity. The global level of recollection, lifetime periods, did not appear substantially within the responses. The students provided evidence of enjoyment of their physical education during their elementary and middle school years, but the majority of responses in the survey, writing sample, and focus group interviews represented general events and event-specific knowledge.

General events level of specificity. There were five principle themes and four subthemes identified within the second level of specificity labeled "general events." The major themes were "making evaluations," "preparation," "the first season," "gamesmanship," and "competition." The themes of "gamesmanship" and "competition" were each comprised of two subthemes labeled "integrity" and "officiating discrepancies," and "playing with boys" and "focus," respectively.

Greater majority of students described their significant and constant involvement in decision-making and evaluative processes in relation to selves, their peers, and teams throughout

various Sport Education seasons. For example, some students described their involvement and responsibility of “closely watching the game to ensure the teams were equal” during team selection phase of the season and “making sure the rules were fair” when setting up competition format. If a change needed to take place, “the equity officers would meet and discuss how they would proceed. Either by a trade, or make a rule change so people would stop doing a dangerous activity.” Additionally, while working as a captain, students would oftentimes need to “decide when people would be going into and out of games.” Students discussed balancing playing while systematically evaluating gameplay in order to “give the class a better experience.” These evaluative and decision-making responsibilities seemed to be present in all Sport Education season phases, albeit in different forms. One commonality for the majority of students was the aim of such evaluation and decision-making processes which was centered on a concept of fairness and responsible competition for a better overall experience for all in the season.

The second major theme within the general events level of specificity was “preparation.” Some students recalled initial practices as “being weak” and “ineffective,” however, they also described students in leadership positions (e.g., coach and warm-up leaders) being “more prepared” for practices and games in later practices and later seasons. Others remembered specific instances of certain students preparing their teams exceptionally well in class and outside of class. The idea that “if we took the time to prepare as a team outside of PE we would compete better,” was described as important throughout numerous seasons. One student described “one coach taking notes of the other team’s best players, so when we practiced, we were prepared for how they would play.” While most students remembered being a player and, “as a player preparing for gameplay during practices, not just during gym class,” and “giving my

coach everything I had, so our team could be the best possible,” other students embodied the role of a coach:

When I coach, I take it serious. I make a playbook, I get the headset out, and I make sure we are practicing after school. I take it very seriously. I made this really sweet playbook for flag football, and I gave it to all of my teammates. I was the coach, you know, because that’s what I do so well. And we had, like, a 20-page playbook. (John, interview)

When thinking back upon their experiences in Sport Education, most students remembered their first season very well. For example, students recalled specific instances from that first season, “I remember playing my first season. I was the coach of the Memphis Grizzlies. We had a good season until the playoffs.” Or, “Rugby was my first. I was captain, and we were undefeated in the pre-season but somehow lost every regular season game. It’s because we always argued. No sportsmanship points.” Other memories were more generic, but descriptively detailed their first experience:

In the fourth grade, ultimate frisbee that was when we entered the sport education world. I don’t remember specifics, but just being out on the field throwing the frisbee with teammates. Those were some good times. I do remember getting our jerseys. I think we were yellow that season. (Clara, individual interview)

Within “gamesmanship,” the subtheme of “integrity” was echoed by a majority of students. They expressed a belief that “sportsmanship is most important,” and that “winning isn’t all that matters. It’s more about respecting not only your team but the team you play against.” Odell explained that, “The most important thing I have learned is to have good sportsmanship, be a fair player and to always remember to be a great teammate.”

