

Knowing in Primary Physical Education in the UK: Negotiating Movement Culture

Knowing in Primary Physical Education in the UK: Negotiating Movement Culture

Abstract

This paper aims to understand how pupils and teachers actions-in-context constitute being-a-pupil and being-a-teacher within a primary school PE movement culture. Dewey & Bentley's (1949/1991) theory of transaction, which views organism-in-environment-as-a-whole, enables the researcher to explore how actions-in-on-going activities constitute and negotiate PE movement culture. To achieve the latter a point of departure is required from the constant flow of actions-in-on-going activities. This can be located by analysing the intentional and unintentional direction of actions or ends-in-view of pupils and teachers (Dewey, 1934). Video footage from 7 primary school PE lessons from a school in the West Midlands in the UK was analysed by focussing upon the ends-in-view of actions as they appeared through the educational content (what) and pedagogy (how) (Quay & Stolz, 2014) of the recorded PE experiences. Findings indicated that the movement culture within the school was a monoculture of looks-like-sport characterised by the privileging of the functional coordination of co-operative action. Three themes of pupils' and teachers' negotiation of the movement culture emerged *U-Turning*, *Knowing the game* and *Moving into and out of games*. This movement culture required teachers to ensure pupils looked busy and reproduced co-operative looks-like-sport actions. In fulfilling this role, they struggled to negotiate between their knowledge of sport-for-real and directing pupils towards educational ends-in-view within games activities. Simply being good at sports was not a pre-requisite for pupils' success in this movement culture. In order to re-actualise their knowledge of sport, pupils were required to negotiate the teacher's 'how' and 'what' by exploring what constituted co-operative actions within the spatial and social dimensions of the activities they were set. These findings suggest that if PE is to be more than just the reproduction of codified sport, careful adjustment and consideration of ends-in-view is of great importance. Without regard for the latter there is potential to create significant complexity for both teachers and pupils beyond that required by learning and performing sport.

Key Words; Primary School, Physical Education, Sport, Movement Culture, Transaction.

Introduction

More than ninety years ago Dewey (1916) argued that learning in school requires pupils to understand not only the subject material they are being tasked to learn, but also their ‘teacher’s requirements’ and the ‘conventions and authority’ of the institutional environment within which they are studying (p.148). Using different theoretical perspectives, contemporary researchers have continued to explore this phenomenon (cf. Pollard, 1982; Renold, 2001; Benjamin, et al., 2003). Using Dewey’s concept of experience, Östman (2010) argues that negotiating these different cultural dimensions of schooling does not necessarily develop through explicit learning, but via a process of socialisation within the normativity of teaching and learning. From this perspective, pupil’s experiences in lessons can be understood in relation to educational content; the intentional and unintentional consequences of teacher’s and pupil’s actions (what), and the pedagogy; the tridimensional interaction of pupil, subject matter and educational activity (how) (cf. Quay & Stolz, 2014; Quennerstedt, et. al. 2011).

For Crum (1993) the ‘what’ and ‘how’ of Physical Education (PE) experiences are integral cultural parts of a consistently changing landscape of ‘movement culture’. He argues it is within this landscape that ‘people realise and experience important values, such as recreation, health, adventure, excitement, togetherness, performance, and self-realisation’ (p. 341). People act with differing purposes and motivations to achieve this realisation, as a result different types of movement cultures can be created (Crum 1992). This cultural mutuality between sport and PE is similarly emphasised by Banks (1993) who draws our attention to the mediation of PE experiences through pupils’ own personal experiences of sport and physical activity. He argues these are developed via their participation in movement cultures both within and beyond the school gates.

We would argue that this understanding of PE as movement cultures resides within a transactional theory of knowledge (cf. Garrison, 2001), in which people and their surroundings are mutually and simultaneously constituted in terms of what Dewey calls ‘organism-in-environment-as-a-whole’ (Dewey and Bentley, 1949, p. 103). People do not ‘interact’ with their locality but are continually in ‘transaction’ with a multidimensional world; experience thus becomes inseparable from situation because; ‘Experiences appear when people act in a situation and the situation emerges when people re-actualise their experiences in action’ (Östman, 2010, p. 81). One way to approach people’s actions with different purposes (Crum, 1992) is through Dewey’s concept of ends-in view (Garrison, 1999; Quennerstedt, 2013b). For Dewey (1938/1981) ends-in-view direct and re-direct these

actions and support participants to act intelligibly through a process of inquiry. Ends-in-view shape events by guiding this inquiry as a means to its own realisation, which is to secure and maintain functional coordination or stability with the environment (cf. Garrison, 2001). From this perspective PE movement cultures are constituted through transactions between teachers, pupils and their locality or actions-in-on-going events (cf. Quennerstedt, 2013b). In this view educational events cannot be isolated into separate parts, but are required to be seen as aspects of the individual, social and cultural dimensions of a PE movement culture, in which one aspect cannot be discussed without relationships to the others (cf. Rogoff, 1995). In PE movement cultures, learning is practical and embodied and therefore action becomes the point of departure to understand how they are constituted through ends-in-view (cf. Quennerstedt, 2012)

