The Physical Educator Vol. 73 • pp. 74–96 • 2016
http://dx.doi.org/10.18666/TPE-2016-V73-I1-5562

PEDAGOGY

Influence of Acculturation and Professional Socialization on Preservice Teachers' Interpretation and Implementation of the Teaching Games for Understanding Model

Catherine E. Vollmer and Matthew D. Curtner-Smith

Abstract

Research on how preservice teachers (PTs) learn to employ the teaching games for understanding (TGfU) model is in its infancy. The purpose of this study was to examine the combined effects of a package of university-based methods and the employment of the model during an early field experience (EFE) on PTs' delivery of TGfU during the teaching internship. The theoretical framework employed was occupational socialization. Participants were 2 PTs. Data were collected with 7 qualitative techniques and analyzed using analytic induction and constant comparison. Although the PTs understood elements of TGfU, a combination of their pedagogical struggles with and misconceptions of TGfU and their prior and concurrent socialization served to mediate and reduce the effects of their initial training. Consequently, neither PT was able to deliver the full version of TGfU during the internship. We suggest that faculty

Catherine E. Vollmer is a physical education and health teacher at Graham High School, Bluefield, VA. Matthew D. Curtner-Smith is professor of sport pedagogy, Department of Kinesiology, University of Alabama. Please send author correspondence to mdsmith@ua.edu

who are training PTs focus on a number of areas including recruiting teaching-oriented PTs, emphasizing the origins of the model in sport, contrasting TGfU and traditional pedagogies, debunking the idea that TGfU and foundational pedagogies are oppositional, providing a graded series of EFEs, teaching within small-sided games, and identifying tactical problems.

The teaching games for understanding (TGfU) model (Bunker & Thorpe, 1982; Mitchell, Oslin, & Griffin, 2006; Thorpe, Bunker, & Almond, 1984) is aimed at enabling students to understand and execute tactics and strategies in games and sports as well as acquire technical competence. Students are asked to explore the tactical and strategic decisions they make as they participate in games. Bunker and Thorpe (1982) described a six-stage process by which this could be achieved and in which the focus shifted from modified game playing, game appreciation, tactical awareness, decision making, and skill execution to performance. Within these stages, teachers select or sample a variety of games and emphasize their tactical complexity. These games are modified so they represent the adult version but exaggerate specific tactical issues (Thorpe et al., 1984). A simplified version of the model involves students playing small-sided conditioned games, answering tactical questions about those games, and solving tactical problems (Mitchell et al., 2006).

The relatively small amount of work in which researchers have examined how physical education teacher education (PETE) faculty have attempted to prepare their preservice teachers (PTs) to use the TGfU model indicates that packages of various methods have been employed. These methods have included reading articles about and discussing the model (McNeill et al., 2004; Peters & Shuck, 2009), teaching PTs content courses using the model, peer teaching within methods classes (McNeill et al., 2004), mentoring by experts (Wang & Ha, 2012), requiring PTs to design games and plan TGfU units, and providing PTs with a TGfU lesson plan template (Curtner-Smith et al., 2007; McNeill et al., 2004).

The aforementioned research, however, indicates that although PTs are often positive about and can gain confidence from using TGfU (Casey, 2014; Li & Cruz, 2008; Roberts, 2007; Wang & Ha, 2009), they have struggled to master the model. Specifically, PTs have had difficulty with the relative fluidity and flexibility of TGfU

pedagogy (Curtner-Smith et al., 2007; McNeill et al., 2004; Peters & Shuck, 2009), planning (McNeill et al., 2004; Randall, 2003), using indirect teaching styles (Curtner-Smith et al., 2007; McNeill, Fry, Wright, Tan, & Rossi, 2008; McNeill et al., 2004; Peters & Shuck, 2009), and teaching within small-sided and conditioned games (Curtner-Smith et al., 2007; Peters & Shuck, 2009). Furthermore, they have worried about students' skill levels and prioritized them over understanding how to play games (Curtner-Smith et al., 2007; McNeill et al., 2004; Randall, 2003). In addition, they have been concerned about students' abilities to understand tactics and strategies and create games (Curtner-Smith et al., 2007). Moreover, PTs have been concerned about their own mastery of foundational instructional skills (i.e., effective teaching and managerial behaviors) while trying to use and learn more advanced TGfU pedagogies (Curtner-Smith et al., 2007; McNeill et al., 2004; Wang & Ha, 2009).

Factors contributing to these difficulties have included an inadequate amount and depth of training (McNeill et al., 2008; Peters & Shuck, 2009; Wright, McNeill, & Fry, 2009) and PTs' lack of pedagogical, content, and pedagogical content knowledge (McNeill et al., 2004; Peters & Shuck, 2009). During the culminating teaching internship, the lack of time, facilities, and equipment (McNeill et al., 2004; Peters & Shuck, 2009); the low level of cooperating teacher (CT) knowledge and support (McNeill et al., 2004; Nash, 2009; Wang & Ha, 2012); and marginalization of the subject, large class sizes, and unpredictable class scheduling (McNeill et al., 2004; Peters & Shuck, 2009) have also proven to be significant constraints on PTs learning the TGfU model. In addition, PTs have been hindered by the resistance of students used to being taught through traditional skill practice-to-game and direct pedagogies focused on skill or fitness development or not being "taught" at all (Curtner-Smith et al., 2007; McNeill et al., 2004; Peters & Shuck, 2009).

