

Running head: PEDAGOGIES OF MEANINGFUL PE

Title: Teacher Educators' Enactment of Pedagogies that Prioritise Learning About Meaningful Physical Education

Words: 6839 (Plus abstract)

Authors: Tim Fletcher, Déirdre Ní Chróinín, Caitlin Price, Nancy Francis

*Tim Fletcher, Department of Kinesiology, Brock University, 1812 Sir Isaac Brock Way, St Catharines, ON, Canada L2S3A1. <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7352-4775>

Déirdre Ní Chróinín, Department of Arts Education and Physical Education, Mary Immaculate College, South Circular Road, Limerick, Ireland.

Caitlin Price, Faculty of Applied Health Science, Brock University, 1812 Sir Isaac Brock Way, St Catharines, ON, Canada L2S3A1.

Nancy Francis, Department of Kinesiology, Brock University, 1812 Sir Isaac Brock Way, St Catharines, ON, Canada L2S3A1.

*Corresponding Author:

Tim Fletcher

tfletcher@brocku.ca

Teacher Educators' Enactment of Pedagogies that Prioritise Learning About Meaningful
Physical Education

Tim Fletcher, Déirdre Ní Chróinín, Caitlin Price, Nancy Francis

Abstract

This research focused on supporting pre-service teachers' (PSTs') learning through the development of pedagogical principles of learning about meaningful physical education (LAMPE) in two physical education teacher education (PETE) programs. In this paper, we share four in-depth examples of the enactment of the pedagogical principles of LAMPE by physical education teacher educators. Data sources included teacher educator weekly reflections, critical friend responses and conversations, non-participant observations, and PST work samples developed in lessons. The four examples highlight decision-making moments and provide further direction on how the pedagogical principles of LAMPE support PST learning about meaningful physical education and illustrate the value of a coherent set of pedagogical principles, such as those offered by LAMPE, in guiding teacher educators' decision-making.

Keywords: self-study; teacher education; pedagogy; meaning; decision-making

Researching Physical Education Teacher Education pedagogies

As a result of the current realities of multiple educational imperatives in schools, there is ambiguity in current forms of physical education. This creates a conundrum for teacher educators in making decisions about the preparation of physical education teachers for the challenges of contemporary schools. A need has been recently identified for more physical education teacher education (PETE) research at the programmatic level to help teacher educators make decisions about how best to support future teachers' learning about physical education (O'Sullivan, 2014). Such research would provide much needed direction on both the emphasis and priorities in PETE as well as identify complimentary pedagogical strategies and approaches that support pre-service teachers (PSTs) in achieving important outcomes in their programmes and beyond. While acknowledging that there is no one superior version of PETE (and resultant physical education) across contexts, we suggest there is great value in sharing of context- and orientation-specific PETE practices (for example, see Oliver and Oesterreich (2013) and Oliver, et al. (2015) related to inquiry- and activist-oriented approaches). To that end, we share this inquiry into our practice with the expectation that aspects will resonate with and be found useful to many teacher educators globally.

The purpose of this paper is to share examples of our approach in PETE, and by doing so illustrate how our prioritisation of PSTs learning about meaningful physical education was enacted in our moment-to-moment and day-to-day decision-making. These examples are valuable in revealing the decision-making processes of teacher educators and illuminating the interplay between our enactment of pedagogical principles and PST learning in individual contexts. Moreover, the sharing of examples of our decision-making serves to extend understandings of the professional knowledge that teacher educators draw from, and generate discussion and debate in the PETE community.

Teacher decision-making is influenced by resources (including knowledge), goals and orientations (values and beliefs influenced by previous experiences) (Schoenfeld, 2010) as well as context. In this research, all teacher educators shared a common goal: the prioritisation of PST learning about meaningful physical education (LAMPE). While resources and orientations varied, the pedagogical principles of LAMPE (that we describe below) provided a shared understanding that framed our overall pedagogical approach. The decision-making moments we focused on were those context-specific factors that required a teacher educator to respond to PST experiences of and engagement with our individual pedagogies as interpreted from what we heard PSTs say, how they engaged with learning tasks, and how they wrote about their experiences. We prioritised PST perspectives and their influence on our decision-making because responsiveness to PSTs' experiences of PETE pedagogies has been demonstrated to enhance their learning (Enright, Coll, Ní Chróinín, & Fitzpatrick, 2017; Oliver & Oesterreich, 2013).

