

INFLUENCE OF NEGOTIATIONS ON PRESERVICE TEACHERS' INSTRUCTION  
WITHIN MULTI-ACTIVITY AND SPORT EDUCATION UNITS

by

ZACHARY WAHL-ALEXANDER

MATTHEW D. CURTNER-SMITH, COMMITTEE CHAIR  
OLEG SINELNIKOV  
ELIZABETH WILSON

A THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts in the Department of Kinesiology in the  
Graduate School of The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2012

Copyright Zachary Wall-Alexander 2012  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## ABSTRACT

Previous research has indicated that sport education (SE) has structural advantages over traditional multi-activity (MA) teaching which may help preservice teachers (PTs) learning to teach. The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of negotiations between pupils and PTs on PTs' instruction within MA teaching and SE. Participants were 17 PTs engaged in a secondary early field experience in which they taught 12-lesson MA and SE soccer units. Data were collected using six qualitative techniques and analyzed using analytic induction and constant comparison. Pupils initiated negotiations aimed at securing changes in instructional tasks and a reduction in standards of performance for those tasks. PTs initiated negotiations aimed at securing compliance with instructional and managerial tasks. During MA instruction, negotiations were relatively negative and common, increased as the unit progressed, and adversely influenced the effectiveness of the majority of PTs' pedagogies. During SE instruction, negotiations were relatively positive and infrequent, declined as the season progressed, and enabled PTs to deliver comparatively good quality physical education.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to extend my sincere appreciation to Dr. Matthew Curtner-Smith, chairperson of my thesis committee and academic advisor, 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. Oleg Sinelnikov 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 .....	iii
INTRODUCTION .....	1
PURPOSE .....	5
METHODS .....	8
TYPES OF NEGOTIATIONS .....	12
EXTENT OF NEGOTIATIONS AND THEIR IMPACT ON PTS'	
PEDAGOGIES.....	20
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION .....	27
REFERENCES.. .....	30

## INTRODUCTION

The "traditional" or dominant curriculum model employed by secondary school physical education teachers has been termed the multi-activity (MA) model (Siedentop, Mand, & Taggart, 1986). High class MA teaching involves teachers taking a predominantly teacher-centered approach to teaching various physical activities, games, and sports. This means that pupils participate in a logical series of progressive practices, drills, small-sided conditioned games, full-sided conditioned games, and full game play which their teachers design, organize, and manage. It also means that teachers primarily employ direct styles of teaching in keeping with their key goals which are skill acquisition and skillful game play (Brown, Carlson, & Hastie, 2004, Curtner-Smith, 2001; Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004). Although their focus is on the psychomotor domain, high quality physical education teachers who employ the MA model often have secondary goals within the cognitive and affective domains. For example, they may be interested in their pupils gaining an advanced understanding of tactics and strategies and in being able to work closely with a partner or within a team. These secondary goals mean that teachers may expand their pedagogies to include more indirect styles of teaching which allow pupils to make more of the decisions during instruction (Parker & Curtner-Smith, 2012).

A more recent physical education curriculum model, fashioned from "play education" (Siedentop, 1968), and also aimed at teaching sports, games, and physical activities, is sport education (SE) (Siedentop, Hastie, & van der Mars, 2011). SE is based on the notion that "a mature sport culture represents an evolution of culture toward a more meaningful form" (Siedentop, 2002, p. 412) and was developed because "many physical education programs, even when taught effectively, were not interesting or challenging enough to inspire students" (Siedentop, 2002, p. 411).

Although SE is consistent with other relatively recent and emerging pedagogical and curricular innovations and initiatives including cooperative learning, games for understanding, peer teaching, and constructivism, it was designed by combining positive components of sport with the managerial strategies emanating from the research on “teacher effectiveness” (Siedentop, 2002).

The overriding objective of SE is to provide an authentic sporting experience for pupils. The model’s main goals are to produce *competent, literate, and enthusiastic* consumers of sport. Specifically, this means that pupils should be competent performers and tacticians. They should be able to demonstrate their sporting literacy by indicating that they both value sport and understand the difference between good and bad sporting practice. Finally, pupils should be able to demonstrate their enthusiasm for sport by participating in a manner, which protects and promotes positive sporting culture (Siedentop et al., 2011).

This overriding objective and these goals are realized and achieved by requiring pupils to take part in sport *seasons* which are generally, although not necessarily, longer than MA units. The core of these seasons is a series of organized, *formal competitions* that generally involve pupils playing modified sport, in terms of team numbers, rules, and equipment, and through which they develop a sense of *affiliation* with the other members of their team. To make these seasons authentic and *festive*, pupils are required to keep *records*, participate in a *culminating event* such as a cup final, and take on a number of different roles other than player. For example, these roles might include captaining or coaching teams, officiating games, scouting opponents, writing newspaper reports on games, and collecting game statistics. In addition, as a sporting season progresses, teachers shift from employing more direct to less direct teaching styles with the aim of giving pupils greater responsibility and more opportunities to make decisions.

Several sport pedagogy researchers have suggested that, in theory, MA teaching has a number of structural disadvantages when compared with SE. Hastie (2003), for example, noted that teachers using the MA model are forced to take on the role of “ringmaster” and continually refocus their pupils on instructional tasks as they are competing with their pupils’ desire to socialize. Similarly, Alexander, Taggart, and Thorpe (1996) observed that when employing the MA model teachers are “center stage” in that they have to drive every aspect of instruction themselves. This means that the MA model is labor-intensive. Moreover, Ennis (1999) pointed out that “negative forces” resulting from the “curricular scaffolding” of the MA model can lead to teacher burnout, “instructional neglect,” and emotional fatigue. Essentially, this is because teachers have to work extremely hard to promote positive pupil interactions, make sure pupils are on-task, ensure that pupils with less skill get equitable instruction, and prevent overly competitive pupils from dominating proceedings. Finally, both Hastie (2003) and Ennis (1995, 1999) have observed that teachers employing the MA model frequently deliver a “negotiated curriculum” whereby in order to secure pupils’ compliance with tasks and reasonable standards of behavior they reduce their levels of accountability.

By contrast, these same authors have suggested that the SE model has some structural advantages when compared with MA teaching. Specifically, Hastie (2003) noted that teachers employing SE do not have to worry about suppressing their pupils’ social system because the model allows for and even promotes pupils’ socializing without interfering with instruction. This is a key reason why teachers using the SE model are able to spend more time on instruction and less time on management than those teaching through the MA model. Moreover, Alexander et al. (1996) pointed out that teachers employing the SE model spend more time “off center stage” since it is their pupils who drive instruction, particularly in the latter stages of a season. This means that



teachers' levels of stress are reduced and that there is more time for them to reflect on their instruction. Furthermore, and following their interpretation of earlier research (Macdonald, 1999; Seashore-Louis & Smith, 1990), Alexander and Luckman (2001) observed that the incorporation of the student social system was partially responsible for SE being more professionally satisfying and empowering than MA teaching since it fostered an improved relationship between teachers and their pupils. In congruence with these thoughts were the observations of Ennis (1999) who noted that SE's curricular structure led to "positive forces" that reduced the likelihood of a negotiated curriculum and promoted a "sense of community" and "positive social relations" among and between teachers and pupils.