PTs' prior experiences of more traditional and direct physical education (PE) teaching and curricula during their own schooling and PETE also appear to have made it difficult for them to learn TGfU (Casey, 2014; Light & Tan, 2006; McNeill et al., 2004; Peters & Shuck, 2009) and have led to faulty conceptions of the model. Specifically, they appear to have misconceived the model in three broad ways (McNeill et al., 2004). First, PTs believe that they are doing TGfU

correctly if they follow and stick rigidly with the stages outlined by academics regardless of whether students learn. Second, they continue to value technical skill development over learning how to play and consequently adapt the TGfU pedagogy to realize this goal or abandon it altogether. Third, they merely see the TGfU approach as a good way to keep students engaged and well behaved without emphasizing learning. Additionally, and as yet, the fears of Chandler and Mitchell (1990) that teachers may misconceive the model and mistakenly reduce it to an explanation of strategies and tactics followed by unsupervised game playing have not been observed among PTs.

The purpose of this study was to examine the combined effects of a package of university-based methods and employing the model during an earlier early field experience (EFE) on PTs' delivery of TGfU during the culminating teaching internship. This combination included many methods that researchers have suggested can lead to positive gains and was specifically designed to address, confront, and rectify the problems and issues that plague previously documented attempts to teach PTs to use the TGfU model. The specific questions we attempted to answer during the study were as follows: (a) How did PTs interpret and implement TGfU? and (b) How did PTs' acculturation and professional socialization influence this interpretation and implementation?

Theoretical Framework

Previous studies (Curtner-Smith, Hastie, & Kinchin, 2008; Li & Cruz, 2008; McNeill et al., 2004; Sofo & Curtner-Smith, 2010) have revealed that PTs "read" curricula in different ways and that this reading heavily influences how they interpret and deliver a given model of instruction. In turn, PTs' reading of curricula is heavily influenced by their occupational socialization (e.g., see Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Lawson, 1983a, 1983b; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009). Therefore, data collection and analysis in this study were also guided by this theoretical framework.

Before they begin PETE, PTs hone their conceptions of the subject by the contexts and cultures in which they exist and by persons in positions of influence. This process of acculturation and PTs' initial interest in PE are often triggered by a strong interest in sport and physically active parents. Key influences on prospective PTs'

beliefs about teaching are their own experiences of PE, extracurricular school sport, and sport outside school as well as their relationships with PE teachers and coaches (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). Prospective PTs learn what it is to be a teacher through an "apprenticeship of observation" (Lortie, 1975). If this apprenticeship involves participating in noncompetitive physical activity or less traditional competitive sport and working with teachers and coaches who give priority to good quality PE over producing high-level extracurricular sports teams, PTs are likely to enter PETE with "teaching orientations" and view coaching as a "career contingency." In contrast, if the apprenticeship involves participating in a relatively high standard of traditional sport and working with teachers and coaches who emphasize extracurricular sport over PE, PTs are likely to enter PETE with a "coaching orientation" and view teaching PE as a career contingency (Lawson, 1983a, 1983b).

The effects of professional socialization (PETE) on PTs are often minimal and fail to change the conceptions of PE with which PTs enter their programs (Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009). PTs who enter PETE with strong coaching orientations are especially resistant to professional socialization (Sofo & Curtner-Smith, 2010). Moreover, weak PETE can serve to strengthen the faulty conceptions of some PTs (Doolittle, Dodds, & Placek, 1993). Conversely, strong PETE has been shown to have a positive influence on all but the most hardened coaching-oriented PTs (Sofo & Curtner-Smith, 2010). This type of PETE includes faculty with specialist training in sport pedagogy who are viewed as credible by PTs. These faculty supervise EFEs closely, agree on a "shared technical culture" (i.e., the skills and knowledge required for teaching effectively; Lortie, 1975), and tackle PTs' faulty beliefs about the subject head-on.

In line with occupational socialization theory, previous research (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008) has also indicated that when PTs with teaching orientations graduate, they are more likely to deliver the "full version" of another innovative and constructivist curriculum model: sport education (SE). Conversely, PTs with coaching orientations are more likely to misconceive SE and "water it down" or to take a "cafeteria approach" by selecting aspects of the model to employ within traditional instruction. Given these results and the finding that American PTs with strong coaching orientations had

more difficulty teaching through TGfU during an EFE than those with teaching orientations (Curtner-Smith et al., 2007), PTs with coaching orientations likely will also struggle with TGfU to a greater extent than those with teaching orientations during the teaching internship. Contradicting this suggestion was the finding of McNeill et al. (2004) that Singaporean student teachers with a higher level of games playing experience did better with TGfU than those who were relatively inexperienced sportsmen and women.