Our understanding of meaningful experiences has been guided by the writing of Scott Kretchmar (2000; 2006; 2008) who identified features of physical education that promoted meaningful experiences for participants. These include: increased social interaction, learning tasks with a 'just right' level of challenge, opportunities for motor skill learning, experiences that were fun in the moment as well as extended experiences in physical activity that were delightful. In addition to the role of personally relevant learning, these features have been supported through a recent review of the literature (Beni, Fletcher, & Ní Chróinín, 2017). While there is substantial support for the value of promoting meaningful experiences, Kretchmar (2000) outlined that there is a lack of understanding of *how* to promote meaningful experiences in physical education for children, noting that 'almost nobody in professional preparation programs is being trained to do it well' (p. 19). To address this gap, we have developed and implemented an approach to PETE that prioritises PSTs' learning

about meaningful physical education (LAMPE) (Fletcher, Ní Chróinín, & O’Sullivan, 2016; Ní Chróinín, Fletcher, & O’Sullivan, 2015).

Following two years of implementing pedagogies to support PSTs learning how to promote meaningful school-based physical education, we identified five pedagogical principles of LAMPE that represent our approach (Ní Chróinín, Fletcher, & O’Sullivan, 2017):

1. Meaningful participation should be explicitly prioritised in planning, teaching and assessing PETE experiences. The potential of particular experiences to foster meaningfulness informed content selection, the design of learning experiences and the articulation of learning outcomes.
2. Pedagogies that support meaningful participation should be modelled by teacher educators and made a source of inquiry for PSTs. We modelled both teacher qualities and actions, such as relational time, that would promote meaningful experiences. Examining and articulating the decisions of teaching can help PSTs learn about the reasons underpinning particular pedagogical selections (Loughran, 2013).
3. PSTs should be supported to engage with meaningful participation as a learner and physical activity participant *and* as a teacher of peers and children.
4. Learning activities should be framed using Beni, et al’s (2017) and Kretchmar’s (2006) and features of meaningful school-based physical education: social interaction, ‘just right’ challenge, motor learning, fun, personally relevant learning, and delight.
5. PSTs should be supported to reflect on the meaningfulness of physical education experiences.

As a result of implementing pedagogies reflected in the five pedagogical principles of LAMPE, PSTs have been supported in their learning about why and how to facilitate

meaningful physical education experiences for participants (Fletcher, et al., 2016; Ní Chróinín, et al., 2015; 2017).

Each of the five pedagogical principles is outlined in a broad, general sense to enable their enactment by teacher educators across PETE contexts. The danger in these principles being articulated too loosely is, of course, that they might not provide sufficient guidance to some teacher educators who wish to take them up in their practices. However, similar to Korthagen, Loughran and Russell's (2006) motives in articulating principles of teacher education practices, we suggest that the pedagogical principles of LAMPE serve as 'guidelines and possibilities (as opposed to rules and procedures) to those teacher educators willing to accept the challenge of reconstructing teacher education from within' (p. 1039). LAMPE offers the potential for a common, shared language that allows others to build upon and extend their own practices resulting in the development of new understandings and approaches of how to facilitate meaningful experiences. In this way, our approach acknowledges diversity in the personal beliefs, values, and approaches of individual teacher educators while also providing a coherent framework that is accessible to both teacher educators and PSTs. We saw value, therefore, in sharing examples of how individual teacher educators drew on the pedagogical principles of LAMPE to guide their everyday decisions and actions. In this paper we answer the following research question: *How do individual teacher educators enact the pedagogical principles of LAMPE to make pedagogical decisions in PETE?*

Methodology

Collaborative self-study of teacher education (S-STEP) provided an overarching methodological framework for LAMPE research in a broad sense. S-STEP 'helps teacher educators build their capacities as educators, allows for experimentation with pedagogies of

teacher education, and provides space for exploration of how/if PETE programme goals are fit for purpose' (O'Sullivan, 2014, p. 171). Over the past several years, S-STEP processes have enabled us to describe our individual beliefs and identities, and examine the ways they are enacted in our practices. This has required us to interpret and make judgments about teaching and learning encounters, and identify enabling and limiting aspects of our pedagogical practices within these encounters. However, in this particular paper we do not include one of the necessary requirements of S-STEP research, which is a deliberate 'turn to self' (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). For interested readers we have considered this quite extensively elsewhere (Fletcher, et al., 2016; Ní Chróinín, et al., 2015; 2017). Instead, we use data generated from the larger S-STEP research to engage in a secondary analysis of the data using a more generic type of interpretive inquiry, considering a different research question we think has merit in being shared with the PETE community. Our design was still guided by LaBoskey's (2004) suggestions for quality and rigour in S-STEP, however, these may not be closely reflected in our reporting of the data in this paper (particularly in maintaining a focus on the self).