As with research within secondary school PE (cf. Rovegno & Dolly, 2006), exploration of PE movement cultures within primary schools has often focussed on the issues and content of teaching (cf. Jess & Collins, 2003; Garrett & Wrench, 2008). Some studies of PE have developed an understanding of pupils' perceptions of their PE experiences (cf. Mowling, et al. 2006). However, most studies have focussed upon the perspectives of non-specialists teachers (cf. Elliot et al. 2011) or sport coaches tasked with delivering PE lessons (cf. Smith, 2013). This research reveals that the 'education' of primary PE in the UK is subverted for narrow performance outcomes as it is shaped by competing sport, health and education discourses (cf. Ward, 2012). This literature describes a dominant PE movement culture which Kirk (2010) terms a 'PE as Sport Techniques'. From a national historical perspective he argues that this enduring idea of PE has been created through the historical practice of teaching techniques and skills mainly in isolation from their movement contexts. What is missing is an understanding of the extent to which this idea of PE is constituted in practice by teachers' and pupils' actions-in-ongoing-activities. By building on previous socio-cultural studies of learning in PE (cf. MacPhail et al., 2008; Quennerstedt et al., 2014; Ward & Quennerstedt, 2014) this paper explores PE movement cultures from a transactional perspective, in particular, how ends-in-view shape actions-in-ongoing events within the PE lessons of a UK primary school. The aim of this study is to explore how the ends-in-view of the participants shape the educational content (what) and pedagogy (how) of their lessons. In doing so we can say something about how pupils and teachers negotiate the constituted PE movement cultures.

Ends-in-view as units of analysis

Dewey and Bentley's (1949/1991) transactional perspective of knowledge used in this paper dissolves the dualism between internal and external, individual and environment (Beista and Burbules, 2003). This is achieved by understanding the environment as a mutually constituted location of 'enmeshed' (p. 244) physical and cultural conditions. It is through trans(actions) that the individual and their physical and cultural surroundings become united and through which learning occurs (Quennerstedt et al., 2011). Linehan and McCarthy's (2001) readings of situated perspectives on learning similarly suggest that as pupils act within a class they both appropriate and reconstruct the context within which they are participating. As a result they argue that 'individual' and 'community' are mutual and evolve from their relations, which include the sociocultural and personal contexts from which they emerge.

Dewey (1916) argues that 'knowing is literally something we do' (p. 367) and that forms of knowledge or objects become integral to a process of inquiry initiated by a motive to resolve a problem in order to 'secure and sustain functional co-ordination' (Garrison, 2001, p. 278). This inquiry is initiated from a requirement to resolve a physical need, emotional disharmony or cognitive doubt (Dewey, 1938/1981). To resolve this tension, action becomes directed towards different directions and different ends or 'ends-in-view' (Dewey, 1934/81, p.10). According to Garrison (2001) ends-in-view are not fixed but are adjusted at every stage of the process of inquiry in order to create a 'newly assured, smoothly fitting ... stabilized situation' (Boisvert, 1998, p.39). Even play activities, which are often regarded as being free of particular 'ends', are subject to ends-in-view. Whilst these may not be represented as external objectives constituted by the social or physical environment, play is governed by the self-regulation of action. Participants are considered free and thus playful because they are able to change their ends-in-view if fulfilment is not being achieved (Garrison, 2001). Garrison (2001) argues this idea of playfulness in the process of inquiry adopts a creative "non-teleological interpretation of intentionality" (Joas, 1996 cited by Garrison, 2001; p.280) in which teleological goals form subfunctions of functional coordination. Ends-in-view allow intelligent action by acting as plans which direct and redirect action to shape the course of events by allowing us to "see where we are going" (Garrison, 1999; p. 293). When experiences within events are confirmed and not overturned, inquiry is no longer necessary and the situation becomes stable (Garrison, 2001). From this theoretical perspective, knowledge is not something that is certain and truthful, but contextual and temporal, which emerges from a stable outcome of inquiry.

The integral role of ends-in-view in the achievement of functional coordination makes them a valuable unit of analysis of activity (Garrison, 2001). PE movement cultures are then constituted through ends-in-view represented within the educational content; the intentional and unintentional consequences of teacher's and pupil's actions (what), and the pedagogy; the tridimensional interaction of pupil, subject matter and educational activity (how) (Quay & Stolz, 2014). By exploring these ends-in-view in relation to the achievement of functional coordination, we can say something about how teachers and pupils negotiate different situations in PE practice in order to achieve this stability within the constituted movement culture.

Methods

Research Design

To capture what Dewey calls actions-in-ongoing-activities within the everyday context of primary school PE lessons using the insights from a transactional perspective, an observational case study was conducted (Öhman & Quennerstedt, 2012). Video-recordings were made of an opportunistic sample (Bryman, 2008) of 7 Year 5 and 6 PE lessons within a state maintained urban primary school. This larger than average school of approximately 500 pupils aged 3-11 was situated in a large town in the West Midlands.