Yet, not everything was positive and went smoothly during the Sport Education seasons as “discrepancies with officials” was identified as one of the subthemes within “gamesmanship.” Memories of “cheating refs,” “bad calls,” and “dishonest, biased referees” were shared by many

students. Problematic refereeing was acknowledged by some students, even when describing themselves in the role of an official:

See, the refereeing was sometimes a problem, depending on who the officials were. Sometimes you get the fair kids in class who are honest, and they call it straight. But other times, like me, sometimes, you know, if my friend is playing, I will shoot him some calls to help him out. Not because I want to be unfair, but because he is my friend. But if I have friends playing against each other, I call it straight. (Donavon, focus group interview)

One of the subthemes within “competition” was termed “playing with boys.” Every female student while recalling her experience within Sport Education had memories of playing with the boys. Recall that in 4th through 6th grades all Sport Education seasons were co-ed, and it was in 7th and 8th grades that students were segregated by gender for several seasons. While some girls expressed positive attitudes toward participating with boys commenting, “I [l]oved playing the hockey season with the boys,” most were nondescript in their episodic memories, recalling “playing seasons with the boys” or “I remember playing the speedball season with the guys.” Notably, there were zero instances of negative Sport Education memories or experiences from seasons voiced by any of the girls in the study. While “playing with boys” was a singular commonality among the female participants when recalling their experiences in Sport Education, not one male student specifically mentioned gender in any of the surveys, writing samples, or interviews.

Another subtheme within “competing” was labeled “focused.” Both, the boys and girls, recalled specific instances of “being so focused.” For example, Joshua recalled being really concentrated during a basketball season. He said that, “For whatever reason that basketball season I was laser-focused. I wanted to beat his team so bad, that’s all I thought about each day.” Lindsay recollected “being in the zone during the season.” For her, it was the 4th grade floor hockey season. She commented, “I felt like every time we competed I was on point. I wasn’t

always like that.” This feeling of intense concentration and being focused for the duration of the entire season was described frequently by a significant number of students.

Event-specific knowledge. There were two main themes with subthemes in event-specific knowledge for the students participating in multiple season of Sport Education. These two themes were “authenticity” and “gameplay.” The theme of “gameplay” had three subthemes of “adversity,” “gut-wrenching losses,” and “champions.”

The theme of “authenticity” referred to students’ recollections of certain memorable events which emulated a professional sporting event atmosphere. Many students remembered assisting and playing in specific all-star games, championship games, and even regular season events, vividly recalling them as being “very similar to a real professional game.” The following excerpts were students’ recollections describing the authenticity of all-star games from previous seasons:

Being an announcer during the basketball all-star game, I will always remember. I got to call the whole game, not just the introductions. I called it like a TV commentator would do in the NBA for the whole game. I had a microphone and everything. We brought in the band; it was dope. I sat at the announcer table and was like, ‘Odell dribbles up court . . . drives . . . fade away . . . YESSSSSS!!! (Matt, focus group interview)

The “Speedball Stars” game was really cool. We had one big field, and the whole grade came and watched. The class picked the top boys and girls on each team to play. I got chosen. I felt like I was playing in front of the big crowd. (Christina, survey)

Other students described analogous memories of being an integral part of authentic competition during formal competition or culminating events such as play-offs, championships, or final performances in Sport Education. Notably, these vibrant and vivid specific memories elucidated the intricacies and minor details within these events; however, the focus of recollections was on the environment and atmosphere of the event and rarely on the outcome. For instance, Lane described a dance championship as being “so cool, it was like we were all in the movie—‘Bring

it on.' I felt like a star on stage in front of the crowd." The following are other students' recollection of their authentic experience:

When we were in the fourth grade, for the hockey championship, we went all out. I don't even remember if I was in it this year but they had music playing, and people ran out of the locker room, grabbed their sticks. The lights were flashing, everyone was all pumped up. They had a blow horn that played when there was a goal scored. (Wayne, focus group interview)

In the basketball championship we tried to make it super like the NBA. We had music playing, and announcers. The coaches even got dressed up really stylish in suits and coached. It was cool, it made it seem realistic. It was like a real championship game, not just another game in gym. (Walt, survey)