Method

Participants

Two PTs, to whom we gave the fictitious names of Emily and Kenny, were the participants in this study. Emily and Kenny were aged 22 years and Caucasian, and they were enrolled in their culminating teaching internship at a university in the Southeastern United States. They were selected because they had been successful in previous coursework but had different orientations to teaching and coaching. In congruence with the university's institutional review board policy on human subjects, both PTs signed consent forms before the study began.

PTs' Prior Training in TGfU

Both PTs were introduced to TGfU during their secondary methods course through class discussion, participation in 12 TGfU lessons as "students," and peer teaching four lessons. Further discussion and peer teaching (six lessons) of the model occurred during the PTs' elementary methods class. In addition, during the elementary methods course, the PTs read a leading text (Mitchell et al., 2006) in which the model was described, designed small-sided and conditioned games, and planned an 18-lesson TGfU unit. PTs were required to write individual lesson plans from this unit plan. Finally, the PTs taught the 18-lesson unit to second and third grade students within classes of eight to 12 students during their elementary EFE.

Setting

The PTs taught at different elementary schools for 7 weeks. Emily's school catered to children in prekindergarten to fifth grade aged 5 to 11 years. Most were African American and from lower

socioeconomic status backgrounds. Emily taught nine-lesson speedball and six-lesson ultimate frisbee TGfU units to one third grade (8 and 9 years old), one fourth grade (9 and 10 years old), and one fifth grade (10 and 11 years old) class for a total of 45 TGfU lessons. Her class sizes ranged from 61 to 73 students, although she had the support of a teaching aide and the CT.

Kenny completed his elementary teaching internship at a predominantly lower to middle class school that catered to Caucasian (69%) and African American (31%) children in third through fifth grades. He taught TGfU units to three third grade (60 lessons) and three fourth grade (60 lessons) classes. Both units comprised a series of mini-units on ultimate frisbee (four lessons), lascoop (an invasion game using scoops and a ball; four lessons), rounders (four lessons), cricket (four lessons), and soccer (four lessons). His class sizes ranged from 40 to 50 students. Kenny also had assistance from his CT.

Data Collection

Seven techniques were used to collect data with the goals of describing how the PTs interpreted and implemented TGfU and explaining how their acculturation and professional socialization influenced this interpretation and implementation. Nonparticipant observation involved extensive field notes being written on the pedagogies employed by Emily (during 19 lessons) and Kenny (during 19 lessons) during the TGfU model. Document analyses of PTs' teaching portfolios were conducted during and at the end of the internship. During these analyses, the focus was on PTs' TGfU unit and lesson plans, evaluations of students, and other materials they had developed during the teaching of their TGfU units. PTs were also asked to provide at least one entry per week in a reflective journal in which they discussed anything they deemed pertinent about their teaching of TGfU. Similarly, they were asked to complete at least one critical incident report per week in which they described a specific and significant event that had occurred during their TGfU teaching. Three types of interviews were used during the study. First, formal semistructured interviews were conducted with each PT at the beginning, middle, and end of the internship. In the initial interview, PTs were asked about their acculturation, professional socialization, and general understanding of the TGfU model. In the second and

third interviews, the focus was on their use of the TGfU model. All six interviews were audiotaped and transcribed verbatim. Second, whenever an opportunity was available, PTs were informally interviewed. Detailed written notes on the contents of these interviews were made as soon after informal interviews as possible. Finally, one stimulated recall interview was conducted with each PT. This involved PTs viewing a filmed lesson from one of their units. These films were paused periodically so the PTs could describe the thought processes that resulted in particular actions.

Data Analysis

Data indicating how the PTs interpreted and implemented TGfU and how their acculturation and professional socialization influenced this interpretation and implementation were identified. The two sets of data were then coded into categories, subcategories, and themes by employing analytic induction and constant comparison (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). This process involved multiple readings of both data sets while data collection was being carried out and after it was completed. During the initial reading, data from all sources were placed in tentative categories and subcategories. In subsequent readings, categories and subcategories were refined, modified, expanded, or collapsed, and data were recoded and moved accordingly. In addition, new categories and subcategories were developed. Toward the end of the process, the categories and subcategories were grouped within emerging themes consistent with the questions we were aiming to answer and the theoretical framework that we employed. The final categories, subcategories, and themes are the basis for the Findings and Discussion section. Trustworthiness and credibility were established by periodic member checking, triangulating findings from the data sources, and searching for negative and discrepant cases (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

Findings and Discussion

Reading About and Teaching TGfU

Comprehension of the model. Although both PTs revealed that they understood elements of the TGfU model, data indicated that in general and in congruence with participants in previous studies (e.g., Curtner-Smith et al., 2007; McNeill et al., 2004; Peters & Shuck,

2009; Randall, 2003), they misunderstood and misconceived it. As illustrated by the following data extract, their ideas on how to implement the model were vague at best:

> I would introduce the sport real quickly and just go over a few rules and then we would just basically have them . . . divide up in teams to go out and play for like 10 to 15 minutes. And then you would come back and you would basically have a practice . . . go back to game play and continually just doing that and eventually having a full game. But your first time, it's modified and you do skills modified and keep adding more skills along the game, and eventually, you would want a full-sized game. (Emily, Formal Interview 1)

In terms of the stages of the model advocated by Bunker and Thorpe (1982), and during their methods courses, both PTs frequently mentioned tactical awareness, skill execution, and performance:

> I probably should have done a better job with the strategies and tactics. . . . I spent a lot of time the first couple weeks on kicking, throwing, and passing, where it was pretty easy to do. . . . I could have spent a little more time and been like, "OK in this situation when this person is guarding you, what should you do?" (Emily, Formal Interview 2)

They did not, however, significantly emphasize game appreciation or students making decisions within games. Moreover, both PTs continued to prioritize technical competence over tactical and strategic understanding:

> Emily stops the students to explain the practice. The students gather behind their team cones. . . . She refers to the practice from the previous day on throwing and catching a frisbee. . . . She asks, "What finger is on top?" . . . "What on the bottom?" . . . "Remember to step with the same foot toward your partner." . . . "How do we catch?" . . . "Like an alligator." . . . She then sends students to practice with a partner with the

option of using a foam or hard frisbee. (Emily, Field Notes, Lesson 2, Ultimate Frisbee Unit, Grade 4)

Similarly, and in line with the thoughts of Thorpe et al. (1984) and Mitchell et al. (2006) on pedagogical principles and the curricular scaffolding of the model, the PTs made plenty of references to "modified" and "small-sided" games and the sampling of "different" games:

> The most significant incident was when I had to modify the ball/frisbee to make the students more successful. . . . I had to modify the goals of lascoop and make them bigger so they could score more frequently. . . . I modified the game of cricket by letting them hit off a tee because they could not throw [i.e., bowl] the ball. (Kenny, Critical Incident Reports, Week 2–4)

> They played some games they had never played before so it kind of took them a day or two to finally get the rules and how everything works. . . . I did a variety . . . two invasion games and then two fielding games. . . . I was going to do a target game, but . . . I swapped it back to soccer. (Kenny, Formal Interview 2)

Conversely, the PTs did not mention modifying or conditioning games for the purpose of emphasizing specific tactical problems, questioning students with the goal of helping them become more tactically aware, or setting tactical problems for students to solve. In short, both PTs appeared to have a rudimentary and limited understanding of the more basic pedagogies associated with TGfU and no understanding of pedagogies that are more complex.

Structure of the model. Not surprisingly, their limited and shallow understanding of the model led to Emily and Kenny delivering units of instruction that, in Curtner-Smith et al.'s (2008) parlance, fell short of the full version of TGfU. Specifically, Kenny took a cafeteria approach to the model and Emily watered it down.

Kenny's version of TGfU essentially involved taking a fairly traditional skill practice-to-game approach with a few more small-sided

games included on the path to the full game than normal. Emily was more likely to teach through small-sided and conditioned games, less likely to include isolated skill drills, and occasionally attempted to teach skills within game contexts. Like Kenny, however, she was still traditional in her focus. Both emphases are portrayed in the following data extracts:

> Emily assigns students to their fields. . . . While students are playing she provides motivational and performance feedback. . . . She blows the whistle to stop class play. . . . She says, "I just saw a team do an awesome play!" . . . Students re-enact what they had just done (three passes among teammates to score). . . . Emily then asks the students, "Where were the players and their teammates?" . . . "What type of passes were they?" . . . She then reemphasizes moving to an open space on offense and executing short, quick passes by asking students, "Why do these strategies work so well?" . . . Emily then blows the whistle to restart game play. (Emily, Field Notes, Lesson 8, Speedball Unit, Grade 5)

> Kenny has students get behind a designated coned area with their team color . . . Students are assigned to designated areas to play one another. . . . Teams start playing. . . . There are 6–7 players per team all playing at the same time on a quarter of the gym space. . . . Kenny organizes two teams on the last court in their straight lines (9 players on each side). They are to practice tossing back and forth and rotating to the end of the line. . . . He then organizes the teams to play again. (Kenny, Field Notes, Lesson 4, Lascoop Unit, Grade 3)

Pedagogies employed within the model. Despite a considerable emphasis in their methods courses on using indirect teaching styles within TGfU units, both PTs' pedagogies were predominantly direct and featured practice-style teaching:

> Kenny has students get behind a designated coned area with their team color. . . . Students are then assigned to designated areas to play one another. . . . He approaches a student and

says, "This is how you want to bat." . . . He then shows the proper stance and fixes the student's feet. . . . He then says, "You want to hit it away from her, and you hit it right to her." . . . He then shouts to the rest of the children, "Hit away from the pitcher." (Kenny, Field Notes, Lesson 1, Cricket Unit, Grade 3)

Informal and stimulated recall interviews also revealed that PTs were focused on using a repertoire of effective teaching behaviors with particular emphasis on "establishing rules, routines, and expectations"; creating momentum and flow; and providing optimal levels of "engaged skill learning time" and adequate "performance" and "motivational feedback." Furthermore, Kenny was keen that his students were well "organized" and Emily put a premium on students "really listening" to her.