Ethical Considerations

Careful consideration was made to the process of gathering the visual data before ethical approval of the study was granted by a University Ethics Committee. When seeking consent from all stake holders, particularly pupils, the aim was to be sensitive to the impact of power relations on decisions to agree to be involved (Robson, 2011). These issues were minimised through the provision of clear and concise information, opportunities for pupils and parents to discuss the study and emphasis on the aim that it would present no change in the ongoing PE lessons taught. Video cameras and iPads were also filtered into and then out of PE lessons to support the children's informed consent for the study, by providing opportunities for them view and reflect upon seeing visual representations of themselves (Robson, 2011). This strategy was adopted until the researcher and camera became less obvious and an accepted part of the everyday, on-going practices within the PE lessons (Robson, 2011). All footage was deleted immediately after the lessons. Lessons included in the study were filmed using a mini-digital camera held by the researcher. Only two children declined to be involved in the study and great attention was paid to ensuring they were not

deliberately filmed or featured in any background of the footage. Whilst posing an additional challenge to the filming process this was necessary to comply with the children's wishes. Instances where these children unintentionally appeared in the films were not used in the study.

Data Analysis

Despite the collection of 7½ hours of film, a complete and comprehensive sociocultural account of how students and teachers negotiate movement cultures within the school was very difficult if not impossible to achieve. Video-recordings can only produce selective data and obtaining personal distance during the interpretation of data is a methodological impossibility (Öhman & Quennerstedt, 2012). In the analysis we focused on the ends-in-view of the event, i.e. actions that allow participants to act intelligibly in relation to both the content (what) and the pedagogy (how) of the event (see e.g. Quennerstedt, 2013a and 2013b). To achieve this, the functions of different actions in the observed situation, lead the analysis. In order to best understand the functions and directions of actions of both teachers and pupils, each of the 7 lessons were first observed in their entirety. Initial field notes were developed which recorded particular events such as those where particular pupils or groups of pupils for example, acted against the main flow of direction of actions. These events were then revisited and specific interactions, content and sequencing of actions noted. The labelling of the latter then directed further in-depth analysis which used detailed transcripts of embodied and spoken actions, including the locality and involvement of artefacts (Öhman & Quennerstedt, 2012). Each group of 'event' transcripts were then analysed individually and collectively examining the relations between the directions of actions and the educational content (what) and pedagogy (how) of the event. This process was first completed separately by the researchers, followed by analysis of both sets of findings. Differences in the latter were exposed to further analysis and examples of corroborated findings were selected as examples of the emergent themes.

Findings

Despite the differences in adults leading and pupils participating in the observed lessons consistent relations in the directions of actions existed which constituted a singular movement culture. Unlike 'PE as Sport Techniques', identified by Kirk (2010), a hybrid form of movement culture was created. Rather than re-enacting competitive sport, the teachers directed pupil's actions using stage-managed games and co-operative practices in

which tension was controlled so as to produce busy looking, but controlled activity. These ends-in-view guided the functional coordination of action to create a mono-movement culture of *looks-like-sport* (cf. Ward and Quennerstedt, 2014). This movement culture was not static or predictable and as action unfolded and both the teachers and pupils were engaged in consistently negotiating their experiences in order to achieve stability in the functional coordination of their actions. Following further data analysis three themes of negotiating the movement culture emerged; (i) *U-turning*, (ii) *Knowing the game* and (iii) *Playing into and out of games*.

U-Turning

As the broader consequences of the direction of pupils' actions became visually explicit to the teachers, it was evident that the teachers' ends-in-view often changed direction. These changes often constituted a U-turn of preceding ends-in-view and were examples of the teachers' own negotiation of the looks-like-sport movement culture. These points of redirection arose primarily when the pupils' actions contravened the everybody looking busy prerequisite of the movement culture. Whilst small proportions of pupils spectating were tolerated as they provided legitimacy to the sport-like action, it was clear that larger groups of seated audiences could not be condoned. The resultant changes in direction of pupils' actions were reflective of their teachers' struggles with games activities. These issues were founded in ends-in-view directed towards sport-like-action, yet constrained by an obligation to direct pupils to functionally coordinate co-operative actions. By changing the 'how', teachers tried to alter the 'what' of experience, moving along a line of competitive exclusory and inclusive co-operative outcomes.

For example, after splitting a class of 28 year 6 pupils into 2 teams, the teacher explains the rules of a version of rounders. A long line of batters await their turn, they entertain themselves by playing sword fights with their bats or chatting. The teacher stands in the middle of the square made by the four posts, orchestrating the game by instructing the fielders on where to throw the ball and the batters on when to run:

Leon who is on first post misses a catch to get a batter out, Teacher: "right lets change the field, Mel you go on first and Leon come into the middle.....Catch the ball Daniel! Yeahh! [claps]" The batter is caught out by the bowler, but it goes unnoticed by the players." Various innings are played and the teacher calls the pupils to change over their batting and fielding roles. No scores are kept. Teacher: "Right has everyone had three goes?" David: "He had four!" Teacher: "Ahhh do not argue with me or you will not even get a go next time! This time when we are playing when you are out you're out! You've got 15 minutes each team!"