To this end, this work responds to calls in the literature to make the practices of teacher education more explicit. For example, it serves as an example of how ongoing S-STEP research can lead to the generation of new, more expansive questions about teacher education practices (O'Sullivan, 2014). It also addresses Zeichner's (2007) call for teacher education researchers to create chains of inquiry that extend beyond the immediate contexts of the teacher educators conducting the work. We do this by making connections between the individual practices and a broad set of pedagogical principles that might be taken up and implemented by others across contexts in a variety of ways. In drawing on examples from three teacher educators from different programmes and in different countries, we also explore 'how pedagogies work and for what purposes' in cross-institutional and cross-national

contexts (O'Sullivan, 2014, p. 178). Making explicit the decision-making processes embedded in our practices can provide direction and insight on pedagogical approaches in ways that might inform and reframe future PETE practices.

Participants and Setting

Four teacher educators (Tim, Déirdre, Caitlin, and Nancy) implemented the pedagogical principles of LAMPE when delivering a games-based course to PSTs. Tim and Déirdre have developed and implemented LAMPE over the past four years (Tim at Brock University in Canada and Déirdre at Mary Immaculate College in Ireland). As part of their inquiry they have acted as critical friends to each other through sharing of, and written responses to, weekly reflective journal entries as well as through conversations on Skype. Some of the examples shared from Tim and Déirdre's practices are taken from the data set generated over the four years of the LAMPE project. Caitlin and Nancy work in the same program as Tim, and have been experimenting with LAMPE pedagogies for one year, documenting their experiences in weekly written reflections. Tim acted as critical friend to Caitlin and Nancy, responding to their written reflections and engaging in weekly face-to-face meetings, which were audio-recorded. All data collection procedures were approved by the research ethics boards at Brock University and Mary Immaculate College.

Data Collection

Teacher educators' experiences of implementing LAMPE were the focus of data collection. Following each class ($n = 23$) the teacher educator identified a critical incident where the pedagogical principles LAMPE informed their decision-making. We found Kosnik's (2001) description of a critical incident to be helpful: an event that raises broad, sustained issues and serves to focus the practitioner's thinking in ways that lead to insights about teacher education practice. Tripp (2011) suggests that analysis of critical incidents can lead to deeper understandings of the beliefs and values underlying practice, thus revealing

things that inform professional decision-making. PST responses to our individual pedagogies provided the main criterion for selection of each incident. Reflection on each of these incidents involved writing a response to questions that prompted the teacher educators to consider the incident from their own and PSTs' perspectives. Questions included: 'Describe the context/pedagogical strategy being employed: What happened? How did you feel? What did you think? What led to a change in your thinking?' alongside insight garnered on the PST perspective during lessons using strategies such as observation, questioning and discussion, written reflections and assignments. Further prompts encouraged the teacher educator to consider how they had responded to PST experiences. This written reflection was shared with a critical friend who affirmed, challenged and questioned the teacher educator's positioning (Schuck & Russell, 2005). Following this critical friend interaction, the teacher educator wrote a final reflection about their learning from the incident. Conversations with critical friends were central to examining each incident and, in particular, our pedagogical decision-making. Tim, Nancy and Caitlin conducted weekly discussions in person ($n = 6$, approx. 3 hours of recording) which were audio recorded and transcribed. Tim and Déirdre had additional data sources to draw on in interpreting critical incidents as some lessons were also observed by a non-participant observer ($n = 12$ lessons) and PST data including work samples and interviews were collected. These data sources were included as a way to avoid self-justification of our teacher education practices (Loughran, 2013).

Data Analysis

The final data for analysis included 23 weekly reflection documents (Tim = 6, Caitlin = 7, Nancy = 3, Déirdre = 7) and critical friend responses ($n = 23$), non-participant observations ($n = 12$), and recorded conversations with critical friends ($n = 6$; 4.5 hours). PST data related to Tim's and Déirdre's teaching included approximately 250 individual work samples and individual interviews ($n = 17$) with PSTs (pseudonyms or initials are used when

referring to all PST data). Qualitative data analysis was an iterative process of engagement with data and research team discussions. First, all data were reviewed and discussed by research team members in the preparation of abstracts for an academic conference. These discussions and subsequent conference presentations prompted further discussions between research team members, followed by further engagement with the data which finally resulted in the collective identification of examples from the critical incidents that illustrated a teacher educator's decision-making. We verified that each example aligned with the pedagogical principles of LAMPE. From these, we selected four decision-making moments to interpret further. Our criteria for inclusion were: a) the presence of supporting data from multiple perspectives and b) representation of moment-to-moment and day-to-day pedagogical decision-making guided by the pedagogical principles of LAMPE. Our intention in sharing these examples is not to provide a template for decision-making (in the unlikely event that the exact same circumstances might arise) but rather to provide insight on how we drew on the pedagogical principles of LAMPE to help us make decisions to better support PST learning how to facilitate meaningful physical education experiences.