In direct contrast to the requirements of the model, both PTs also revealed a lack of flexibility in their teaching. Again, Kenny was the worst offender in this regard. Observations indicated that both PTs usually followed their original lesson plans faithfully and were not willing or able to make alterations based on students' needs. The rigidity in their thinking was also apparent in their stimulated recall interviews:

I spent a lot of time on my lesson plans to make sure I was as organized and as prepared as possible, so I pretty much just stuck to those. I tried to make sure I didn't stray from them too much. (Emily, Stimulated Recall Interview)

Finally, PTs also found it "difficult" to "identify tactical issues" on which to focus, to ask questions about tactics and strategies, and to teach within game play. Lesson plans were for the most part devoid of tactical problems to be examined and example lead questions on tactics and strategies to be asked. Because both PTs were excessively plan dependent and inflexible, they rarely focused on major tactical issues within their classes. Emily admitted in her stimulated recall interview that she "should have done a better job with the strategies and tactics" because the focus on skills was essentially "pretty easy to do." For the majority of the PTs' internships, most questions includ-

ed in lesson plans or asked during lessons were either skill- ("When you kick, should you use the inside or outside part of your foot?") or rule-focused ("What does every game start off with?"). Toward the end of her internship, however, Emily started to plan and ask tactical questions ("What do you think you are supposed to do with more players in this situation?"). Unfortunately, if students were unable to answer her initial question, Emily did not possess the ability to ask a follow-up question that was simplified or modified.

Both PTs were also relatively quiet during the game play segments of their lessons compared to the isolated skill practices they organized, during which they provided liberal amounts of performance and motivational feedback. Emily was the more engaged of the two PTs within game play segments, but her interaction with the students was usually aimed at motivating them ("Nice pass, [Dameon]! Did you all notice how he looked for the open player?"), and during her stimulated recall interview, she relayed that she "felt that [she] spent more time correcting the rules than [providing] actual feedback about the performance and decisions made." Kenny's level of interaction with his students during game play segments was low at the beginning of his internship and "tailed off" to the point that it was virtually nonexistent. The rationale for this pattern of behavior, provided in his stimulated recall interview, was that he had come to realize that his students "just needed to play so they would figure it out."

Factors Influencing PTs' Reading About and Teaching TGfU

Acculturation. Two key elements of the PTs' acculturation appeared to be partially responsible for the orientations with which they entered PETE and the ways in which they read about and taught TGfU units during their teaching internships. These were their involvement in conservative forms of sport and their own schooling.

Involvement in conservative forms of sport. In congruence with many other PTs (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009), Emily and Kenny were initially attracted to careers in PE based on their "love" of children and their early, continued, and for the most part, positive involvement in physical activity and sport inside and outside the school setting:

> I played lots of sports growing up. . . . I just like working with kids and I felt that PE was my strong suit . . . since I can't play anymore. PE was a way to still keep up with my love of sports. (Kenny, Formal Interview 1)

Having played a "variety" of organized youth sports in her early childhood, during high school, Emily specialized in soccer, which she "had played [her] whole life," and basketball. When he was a child, Kenny participated in organized sports within "recreation leagues." During his early adolescence, he played traditional team games, but in high school, he "just did baseball." This focus and Kenny's athletic ability led to him "playing baseball for two years" at a local community college.

Emily and Kenny spent their childhood and youth participating mainly in "traditional" sports that were "coach controlled," which guaranteed that they made few decisions about tactics or strategies. To the contrary, they learned that coaches made decisions and players played. Because Kenny had participated in a major male American team sport at a higher level than Emily, his experiences, in this sense, were more extreme. It was, then, not surprising that he and Emily found it difficult to let their students make tactical and strategic decisions in PE.

PTs' own schooling. The PTs' apprenticeship of observation also influenced their future career and pedagogical choices. Although their elementary PE teachers used "direct styles of teaching" and were "very traditional," Emily and Kenny rated them as "great" and "good" because they "kept children active the whole time and always taught different games" (Emily), "didn't have free play" (Kenny), and "had certain things [they] had to do," including a "fitness unit each year [for] which [students] got rewarded for reaching fitness goals" (Kenny). Moreover, both PTs decided to train to be PE teachers partly based on the modeling that these elementary teachers provided:

> It was all because of my elementary teacher. . . . She was so great. She kept us active the whole time, we never sat down, and we were always playing. She always taught us different games. . . . I just loved her and just loved PE. . . . From elementary on, I just wanted to be a PE teacher. (Emily, Formal Interview 1)

The pedagogies modeled by their elementary teachers had a positive effect on Emily and Kenny despite running counter to the requirements within TGfU, but those of their middle and high school PE teachers had a neutral or negative effect. This was because both PTs experienced nonteaching middle school PE teachers who "rolled out the ball" and would "help [students] with basketball because that's all she cared about" (Emily) and "pretty much [supervised] free play every day" (Kenny). In addition, their high school teachers had strong coaching orientations and allowed Emily and Kenny to bypass their (admittedly weak) PE programs and, ironically, use the time to train for their extracurricular sports instead with a specific focus on honing their "techniques and strategies."