Teachers particularly struggled with generating competition between pupils and in this game of rounders for example, notions of competitive sport were upheld by the teacher calling ‘outs’ and the pupils shouting ‘Rounder! Rounder!’. However, in order to ensure a flow of play and maintain the everybody-looking-busy condition of the movement culture, the teacher was required to create quasi-competitive action between teams rather than privileging pupils to outwit their opponents at every opportunity. This end-in-view was manufactured by stage managing functionally co-operative actions between teams, characterised by the absence of scoring and creation of fragile low-level tension between players in the field. When pupils’ drifting attention threatened this end-in-view the teacher was required to consistently negotiate and redirect players’ attention to their role in maintaining the flow of co-ordinated play.

Teachers’ experiences of directing action away from competition towards more co-operative ends-in-view were less problematic as they were more aligned with the looks-like-sport movement culture. For example, the original end-in-view for a Year 6 tennis lesson was to use controlled rallying shots to play a doubles game. The provision of one solitary net placed a sole game of doubles for 4 pupils at the centre of this lesson, whilst the remainder of the class were limited to practicing or adopting a spectator role. As the lesson progressed, a critical mass of pupils shifted from practicing to sitting down in the vicinity of the game. This direction of action jarred against the everybody-looking-busy movement culture:

A doubles game is built into a 6 vs 6 as sitting pupils ask if they can join in. Teacher: “30 love! I tell you what keep the ball going. That’s it.” The teacher joins in and she encourages the pupils to have as many hits as needed to send it over to the other side of the court. The pupils comply with enthusiasm.

By discarding the doubles game and allowing sitting pupils to join in a mass rally game the teacher redirected action by 180°. The ease in the creation and success of this new direction of action was a result of its dovetail fit with the functional coordination of co-operative actions that lay at the heart of the looks-like-sport movement culture. These illustrations of teachers’ struggles with re-actualising sport-for-real within the movement culture were matched by the pupils’ own negotiation of the ‘how’ and ‘what’ of their PE experiences. Whilst some faced significant difficulties with re-actualising their knowledge of sport-for-real others were more successful.

Knowing the game

Re-actualising knowledge of sport-for-real within this looks-like-sport movement culture required careful negotiation, grounded in knowing the rules of engagement of the

tasks set. This did not focus upon the reproduction of sport-for-real, but the need to explore the boundaries of the movement culture in order to discover alternative directions of action to which led to stability in the functional coordination of their actions. In tennis, rather than hitting recognisable shots with the aim of making them difficult to return or to “whack it... as anyone can do that!” (Teacher), Year 6 pupils were tasked with hitting co-operative passes to each other in pairs:

Three pairs of girls are outside a fenced area on the school playground and a Learning Support Assistant (LSA) is positioned in the locality. The girls rally with varying success and at one point partners are running frantically across the playground to retrieve balls. LSA: “right all of you come in”. Various girls reply: “What me?...No?...All of us?” LSA: “Yes, all of you!” Jemma: “Why are you going to get told off?” LSA: “No, right, stand that far away from your partner [she holds up arms up and hands apart]...your ball should not be going down there!” Jemma: “She [points to her partner Kayleigh] hits it diagonal, she hits it like this!” Jemma demonstrates with her racket. LSA: “Look give the racket to me”. She reaches to take Kayleigh’s racket and explains how to hit it showing an underarm hit with a restricted swing. Jemma: “But professional players don’t bend down and do this!” She stands with her feet apart and swings her racket between them as if hitting a ball. LSA: “But you are not a professional!” She repeats the instruction to stand close and “make sure the ball does not go everywhere!” Jemma: “But I’m a professional...look!” She does reproduce a double handed forehand shot with a big back swing and follow without the ball. Jemma: “But Miss imagine if you were in a tennis game and did that”. She demonstrates little hits with her racket while the LSA walks off and organises the other pairs.

In this example the LSA fulfilled her role as custodian of the teacher’s ends-in-view by reinforcing the replication of the looks-like-sport action. The pupils, however, struggled with the ‘how’ and ‘what’ of hitting reciprocally and more significantly for Jemma, the resultant experience actually had little meaning. This was made clear in her open critique of the authenticity of the ‘what’ of the task through her re-actualisation of knowledge of the sport of tennis. However, negotiation of her difficulties with her experience was cut abruptly short by the LSA moving away. Jemma’s exploration and direct challenging of the teacher’s ends-in-view at the boundaries of the movement culture lead her with nowhere to go.

In contrast in Jemma’s direct challenge to the teacher’s ends-in-view, a small number of pupils chose to negotiate difficulties with the task and change their experience by approaching the teacher directly. This direction of action however, placed both the pupils’ partnership and their ability to learn under the direct judgement of the teacher. Such action thus heightened the requirement to either succeed at the task or to demonstrate a concerted effort to meet the teacher’s ends-in-view. When both pupils and teacher were met with failure the teacher was required to create a different experience which still met her ends-in-view but was achievable for the pupils concerned. The solution offered negated the need for functionally coordinated action in pairs, by directing pupils to self-tip a ball on their racket. Less forthcoming pairs within the class suffering difficulties with the task or those paired

with unco-operative ‘whackers’ of the ball, unofficially pounced upon this legitimate solitary alternative to create a new independent looks-like-tennis experience.