Explicit memories depicting certain events during the multiple seasons contributed to students' experience within Sport Education. A considerable number of students were able to describe in great detail the instances of facing and overcoming adversity. For example, Mickey described an instance when his team "came back from a 16-0 deficit and beat the other team 42-37," while others recollected their individual efforts of "bringing my team all the way back in the 5th grade speedball championship to win the title." Additionally, many students offered equally gratifying recollections of the opportunities of working through challenges even without "winning championships." The mere fact of "working hard and overcoming perceived odds" seemed to be what mattered most and therefore it was what was most remembered. For example, Matt observed that, "My team went to the hockey championship, although the odds were 100 to 1. We didn't end up winning, but our team worked so hard just to get there." Others articulated similar memories describing instances when they had faced adversity during pivotal points in the season:

This season in the pro-bowl my team was not supposed to win. In the halls we talked about the chances and what the spread on the game should be. They decided it would be like 21 points or something. We ended up winning on the last play. It was so great to win that game. No one expected us to even come close but we won. (Chris, focus group interview)

In the 5th grade during the rugby season, I had to stay late in my class before gym, so I came late to class. When I got there we were losing 2-0. I had ended up bringing my whole team back and we won 4-2 in that game. (Odell, survey)

The hockey championship for me, that was cool. Our hockey team was really, really bad at the beginning of the season and we did end up winning the championship. I scored a goal in the championship. (Albert, focus group interview)

However, many event-specific memories centered on students' recollections of their participation and, importantly, winning a culminating event. A majority of the students easily recalled "being the champion in softball" or "beating Jessie's team in tchoukball to win the championship" and many were very descriptive in their accounts although the events might have taken place 3 to 4 years ago:

My team won the track and field championship back in 6th grade That was one of my favorite moments because I was the coach, and my captain didn't do the best job, so I felt like it was on me to help carry the team. We worked really hard all season, so it all came together winning at the end. (Maggie, focus group interview)

In the basketball championship, I scored all of my teams points except for like 4. It was a close game at first, but then we broke away at the end. We had such a killer team, and it was my best moment in class. (John, survey)

While many students recalled successful memories of formal competition, specific gameplay episodes, or culminating events, others reminisced about specific "gut-wrenching losses" they have experienced. For example, many students recalled losing close games or "games that mattered." "Games that mattered" could have been championship games or final performances, games, or events that allowed the teams to progress to play-offs or culminating events, or simply games or performances against individuals or teams considered to be "the best in class:"

I wanted to beat Wayne's team so bad in hockey. Everyone knows he's the best. This one game late in the season, it may have even been in the playoffs. Well, the game was close the whole time. We lost because he scored with like 2 seconds to go. It still haunts me. (Walt, focus group interview)

Comments like, “winning every game, and losing one in the playoffs,” “falling one point shy in speedball,” or “hitting the post with a shot in soccer that would have won us a game” were recurrent examples of student memories when recalling from event specific knowledge of Sport Education seasons.

Discussion

A number of authors within sport pedagogy have called for longitudinal research designs when examining Sport Education (Hastie et al., 2011; Perlman, 2012; Siedentop, 1998; Sinelnikov & Hastie, 2010a; Wallhead & O’Sullivan, 2005). This study answers this call and provides important contribution to our understanding of middle school students’ memories of physical education in a program which had been designed and delivered through the exclusive use of Sport Education. This is the only study to date that (a) provides an account of such program and (b) does so through the examination of students’ most significant memories. Specifically, students’ episodic autobiographical memories of participation in physical education over the period of 5 years were reconstructed through the use of an augmented memory system, cue words, and using an encoding specific principle.

The examination of students’ memories of physical education revealed that students were able to recall their participation in a significant number of Sport Education seasons within general events and event-specific knowledge levels of autobiographical memory. Similar to previous research (Sinelnikov & Hastie, 2010a), most descriptive and vivid student recollections were centered on features of the model that are critical to the structure of Sport Education. This finding is essential in support of the argument for not compromising and not offering a “watered down version” (Curtner-Smith, Hastie & Kinchin, 2008) of Sport Education, since the model

“has distinct pedagogical features which positively contribute to many of the dimensions of physical literacy” (Hastie & Wallhead, 2015, p. 1).

