Title: Using meaningful experiences as a vision for physical education teaching and teacher education practice

Authors:

Déirdre Ní Chróinín, Mary Immaculate College, University of Limerick

Stephanie Beni, Brock University, Canada

Tim Fletcher, Brock University, Canada

Ciara Griffin, Mary Immaculate College, University of Limerick

Caitlin Price, Brock University, Canada

Author biographies

Déirdre Ní Chróinín is a physical education teacher educator at the primary level in the Department of Arts Education and Physical Education, Mary Immaculate College in Ireland. Her current research is focused on the promotion of meaningful experiences for children and young people in sport and physical activity settings.

Stephanie Beni is a PhD student at Brock University, Canada. Her topic of study is understanding teachers' experiences of implementing an approach designed to promote meaningful physical education experiences for students.

Tim Fletcher is an Associate Professor in the Department of Kinesiology at Brock University, Canada. Tim's research interests are in teacher/teacher educator socialisation and identity, preservice teacher education, and self-study of practice methodology.

Caitlin Price is a high school teacher in Canada.

Ciara Griffin is a primary school teacher in Ireland.

Abstract

Background: Teachers' visions are vivid and concrete images of ideal classroom practices. A vision for teaching is important to both practices in the classroom as well as teacher development across time. A useful tool to explore and analyse the role of vision in teacher practices is provided by Hammerness (2003), whose framework of vision consists of three dimensions: focus, range and distance.

Purpose: The writing of R. Scott Kretchmar (2000; 2008) provides the basis for a vision focused on meaningful experiences in physical education. The purpose of this paper is to describe the ways a vision based on meaningful experiences enabled two teachers and three teacher educators to name, describe, and enact their physical education teaching and teacher education practices.

Methodology: Raw data from six separate self-studies of practice involving the five participants provided the starting point for this research. Data sources, including written reflections and critical friend responses as well as audio recordings of conversations with critical friends, were mined to identify examples where vision was represented. Further data were generated in a focus group where participants shared and analysed their experiences and discussed how meaningful physical education served as both an individual and collective vision for practice. A final written reflection allowed participants to articulate their current vision for meaningful physical education. A thematic analysis of all data sources supported organisation of data into three distinct phases of development of practices with emphasis on the role of vision in each phase.

Findings*:* Over time, there was an evolution in our understanding of both what meaningful physical education consisted of and how we might facilitate meaningful experiences for children. In particular, our visions became clearer and better aligned with our practices. We illustrate how we developed our practice in ways that allowed us to take ownership of this

vision, and, in the process, changed who we were as teachers and teacher educators. Finally, we share how the process of exploring and analysing our individual visions allowed us to articulate a shared vision of meaningful physical education and explain how to go about implementing our collective vision in practice.

Conclusion: We highlight the value of paying attention to the role of vision in promoting and supporting educators, individually and collectively, in developing and sustaining innovation in teaching and teacher education practice.

Summary for Practitioners (150 words)

Three teacher educators and two primary teachers adopted a vision focused on meaningful experiences in primary physical education (Kretchmar, 2000; 2001; 2006; 2008) to develop their practices. Guided by Kretchmar's writing as well as a review of the literature (Authors, 2017), each participant implemented pedagogies and approaches to promote meaningful participation using the following features: social interaction, challenge, fun, motor competence, delight, and, personally relevant learning. Analysis of our experiences illustrates how a vision for practice provided impetus early in the process, was a guide and measure of our success as our practice developed and now provides confidence and a sense of purpose to our teaching approaches. We highlight the value of paying attention to the role of vision in promoting and supporting educators, individually and collectively, in developing and sustaining innovation in teaching and teacher education practice.