## PURPOSE

Curtner-Smith (2012) has suggested that new physical education pedagogies need to be “sold” to preservice teachers (PTs) in order that they “buy into them” them during physical education teacher education (PETE) and adopt and use them on graduating. He also suggested that one way of selling SE to PTs was to emphasize the structural advantages the model has over traditional MA teaching and to let PTs experience these advantages first hand by teaching parallel SE seasons and MA units.

PTs and younger, inexperienced in-service teachers are much more likely to negotiate with their pupils than older, more experienced and expert teachers (Ennis, 1996; Siedentop & Tannehill, 2000). Further, and as noted in the preceding discussion, teachers of varying experience and expertise are thought to enter into negotiations with their pupils to a greater degree during MA teaching than when employing the SE model (Ennis, 1999; Hastie, 2003). It seems logical, then, that research illuminating exactly how PTs and their pupils engage in these negotiations during MA units and SE seasons, as well as the pedagogy resulting from this dialectic, may aid PETE faculty in selling the SE model to their charges. The purpose of this study, therefore, was to examine the influence of negotiations between pupils and PTs on PTs’ instruction within MA teaching and SE. Three sub-questions drove data collection and analysis. These were: (a) In what ways do pupils and PTs attempt to negotiate with each other during MA and SE units?, (b) To what extent do pupils and PTs attempt to negotiate with each other in MA and SE units?, and (c) How, if at all, do negotiations between pupils and PTs appear to alter the pedagogies of PTs during MA and SE units?

### **Research of Teacher-Pupil Negotiations**

Most instructional contexts involve at least some negotiation between teacher and pupils (Doyle, 1992; Ennis, 1996). Following Woods (1978), such negotiations include actions taken by pupils aimed at modifying or changing instructional tasks, standards of performance required to complete those tasks satisfactorily, and the conditions under which tasks are carried out. Pupils engage in these kinds of negotiations when they believe they are being treated unfairly, and when instructional tasks are too easy, too difficult, providing little opportunity for success, boring, potentially embarrassing, or simply irrelevant or helpful (Ennis, 1995; Erickson & Shultz, 1992; Tousignant & Siedentop, 1983). In addition, conditions which promote and facilitate pupil negotiation include the presentation of ambiguous or unclear tasks, which give pupils room to maneuver; and the requirement that pupils participate in tasks for which accountability is strict and of a high standard; and which involve pupils risking relatively more in terms of failure, poor evaluation, and status among their peers (Siedentop, 1988; Supaporn, Dodds & Griffin, 2003; Tsangaridou & O'Sullivan, 2003). Furthermore, within physical education, pupils appear more likely to engage in negotiation when they are asked to complete non-applied practices and drills for any length of time because they lack the excitement and relevance of game play and provide few opportunities for socializing (Ennis, 1995; Hastie & Siedentop, 1999).

Pupils have been shown to employ a variety of strategies and tactics when they negotiate (Supaporn et al., 2003). The most common of these appears to be verbal and ranges from direct confrontation or argument to appealing (Burbules, 1986). Other tactics and strategies used by pupils during negotiations are relatively subtle; for example, deliberately making less effort when asked to give more, making minor modifications to instructional tasks that are difficult for the teacher to detect, simply not participating in tasks without explanation or confrontation, and

presenting excuse notes to the teacher (Doyle, 1983; Ennis, 1995; Jones, 1992; O'Donovan & Kirk, 2007).

Experienced and expert teachers have been shown to be willing to engage in negotiation with their pupils if such action aids in realizing their instructional goals (Tsangaridou & O'Sullivan, 2003). Moreover, following Mosston and Ashworth (2008), expert teachers may employ relatively indirect teaching styles in which it is desirable for pupils to make many of the decisions and choices about instruction and so positive negotiation is used as a pedagogical tool and encouraged. Conversely, less experienced and less skilled teachers may capitulate under the pressure of negotiating pupils and allow instructional tasks, conditions, and goals to be altered without much resistance. This kind of pressure may also cause teachers to change the language they use as well as their patterns of feedback (Doyle, 1979). Commonly, weaker or less experienced teachers will offer less difficult instructional tasks and lower the accountability for accomplishing them, as well as more opportunities for pupils to socialize, in exchange for pupils' compliance with their managerial systems (Doyle & Carter, 1984; Hastie & Pickwell, 1996; Tsangaridou & O'Sullivan, 2003). All these changes are made with the hope of avoiding confrontation and further negotiation (Doyle 1979; O'Donovan & Kirk, 2007; Tsangaridou & O'Sullivan, 2003).

## METHODS

### **Participants**

The participants in this study were the 17 PTs enrolled in a 6-week secondary early field experience (EFE) at a major research university in the southeastern United States. All participants signed consent forms in compliance with the university's human subjects policy.

### **Setting**

Immediately prior to engaging in the EFE, the PTs took a 9-week secondary methods course. The instructor of the EFE and the methods course was the same professor of sport pedagogy and an experienced teacher educator and researcher. His overarching goal in both the methods course and EFE was to “break the cycle of non-teaching physical education teachers” (Curtner-Smith, 2009).

**The secondary methods course.** During the methods course, the first in a series of three that they took, the PTs were focused on three main pedagogical areas. These were effective teaching behaviors (Graham & Heimerer, 1981; Silverman, 1991), the spectrum of teaching styles (Mosston & Ashworth, 2008), and different physical education curricular models (Metzler, 2005). The two main curriculum models examined in the methods course were the MA model and SE. PTs were also introduced to the games for understanding (Bunker & Thorpe, 1982), health-related exercise (Penney & Waring, 2000), self-responsibility (Hellison, 1978), human movement studies (Lawson & Placek, 1981), and outdoor education models (Wurdinger & Steffen, 2003) so as to make it clear that teachers have a number of options for teaching secondary physical education and with the goal of preparing the PTs to study some these models in more depth in later coursework. Other practically focused content featured within the methods course was unit and lesson planning, management, and teacher-coach role strain. Additional

theoretical perspectives woven into the methods course included constructivism, value orientations (Jewett, 1994), ecology (Hastie & Siedentop, 1999), and knowledge types (Shulman, 1987).