Orientations to teaching and coaching. Both PTs' acculturation was conservative and similar. However, because Emily's elementary PE teacher had such a big effect on her, Emily entered PETE with a teaching orientation and clearly viewed coaching as a career contingency, and because Kenny was relatively successful in a traditional form of sport, Kenny entered the same program with a "moderate coaching orientation" (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008), meaning he was still open to teaching curricular PE "properly" even if it was not his priority. These two perspectives were still intact at the time of the study:

> I feel like I have a strong voice and strong opinion about teaching. . . . I am very organized and I feel that a teacher needs to have a plan and follow through with that plan every day. . . . I want students to understand what they are doing, why they are doing it, and how to do it the correct way. (Emily, Formal Interview 1)

> My first career choice is to be a teacher . . . and I know a lot of schools around here . . . need help because . . . I've talked to a lot of people. . . . They have said . . . if you ever get this job, in an interview, say you would be able to help out and coach . . . and that's when I would step in. (Kenny, Formal Interview 2)

Crucially, these teaching and coaching perspectives had served to filter the messages the two PTs had received about TGfU during

their PETE and continued to influence their teaching of it during their internships.

Professional socialization. The PTs' TGfU-PETE contradicted and competed with their prior socialization. Because of his more conservative acculturation, and because he entered the program with a coaching orientation, the contradiction and competition of the TGfU model with what Kenny considered to be "good" PE pedagogy was much greater than it was for Emily with her teaching orientation.

Influence of PTs' TGfU-PETE prior to the teaching internship. Both PTs were generally complimentary about the package of strategies, methods, and experiences the faculty had put together for TGfU-PETE prior to their teaching internships. Emily was particularly positive about the "book [Mitchell et al., 2006] that gave you a bunch of ideas for games for understanding." Kenny noted that he often referred to "sample" games in the textbook, "but [that] a lot of time [he had] used the Internet trying to find interesting games that kids [had never] played before." By contrast, Emily lamented that only one EFE was focused on TGfU and Kenny explained that it was difficult trying to teach large classes using TGfU during his internship because he had only taught relatively small classes during the TGfU EFE:

> I would have liked better to actually teach more because I feel like for one of the classes we were in there for so long just learning all these games, which was helpful, but it was too long of a time to spend in a classroom. We could have quickly gone over it . . . and sent us off. So, I feel like I didn't have enough time to incorporate all those games I learned into my teaching. (Emily, Formal Interview 1)

> I think it [the TGfU EFE] is mainly focused on the small classes . . . When I'm teaching 10 kids and there is enough equipment for . . . 10 kids . . . but when I have 50 you start to think about . . . am I going to have enough [equipment] and trying to keep as many people as I can active for most of the period of time. (Kenny, Formal Interview 1)

Both PTs also indicated that they saw a contradiction and contrast between the direct nature, control, and safety of the foundational pedagogies (i.e., behaviors based on the research on effective instruction and management) they were being taught and the indirect nature, relative lack of control, and risk involved with employing TGfU:

> I'm a little hesitant about teaching TGfU. . . . I mean we have only done it with about 10 kids, and now I'm going to be teaching 70 or so. . . . It might be kind of chaotic at first, and I might be more comfortable with skill themes. (Emily, Formal Interview 1)

Teaching internship. Several elements of the teaching internship had a pronounced effect on the degree of success the PTs achieved when implementing their TGfU units. In line with previous socialization research (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008; Curtner-Smith et al., 2007; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009), these were facilities and equipment, CTs, students, and class size. In general, these elements had a positive effect on Emily's teaching and a negative effect on Kenny's instruction.

Facilities and equipment. Emily had access to "a good-sized gym" and "a lot of field space." Moreover, she often noted that she had "plenty of equipment for students . . . especially during the practice." In contrast, Kenny taught on the outfield of a baseball field and "struggled" when he taught "inside on half of the gym for 50 kids." Moreover, Kenny was hampered by a lack of equipment. Despite these issues, Kenny optimistically noted that he had "always said, 'ya know, you can make do with what you have, even if you don't have a lot.' . . . I try to keep as many students as I can physically active."

CTs. The CTs who supervised Emily (Leslie) and Kenny (Vaughn) had been through the same PETE program as the PTs and were in the same cohort 19 years prior to the study. At this stage in their careers, however, Leslie possessed a strong teaching orientation and Vaughn, who was also the head football coach at the local high school, was coaching oriented. This meant that Emily received more support for her teaching than Kenny, particularly in "helpful ways of going about teaching a large group of students . . . making sure lessons [were]

safe and that students [were] constantly being active." Vaughn was not nearly as structured as Leslie, and consequently, conditions for Kenny's teaching were less favorable. In addition, Vaughn seemed more interested in helping Kenny move into an extracurricular coaching role than in improving his teaching and was quick to voice his approval of Kenny coaching baseball at a local middle school while he was completing his internship as it would help him "get his foot in the door." Vaughn also noted that during his training, TGfU "was different than what it is now . . . this play, practice, play stuff. What's that?"