Findings

We share four examples to illustrate how we drew on the pedagogical principles of LAMPE to guide our decision-making in response to PSTs' experiences of the pedagogies of teacher education. Each of the moments shared was selected based on the presence of the pedagogical principles of LAMPE to support decision-making as well as the presence of supporting data from multiple perspectives. We draw on our own teacher educator-generated data as well as PST and non-participant observer data, where possible, to illuminate each example.

Decision-making Example 1: Responding to Within-task PST Experiences

In this example Tim was modelling the teacher role and PSTs were physically active as learners/participants playing a small-sided game of Danish Longball (a striking/fielding game). Danish Longball was new to most students so Tim had the instructions printed for each of the groups, from which they were encouraged to read, discuss, and negotiate how to play the game. This negotiation within groups typically includes some learner-selected modifications in order to make the level of challenge 'just right' for them. The group then needs to confer, negotiate, and agree with the other group they are playing against, and then the game can begin. Tim was observing two groups playing against each other for the first time. He wrote:

I could hear lots of people asking each other questions and putting forth their opinions about the interpretation of the rules. During the first two innings I overheard a couple of students saying 'this is boring' or 'I'm confused' or 'I have no idea what is going on'. I let them have this time but said: 'After each team has batted once, I want you to confer with the other group again and iron out the kinks in the rules that you have experienced. You have 2 mins to agree and decide upon how the game will be played for the remainder of the class'. (Tim, Sem 2, Week 5)

Tim explained the reason for this decision, identifying that:

Prior to setting the 2 min time limit and putting boundaries on the conferring of rules, I was very close to calling the groups in and stating my interpretation of the rules, but I held back from doing this. (Tim, Sem 2, Week 5)

The PSTs successfully negotiated the challenge set by Tim as noted by the non-participant observer: '[There was] laughing during the Danish Longball game as students were running from base to base...Students celebrated when they got the change-up rule!...Opposing team

members cheer their opponents on as they played Danish Longball: “nice spinning action”.’

(Non-participant observer, Sem 2, Observation 3)

At the end of the class Tim returned to the decision he had made, conscious that it may have been interpreted by students as inaction on his part. He reflected on the discussion he led with PSTs:

The reason I did this was to demonstrate that my *not* stepping in to change things was not due to an absent mind but rather a conscious decision based on meaningful experiences. If, after conferring for 2 mins the games had not changed for the better (through my observations of their engagement, particularly my interpretations of whether they were having fun – smiles, laughing, effort, etc.) I would have had to change my approach... The main focus of the discussion was on the ways I used meaningful experiences to help me make a decision I was comfortable with. (Tim, Sem 2, Week 5)

This example illustrates how, within a learning task, Tim drew on the principles of LAMPE to make a pedagogical decision in response to PST engagement, particularly through using features of meaningful experiences, such as social interaction, challenge, and fun (Principle #3) (Beni, et al., 2017; Kretchmar, 2006). He then made further decisions to examine this moment with the PSTs at the end of the class. Specifically, Tim helped the PSTs to reflect on these experiences through discussion where he made explicit his decision-making process in a teacher role by examining the actions he had modelled (Principles #2 and 5). Tim’s modelling, and subsequent public examination of his actions, that was aligned with features of meaningful physical education influenced PST learning about how they would approach their own teaching in the future. Using this example, Jacob (pseudonym) described an incident from his past where he worked as a camp counsellor that he had now reframed based on his learning experiences within LAMPE:

... it was about 6 or 7 year olds... they were playing some kind of game, and they were just chasing the ball all around the field like bees to a honey pot as usual, but then one of them said: 'Awww, can we move on to something else?' and I was like: 'No, no, no, no. We'll keep going with this.' And I thought, to me that was just: 'No, we'll keep doing this until we're done, and then we'll move on'. But then now doing this [class], I've sort of realized well maybe that wasn't the best thing for that kid in particular, even though it's not all about just one kid. The fact that he's saying he got bored with it sort of means that by keeping going with it we're slowly excluding him... what I feel like I could do now is sort of listen or gauge what they're thinking of the game. (Jacob, Sem 2, Interview 2)

It is encouraging that the PSTs made direct connections between their learning to teach meaningful physical education based on Tim's enactment of the pedagogical principles of LAMPE and their past and future practices (Principle #3). This example provides corroborating evidence of the value of making moment-to-moment decisions within tasks aligned with the pedagogical principles of LAMPE to support PST learning about meaningful physical education.