Introduction

A vision for teaching is positioned as foundational to teacher learning, development and effectiveness (Hammerness et al., 2005; Shulman and Shulman, 2004). Kosnik and Beck's (2009) longitudinal research on beginning teachers led them to identify the development of a coherent vision for teaching as one of seven priorities for teacher education. However, they also explain that attention to vision is often neglected in teacher education and ongoing teacher development in both the practical and empirical sense. We believe this claim is especially applicable in physical education, with little research on the role vision plays in how teachers develop, enact and sustain their teaching practices. Developing a coherent vision not only has relevance for individual teachers but also for the field of physical education more broadly. For instance, Quennerstedt (2018) suggested that fragmentation may lead physical education to be at risk of losing sight of its vision. This point has been echoed by others, resulting in calls for a redesign of physical education based on conceptual clarity and precision (Lawson, 2018), and a renewed focus on the personal relevance of physical education to children's lives (Thorburn, 2018). When a clear vision is lacking, the resulting incoherence between what is taught to children in physical education, how it is taught and why it is taught can lead to potentially adverse outcomes for pupils, teachers and the field as a whole. The purpose of this research was to explore how a coherent vision for teaching guided both the articulation and enactment of new teaching approaches focused on meaningful experiences for a small group of physical educators.

A vision for teaching

A vision consists of 'images of what teachers hope could be or might be in their classrooms, their schools, their communities, and in some cases even in society as a whole' (Hammerness, 1999, p.4). In a curricular sense, a vision for teachers 'rests in an understanding of learning and learners as these intersect with education goals and purposes,

principles of instructional design, and an understanding of teacher options and possibilities'
(Bransford, Darling-Hammond and LePage, 2005, p.35). Teachers draw on vision ideas to
make a wide range of curricular decisions, including what to teach and why, how to organise
subject matter, and how to design and sequence tasks in light of the goals they are aiming for.
Vision therefore refers to a 'set of vivid and concrete images of practice' (Hammerness,
2006, p.1) that draw on a vast network of ideas and principles, both theoretical and practical
(Kosnik, Beck, Cleovoulou and Fletcher, 2009) to interpret how aspects of the 'big picture'
of teaching fit together and can be implemented in the classroom. Vision also has an
emotional element, bringing together 'teachers' passions – their hope, cares, and dreams –
with their understandings – their knowledge about how and what children should be
learning', and can help teachers imagine what is possible in their teaching (Hammerness,
2006, p.5). Kosnik and Beck (2009) suggest that some may interpret this as too broad or
ethereal; however, Kennedy (2006) provides a helpful distinction between 'loose'
interpretations and those we see as being helpful:

> I use the term *vision* to describe teachers' plans, [but] I do not mean this in the
> religious, idealist, or head-in-the-clouds sense of the term but rather, to mean that
> teachers have a feet-on-the-ground sense of purpose and direction and of actions
> that get there from here. They are plans: scenarios that are envisioned (p. 207)

In this way, vision plays an important role in helping teachers feel and see that they are
making a positive difference in the world (Hammerness, 2003). Turner (2006, p.311) outlines
how articulating a vision for teaching can be empowering for teachers as they 'tap into a rich,
internal source of professional power and integrity that can potentially enhance their
teaching'.

Identifying and explaining a vision plays an important role for beginning teachers,
particularly in helping to avoid what Loughran (2006) refers to as a 'hunter-gatherer'

mentality, where they seek the familiar strategies used by their own teachers. Kosnik and Beck (2011) suggest to beginning teachers that without a vision 'gathering endless strategies, practical tips, and curriculum information will not help you much as a teacher' (p. 122) because there is a lack of coherence and integration in practice – it can undo the very purposes of one's teaching. Teachers who develop a clear vision for their teaching have better balanced and more focused programmes (Kosnik et al, 2009), are more likely to be effective teachers (Darling-Hammond et al, 2005; McElhone, Hebard, Scott, and Juel, 2009; Parsons and LaCroix, 2013), and can find ways to overcome obstacles to enact their vision (Vaughn and Faircloth, 2011; Vaughn and Parsons, 2012; Vaughan, 2015).

Hammerness (1999; 2001) proposes that teacher's visions vary across three important dimensions: focus, range, and distance. The *focus* of a vision is the area of attention or interest within the vision, moving from cloudy to clear along a continuum (Hammerness, 2001). Focus also refers to the clarity of the vision, on a continuum from blurry and indistinct on one end to sharply defined and distinct on the other. *Distance* is a measure of how far or close the gap is between current practice and the ideals of the vision image, on a scale from close to distant. The *range* refers to the field of vision and extends from narrow and specific to broad and panoramic, spanning from one child or classroom to a whole community or school system. Hammerness (2003) also emphasises the role of context in the interplay of teachers' visions and their practices. She highlights the role of a teacher's positive or negative perceptions of support as supportive, neutral or not supportive (Hammerness, 2001) in influencing their ability to implement their vison.