Within the event-specific knowledge level of autobiographical memory, numerous students recalled descriptive accounts of their participation in Sport Education and how their physical education reminded them of organized sports and activities. This result is foundational to the concept of the authentic nature of Sport Education and how authenticity is inherently embedded in structural features of seasons, affiliation, formal competition, record keeping, festivity, and culmination event (Siedentop et al., 2011). The most memorable recollections for students in this study were specific memories from gameplay, overcoming adversity, winning championships, and gut-wrenching losses. These findings are in line with a plethora of previous research exploring students’ experiences in Sport Education (Hastie & Sinelnikov, 2006; Mowling, Brock & Hastie, 2006; Ko, Wallhead & Ward, 2006; Sinelnikov & Hastie, 2010a).

Students recounted their experiences preparing for gameplay through a significant number of general event level memories. A few researchers have voiced concerns over the quality of student led practices in Sport Education (Hastie, 2000; Hastie et al., 2011; Wallhead & Sullivan, 2005). Students who have participated in a significant number of Sport Education seasons found this to be true in the first few seasons and described their team practices led by student coaches during initial seasons as being “ineffective” and “weak.” However, participants also noted increased levels of complexity and effectiveness of team practices, which then led to the development of technique and skill, in later Sport Education seasons. These findings lend support to the notion of Pereira et al. (2015) that to properly train student-coaches, ample time is required to ensure that students have developed the required skill set for peer-teaching. Similar to effective teaching (see Rink, 2006), subject matter content, familiarity with progressive

instructional strategies related to task presentation, and constant communication with the teacher are essential for exceptional performance from student-coaches (Pereira et al., 2015).

Similar to few initial reports (Hastie & Sinelnikov, 2006; Kinchin, MacPhail & Ni Chroinin, 2009; Pereira et al., 2015; Sinelnikov & Hastie, 2008), students in this study identified determination and willingness to practice and prepare individually and as a team for competition and culminating events not only during physical education but outside of class time as well. Additionally, students recalled giving maximal effort and understanding the association between preparation and improvement. The latter association, suggesting the development of task-oriented determinants, is particularly notable given the critical nature of creating a mastery oriented climate during Sport Education seasons (Sinelnikov & Hastie, 2010b).

A distinguishing component of the Sport Education model is an emphasis on students exhibiting positive pro-social behaviors based on the concept of fair play (Siedentop et al., 2011). As Siedentop, Hastie, and van der Mars (2004) wrote, “[o]ne goal is for girls and boys to learn fairness, teamwork, and compassion as they participate in sport” (ix). The absence of harmful behaviors, not arguing with referees, and the presence of pro-social behaviors, such as shaking hands with opponents after the game, are encouraged and awarded within the structure of the model. Previous research on officiating in Sport Education presents positive student responses to being an official as well as high level of engagement in officiating tasks (Hastie et al., 2011; Hastie & Sinelnikov, 2006). However, the results of this study raise concerns about student officials’ competency and accuracy, especially during initial Sport Education seasons.

The misunderstanding of students’ conceptions of fair play constructs and pro-social behaviors that accompany these constructs has been initially reported by a limited number of studies (Brock & Hastie, 2007; Sinelnikov & Hastie, 2008). For example, in some iterations of

Sport Education, students justified “star players” to participate more frequently in high-pressure situations (Brock & Hastie, 2007). Conversely, in other Sport Education seasons, students were concerned about “not giving an advantage to any particular team” when officiating (Sinelnikov & Hastie, 2008, p. 217). Since in Sport Education the duty team officials typically carry out the evaluation of other players’ and teams’ conduct (Siedentop et al., 2011), the findings of this study provide further credence to the critical importance of developing literate sportspeople as one of the objectives of Sport Education.