Students. The children in Emily's and Kenny's classes also had a profound effect on the PTs' ability to employ the TGfU model. Although her class sizes were larger than Kenny's, Emily's students were relatively well behaved and enthusiastic, allowing her to experiment with the model with confidence:

> Students are very attentive while Emily tells them which team will be playing one another. . . . Students are anxious to begin playing the game. . . . When a ball is hit too high through the goal (a rule Emily established for safety purposes), students look around to see if she saw because it was "accidental" and don't want to sit out . . . Students who are substitutes are highly engaged and cheer for their teammates as they wait their turn. (Emily, Field Notes, Lesson 6, Speedball Unit, Grade 5)

In contrast, Kenny's students were often poorly behaved, and understandably, this made him wary of using the indirect teaching styles called for when working within TGfU. Moreover, they frequently resisted his attempts at using the model:

> Kenny assigns students to their designated fields. Teams consist of 6 to 8 students. . . . He asks certain teams to begin playing, but they are unorganized. . . . Exasperated, Kenny says, "Y'all are trying to stop them from scoring. . . . I told you several times . . . you have to pass it. . . ." Two girls on the first field get bored because no one is passing them the ball and choose to sit down by the fence. . . . Other students

> are arguing with Kenny about who has possession of the ball. (Kenny, Field Notes, Lesson 2, Ultimate Frisbee Unit, Grade 3)

Both PTs also expressed their concern about their students' relative lack of skill and experience in the activities they were teaching. They were also skeptical about their ability to comprehend and use anything more than the most straightforward tactics and strategies:

> The students don't have the skill level I thought they would coming in to this. . . . I have broken down the practices into basic stuff, especially for the third graders. . . . I would normally just do skill themes with these kids, but I see this as a challenge for myself to stick with the games for understanding. (Kenny, Informal Interview, Ultimate Frisbee Unit)

Conclusions

Assuming the results of this study transfer to other PTs and programs, its implications for TGfU-PETE can be divided into (a) recruitment and selection of PTs and (b) training PTs to use TGfU during methods courses, EFEs, and the culminating teaching internship. In line with previous research and commentary (Curtner-Smith, 2012), this study implies that PETE faculty have more chance of "selling" TGfU to PTs with teaching orientations than to those with coaching orientations. Given the relatively small potential pool of teaching-oriented recruits in the United States, in addition to identifying PTs with this background, PETE faculty also need to consider strategies that may help them sell the model to PTs with moderate coaching orientations, who can be turned. The most obvious of these may be emphasizing the origins and connections of TGfU in and with "real" sport and the potential to decrease managerial issues by increasing the ratio of instructional game play to skill practice. Overtly contrasting the effectiveness of the pedagogies employed in TGfU and traditional teaching in terms of instruction, relevance, and management, as has been done with some success by those training PTs to use the SE curriculum model (Curtner-Smith, 2012), may also be of use.

This study also indicates that PETE faculty should consider giving priority to a number of issues when designing their TGfU-PETE packages and seeking internship placements. The first of these is debunking the idea that foundational and TGfU pedagogies are oppositional and incompatible. The second is asking PTs to examine the current obsession with keeping students "active" and "moving" for health-related purposes when such actions, taken to an extreme, may inhibit learning. The key concept here is that gaining more complex tactical and strategic knowledge may necessitate pauses in game play for explanation and reflection. The third is the search for decent school environments in which interns can practice the model, which may necessitate vetting potential CTs and training them to use the TGfU model during in-service sessions.

As the PTs in the study noted, and as has been suggested for other curricular models (Curtner-Smith, 2012), PETE faculty also need to include a series of graded EFEs so PTs can begin teaching the model using familiar content in relatively controlled, simple, and safe environments (e.g., peer teaching, teaching small classes of students) and gradually progress to teaching less familiar content in contexts that are more complex and realistic. In this study, it appeared that too little time was spent on practicing the model prior to the internship and that the jump from teaching TGfU in one EFE to teaching the model to large classes within the internship was too great.

The study also highlights the need to prioritize helping PTs to acquire the skills to teach within small-sided games, particularly asking questions about tactics and strategies. This may involve PETE faculty attempting to socialize PTs into using TGfU, focusing much of their initial effort on deconstructing the way PTs think about games and games teaching. Subsequently, faculty can then reconstruct this knowledge by employing a games-centered constructivist approach. Strategies that could be employed to achieve this goal include faculty modeling and requiring PTs to study expert TGfU teachers (live and on film), participate in TGfU units as students, reflect on film of their teaching using a modified stimulated recall protocol, code film of their teaching with relevant systematic observation instruments, and engage in specific practice with feedback. In addition, the study indicates that faculty focus on aiding PTs to identify tactical problems and issues that students have within game play. This

may also be achieved through modeling and practice. Conversely, an increase in the number of courses aimed at improving PTs' content and pedagogical content knowledge may be necessary. Finally, faculty may have a relatively narrow focus and modest expectations when PTs first attempt to use the model, perhaps only holding them accountable for designing a series of small-sided and conditioned games without having to react to students. Once PTs are comfortable with this process, other aspects of TGfU pedagogy could be layered on this foundation. These include focusing on one tactical problem at a time, asking progressively more complex questions in game play, and conditioning and modifying games in reaction to students' responses. Further research to examine the effectiveness of these pedagogical strategies, in terms of socializing PTs to employ TGfU effectively, would be useful. As well as conducting case studies, those who engage in this research may gain by employing an action research model.