**The EFE.** The EFE took place twice a week at a local middle school attended by Caucasian and African-American pupils from a mixture of low and middle income families and in the 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> grade. It was closely supervised by the sport pedagogy professor. PTs team/turn taught one 12-lesson mini-MA unit and one 12-lesson mini-SE season. The content for both units was soccer. During each session of the EFE, PTs taught one MA lesson and one SE lesson on the school playing field to small mixed-gender classes of between 8 and 13 pupils. Lesson length was 50 minutes. At least one ball was available for each pupil and other essential equipment, including cones to mark practice and playing areas for each class, was plentiful.

The MA unit was focused on teaching the skills and strategies of soccer through traditional practices, drills and small-sided and conditioned games. Specifically the PTs taught the techniques of juggling, dribbling, tackling, passing, shooting. Strategies taught during the MA unit were finding and denying space, marking, and defending with depth. The SE season was divided into three phases. Phase 1 consisted of five lessons and was devoted to skill and strategy acquisition learning roles, and team bonding. Phase 2 involved three lessons of pre-season competition, while during the four lessons of Phase 3, pupils participated in a five-game regular season, playoffs, and an awards ceremony. Skill drills, practices, small-sided games, and conditioned games used in the EFE were taken from the text *Progressive Soccer Coaching: From Novice to Expert* (Curtner-Smith, Johnson, & Vincent, 2003).

## **Data Collection**

Six qualitative techniques were employed to collect data which indicated how pupils attempted to negotiate with PTs; to what extent these negotiations took place; and how, if at all, these negotiations altered the PTs' pedagogies during the MA and SE units. *Non-participant observation* involved observing PTs' instruction and taking extensive field notes during all 12 EFE sessions. All 17 PTs were *formally interviewed* during the latter stages of the EFE. The three research questions served as the basis for these interviews with the semi-structured protocol (Patton, 1990) allowing for multiple follow-up prompts and questions. Formal interviews lasted approximately 30 minutes and were audio taped and transcribed verbatim. Whenever the opportunity presented itself, PTs were also *informally interviewed*. On these occasions, notes were made as soon after the interview as possible. Seven purposefully selected PTs who were engaged in more or less and specific types of negotiation with their pupils and were more or less influenced by these negotiations also completed a 50-minute *stimulated recall interview* towards the end of the EFE. This involved the researcher playing selected filmed extracts of the PTs' lessons during which their pupils were attempting to negotiate with them. PTs were then asked to comment on their pupils' negotiating tactics and strategies and to explain their own thinking and actions in response to these tactics and strategies. Stimulated recall interviews were audio taped and transcribed verbatim. PTs were also asked to submit two focused *critical incident reflections* (Flanagan, 1954) following each EFE session. One reflection was on the MA lesson and one on the SE lesson they taught in the session. Within each reflection, PTs responded in writing to the question: "How, if at all, did the pupils in your MA/SE lesson influence your teaching today?" Finally, *document analysis* was carried out on the PTs' lesson plans for both units which they were asked to supply at the conclusion of the EFE. The focus of this analysis was to search for text alluding to or directly describing PT-pupil negotiation.

## **Data Analysis**

Data were analyzed inductively by employing standard interpretive methods. Separate analyses were carried out on the data gathered during the MA and SE units. Within each analysis, initial data that indicated how pupils attempted to negotiate with PTs, the extent to which pupils attempted to negotiate with PTs, and how these negotiations altered the pedagogies of PTs were identified. Analytic induction and constant comparison (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984) were then employed to code these data into meaningful categories and themes. Data trustworthiness and credibility was established through a search for negative and discrepant cases (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984) and by triangulating findings from the six data sources.



## TYPES OF NEGOTIATIONS

**Pupil-initiated negotiations.** During the course of the study, two broad types of pupil-initiated negotiation were identified. Specifically, pupils negotiated for a change in instructional tasks and a reduction in the standards of performance by which they were judged.

*Negotiating for a change in instructional tasks.* In congruence with previous research (Ennis, 1995; Erickson & Shultz, 1992; Tousignant & Siedentop, 1983), pupils in the current study were observed negotiating with the PTs for a change in the tasks they were being asked to complete. The catalysts for this negotiation included concerns that tasks were too physically or mentally demanding, irrelevant, and, as one PT (Jim<sup>1</sup>) explained, “to make life easier for themselves.” The following data extracts illustrate these more negative forms of negotiation:

Gibson (scorekeeping pupil): Can you keep up with our points?

Chris (PT): No, you each will keep up with your own points.

Gibson (pupil): But I am no good at counting, and I will pass better if you do it for me.

Chris (PT): Fine, you will all just pass at the same time and I will keep track of the points for everyone. (Field notes, SE lesson 4)

Mainly, the girls would try to bargain. They would say, “We are not going to do this anymore we are tired.” They would stand there on one side and not do anything. I would just keep telling them to keep trying that they could do it. But they would just keep coming at me. They had all different ways to try to get out of doing the activity. They would tell me if they sat this one out, they would do the next activity. Most of the time those girls would participate but they always tried to get out of doing the work. (Michael, formal interview)

One girl, Anastasia, complained about doing the juggling activities. She asked if she could juggle for less time or do something different. She said things like, “This is stupid. We will never juggle when we play real soccer games.” (Elizabeth, critical incident reflection 7)

Again, in line with previous research, other pupil negotiations for a change in task were more positively motivated, their main goal being to make the task “harder:”

During warm-up, in which pupils are told to hold the soccer ball out in front of them and perform trunk rotations for 30 seconds, Timothy asks if he can “rotate at different levels.”

---

<sup>1</sup>The names of all participants in this paper are fictitious.

After a few seconds of thought, Jim [a PT] tells him to just work on it standing upright. Timothy then says, “Come on now, this too easy, can I do some upright, some bent over a little bit, then some bent over a lot?” Finally, Jim gives in and tells the whole group, “If you want to challenge yourself, try rotating at different levels, high and low.” (Field notes, MA lesson 9)

Jacob (pupil): Me and Jason finished the juggling drill, we both got five each. Can we practice our passing now?

David (PT): Not yet, I want you to be expert jugglers by the end of today.

Jacob (pupil): If we can both get five more [juggles] in a row, can we work on our passing?

David (PT): Yeah, just do it by those cones so you don't get in the way. (Field notes, MA lesson 8)

There was this boy Lorenzo who was probably my best athlete. There were a couple of times when I tried to teach him the Cruyff and the Scissor move but he was not getting it. Sometimes people would stick around to help us pick up all the soccer balls and cones. One day he asked if I could stay and watch him do it after class. I had to be inside and couldn't stay out, but he said he would help bring in the cones in the rest of the classes if I helped him. He eventually got the moves down after working hard at it for a while. (Austin, formal interview)

In line with the findings of Ennis (1995), some negotiations of this type were aimed at changing from one skill practice to another because “they liked another drill better;” from skill practice to game play because “they would get tired of the drills . . . they just wanted to play;” or changing the content being taught because “they enjoyed playing a different sport:”

David (PT): Now we are going to work on juggling some more.