The dimensions of vision provide a framework to better understand how visions of teaching influence teachers' approaches and decision-making (Hammerness, 2003). Having a clear vision provides a means to navigate the gap between their current practice and their intentions in ways that allow their teaching towards this vision to be sustained. If teachers

perceive the vision to be within reach, then this measure can be motivational and inspirational. Conversely, if the distance between vision and current practice is too distant, disillusion and a sense of powerlessness can result (Hammerness, 2003). The impact of vision in teachers' personal and professional lives, therefore, seems to be directly related to both the distance between vision and current practice, and the clarity of focus of the vision (Hammerness, 2001).

The role of vision in teacher learning

Vision can play a significant role in teacher learning (Hammerness, 1999; 2001; 2003) and development (Shulman and Shulman, 2004). In particular, it can help address one of the overarching problems of teacher learning, the 'problem of enactment' (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Kennedy, 1999), which highlights the gap between what teachers can consider and what they are able to do (McDonald, Kazemi and Kavanagh, 2013). Vision is positioned as one of five factors important to teacher development in a model proposed by Shulman and Shulman (2004), which includes teachers being ready (vision), willing (motivation), able (practice and understanding), reflective (reflection) and communal (community). The factor that incorporates vision -- being 'ready' – is positioned as the cornerstone of the model.

Teachers' visions are generally concrete, vivid, stable and consistent but do evolve across time as they are shaped by individual experiences, values, and assumptions about teaching and learning (Hammerness, 2006). When teachers meet a new idea, they may be prompted to examine, expand and revise previous beliefs and, as a result, modify their vision. Shulman and Shulman (2004) describe how a teacher can formulate 'a new vision of teaching based on encountering role models, reading cases, viewing tapes, holding discussions with peers, reading theoretical accounts, etc., and be quite displeased with the status quo' (p. 259). However, having this vision alone does not result in changes to practice unless teachers

encounter the right set of circumstances, such as context, support, and motivation, to implement this new vision. Reflection on the success of implementation involves evaluation, review and learning from experience. Such reflection is central to developing, sustaining or abandoning this new vision.

Articulation of vision is one way to support teachers to take personal ownership of their vision as a guide to practice (Duffy, 2002; Parsons and LaCroix, 2013) and also to share their vision with others to identify and establish common aspects of individual visions. Hammerness (2003) describes several processes that can help teachers articulate their vision. First, *surfacing the vision* means bringing a teachers' beliefs to light. This can be done through written or verbal reflection, or through using visual images. Second is *plumbing the depths,* which involves interrogating and expressing how the surfaced beliefs and visions can be enacted in practice. The third process is *dealing with the gap,* which helps teachers address distance between their expressed vision and the realities they face teaching in schools. These processes might be particularly helpful for teacher educators who wish to help pre-service teachers develop and articulate their own vision for teaching.

Shulman and Shulman (2004) position a shared vision of teaching as core to communities of professional learning, highlighting the importance of 'environments that support, sustain, and "tune" the visions, understandings, performances, motivations, and reflections of all its members' (Shulman and Shulman, 2004, p.270). Hammerness (2001) provides direction on how such learning communities arrive at a common vision for practice:

> developing a common vision that yields from and builds upon the experiences and
> passions of teachers' individual visions could result in a deeply motivating and
> personally meaningful sense of shared purpose, one that provides a powerful force for
> reform. By drawing upon the power and potential of personal ideals, work with

teachers' visions may lead to the kinds of community, collaboration and commitment that organizational visions are meant to engender (p. 161).