Decision-making Example 2: Responding to the Unexpected

The following example is again drawn from Tim's teaching, where PSTs were completing a station-based games activity. Some hula-hoops were included as part of the equipment at one station. As the students had completed the task and were rotating to the next station, Tim observed:

Two students with the hula hoops started hula hooping – quite well! – round their hips and wrists and ankles and necks. People from their group who were milling about and people from the next group who were moving to that station were watching them and a few cheers and laughs etc. were directed toward the two

students. There was lots of laughing and the two students eventually put the equipment away and joined their group in moving to the next station. (Tim, Sem 2, Week 3)

Tim drew on his understanding of meaningful physical education to leverage learning about teaching from this incident. He described in his weekly reflection how he proceeded:

I asked the group with the two hula hoopers to come back over for a minute along with the group who had arrived at the station. I said: 'OK, Students X and Y were just hula hooping after I'd asked the groups to pack up and move to the next station. So what am I going to do about it?' After ensuring Students X and Y they were not 'in trouble', among the responses I got were 'You ask them to hurry up', 'Ask them to listen and pay attention to instructions', 'Sit out the next activity', etc. Most responses were underpinned by reasons supporting the need for the teacher to maintain control and so on. One student said 'Nothing', to which I replied: 'Yes, I am probably going to do nothing. But why?' 'They were being safe', 'No one was hurt', 'It was fairly minor' and so on. I wanted to see how they would respond if my reasons were supported by [the features of] LAMPE. So I explained that the reason I would do nothing is because they were having fun and practicing a skill. Other people in their group and the new group were having fun with it too. If we are about encouraging movement and participation in our gyms, then we should celebrate situations where it is clear that students are engaged in things that are meaningful: they are having fun, interacting, challenged, developing skills, and so on. (Tim, Sem 2, Week 3)

In this example almost all of the pedagogical principles of LAMPE are evident. Specifically, by using Principles #2 (modelling) and #4 (using features of meaningful experiences to guide pedagogical decisions), Tim modelled how he would respond as a teacher who prioritises

meaningful experiences (Principle #1). This intentional decision-making allowed him to illustrate how a singular focus on the promotion of meaningful experiences in school-based physical education results in particular decisions over others. The learning experience of the group was enhanced by his subsequent sharing of his decision-making processes, positioning PSTs simultaneously as learners and as future teachers (Principle #3).

A number of the PSTs referenced this incident in interviews about their experiences of the course. Kirsten was one of the hula hoopers. She described how her experience of the incident as a learner would influence her approach as a teacher in the future:

... being able to let the kids/students/athletes be social and have fun with it as long as they're not disrupting anyone else. I think that's a big thing for it and I think noticing the difference between, 'No, that's bad. You're disrupting. Don't do that,' and, 'OK. It's not that big of a deal. You can go off and play a little bit, but come back in a bit.'... Just be adaptive, and just listen to the people that you're working with. (Kirsten, Sem 2, Interview 2)

Kirsten's classmates were also impacted by this incident. Shayla explained:

... going into this summer as a camp counsellor, I know that now if something's not affecting me or anyone else negatively, I'm not going to stop it. I'm just going to let them do their own thing until if it is a disruption. (Shayla, Sem 2, Interview 2)

Tim was successful in encouraging PSTs to use the features of meaningful physical education as a frame of reference for their decision-making about the quality of physical education experiences they facilitated. His articulation of the reasoning behind his decision resonated with PSTs in ways that they translated to their own practice. Tim did not plan for what happened but he was still able to draw on the pedagogical principles of LAMPE to guide his moment-to-moment decision-making in ways that influenced PST learning. However, a

critical friend conversation between Tim and Déirdre helped them to identify that the PST data may also capture a slight misunderstanding of the promotion of meaningful experiences. Specifically, the two data excerpts suggest PSTs have conflated the promotion of fun with an ‘anything goes’ attitude, which was not our intention. Our approach acknowledges the need for teachers to be flexible and adaptive in how they make decisions guided by the promotion of meaningful experiences, though we support the need for teachers to facilitate student learning in an intentional manner.

Decision-making Example 3: Responding to Evolving Learning Needs

During a mid-term review PSTs in Déirdre’s class indicated uncertainty around how the practical implementation of meaningful physical education would play out with children in schools while they were in school placement. In response, Déirdre reviewed the principles of LAMPE and designed a task in which PSTs would teach a small group of children guided by the features of meaningful physical education as a frame (i.e., social interaction, challenge, fun, motor competence, personally relevant learning, and delight). The task was built around a process of teaching, observing, discussing and reflecting with reference to meaningful experiences. Across a three-week period, teams of PSTs led activities for small groups of children using games-centred approaches. Pairs of PSTs completed an observation of another pair using a template based on the features of meaningful physical education. This template made explicit the priority on meaningful participation (Principle #1). For example, the prompts for ‘just right’ challenge and skill learning asked them to consider whether the learning tasks had an appropriate level of challenge, sufficient practice time, opportunities to receive feedback, and differentiation to accommodate different learners (Principle #4). One example of PST observer comments in relation to teacher action included: ‘teachers praised students well and advised them well and encouraged pupils to correct their errors’. They

recorded that the pupils ‘corrected their own errors well and put them into practice when they played the game again’ (Peer observation 1, Sem 1, Week 3).