The results of this study uncovered that during initial seasons of Sport Education some students misunderstood, misinterpreted, and misapplied the fair play criteria when making evaluations of others. Furthermore, some students reported overt and covert resistance to notions of fair play during initial Sport Education seasons. This resistance was displayed in the form of making intentional incorrect calls, failing to make officiating decisions, or awarding/deducting points not based on actual fair play behaviors, but rather on the degree of friendship with players. Such intentional decisions of making incorrect calls or rewarding a team because of a friendship with one of the players have not been previously discussed in the literature. It is critical to note, however, that the overt and covert resistance has significantly subsided as students continued their participation in further Sport Education seasons. The students’ understanding of fair play and its critical role in creating positive experiences during physical education has continued to evolve throughout seasons. Ultimately, students in this study interpreted fair play based on and by “how well you work with others, being a good teammate, and respecting whatever sports you’re playing.” This seems to be in concert with Siedentop’s original ideas for student development during Sport Education.

Vidoni and Ward (2009) demonstrated that fair play instruction during Sport Education increases active student participation and decreases the number of harmful behaviors, and the results of this study suggest that it takes significant time and effort to do so. Furthermore, in order for students to become competent, literate, and fair officials, a participation in multiple seasons of Sport Education may be necessary. While further research in this area is warranted, findings of this study provide powerful support to the necessity of employing sequential Sport Education seasons in order for students to embrace notions embedded in the concepts of fair play and become “literate” and “enthusiastic” sportspeople. This is especially important given that one function of autobiographical memory is shaping beliefs and prejudices based on remembered experiences (Cohen, 1996). In conclusion, the key findings of this study suggest that students’ recollections of participation in a significant number of seasons reinforce the importance of the adhering to the central features of Sport Education. Additionally, meaningful participation in several iterations of quality Sport Education seasons may be required for students to move closer to achieving the lofty goals of the model of becoming competent, literate and enthusiastic sportspeople.

REFERENCES

- Baddeley, A.D. (1999). *Essentials of human memory*. Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Brock, S.J., & P.A. Hastie. (2007). Students' conceptions of fair play in sport education. *ACHPER Australia Healthy Lifestyles Journal*, 54(1), 11-15.
- Burt, C. (2008). Time, language, and autobiographical memory. *Language Learning*, 58(1), 123-141.
- Casey, A., & Quennerstedt, M. (2015). "I just remember rugby": Remembering physical education as more than a sport. *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport*, 86(1), 40-50.
- Cohen, G. (1996). *Memory in the real world*. Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Conway, M.A., & Pleydell-Pearce, C.W. (2000). The construction of autobiographical memories in the self-memory system. *Psychological Review*, 107, 261-288.
- Conway, M.A., & Rubin, D.C. (1993). The structure of autobiographical memory. In A.F. Collins, S.E. Gathercole, M.A. Conway, & P.E. Morris (Eds.), *Theories of memory* (pp. 103–137). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Curtner-Smith, M.D., Hastie, P.A., & Kinchin, G.D. (2008). Influence of occupational socialization on beginning teachers' interpretation and delivery of sport education. *Sport, Education and Society*, 13(1), 97-117.
- Engelkamp, J. (1998). *Memory for actions*. Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Goetz, J.P., & LeCompte, M.D. (1984). *Ethnography and qualitative design in education research*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Hastie, P.A., (2000). An ecological analysis of a sport education season. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 19, 355-373.
- Hastie, P.A. (2012). The nature and purpose of sport education as an educational experience. In P. Hastie (Ed.), *Sport education: International perspectives* (pp. 3–14). London, UK: Routledge.
- Hastie, P.A., de Ojeda, D.M., & Calderón-Luquin, A. (2011). A review of research on sport education: 2004 to the present. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 16, 103-132.
- Hastie, P.A., & Sinelnikov, O.A. (2006). Russian students' participation in and perceptions of a season of sport education. *European Physical Education Review*, 12(2), 131-150.