Vision in physical education

In spite of the benefit that can be derived from articulating a collective vision, this has largely eluded the field of physical education across time. Several scholars have traced the collective vision(s) of physical education over the years, illustrating tensions between relative values such as health, personal meaning and movement in contemporary physical education (Ennis, 2006; Kirk, 2009; Lawson, 2018; Quennerstedt, 2018). These 'grand visions' are internalised by teachers and teacher educators in different ways. For example, while teachers' philosophies are drawn from ideologies related to sport, health and academics, Green (2002) describes these philosophies as being only partially formed, having an emphasis on the practical. He also suggests these philosophies are sometimes confused and contradictory. In contrast, McEvoy, Heikinaro-Johansson, and MacPhail (2017) highlight that while teacher educators express some relative consensus on the overarching purpose of physical education as preparing young people for lifelong physical activity participation, how they framed this purpose has evolved over time, influenced by institutional and societal pressures. As a result, there continue to be proposals for new visions of physical education that are better adapted to the ever-changing needs of pupils in today's schools (for example Ennis, 2017; Kirk, 2009).

Even when there is evidence of some consensus about elements of a collective vision for physical education, there appears to be a lack of descriptions of practice that are informed by and aligned with a clearly articulated vision. Though there are a limited number of studies that have described vision-informed practices, here we highlight two that we perceive as being closest to doing this work. MacPhail, Tannehill and Goc Karp (2013) described how they used constructivist pedagogical principles to help prepare pre-service teachers to develop instructionally aligned lessons. While constructivism itself might not be described as

a vision per se, it represents a theoretically and ethically informed view of several principles that can shape not only what students learn but how they learn. They suggest the importance of teacher educators modelling content and pedagogies that pre-service teachers can transfer to their own practices in schools. Enright and O'Sullivan (2010) also present a description of practices used by several teachers to negotiate a physical education curriculum with adolescent girls. The vision in this case (though not defined as a vision in the research) can be interpreted as harnessing and privileging student voice in the design and delivery of physical education. As well as advocating for this type of approach, Enright and O'Sullivan (2010) provide rich descriptions of the practices involved in making their vision come to life in the classroom. For example, the teacher was required to negotiate new roles with students, while also navigating the tension in enabling students' ownership of their learning while at the same time holding them accountable.

We do not suggest that there is one best vision for physical education, however, one vision that has resonated with *our* beliefs and values for school-based physical education is where personal meaning and relevance serve as the driver for design and delivery of school-based physical education (Kretchmar, 2000; 2001; 2006; 2008). This is supported by Ennis (2017), who describes personal meaning as one of the keys for transformative learning experiences of pupils in the 21st century. The compelling nature of this vision provided the impetus for our overall research initiative focused on facilitating meaningful experiences in school physical education. We set about developing our physical education practices aligned with these ideas.

A strong tradition of advocacy for the prioritisation of meaningful experiences in physical education can be traced back at least 50 years (Metheny, 1968; Arnold, 1979; Kretchmar, 2006). Focusing on meaningfulness suggests that more attention is paid to the quality rather than the quantity of children's movement experiences, with a privilege being

given to the joy and richness that movement can bring to one's life and the impact it can have on one's sense of well-being. Kretchmar (2007) defines meaningful experiences as those that hold personal significance for the participant. This implies that such experiences are subjective and idiosyncratic because individuals will attach different values, symbols, or emotions to different experiences (Metheny, 1968). Despite acknowledgement of the subjectivity in these types of experiences, Authors (2017) reviewed 50 articles and identified several features that young people commonly suggested contributed to meaningfulness in physical education and youth sport:

- positive and varied forms of social interaction with peers and/or teachers;

- engaging in tasks that have an optimal level of challenge;

- developing and demonstrating competence in motor skills;

- having fun, and;

- experiencing things perceived as personally relevant for lives inside and outside of school.

As well as identifying these features of meaningful experiences, Authors (2017) also pointed out that there was ambiguity around how to teach in ways that support meaningful experiences for children. Several authors have suggested that reflection on movement experiences can support how pupils make meaning (Nilges, 2004; O'Connor, 2018), and there is evidence that autonomy-supportive strategies, personal goal-setting, and certain pedagogical models can also support meaningful experiences (Authors, 2017).