In addition to the features of meaningful physical education, the template also prompted the observer to notice how the children were supported to make sense of their experiences by setting goals for their own learning, consideration of how learning activities were aligned with these goals, and opportunities to reflect on participation (Principle #5); for example, questioning or draw and write activities. One PST observer wrote: ‘The teachers made sure that the children were aware of their previous score and encouraged them to make it a goal to beat this score’. They noted in response that the children ‘were more motivated and engaged’ (Peer observation 2, Sem 1, Week 9). Peer feedback based on these observations was shared with each pair after their teaching episode in three consecutive weeks. PSTs were encouraged to use the feedback each week to reflect on their teaching and identify written goals for their teaching the following week. The PSTs completed a written reflection on their teaching experiences following this feedback session. After the second round of observation and feedback the non-participant observer noted: ‘[PSTs] seem happy that they have improved from the previous week and feel better able to manage the pupils and use game centred approaches’ (Non-participant observer, Sem 1, Week 4).

Indicative of Principle #5 (reflection on meaningful experiences), in their written reflections the PSTs outlined how the peer feedback in relation to each of the features of meaningful experiences helped them to review and plan their lessons, for example: ‘it allowed me to note the students’ interests so planning may be more focused’ (PC Written reflection, Sem1, Week 3-4). The features of meaningful physical education provided a shared language between peers to allow them to analyse and connect a teacher’s actions and participants’ experiences (Principle #4). PSTs identified specific actions to enhance meaningfulness for participants based on peer feedback. For example ‘just right’ challenge

was enhanced by ‘adapting for each child’ (LS Written Reflection, Sem1, Week 3-4), while fun was enhanced when one PST ‘split children into smaller groups’ (EC Written Reflection, Sem1, Week 3-4). Social interaction was promoted when another PST ‘planned for pupils to be engaged with each other and work as a team’ (JOL Written reflection, Sem1, Week 3-4). These examples demonstrate how reviewing their teaching in relation to the features of meaningful physical education resulted in a change in teacher action and participant experience in ways that may better facilitate meaningful engagement.

Déirdre’s engagement with the pedagogical principles of LAMPE helped her respond to PSTs’ needs in ways that enhanced their learning about meaningful physical education. By aligning task features with the principles of LAMPE she helped PSTs to engage more deeply with each feature and see explicit links between their actions as teachers and the promotion of meaningful experiences for participants (Principle #3). This example illustrates the merits of the pedagogical principles of LAMPE as a reference point for teacher educators’ day-to-day decision-making about how to develop and implement pedagogies to support PST learning about meaningful physical education.

Decision-making Example 4: Responding to Opportunities to Enhance the Learning Environment

Caitlin’s lessons took place each week in the early morning. During a lesson on Low Organization Games that focused on locomotor and stability skills, PSTs engaged in the first activity of Pylon Tag. The purpose of the task was to utilise strategies and movement skills to touch as many scattered pylons as they could in one minute. As the game progressed, PSTs were tasked to discuss and identify movement cues that they could use to teach a young child. Caitlin played music during activity time and stopped the music to allow for prompts and discussion in parts of the activity. She explained: ‘At first, I contemplated using music for one of the upcoming activities, as I knew students would have to be involved in discussion

and I didn't want it to overpower the discussion portion or take away from their learning'.

(Caitlin, Sem 1, Week 2)

In the next activity of Mingle Mingle Tennis, Caitlin did not play music as she thought that students might want to communicate with each other verbally as they travelled around. She explains what happened next:

One student said, 'Hey, the music died!' I replied with 'Did you enjoy the music?'