Tyson (pupil): I hate juggling, we will just pass instead, OK?

David (PT): No, we just did that, work on juggling.

Tyson (pupil): No, we actually pass in the games! Why do we need to learn how to juggle?

David (PT): It's part of soccer and you can use it in the game. (Field notes, SE lesson 9)

Michael (PT): Today we are going to be working on passing with a partner, then juggling skills before we play some modified games.

Trisha (pupil): We don't need no practice. Let's just play. What about that?

Michael (PT): I know y'all want to play, and we will play just after we do these drills.

Trisha (pupil): Those drills are stupid, I don't like them. (Field notes, MA lesson 3)

Brook (pupil): I don't want to play no soccer, I want to play me some [American] football. When are we playing that?

Willard (PT): We are playing soccer, not football, it's fun!

Brook (pupil): What about next lesson if we are good? Can we play football then? (Field notes, SE lesson 2)

Finally, a last sub-type of pupil-initiated negotiation was aimed at changing tasks so as to enable pupils to socialize to an increased degree:

The student's goals? Just to do what they wanted to do. They wanted to have fun and talk to their friends even when they were participating. They wanted to do the drills when they could move, play, and also be talking. (Alex, formal interview)

On occasion during sport ed a student would ask, "If you let us referee together we will do a great job." Or, "If you let us play on the same team, we will try even harder next class during practice." Every once in a while when I separated them to different fields they would be like, "Can I go here, she's my best friend." You know, things like that. (Alex, formal interview)

*Negotiating for a reduction in standards of performance.* Pupils were also observed negotiating for a reduction in the standards of performance by which they were evaluated either formally or in terms of feedback provided by the PTs. This seemed more likely to occur when they were asked to perform tasks with which they were unfamiliar:

The team discusses who their statistician will be during the coming season. Nathan, the PT working with this group, has to intervene and, reluctantly, Tyrese agrees to take on the role. During his conversation with Nathan, Tyrese states, "I will do it but then once we get outside, I ain't running hard. Hope you know that." (Field notes, SE lesson 1)

A student influenced my lesson today by not wanting to dribble against a defender who started the drill too close to her. She kept insisting that she could not win, and asked if the defender could start further away. (Jason, critical incident reflection 3)

Amanda (pupil): Do the passes only count if they go through the cones and our partner traps it?

Austin (PT): Yes.

Amanda (pupil): Well, that is too hard. Can Danielle move in closer towards me? We will never get points if it stays like this.

Austin (PT): Try five more passes at this length. If you are still struggling, you can move the cones in closer. (Field notes, MA lesson 7)

*Pupils' negotiation tactics and strategies.* The tactics and strategies used by pupils during negotiations in the current study were also similar to those noted in past research

(Burbules, 1986). As illustrated in the preceding section, pupils' main method of negotiating was verbal. More specifically, they bargained for a change in task or a reduction in the standards for performing tasks by claiming they were "tired" or "sick," offering to "behave" at some point in the future if they got what they wanted in the present, asking politely, arguing, pleading, and promising to complete the next task well if they got a change in the current task or the accountability for performing it was reduced:

If we play Bulldog instead of work on defense we will be good the rest of the class.  
(Emily, formal interview, paraphrasing one of her pupils)

Can we do this drill instead? We like it better. (Alex, formal interview, paraphrasing one of his pupils)

I just want you to know I am getting a cold, and I am not doing anything else today.  
(Field notes while observing Jim, MA lesson 8)

Come on now. If all of us do this next activity hard for 30 more seconds can we take a break? (Field notes while observing Lee, MA lesson 2)

Please don't make us do this passing drill no more. If you switch it up, we'll all be good. I promise. (Field notes while observing Brian, MA lesson 6)

In addition, there were incidents where pupils opened negotiations by verbally abusing the PTs, refusing to participate in the tasks which they did not like, and threatening to disrupt lessons if their demands were not met:

Everything was going well until that new girl Kendall came into my group. I told her that when we warmed up, she had to start dribbling. She came right up to me and told me that she wasn't going to do anything today and that I didn't have a choice. She said that if I kept bothering her she would tell other students not to listen to me either. (Jim, informal interview following SE lesson 2)

When asked by Emily to juggle, Lisa responds by shouting "Never!" and laughing. . . . When reminded, again, that she needs to perform four more juggling attempts before she can rest, Lisa states, "I think I am done juggling for the day." (Field notes, MA lesson 8)

Elizabeth (PT): Bob, are you going to start the drill?

Tyreke (pupil): Nope. Wasn't planning on it.

Elizabeth (PT): You can do it, why don't you give a try?

Tyreke (pupil): You think I am going to listen to you? I don't think so. I am done.

(Field notes, MA lesson 4)

More subtle non-verbal tactics employed by pupils during negotiations involved giving little effort, modifying tasks without asking, or not engaging in tasks when they were asked to:

Michael instructs, “Now, still passing, I want you to move around the cones while keeping your head up. Try and pass to your partner while you’re both on the move.” Only one group follows these directions, while the others remain static but keep passing. (Field notes, SE Lesson 4)

Sometimes when you gave the students instructions about a task you wanted them to perform they would just sit there and look at you. Other times after you gave them instructions they would nod but the minute you walked away they wouldn’t do whatever it was you wanted them to do. (Emily, formal interview)

From time to time we would tell students to practice rollbacks with a partner or dribble as fast as they could between the cones. Some students listened to you but they rarely went full speed. They would do the task partially, but never exactly how you wanted it. They acted like they couldn’t hear us but they obviously did. (Brett, formal interview)

There were also occasions when whole classes or small groups of pupils negotiated with a PT (as opposed to a single pupil) using one or a combination of the tactics and strategies described in the preceding paragraphs:

Greg (pupil): I have a bad back, I can’t do this [a tackling practice that begins in the push-up position].

Jason (PT): You will be fine, just try it a few times. Lie down, come on.

Greg (pupil): I ain't getting on the ground its wet. No way.

Greg (pupil): That way is much easier [demonstrates starting the practice standing]. If you make us lie down, we ain't doing this.

Other pupils in chorus: Yeah!

Jason (PT): You all want to do it this way?

Entire group in chorus: Yeah!

Jason (PT): OK, you all can start like that as well. (Field notes, MA lesson 6)

***Differential engagement in negotiation.*** Not all pupils engaged in negotiation to the same extent and different groups of pupils were motivated to do so for different reasons. Specifically, high-skilled and aggressive boys were more likely to negotiate than other pupils and focused primarily on increasing the amount of game play within lessons. Low-skilled boys and

girls were more likely to negotiate for a reduction in task accountability or to change tasks so that they could socialize. High-skilled girls were less inclined to negotiate at all.