A different direction in altering their looks-like-tennis experience was also initiated within a very similar co-operative rallying experience in a Year 5 tennis lesson. However, in this case changes to both the ‘what’ and ‘how’ of the task crashed into a similar barrier as Jemma:

Teacher: “OK....what I would like you to do is just practice by passing the ball to each other without a net OK?...” Jordan walks away from the group and bounces the ball on his racket. Shane does the same then hits two forehand shots in a row using the side netting of the tennis court. Jordan copies him. Teacher: “... If you carry on boys there will be no PE or ICT this afternoon! You will [be removed from the lesson].”

Shane and Jordan’s ends-in-view were made very explicit through their choice to hit-for-real against the fence. This action was solitary and unco-operative and involved a less defined and more uncontrollable product. It clashed completely with the ‘what’ and ‘how’ of the teacher’s ends-in-view and created consequences for both boys beyond their immediate lesson. Clashing with the teacher’s ends-in-view was overlooked, such as taking unofficial temporary breaks from rallying, as long as it did not interfere with the direction of actions of the majority of the class. In Shane’s and Jordan’s case they made the big mistake of mistiming and miss-locating a radical alteration of the intended experience, directly in the locality of the teacher and immediately after the task instruction. Their direct challenge to the ‘how’ and ‘what’ of the teacher’s ends-in-view created severe consequences of threats of being removed from their PE lesson and potential exclusion from other curricula experiences. This was an example of the high level of conformity to co-operative activity expected within the movement culture. In order for pupils to re-actualise their knowledge of the sports being acted out, negotiating the ‘how’ and ‘what’ of the experiences required more subtle and intelligent alteration to the teacher’s ends-in-view. This lay in the subtle exploration of the social and physical boundaries of the movement culture.

For some Year 6 pupils understanding the spatial margins of the locality enabled them to create a different experience by reconciling a desire to hit for real in tennis within the co-operative passing task. A key facilitator of this action was the freedom granted by the teacher to use space outside of a fenced area. This was accompanied by the pupils’ understanding that greater space between them provided sufficient opportunity to hit for real, whilst allowing errors in their accuracy. By positioning themselves outside of the fenced area, on the social periphery of the class, these pupils ensured they did not interfere with others.

Working co-operatively and being further away from the teacher's gaze also lowered the risk of any potential clash of their change in the 'what' with the teacher's desire for pupils not to 'whack' the ball.

Similar insightful negotiation of the 'how' of their experience was also achieved by a pair of Year 6 boys who chose to re-actualise their knowledge of the sport of tennis, this time in the form of playing a game:

In the vicinity of the teacher, who is rallying with a boy, two other boys appear to be using two lines about 5m apart as side-lines to their court. There is no actual net. Daniel shouts out the score "30-30" as his partner retrieves the ball. Jay, his partner retakes his position and does a self-fed bounce forehand hit to serve. Daniel returns, Jay replies and then Daniel misses and shouts "40-30". He does the same type of serve back. Jay returns, Daniel hits and Jay misses. Daniel waves his fist in Andy Murray style and circles it shouting "40-40"..... Bentley (excused PE) arrives who has been watching from outside while retrieving balls hit over the fence. He gradually becomes an umpire, however, the scores and order of play are still negotiated between the three boys.

Rather than hit for real, Daniel and Jay modified the co-operative passing task, using it as the basis to play a competitive game of singles. Occupying an acceptable space for the paired task within the fenced area, the boys utilised the presence of convenient side lines and the arrival of a willing spectator to authenticate their game. They maintained the passing action to both serve and return the ball and functionally co-ordinate their actions within their game. Due to the absence of base-lines and a net, this flow of play was interspersed by co-operative negotiations, particularly with Bentley, to decide the score. In this way, a game was created and indirectly approved by the teacher. In this negotiation everyone was satisfied; the teacher's ends-in-view were fulfilled and all three boys were able to re-actualise their knowledge of tennis.

Understanding the consequences of altering the 'how' of experience was central to the re-actualisation of knowledge of sport within this movement culture. Jemma's attempt to openly negotiate the 'what' of an experience ended in failure, particularly when it was directed at the custodian of the movement culture who was committed to ensuring the direct replication of the teacher's ends-in-view. Alternatively, seeking direct assistance from the teacher placed pressure on a partnership by admitting failure and by placing both parties under the direct judgement of the teacher. Such action required pupils to be committed to realising the teacher's ends-in-view by committing to learning under their immediate supervision. A more subtle route was to change the 'how' by copying a new practice offered to those who sought the teacher's assistance and create a different independent looks-like-tennis experience. Pupils who chose to radically challenge the 'what' and 'how' of their experiences such as Jordan and Shane, risked direct confrontation with the teachers' ends-in-

view. Successful forms of this line of negotiation required pupils to explore the boundaries of the movement culture. They were required to know how to avoid drawing unnecessary attention to their actions and to also understand how to adjust the spatial dimensions of the task. By applying this knowledge, these pupils perceptively altered their experience and were able to re-actualise their knowledge of the sport of tennis but remain aligned with the teacher's ends-in-view.