They responded saying, 'Yes, it was pumping me up'. I decided to put back on the music as a result of the surrounding nodding heads. Students were dancing around to the beat of the music as they travelled in the space throwing and catching their tennis balls. (Caitlin, Sem 1, Week 2)

Caitlin explained her decision based on PSTs' articulation of how the music enhanced their overall learning experience. She noted: 'It was very evident this group really enjoyed the music... it seems that the music takes away the almost "awkwardness" and creates an environment that enables a "flow of conversation".' (Caitlin, Sem 1, Week 2)

Based on her observations and PST feedback Caitlin continued to use music during task activities for the remainder of the lesson. Exemplifying Principles #2 and 5 (modelling and reflection, respectively), Caitlin returned to the decision she had made to continue playing the music throughout the lesson at the end of class with the PSTs:

I asked students what they enjoyed about the lesson... Students mentioned they like the idea of the music playing and how they got to work in smaller groups again. They felt that they were starting to really get to know each other as we have such a small lab... When I asked student about what meaningful experiences they had on in lab they mentioned the music and how it gave them energy in the morning. I told students I would make note of this and try to include music more

often in the lesson if it helped them being in the 8:00 am lab. (Caitlin, Sem 1, Week 2)

Caitlin went further in modelling the features of a meaningful experience (Principle #2): ‘I even mentioned if they had any appropriate songs they would like me to play to let me know at the end of the lab or next week. I wanted to be responsive to their interests’. (Caitlin, Sem 1, Week 2)

In discussion with critical friends she explained her pedagogical decisions in relation to Principle #4 (using the features of meaningful experiences to guide decisions): ‘The music encourages the social interaction in their small groups because they are more willing to participate in the activity.’ (Caitlin, Sem 1, Discussion 2). Tim, as critical friend, suggested a particular role for music in accessing qualitatively special experiences that are often difficult to capture and articulate (Beni, et al., 2017): ‘...perhaps things like music can enable us to get towards those moments of delight in teacher education? If delight is so hard to get in a short class, that [music] can help [students] understand it, help students experience it’ (Tim, Sem 1, Discussion 2). This suggestion resonated with Caitlin who saw the use of music as providing motivation and making activities more enjoyable aligned with her understanding of delight as a feature of meaningful experiences as well as the promotion of ‘personal playgrounds’ (Kretchmar, 2008). For the remainder of the semester, Caitlin integrated music into lesson activities to enhance enjoyment and possibly foster delight. PSTs regularly asked for the music to be added to their learning activities. In this example, PSTs lived how learners’ experiences can be enhanced by music.

In sharing this example we do not suggest that music should, or could, provide the backdrop for all PETE learning experiences but it is clear that music enhanced the learning experience for these PSTs, both by providing motivation as well as creating a comfortable atmosphere that facilitated social interaction in small group learning tasks. The example

illustrates how the accessibility of a concrete teaching strategy (such as using music) enabled Caitlin as a beginning teacher educator to experiment with the principles of LAMPE and experience how it can be used to guide moment-to-moment and day-to-day pedagogical decisions, while also influencing students' experiences of meaningfulness in physical education (Principles #1, 3, 5).

Discussion and Conclusion

This research provides new understanding of how a pedagogical framework (the pedagogical principles of LAMPE) can guide teacher educators' decision-making to support PSTs' learning about how to facilitate meaningful participation in physical education (Ní Chróinín, et al., 2017). The examples shared illustrate how the pedagogical principles of LAMPE provided an overall guiding framework that influenced pedagogical decision-making including specific decisions and actions of teaching within individual learning activities as well as within course content, design, and organisation. In each example shared, the pedagogical principles of LAMPE provided us with a theoretical framework against which to reference a critical incident, make sense of PSTs' experiences, and then respond in ways that influenced their learning in impactful ways. Drawing on the pedagogical principles of LAMPE to make these decisions led to refinement of learning activities and greater congruence and consistency of our overall message around meaningful physical education.

We highlight the value of a broad, general pedagogical frame such as LAMPE as a reference point to promote consistent teacher educator decision-making while also being flexible and sensitive to individual teacher educator's beliefs and values (Korthagen, et al., 2006). Such direction is valuable in supporting PST learning how to promote meaningful experiences in school-based physical education as well as illustrating to PSTs the value of

their operating from a coherent set of principles focused on meaningful experiences to make decisions about their teacher actions and participants' learning experiences.

All four examples reflected some, or all, of the pedagogical principles of LAMPE. First, in all examples the teacher educator demonstrated an explicit prioritisation of meaningful experiences in their decision-making processes. Second, pedagogical decision-making that promoted meaningful participation was modelled. Modelling and articulating to PSTs how the features of a meaningful experience guided decision-making allowed teacher educators to make explicit how they prioritised meaningful participation. Third, PSTs engaged with meaningful participation from both a learner and future teacher perspective. Fourth, features of meaningful experiences (Beni, et al., 2017; Kretchmar, 2006) framed learning experiences and provided a coherent frame for teacher educator decision-making and action. In particular, drawing on the features of meaningful physical education provided a shared language of learning that allowed us to give insight into our decision-making processes in ways that were explicit to PSTs as well as facilitating discussion about the quality of experience being created for participants. This shared language allowed PSTs to articulate what is important to them as teachers and to identify strategies to promote meaningful experiences in physical education. Fifth, in all examples, discussion and reflection on the meaningfulness of physical education and sport experiences was central to our decision-making processes. PST perspectives, incorporating reflection on their class experiences, were central to their learning and our decision-making. Paying particular attention to PST experiences influenced the decisions we made and assisted in making pedagogical decisions that enhanced learning experiences (Enright, et al., 2017). Similar to Oliver et al. (2015), we highlight the importance of individual pedagogies being flexible enough to respond to PST learning needs and perspectives as they arise.