**PT-initiated negotiations.** Three broad types of PT-initiated negotiations were identified during the course of the study. These were negative negotiations, consequence-oriented negotiations, and positive negotiations. Again, these types of negotiation were similar to those described in previous research (Mosston & Ashworth, 2008; Tsangaridou & O’Sullivan, 2003).

*Negative negotiations.* Negative negotiations were largely fear-driven, reflected the PTs’ concern for survival, and were initiated from a position of relative weakness. This type of negotiation often diminished the chances of learning occurring as instructional rigor was sacrificed to preserve managerial order. One form of this type of negotiation involved PTs bargaining for pupils’ compliance with instructional tasks; in terms of participating, staying on task, and giving more effort; by offering changes in those instructional tasks, shortening their duration, or reducing accountability for performing them. Offers made in this type of negotiation included an expedited move through skill practices and toward “playing the game:”

The pupils do not appear interested in . . . juggling. Lloyd states, “Come on, give it a try.” After only a few of the group make a half-hearted attempt to juggle with limited success, Lloyd continues, “If you try this and we all can get two more [juggles] each we’ll move on to something else.” (Field notes, MA Lesson 4)

I wanted them [i.e., the pupils] to do air squats with the soccer ball in their hands. After a little while they were having a hard time with it. So I told them that if they went all out for the next twenty seconds then they could have a longer break. . . . They were originally supposed to do it for a minute but they really weren’t doing it. I figured it’s better to have them doing it right shorter, than not right longer. (Emily, stimulated recall interview)

The first day we did a drill which was a one-on-one tackling drill where they were supposed to pretend to tackle their partner and win the ball. The defender was supposed to try and get in front of the player with the ball but couldn’t steal it. . . . The kids wanted to steal it anyway, but we didn’t let them. The next drill was the same except they could actually steal it. It was a slight variation. Once I realized that they didn’t like the first drill I took it away for the next class because I knew they wouldn’t participate correctly. That

next class period I told the kids what I had done, and told them that in return they had to . . . perform the drill like it was supposed to go. (Austin, formal interview)

Drew (pupil): This drill stinks, when are we playing against that team?

Michael (PT): We can play them after this drill if you're all good.

Drew (pupil): That's in so long, let's play them now.

Michael (PT): It's not that long, keep up the good work and we will play them in five minutes.

Drew (pupil): OK, we can do that. (Field notes, MA lesson 10)

A second type of negative negotiation involved PTs offering the same changes in instructional tasks and reductions in accountability for performing them or changes to managerial tasks in exchange for compliance with their managerial systems:

If you stop talking I will make this very fast and then I will let you go inside. (Field notes, comments made by Matt during MA, lesson 8)

If you stop being disruptive I can let you do a different drill. (Field notes, comments made by Chris during SE Lesson 3)

Brett is talking to his pupils. "Make sure that before the class starts you go look at the class schedule to see who you are playing," he says. The schedules are posted next to the team posters on the wall. "Make sure to do this every day. If you do this, we will be able to get to the games quicker." (Field notes, SE Lesson 6)

I think it was during the third lesson, we weren't supposed to have a 3 v 3 game at the end of class. But I told them in the beginning, if . . . you all act right, then we will play a game. . . . They cooperated and behaved and we eventually played a small-sided game. (Jason, formal interview)

*Consequence-oriented negotiations.* Consequence-oriented negotiations were used by PTs in an attempt to keep pupils engaged with instructional tasks or in compliance with their managerial systems. Unlike negative negotiations, however, they were opened from a position of relative strength. Rather than offering changes in instructional tasks or reduced standards for performing them, the negative consequences for not complying were made clear to pupils. Frequently, these included not being able to participate in game play or informing their regular teacher of any poor behavior:

Talking to Brook and Kim, who are supposed to be learning how to officiate but are not paying attention, Willard states, “You stand over here and you over there. Pay attention! If you don’t listen and know how to ref these games then you can’t play.” (Field notes, SE Lesson 5)

If a student said, “I ain’t doing anything today,” I would be like, “OK fine, when we start the season you just aren’t going to play.” Well, telling them that made them want to participate. After that, every Tuesday and Thursday when they would get to the field they wanted to learn. That’s what I would tell them to keep them motivated and participating. (David, formal interview)

Brett instructs his pupils to “walk those balls to the side of the field.” Brad and Todd ignore him and punt their balls across the field into the bleachers. Brett tells the boys to fetch their balls and to do as he asked. When they refuse, he says, “If you don’t get those balls back here in thirty seconds, I am going to get Mrs. Black and she will have to call your parents.” The boys reluctantly comply. (Field notes, MA lesson 7)

*Positive negotiations.* Positive negotiations were also initiated by PTs from a position of strength and were aimed at improving the effectiveness of instruction. They were employed as an instructional tool and occurred when PTs employed more indirect teaching styles and tried to coax pupils into making decisions about their learning:

Michael (PT): Alright, now what do you want to do next? Since you did those skills so well, I will let you choose the next drill.

Cedric (pupil): Can we practice all the moves at once?

Michael (PT): How about you have the choice of doing any of the skill moves we just went over, but work on it with a partner defending you?

Cedric (pupil): OK, cool! (Field notes, SE lesson 8)

During one of the first pre-season games, I reminded my team coach, Eric, about the fair play points before the game by asking him what the team needed to do at the end of each game. He responded by saying, “Shake hands with the other team, tell them they did a good job. Also tell the officials they made good calls.” At halftime, he brought the whole team together and said, “Guys, don’t forget. Shake the other team’s hands if we want to get those fair play points.” (Brian, formal interview)



## EXTENT OF NEGOTIATIONS AND THEIR IMPACT ON PTS PEDAGOGIES

**MA unit.** From the outset, there was a good deal of negotiation initiated by both pupils and PTs during the MA unit. Although there were numerous examples of pupils negotiating for a reduction in the standards required for performing tasks, as observed by many of the PTs, most prevalent were pupils' negotiations for changes in task, particularly "trying to get out of doing almost all of the drills," so they could engage in more game play:

[The pupils negotiated] all the time during multi-activity, from the first to the last lesson. They would say, "Hey, we already know how to do this. Let's just move on. Or, "We have already done this before, this is so boring. I don't like this. I am never going to use this." It was all the time during multi-activity. . . . The students tried to change everything so they could get done with it quicker so that they could play in the games. (Chris, formal interview)

The kids would complain about having already done these drills so I had to teach differently and switch things up regularly so they wouldn't get bored. (David, stimulated recall interview)

We had a new boy this week who just would not listen to anything we said. He told us he would disrupt the lesson if we didn't start playing games. We had to switch some of the drills around because he wouldn't participate in them at all. (Jason, informal interview following SE lesson 5)

In congruence with past research (Supaporn et al., 2003), those PTs who were less clear in their instructions and directions for carrying out tasks invited and received more pupil-initiated negotiation than their peers:

Most of the time there were two or three students who would always do what I asked but one day I don't remember what we were doing but they just stood there and said they weren't moving anymore. I think it was my fault because I couldn't get the lesson across. I think the students were confused, they didn't know what to do so they just shut down. (Chris, formal interview)

At this point, Julio, who always gave me problems, just stopped participating. He did not seem to have a clue what he was supposed to be doing. I think he was just confused and gave up. I think it might have taken me a long time to give them the directions, but I am not sure. (Lloyd, stimulated recall interview)

Further, the fact that the pupils' regular physical education program was generally the kind of non-instructional, game-focused affair described by Ennis (1999) meant that pupils were used to socializing during lessons and so there was a considerable amount of negotiating in the MA unit aimed at altering tasks to allow more of this kind of interaction. The difference between the kind of MA unit the PTs were trying to deliver and the instruction to which the pupils were used also meant that any form accountability for performance employed by the PTs, including the provision of positively given performance feedback, was met with surprise, distrust, and even anger:

It was very difficult to provide feedback to students today. They seemed to think that I was just being mean. I was only trying to correct them, but the students took it very personal [*sic*]. (Lee, critical incident reflection 2)

Matt (PT): Make sure that you are using the inside of your foot when you make your passes, not your toe.

Matt (PT): Trisha, that was your toe, try using the inside of your foot next time.

Trisha (pupil): Huh? I know how to play soccer. I have done it before.

Matt (PT): I know. It just works better this way.

Trisha (pupil): [*sarcastically*] I am sure it does. (Field notes, MA lesson 2)

This situation ensured that, for many pupils, participating in the unit involved high risk and so encouraged them to engage in negotiation.

Strategies and tactics most commonly used by pupils when negotiating during the MA unit were asking, arguing, promises of improved behavior, and refusal to participate if changes to tasks or reductions in accountability were not made. Group negotiations were comparatively rare, much more powerful than negotiations by individual pupils, and almost always successful:

Toward the end they got to where they wanted to just play a game. So as a group they would ask me, "Hey can we just skip right to the game now." That was harder than when one person asks because now you have to persuade all of them to do what you wanted them to. (Alex, formal interview)

I think it is easier to resist when only one person comes to you. When it's one person you can either ignore them or tell them to keep going. When it's the whole group coming at

you there is a lot of pressure and you feel like you must be doing something wrong. (Jason, stimulated recall interview)

When the whole group tried to bargain with you, it would be more persuasive. . . . If it was only an individual and the other kids were getting something out of a drill, I would mostly say the drill was good and would keep it going. When it was the whole group there would be certain kids who you didn't expect to say something to you about it, and then you thought to yourself, "OK, well I guess I need to change it." Well you don't have to change it, but you feel like you need to. The whole group is stronger. (David, formal interview)

PTs' reactions to the amount and degree of pupil-initiated negotiation were generally to initiate negotiations themselves. This was more likely to occur when faced with particularly hostile reactions to their instruction by more aggressive boys. Again, as recognized by the PTs at the end of the unit, their most prevalent mode of negotiation was negative:

I think I negotiated with the students during the MA lessons. There were many times when some of the boys would get on my case about things they didn't like. They wanted to either skip drills or play games right away. This made me question my lesson and that's when I would bend. (Ricky, formal interview)

That boy right there, Martin, was always yelling and talking back to me. The majority of the group would follow his lead. If he didn't want to participate, then the rest of the group was likely to stop. Sometimes, before I taught, I knew there would be parts of the lesson he wouldn't want to do, and I would just leave them out. (Willard, stimulated recall interview)

Given their pupils' foci, not surprisingly the PTs' most common strategy was to offer a reduced amount of time in skill practice and drills and a move to game play. Less often used were consequence-oriented negotiations, while positive negotiations were relatively rare.

PT-initiated negotiations also had the unintended effect of encouraging their pupils to engage in even more negotiating themselves. This vicious cycle of ever increasing negotiation meant that by the end of the unit many of the PTs were worn down by the constant pressure. Consequently, and despite the fact that most of them had begun the unit as relatively tough negotiators, 11 of them capitulated to their pupils' demands and their later lessons included less

skill practice, more game play, less conditioned game play, more full game play and less

feedback regardless of whether the progress of the students warranted these types of shift or not:

The students would get tired of drills and they would talk me out of doing them. They wanted to skip to the games. Sometimes I would just let them. (Lloyd, formal interview)

They were all telling me that they were not going to do this drill. They were all angry and didn't seem like they would participate so I told them I would skip it. . . . I didn't want to tell them to do something and have no one listen to me at all. I thought maybe if I was lenient here, they would try harder the rest of the class. (Jim, stimulated recall interview)

Six of the stronger PTs, however, were exceptions to this pattern of collapse. Encouraged

by their PETE professor, these PTs were generally inclined to engage less with pupils who tried

to initiate negotiations with them or to open negotiations themselves. Moreover, when they did

get involved in this type of interaction, they were more likely to engage in consequence-oriented

or positive negotiations:

I always stuck to my lesson plan the best that I could. Obviously drills wouldn't always go as expected, but I wouldn't let students pressure me into changing things or skipping things they didn't like. They would ask me all the time if we could just play games.

When they would ask I tried to repeat how important learning the skills were and asked what they thought they needed to improve on. (Nathan, formal interview)

For these reasons, the lessons of these PTs were largely unaffected by negotiation and were

comparatively sound from a pedagogical perspective.

**SE unit.** As confirmed by the PTs, there was generally less negotiating initiated by both pupils and PTs during the SE season than there was in the MA unit:

In multi-activity it [i.e., negotiating] was all the time. In sport ed they knew what was at stake [i.e., competition] and they knew what they had to do to get there. During sport ed I never had a problem with students [negotiating to] not do the drills. (Chris, formal interview)

Further, and in direct contrast to the pattern of negotiation observed in the MA unit, the amount and degree of negotiation steadily declined during the course of the SE season.