Playing into and out of games

Negotiating the need to functionally coordinate actions within tasks was also reflected in pupils' movements between different roles within large team games. This was achieved by changing the 'what' of their experience whilst contributing to the teacher's end-in-view; maintaining a supply of co-operative play in functionally managed action between teams. In rounders, for example, despite prescriptive management of the 'how' by the teacher which restricted the pupils' negotiating options, there existed space to regulating the 'what' of their experience. Within these looks-like-rounders games the 'how' was regulated through the direction of pupils' actions by the teacher, physical structure of the pitch and the pupils' skill levels. Apart from the key bowling, back-stop and first post roles, pupils were given free rein to find a position to field which provided these opportunities to negotiate different experiences:

A group of three girls have chosen to position themselves between second and third posts, one of them has moved from fourth post and chooses to sit down. One of the group, Shannon, approaches Crystal who is on second post. They exchange brief words (inaudible), Shannon puts her hands over her face which is mirrored by Crystal who adopts a body posture half facing Shannon and half facing play. Shannon attempts to drag Crystal's attention from the game and her duties, despite this she keeps her main focus on the game. Shannon gives up and joins the other two girls whom are now sitting on the floor. The ball has yet to go past the side of a rectangle [rounders pitches are comprised of 4 posts] between 2nd and 3rd post. The girls sit in this space and watch play as it is directed by the teacher who is positioned by the bowler There is an exciting moment in the game and Amy joins in the shouting..... Amy draws attention of teacher "What time is it miss?" On looking at the girls the teacher tells them to stand-up and approaches them. Teacher: "Amy go on a post!" Amy: "Noooo! Don't wanna do that!" Amy is encouraged to go on third post, the old third post comes off willingly. Shannon is sent forward into the rectangle and her actions become more animated, she fields a ball and receives praise from the teacher. The teacher positions herself next to Amy, and both girls remain standing for the remainder of the innings.

Crystal subtly negotiated between her friendship ties with Shannon and her end-in-view to adopt a defined functional role within the game. Amy and Shannon demonstrate understanding of the physical limitations of the game; the inability of nearly all the pupils to hit, created a dead zone of space in the outfield between 2nd and 3rd posts. They utilized this knowledge to create a spectating role, however, Amy then enlisted the teacher to broker a

new role for her in the game. The teacher obliged as they were blatantly contravening her end-in-view for everyone to be looking-like they were engaged within the game. Her verbal directions of Shannon re-engage her in a new active fielder role and her continual physical presence maintained Amy's looks-like-involvement as she remained standing. As the repetition of innings were played out, pupils rotated their positioning within the field, creating a flow of negotiations between acting as unofficial spectators in the outfield, adopting more active fielder roles in the infield or adopting more a functionally defined role by standing on a post, being the bowler or backstop.

In contrast to this tight control of the 'how' in games, a teacher's ends-in-view in a gymnastics lesson guided pupils towards more open-ended functionally coordinated action by relinquishing restrictions over both the 'how' and 'what'. This created space for pupils to experiment in their re-actualisation of knowledge and openly negotiate within small groups to explore this broader end-in-view. This greater freedom to negotiate the boundaries of the movement culture created a very different experience of looks-like-sport. For example, Year 6 pupils were tasked by the teacher in gymnastics to "make-up a sequence to show to the class at the end of the lesson":

A group of 5 boys work to create their sequence. Their actions focus ensuring that everyone has a part to play. They combine forward and backward rolls and those who cannot do this hold a shape still. Bodies are chosen or volunteered to be used as obstacles to go over and under. They choose actions they can perform to move over a boy rolling like a log down the mats and take it in turns to lead on ideas and stop to talk through possible combinations of movements. The boys collectively ensure that they get to show what they can do; one body balances on his head and hands while another supports him which is executed as the other three roll and jump. This continues for 30 minutes without interjection from any adult. The pupils are then called together and present their sequences to the class.

In this example the teacher referenced the sport of gymnastics in her ends-in-view, through her attempt to redirect pupils' actions towards gymnastic aesthetic norms and the need to perform a sequence in front of others. The freedom to solve the task clearly demanded similar levels of understanding needed throughout the movement culture. Pupils were still required to be socially skilled and understand the need to functionally coordinate co-operative actions. In this case it appeared that these ends-in-view of the movement culture enabled the pupils to work cohesively and inclusively. This facilitated their negotiations to re-actualise their ideas of moving co-operatively with others. Whilst what they produced did not look like the sport of gymnastics (despite the teacher's efforts to redirect some pupils to do so) the processes in which they were engaged were reflective of high socially skilled action, facilitated by the teacher's broader ends-in-view.

Conclusions

In exploring the teachers' negotiation of a looks-like-sport movement culture (cf. Ward & Quennerstedt, 2014) it was evident that they struggled to balance recreating sport-for-real and directing pupils towards educational ends-in-view. The latter privileged the reproduction of co-operative busy looking activity which created a *looks-like-sport* movement culture. These ends-in-view posed particular challenges for the teachers to balance the functional need for players to beat opponents with inclusive and co-operative ends-in-view. Negotiating this conflict resulted in the teachers redirecting their ends-in-view to ensure pupils were guided away from generating winners and losers, towards regaining a constant flow of functionally coordinated co-operative action. In order to re-actualise their knowledge of sports within these ends-in-view, pupils were required to carefully negotiate the social, spatial and physical boundaries of the movement culture. Simply being good at sports was not a pre-requisite for success in this movement culture. Presenting a direct challenge to the 'how' and 'what' of the experience did not result in any alteration of the teachers' ends-in-view. This course of action contravened the teachers' expectation of explicit conformity to the reproduction of co-operative actions. Pupils who chose to do this overtly were considered deviant and faced the threat of being sanctioned. More successful alteration of the teacher's 'how' and 'what' required pupils to explore what constituted co-operative actions within the spatial and social dimensions of the activities they were set. This demanded fitting their ends-in-view within the teacher's by exploring what was acceptable and how they could re-actualise their knowledge of sport techniques within co-operatively directed action.