- Hastie, P.A., Sinelnikov, O., Wallhead, T., & Layne, T. (2014). Perceived and actual motivational climate of a mastery-involving Sport Education season. *European Physical Education Review, 20*(2), 215-228.
- Hastie, P. A., & Wallhead, T. L. (2015). Operationalizing physical literacy through sport education. *Journal of Sport and Health Science, 2*, 1-7. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jshs.2015.04.001
- Kinchin, G.D., MacPhail, A., & Ni Chroinin, D.D. (2009). Pupils' and teacher' perceptions of a culminating festival within a sport education season in Irish primary schools. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 14*(4), 391-406.
- Ko, B., Wallhead, T.T., & Ward, P. (2006). Professional development workshops—What do teachers learn and use? *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 25*(4), 397-412.
- Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- McQuarrie, E.F., & McIntyre, S.H. (1990). What the group interview can contribute to research on consumer phenomenology. In E.C. Hirshman (Ed.), *Research in consumer behavior* (pp. 165-194). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mowling, C.M., Brock, S.J., & Hastie, P.A. (2006). Fourth grade students' drawing interpretations of a sport education soccer unit, *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 25*(1), 9-35.
- Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Pereira, J., Hastie, P., Araujo, R., Farias, C., Rolim, R., & Mesquita, I. (2015). A comparative study of students' track and field technical performance in sport education and in a direct instruction approach. *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine, 14*, 118-127.
- Perlman, D. (2012). An examination of amotivated students within the Sport Education Model. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education, 3*(2), 141-155.
- Rink, J.E. (2006). *Teaching physical education for learning* (5th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Siedentop, D. (1968). *A curriculum theory for physical education in schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Siedentop, D. (1998). What is sport education and how does it work? *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 69*(4), 18-20.
- Siedentop, D., Hastie, P., & van der Mars, H. (2004). *Complete guide to sport education*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

- Siedentop, D., Hastie, P.A., & van der Mars, H. (2011). *Complete guide to sport education*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Sinelnikov, O., & Hastie, P.A. (2008). Teaching sport education to Russian students: An ecological analysis. *European Physical Education Review*, *14*(2), 203-222.
- Sinelnikov, O.A., & Hastie, P.A. (2010a). Students' autobiographical memory of participation in multiple sport education seasons. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, *29*(2), 167-183.
- Sinelnikov, O.A., & Hastie, P.A. (2010b). A motivational analysis of a season of sport education. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, *15*(1), 55-69. doi: 10.1080/17408980902729362
- Tulving, E. (1983). *Elements of episodic memory*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Tulving, E. (2002). Episodic memory: From mind to brain. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *53*, 1-25.
- van den Hoven, E., & Eggen, B. (2008). Informing augmented memory system design through autobiographical memory theory. *Journal of Personal and Ubiquitous Computing*, *12*, 433-443.
- Vidoni, C., & Ward, P. (2009). Effects of fair play instruction on student social skills during a middle school sport education unit. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, *14*(3), 285-310.
- Wahl-Alexander, Z., & Curtner-Smith, M. (in press). Influence of negotiations between preservice teachers and pupils on instruction within multi-activity and sport education units. *Sport, Education and Society*.
- Wallhead, T., & O'Sullivan, M. (2005). Sport education: Physical education for the new millennium? *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, *10*, 181-210.

APPENDIX

Office for Research
Institutional Review Board for the
Protection of Human Subjects



June 26, 2014

Zachary Wahl-Alexander
Department of Kinesiology
College of Education
Box 870312

Re: IRB # 14-08-246, "Negotiated Sport Education Season"

Dear Mr. Wahl-Alexander:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for your proposed research.

Your application has been given expedited approval according to 45 CFR part 46. Approval has been given under expedited review category 7 as outlined below:

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

Your application will expire on June 24, 2015. If your research will continue beyond this date, please complete the relevant portions of the IRB Renewal Application. If you wish to modify the application, please complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol Form. Changes in this study cannot be initiated without IRB approval, except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants. When the study closes, please complete the appropriate portions of the IRB Request for Study Closure Form.

Please use reproductions of the IRB approved stamped consent forms to obtain consent from your participants.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this proposal, please include the above application number.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,

Office for Research Compliance
The University of Alabama


554 Ross Administration Building
Box 870117
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35402-0117
(205) 945-6467
Fax: (205) 948-2167
TDD: (205) 948-2666