It is noteworthy that while all four examples illustrate the pedagogical principles of LAMPE, they also show that the principles are flexible enough to allow for variety of interpretation in different contexts. Sharing these illustrative examples, or micro-case studies, is useful in providing insight into the implementation of pedagogies and teacher educator decision-making, allowing others to interpret and consider how they would approach this same situation and what principles they might draw on in making decisions (Korthagen, et al., 2006). The pedagogical principles of LAMPE provided a useful frame of reference for a range of decision-making moments that we encountered both from moment to moment and day-to-day in a variety of situations: within tasks, facing the unexpected, dealing with evolving learner needs, and responding to enhance the learning environment. These examples, therefore, hold generative possibilities in making explicit the daily pedagogy of enactment in PETE across contexts and advancing understanding of how teacher educators draw on pedagogical principles to guide decision-making in their PETE practices in ways that influence PST learning.

References

- Beni, S., Fletcher, T., & Ní Chróinín, D. (2017). Meaningful experiences in physical education and youth sport: A review of the literature. *Quest*, *69*, 291-312.
- Enright, E., Coll, L., Ní Chróinín, D., & Fitzpatrick, M. (2016). Student voice as risky praxis: Democratising physical education teacher education. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, *22*, 459-472.
- Fletcher, T., Ní Chróinín, D., & O'Sullivan, M. (2016). A layered approach to critical friendship as a means to support pedagogical innovation in pre-service teacher education. *Studying Teacher Education*, *12*, 302-319.
- Korthagen, F., Loughran, J. & Russell, T. (2006). Developing fundamental principles for teacher education programs and practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *22*, 1020-1041.
- Kosnik, C. (2001). The effects of an inquiry-oriented teacher education program on a faculty member: Some critical incidents and my journey. *Reflective Practice*, *2*, 65-80.
- Kretchmar, R. S. (2000). Movement subcultures: Sites for meaning. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, *71*(5), 19-25.
- Kretchmar, R. S. (2006). Ten more reasons for quality physical education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, *77*(9), 6-9.
- Kretchmar, R. S. (2008). The increasing utility of elementary school physical education: A mixed blessing and unique challenge. *The Elementary School Journal*, *108*(3), 161-170.
- LaBoskey, V. K. (2004). The methodology of self-study and its theoretical underpinnings. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey & T. Russell (Eds.). *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices*. (pp. 817-869). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

- Loughran, J. (2013). Pedagogy: Making sense of the complex relationship between teaching and learning. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 43, 118-141.
- Ní Chróinín, D., Fletcher, T., & O'Sullivan, M. (2015). Using self-study to explore the processes of pedagogical innovation in physical education teacher education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education*, 6, 273-286.
- Ní Chróinín, D., Fletcher, T., & O'Sullivan, M. (2017). Pedagogical principles of learning to teach meaningful physical education. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 1-17. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1080/17408989.2017.1342789.
- Oliver, K. L., & Oesterreich, H. A. (2013). Student-centred inquiry as curriculum as a model for field-based teacher education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 45, 394-417.
- Oliver, K. L., Oesterreich, H. A., Aranda, R., Archeleta, J., Blazer, C., de la Cruz, K....Robinson, R. (2015). 'The sweetness of struggle': innovation in physical education teacher education through student-centered inquiry as curriculum in a physical education methods course. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 20, 97-115.
- O'Sullivan, M. (2014). Where we go from here: Developing pedagogies for PETE and the use of self-study in physical education and teacher education. In A. Ovens & T. Fletcher (Eds.). *Self-study in physical education teacher education: Exploring the interplay of practice and scholarship*. (pp. 169-180). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Pinnegar, S. & Hamilton, M. L. (2009). *Self-study of practice as a genre of qualitative research: Theory, methodology, and practice*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Schoenfeld, A. H. (2010). *How we think: A theory of goal-oriented decision making and its educational applications*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Schuck, S., & Russell, T. (2005). Self-study, critical friendship, and the complexities of teacher education. *Studying Teacher Education*, 1, 107-121.

Tripp, D. (2011). *Critical incidents in teaching: Developing professional judgement*. 2nd ed.

Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Zeichner, K. 2007. Accumulating knowledge across self-studies in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58, 36-46.