These findings suggest that if PE is to be more than just the reproduction of codified sport, careful adjustment and consideration of ends-in-view is of great importance. Without regard for the latter there is potential to create significant complexity for both teachers and pupils beyond learning and performing sport techniques. The example in gymnastics of greater freedom for pupils to demonstrate what they know and combine this with the ideas of their peers, highlights the potential of this aspect of the movement culture to lead to the achievement of educational outcomes within a looks-like-sport movement culture. Transactional studies such as this enable researchers and teachers to understand the relations between their ends-in-view, the 'how' and 'what' of their lessons and their desired educational outcomes. Particularly how these relations constitute the PE movement culture within their lessons and school, but also how this shapes their and the pupils' actions. At a

more sophisticated level this type of approach has the potential to become a pedagogical tool to support teachers in encouraging pupils to evaluate and reflect upon the implications of ends-in-view of activities upon their experiences. This process would support Crum's (1993) argument for PE to develop critical consumers of movement cultures.

The emphasis on competitive games contained within the latest revision of the National Curriculum for PE (DfE 2013), may pose a particular hurdle within this looks-like-sport movement culture for both pupils and teachers. This will continue to apply pressure on the need to balance working towards co-operative busy looking ends-in-view, with the re-actualisation of knowledge of competitive sports outside of the school gates. Utilising pedagogical models to deliver PE curricula and help navigate the difficult terrain created by competition, inclusion and cooperation may be a way forward (Pope, 2011). However, this solution is out of reach to the majority of non-specialist teachers, particularly when set in the context of limited teacher training and continuous professional development in addition to low self-confidence to deliver PE (DeCorby et al. 2005; Morgan & Bourke 2005; 2008; Harris et al. 2012). These conditions in addition to the recent £150 million continuation of the Pupil Premium for PE (HM Treasury, 2013) will continue to play their part in remodelling movement culture within primary schools. The growing subcontracting of sports coaches and support staff to deliver PE (Griggs, 2010; Blair & Capel, 2011; Smith, 2013) will remould the challenges presented to pupils and coaches alike. PE experiences for both will become a melting pot of specialist and non-specialist knowledge of sports and a diversity of pupil experiences and motivations. This suggests the value of continued transactional analysis to support those involved to understand the constituted movement cultures created and the implications they pose for learning.

References

- Banks, J. (1993). The canon debate, knowledge construction and multicultural education. *Educational Researcher*, 22(5), 4-14.
- Benjamin, S., Nind, M., Hall, K., Collins, J. & Sheehy, K. (2003). Moments of inclusion and exclusion: pupils negotiating classroom contexts. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 24(5), 547-558.
- Biesta, G. & Burbules, N. (2003). *Pragmatism and educational research*. Boulder, CO: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Blair, R. & Capel, S. (2011). Primary Physical Education, coaches and continuing professional development. *Sport, Education and Society*, 16(4), 485-505.
- Boisvert, R. (1998). *John Dewey: Rethinking our time*. New York: State University of New York Press
- Bryman, A. (2008). *Social research methods (3rd Edition)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Crum, B. (1993). Conventional thought and practice in physical education: problems of teaching and implications for change. *Quest*, 45, 339-356.
- Crum, B. (1992). *Over de Versporting van de Samenleving*. Haarlem: De Vrieseborch.
- DeCorby, K., Halas, J., Dixon, S., Wintrup, L. & Janzen, H. (2005). Classroom teachers and the challenges of delivering quality physical education. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 98(4), 208-220.
- Department for Education (2013). *Primary school PE and sport funding*, Available at: <http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/adminandfinance/financialmanagement/b00222858/primary-school-sport-funding> [Accessed 10/07/13]
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: The Free Press.
- Dewey, J. (1934/81). Art as experience, in J. A. Boydston (Ed.) (1981-1990) *John Dewey: the later works: 1925-1953*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: South Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J., & A.F. Bentley. (1949/91). Knowing and the known, in J.A. Boydston (Ed.) *The later works, 1925–1953*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: South Illinois University Press
- Elliot, D. L., Atencio, M., Campbell, T., & Jess, M. (2011). From Physical Education experiences to Physical Education teaching practices? Insights from Scottish primary teachers' experiences of Physical Education, teacher education, school entry and professional development. *Sport, Education and Society* i-first article. doi/full/10.1080/13573322.2011.609165#.Uo-JWdK-2m4
- Garrett, R. & Wrench, A. (2008). Connections, pedagogy and alternative possibilities in primary physical education, *Sport Education and Society*, 13(1), 39-60.
- Garrison, J. (2001). An introduction to Dewey's theory of functional 'trans-action': an alternative paradigm for activity theory. *Mind, Culture and Activity*, 8(4), 275-296.
- Griggs, G. (2010). For Sale – Primary Physical Education. £20 per hour or nearest offer. *Education 3-13*, 38(1), 39-46.
- Griggs, G. & Ward, G. (2013). The London 2012 Legacy for Primary Physical Education: Policy By the Way, *Sociological Research Journal Online*. <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/18/3/13.html>
- Harris, J., Cale, L., & Musson, H. (2012). The predicament of primary Physical Education: a consequence of 'insufficient' ITT and 'ineffective' CPD? *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy* 17(4): 367-381
- Her Majesty's (HM) Treasury (2013). *Autumn Statement 2013*. London: The Stationary Office.
- Hodkinson, P., Biesta, G. & James, D. (2007). Understanding learning cultures. *Educational Review*, 59(4), 415–27.
- Jess, M. & Collins, D. (2003) Primary physical education in Scotland: the future in the making, *European Journal of Physical Education*, 8(2) 103-118.
- Kirk, D. (2010). *Physical Education Futures*. London: Routledge.
- Linehan, C. & McCarthy, J. (2001). Reviewing the "community of practice" metaphor: an analysis of control relations in a primary school classroom. *Mind, Culture and Activity*, 8(2), 129-147.
- MacPhail, A., Gorely, T., Kirk, D. & Kinchin, G. (2008). Exploring the meaning of fun in physical education through Sport Education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 79(13): 344-356.
- Morgan, P. & Bourke, S. (2008). 'Non-specialist teachers' confidence to teach PE: the nature and influence of personal experiences in schools', *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 13(1), 1-29.
- Mowling, C., Brock, S. & Hastie, P. (2006). Fourth Grade Students' Drawing