Within the initial lessons of the SE season, there were more attempts by pupils to change tasks and reduce accountability due to the absence of game play; the focus on learning roles other than player, basic skills and tactics, and rules which they were not used to; and the relative lack of opportunity to socialize. By the end of the season, however, such attempts were virtually non-existent:

[The pupils] did not respond well with having to pick out their own responsibilities [at the beginning of the season]. However, by the end of the season the kids really turned around. Once they realized why they had responsibilities and goals they were excited about wanting to do them and actually participating. (David, formal interview)

This meant that at the beginning of the season there were also more negative PT-initiated negotiations offering pupils what they wanted in exchange for some semblance of compliance and more consequence-oriented negotiations aimed at securing control:

Chris gathers a team up on the bleachers. He is trying to sort out their team name and color. . . . “We need to figure out a team color and name,” he says. “Once we do that, we can go out and have some fun.” (Field notes, SE lesson 1)

Over the next two weeks you are going to start playing competitive games. As a team you need to learn the skills and rules in order to win. If you don't work as a team, you don't win. Everyone needs to perform all their roles for this to run smoothly. If someone doesn't perform their roles they let the whole team down. (Field notes while observing Brian, SE lesson 1)

Once the season progressed to the game-playing phases, however, the pupils “got into SE” and “were excited about playing.” They also understood that practicing skills, warming-up, and generally learning more about soccer were beneficial in terms of their teams being competitive. This enjoyment and realization meant that the amount of negotiation, aimed at modifying tasks to make them easier and shorter, decreased dramatically. This decrease was also aided by the fact that PTs engaged in more positive negotiation permitting pupils to choose and design their own practices, drills, and small-sided games:

I remember one time during sport ed, I think it was right before we started the playoffs, I asked my team coach what he thought our team's weakness was and what we should work on in practice. He went to the team, they voted, and decided that they wanted to improve their team defense, so that's what our team worked on. (Nathan, formal interview)

PTs also noted that once they moved deeper into the SE season, they were more confident in rebuffing those few attempts by pupils to negotiate unhelpful modifications to tasks:

During the sport ed season it was a whole lot easier to keep students motivated to perform the drills. If they complained and didn't want to do one, you could easily tell them why each drill is important and how practicing could help them reach their goal [i.e., winning the competition]. Telling them they could have scored a goal if they worked harder on the zigzag drill. The students really responded when you commented on their performance within the games. (Jim, formal interview)

Moreover, once pupils in leadership roles (i.e., captain and coach) had designed their own tasks, it was they, rather than the PTs, who opened negotiations with their peers with the goal of getting them to participate. Again, these pupil-pupil negotiations were mostly successful due to the motivation to compete:

Before class starts a warm-up leader asks, "Can I try my own warm up today?" After being denied the chance by Brian, the PT, she says, "I promise I will get the whole team to do them. If you let me choose my own they will all behave." Brian allows the warm-up leader to modify the warm-up and all goes well. As promised, she makes sure that each pupil participates fully and enthusiastically. (Field notes, SE lesson 9)

The warm-up leader negotiated with his teammates all the time. If students weren't participating in the drill he would get on to them, tell them they needed to step up. (Matt, formal interview)

We had some students who would try to bargain with others to get them to participate. If we had a student who came in and didn't want to do this or that, the student would try to pick them up and say, "Come on, let's work harder. If you do all these drills we will all get better." Stuff like that. (Alex, formal interview)

I had one boy who told his friend, who wasn't trying during a play-off game, that he would buy him lunch if he tried harder and scored a goal." (Michael, formal interview)

Furthermore, the drive to be competitive also meant that the amount of pupil-initiated negotiation aimed at making tasks more difficult actually increased:

Whenever we learned the skill moves, students asked if instead of doing just the moves, they could do them fast or with a defender to make it harder. (Emily, formal interview)

After some students mastered the passing, they came up and wanted to see if they could pass as they jogged. I didn't want them to skip ahead so I told them not to. They kept asking and said they would behave, and when the rest of the class was practicing the moving passes, they would sprint and practice that way. (Lloyd, formal interview)

One team lost its poster whenever the gym teachers took them off the wall. . . . About two weeks before the last day, the statistician asked us what she needed to do with the stats since she could no longer put them on the poster. I told her to hang on to them. She asked if she could put them on a board herself. I told her not to worry about it and that as long as she had them on a sheet of paper that was good enough. She told me she wanted her team to have a nice poster like the other teams, and that next class period, she brought in a poster with the stats already posted. (Willard, formal interview)

Finally, pupil negotiation aimed at securing more time to socialize also virtually disappeared as they realized that there was plenty of opportunity to engage in this kind of behavior within the tasks:

The students influenced my teaching during the sport education lesson by not asking me if they could work with a specific partner. This was the first lesson that this happened. Usually I have to get on them to stop talking and participate or they all ask me again and again to work with someone. This did not happen today and I got through my whole lesson. (Ricky, critical incident reflection 6)

For these reasons, having held their nerve during a difficult first few lessons due to the constant encouragement from their course instructor, all of PTs were able to go on to deliver a SE unit much as initially intended.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of the study described in this paper was to examine the influence of negotiations between pupils and PTs on PTs' instruction within an MA unit and an SE season taught during an EFE. Findings indicated that pupils initiated negotiations aimed at securing changes in instructional tasks and a reduction in standards of performance for those tasks. Overt tactics employed by pupils during these negotiations included various forms of verbal bargaining, abusing PTs, refusing to participate, and threats to disrupt lessons. More subtle tactics included giving little effort, modifying tasks, and not engaging in tasks. Group negotiations were more powerful than single-pupil negotiations. The degree to which pupils engaged in negotiations and the type of negotiations in which they were involved were influenced by gender, skill level, and physical size.

PTs initiated negotiations aimed at securing compliance with instructional and managerial tasks. Negative negotiations often led to instructional rigor being sacrificed. Consequence-oriented negotiations were intended to preserve instructional tasks and positive negotiations often enhanced instruction.

During the MA unit, both pupil-initiated and PT-initiated negotiations were common, the most prevalent being pupil-initiated negotiations aimed at securing changes in instructional tasks and PT-initiated negotiations classed as negative. Moreover, the degree to which negotiation occurred increased during the course of the MA unit with the effect of severely curtailing the effectiveness of much of the teaching. A few relatively strong PTs, however, resisted attempts by their pupils to initiate negotiations and infrequently initiated negative negotiations themselves. The units delivered by these PTs appeared to be relatively successful.



Conversely, both pupil- and PT-initiated negotiation was less frequent during the SE season. Moreover, during the course of the season, the degree to which pupils negotiated and PTs negotiated negatively and by referring to consequences for non-compliance declined sharply. In addition, the amount of positive negotiating by PTs increased as the SE season progressed and instructional quality was also aided by more positive forms of pupil-initiated negotiations with PTs as well as pupil-pupil negotiations initiated by those in leadership roles. Consequently, most PTs were able to deliver effective SE seasons.

The results of the study, then, provide further evidence of the structural advantages SE has over MA teaching. They also suggest that PETE faculty would do well to feature SE more prominently than MA instruction in their programs, particularly when they are aware that PTs are likely to both train and take positions in schools with relatively poor standards of and little support for physical education. In addition, the results of the study provide another perspective from which PETE faculty can explain the advantages of SE over MA instruction to PTs and construct a persuasive argument by which they might sell the model (Curtner-Smith, 2012) to their charges.