References

Bunker, D., & Thorpe, R. (1982). A model for the teaching of games in secondary schools. *Bulletin of Physical Education, 18(1),* 5–8.

Casey, A. (2014). Models-based practice: Great white hope or white elephant? *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 19,* 18–34. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2012.726977

Chandler, T., & Mitchell, S. (1990). Reflections on "models of games education." *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 61*(6), 19–21. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07303084.1990.10604541

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 beginning teachers' interpretation and delivery of sport education. *Sport, Education, and Society, 13,* 97–117. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13573320701780779

Curtner-Smith, M. D., Woodruff, E. A., Stran, M. E., Zmudy, M., Oh, J. I., & Zengaro, F. (2007, March). *Preservice teachers' conceptions of teaching within skill theme, games for understanding, and sport education units.* Paper presented at the National AAHPERD conference, Baltimore, MD.

Doolittle, S. A., Dodds, P., & Placek, J. H. (1993). Persistence of beliefs about teaching during formal training of preservice teachers [Monograph]. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 12,* 355–365.

Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). *Ethnography and qualitative design in education research.* Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Lawson, H. A. (1983a). Toward a model of teacher socialization in physical education: Entry into schools, teachers' role orientations, and longevity in teaching. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 3,* 3–15.

Lawson, H. A. (1983b). Toward a model of teacher socialization in physical education: The subjective warrant, recruitment, and teacher education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 2,* 3–16.

Li, C., & Cruz, A. (2008). Pre-service teachers' occupational socialization experiences on teaching games for understanding. *New Horizons in Education, 56*(3), 20–30.

Light, R., & Tan, S. (2006). Culture, embodied experience, and teachers' development of TGfU in Australia and Singapore. *European Physical Education Review, 12*(1), 99–117. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1356336X06060659

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

McNeill, M. C., Fry, J. M., Wright, S. C., Tan, C., & Rossi, T. (2008). Structuring time and questioning to achieve tactical awareness in games lessons. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 13,* 231–249. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17408980701345766

McNeill, M. C., Fry, J. M., Wright, S. C., Tan, W. K. C., Tan, K. S. S., & Schempp, P. G. (2004). 'In the context:' Singaporean challenges to teaching games on practicum. *Sport, Education, and Society, 9,* 3–32. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1357332042000175791

Mitchell, S. A., Oslin, J. L., & Griffin, L. L. (2006). *Teaching sport concepts and skills: A tactical games approach* (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Nash, M. (2009). Using the idea of "communities of practice" and TGfU to develop physical education pedagogy among primary generalist pre-service teachers. *Asian Journal of Exercise and Sports Science, 6*(1), 15–21.

Peters, J., & Shuck, L. (2009). Breaking down the barriers: Insights into using a student centred games approach in Australian and Malaysian pre-service settings. *Australian Council for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 56*(3–4), 29–35.

Randall, L. (2003). Preservice teachers' understanding of the teaching games for understanding approach to content delivery. *Avante, 9*(1), 49–61.

Roberts, S. (2007). The motivational effects of incorporating teaching games for understanding within a sport education season. *Physical Education Matters, 2*(2), 41–46.

Sofo, S., & Curtner-Smith, M. D. (2010). Development of preservice teachers' value orientations during a secondary methods course and early field experience. *Sport, Education, and Society, 15,* 347–365. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2010.493314

Stran, M., & Curtner-Smith, M. D. (2009). Influence of occupational socialization on two preservice teachers' interpretation and delivery of the sport education model. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 28,* 38–53.

Thorpe, R., Bunker, D., & Almond, L. (1984). Four fundamentals for planning a games curriculum. *Bulletin of Physical Education, 20*(1), 24–29.

Wang, C. L., & Ha, A. S. (2009). Pre-service teachers' perceptions of teaching games for understanding: A Hong Kong perspective. *European Physical Education Review, 15,* 407–429. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1356336X09364724

Wang, C. L., & Ha, A. S. (2012). Factors influencing pre-service teachers' perceptions of teaching games for understanding: A constructivist perspective. *Sport, Education, and Society, 17,* 261–280. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2011.607954

Wright, S., McNeill, M., & Fry, J. (2009). The tactical approach to teaching games from teaching, learning, and mentoring perspectives. *Sport, Education, and Society, 14,* 223–244. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13573320902809153