- Interpretations of a Sport Education Soccer Unit. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 25(1), 9-35.
- National Curriculum Council (NCC) (1992). *Non statutory guidance for physical education*. London: HMSO.
- Östman, L. (2010). Education for sustainable development and normativity: a transactional analysis of moral meaning-making and companion meanings in classroom communication. *Environmental Education Research*, 16(1), 75-93.
- Öhman, M. & Quennerstedt, M. (2012). Observational Studies, In K. Armour and D. Macdonald (Eds.) *Research methods in physical education and youth sport* (189-203). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Pollard, A. (1982). A model of classroom coping strategies. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 3(1), 19-37.
- Pope, C. (2011). The physical education and sport interface: Models, maxims and maelstrom, *European Physical Education Review*, 17(3), 273-285.
- Quay, J. (2014). *Education, experience and existence*. Abingdon: Routledge
- Quay, J. & Stolz, S. (2014). Game as context in physical education: A Deweyan philosophical perspective. In R. Light, J. Quay, S. Harvey and A. Mooney (Eds.), *Contemporary Developments in Games Teaching* (15–28). London and New York: Routledge.
- Quennerstedt, M. (2013a). PE on YouTube: Investigating participation in physical education practice. *Physical education and Sport Pedagogy*, 18(1), 42-59.
- Quennerstedt, M. (2013b). Practical epistemologies in physical education practice. *Sport, Education and Society*, 18(3), 311-333.
- Quennerstedt, M., Annerstedt, C., Barker, D., Karlefors, I., Larsson, H., Redelius, K. & Öhman, M. (2014). What did they learn in school today? A method for exploring aspects of learning in physical education. *European Journal of Physical Education*, 20(2), 282-302.
- Quennerstedt, M., Öhman, J. & Öhman, M. (2011). Investigating learning in physical education – a transactional approach. *Sport, Education and Society*, 16(2), 159-177.
- Renold, E. (2001). Learning the 'Hard' Way: Boys, hegemonic masculinity and the negotiation of learner identities in the primary school, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 22(3), 369-385.
- Robson, S. (2011). Producing and using video data in the early years: Ethical questions and practical consequences in research with young children. *Children and Society*, 25, 179-189.
- Rovegno, I. and Dolly, J. (2006) Constructivist perspectives on learning, in D. Kirk, D. Macdonald & M. O'Sullivan (Eds.), *The Handbook of Physical Education* (242-261). London: Sage.
- Rogoff, B. (1995). Observing sociocultural activity on three planes: Participatory appropriation, guided participation, and apprenticeship, in J. Wertsch, P. Del Rio, and T. Alvarez (Eds) *A. Sociocultural studies of mind* (139–164). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, A. (2013). Primary school Physical Education and sports coaches: evidence from a study of School Sport Partnerships in north-west England. *Sport Education and Society* i-first article. doi/full/10.1080/13573322.2011.609165#.Uo-JLNK-2m4
- Ward, G. (2012). Learning movement culture: mapping the landscape between physical education and school sport, *Sport Education and Society*, i-First Article. doi/abs/10.1080/13573322.2012.690342

- Ward, G. and Quennerstedt, M. (2014) Transactions in Primary Physical Education in the UK: A smorgasbord of looks-like-sport, *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, i-first article, available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2014.923991>
- Wertsch, J. (1998). *Mind as action*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wickman, P. & Östman, L. (2002). Learning as discourse change: A sociocultural Mechanism. *Science Education*, 86, 601–23.