The study also provides further indication that requiring PTs to teach parallel MA and SE units is a good strategy for PETE faculty to employ (see also Curtner-Smith, 2012; Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004). Moreover, it indicates that requiring PTs to teach the “full version” of the SE model rather than a “watered down” version or taking a “cafeteria approach” (i.e., using components of the model within what is essentially MA instruction) (Curtner-Smith, Hastie, & Kinchin, 2008) is the best way to teach it. Finally, the study indicates the importance of PETE faculty providing a good level of support for PTs when they teach the model for the first time, particularly in the early lessons when the level of negotiation will be at its peak.

The PTs investigated in this study were very inexperienced, in the first semester of their PETE program and, as alluded to in the results section, were working with pupils used to low quality physical education. Further, they were provided with a high level of support from a PETE faculty member who was an expert in the SE model. The conclusions in the preceding paragraphs might be strengthened or modified by studies of more experienced PTs, teaching MA units and SE seasons to pupils used to relatively high quality physical education, and with differing levels of supervision. Finally, research of a similar nature examining the type and level of negotiations that occur when more experienced and expert teachers employ both the MA and SE models would be enlightening and of use.

## REFERENCES

- Alexander, K., & Luckman, J. (2001). Australian teachers' perceptions and uses of the sport education curriculum model. *European Physical Education Review*, 7(3), 243-267.
- Alexander, K., Taggart, A., & Thorpe, S. (1996). A spring in their steps? Possibilities for professional renewal through sport education in Australian schools. . *Sport, Education and Society*, 1(1), 23-46.
- Brown, T.B.J., Carlson, T.B., & Hastie, P.A. (2004). A comparison of rugby seasons presented in traditional and sport education formats. *European Physical Education Review*, 10(2), 199-214.
- Bunker, D., & Thorpe, R. (1982). A model for the teaching of games in secondary schools. *Bulletin of Physical Education*, 18(1), 5-8.
- Burbules, N.C. (1986). A theory of power in education. *Educational Theory*, 36(2), 95-114.
- Curtner-Smith, M.D. (2001). The occupational socialization of a first-year physical education teacher with a teaching orientation. *Sport, Education and Society*, 6(1), 81-105.
- Curtner-Smith, M.D. (2009). Breaking the cycle of non-teaching physical education teachers: Lessons to be learned from the occupational socialization literature. In D.L. Housner, M.W. Metzler, P.G. Schempp, & T.J. Templin (Eds.). *Historic traditions and future directions of research on teaching and teacher education in physical education*, (pp. 221-226). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- Curtner-Smith, M.D. (2012). Preparing physical education teachers to teach sport education. In P.A. Hastie (Ed.). *Sport education: International perspectives*, (pp. 151-165). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Curtner-Smith, M.D., Hastie, P.A., & Kinchin, G.D. (2008). Influence of occupational socialization on beginner teachers' interpretation and delivery of sport education. *Sport, Education and Society*, 13(1), 97-117.
- Curtner-Smith, M.D., Johnson, M.L., & Vincent, J. (2003). *Progressive soccer coaching: From novice to expert* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). Boston, MA: American Press.
- Curtner-Smith, M.D., & Sofo, S. (2004). Preservice teachers' conceptions of teaching within sport education and multi-activity units. *Sport, Education and Society*, 9(3), 347-377.
- 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., & Carter, K. (1984). Academic tasks in classrooms. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 14(2), 129-149.

- Doyle, W. (1992). Curriculum and pedagogy. In P.W. Philips (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 486-516). New York: Macmillan.
- 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.
- Ennis, C.D. (1999). Creating a culturally relevant curriculum for disengaged girls. *Sport, Education and Society, 4*(1), 31-49.
- 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.
- Flanagan, J.C. (1954). The critical incident technique. *Psychological Bulletin, 51*(4), 327-358.
- Goetz, J.P., & LeCompte, M.D. (1984). *Ethnography and qualitative design in education research*. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Graham, G., & Heimerer, E. (1981). Research on teacher effectiveness: A summary with implications for teaching. *Quest, 33*(1), 14-25.
- Hastie, P.A. (2003). Teaching sport within physical education. In S. Silverman & C. Ennis (Eds.), *Student learning in physical education: Applying research to enhance instruction* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (pp. 227-240). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hastie, P.A., & Siedentop, D. (1999). An ecological perspective on physical education. *European Physical Education Review, 5*(1), 9-29.
- 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.
- Hellison, D. (1978). *Beyond balls and bats*. Washington, DC: American Alliance for Health, Physical Education and Recreation.
- Jewett, A.E. (1994). Curriculum theory and research in sport pedagogy. *Sport Science Review, 3*(1), 56-72.
- Jones, D.L. (1992). Analysis of task systems in elementary physical education classes. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 11*, 411-425.
- Lawson, H.A., & Placek, J.H. (1981). *Physical education in the secondary schools: Curricular alternatives*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.
- Macdonald, D. (1999). The professional work of experienced physical education teachers. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 70*(1), 41-55.

- Metzler, M.W. (2005). *Instructional models for physical education* (2nd ed.). Scottsdale, AZ: Holcomb Hathaway Pubs.
- Mosston, M., & Ashworth, S. (2008). *Teaching physical education*. (1<sup>st</sup> 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.
- Parker, M., & Curtner-Smith, M.D. (2012). Preservice teachers' use of productive and reproductive teaching styles within multi-activity and sport education units. *European Physical Education Review*, 18(1), 127-143.
- Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Penney, D., & Waring, M. (2000). The absent agenda: Pedagogy and physical education. *Journal of Sport Pedagogy*, 6(1), 4-37.
- Seashore-Louis, K., & Smith, B. (1990). Teacher working conditions. In P. Reyes (Ed.), *Teachers and their workplace: Commitment, performance and productivity* (pp. 23-47). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Shulman, L.S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-22.
- Siedentop, D. (1968). *A curriculum theory for physical education in schools*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington).
- Siedentop, D. (1988). An ecological model for understanding teaching/learning in physical education. *New horizons of human movements: Proceedings of the 1988 Seoul Olympic Scientific Congress*. Seoul: SOSCO.
- Siedentop, D. (2002). Sport education: A retrospective. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 21, 409-418.
- Siedentop, D., Hastie, P.A., & Van Der Mars, H. (2011). *Complete guide to sport education*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Siedentop, D., Mand, C.L., & Taggart, A. (1986). *Physical education: Teaching and curriculum strategies for grades 5-12*. Palo Alto, CA: McGraw-Hill Humanities/Social Sciences/Languages.
- Siedentop, D., & Tannehill, D. (2000). *Developing teaching skills in physical education* (4 ed.). Palo Alto, CA: McGraw-Hill Humanities/Social Sciences/Languages.

- Silverman, S. (1991). Research on teaching in physical education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 62(1), 352-365.
- 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.
- Woods, P. (1978). Negotiating the demands of school work. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 10(4), 309-327.
- Wurdinger, S., & Steffen, J. (2003). *Developing challenge course programs for schools*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.