In this paper, we examine how a vision for meaningful physical education has guided our approaches. Our study was guided by the following research question: How can a vision based on meaningful physical education guide and support the work of physical educators? By sharing insights on how vision shapes the development and teaching practices of physical educators this paper makes a valuable contribution to understanding how teacher learning and

development can be supported in ways that allow changes in practice to be embedded and sustained across time.

Methodology

Examining vision within self-study research

Self-study of practice has been proposed as a suitable methodology to explore a vision of teaching for both teachers (Samaras, 2010) and teacher educators (Berry, 2009; McElhone et al., 2009; Ritter, 2009). In a physical education context, O'Sullivan (2014) sees merit in self-study research in working towards a shared vision of practice for school-based physical education by teachers and teacher educators. In this paper we use analysis of data generated in previously conducted self-studies to guide several other new data collection strategies, which are brought together in a more generic type of interpretive practitioner inquiry. By looking across our practices to explore the influence of a vision for meaningful physical education we respond to Zeichner's (2007, p.36) recommendation to situate 'individual studies within coherent research programs on particular substantive issues' to increase the influence of individual self-studies on the field. We acknowledge that our collective and individual vision(s) based on the prioritisation of personally meaningful experiences shaped how we designed, conducted, and presented the research in this paper. Readers should therefore consider our positioning while interpreting our arguments and analysis, and deciding the extent to which the findings we present resonate with other particular contexts. Below we introduce each participant, with a particular focus on their context and their involvement in learning about meaningful physical education, and identifying the published self-study that served as a springboard for the analysis conducted in this particular paper.

Participants, their settings, and previously conducted self-studies

Table 1 offers a summary of our respective involvement in six previously published self-studies across a four-year period (Authors 2015, 2016, 2018a, 2018b, 2018c, 2018d) that were analysed prior to generating new data for this paper.

[INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE PLEASE]

Jenny and Tom: Jenny and Tom are teacher educators who have researched their experiences of supporting pre-service teachers' learning about meaningful physical education over the past five years. At the time of writing, Jenny has taught teachers in Country 1 for X years, and Tom has taught teachers in Country 2 for eight years. Both are qualified teachers and taught in schools prior to becoming teacher educators, and both were involved in all six previously published self-studies. Jenny and Tom began inquiring into ways they could teach teachers how to promote meaningful physical education and introduced the other participants to research and other ideas about meaningful physical education.

Karla: Karla is a recently graduated teacher of secondary physical education. During her master's degree Karla acted as a teaching assistant (much like an apprentice teacher educator) on a developmental games module where she observed Tom's implementation of the approach and applied these principles in her own teacher education practice. She also worked as a research assistant on the project during her master's. Data from one self-study Karla was involved in as a teacher educator were analysed prior to generating new data for this paper (Authors, 2018a).

Gail: Gail is a recently graduated primary/elementary generalist teacher. As part of her master's research she conducted a self-study of her experiences implementing an approach focused on facilitating meaningful experiences for primary school children in physical education (Authors, 2018d). Jenny and Tom were co-supervisors of her research. During that time Gail also observed Jenny's implementation of the approach and worked as a research assistant on the project.

Sara: Sara's undergraduate thesis research was a self-study of her experiences of teaching meaningful physical education in a primary school, and data from that research (Authors, 2018b) were analysed prior to generating data for the present study. Tom and Jenny acted as co-supervisors for this research. The problem of practice focused on facilitating meaningfulness for her pupils in physical education. Sara was a student in one of Tom's classes where he implemented principles of the approach, and after that time she worked as a research assistant on the project.

Data Collection

Given that all six self-studies outlined in Table 1 shared a similar overall focus on meaningful physical education as well as a shared methodology it followed that a general form of interpretive practitioner inquiry held the potential to help us synthesise ways our practices and visions interacted and evolved as we explored meaningful physical education in our respective contexts. The findings presented in this research are drawn from (a) secondary analysis of data generated in six previously published self-studies conducted over a period of five years, and (b) analysis of new data focused on the development of a vision for teaching (conducted over six months). Below we describe the four steps we followed to explore our respective visions for teaching meaningful physical education, both individually and collectively.

First, we each read a number of research articles (e.g. Hammerness, 2001; 2003; Kosnik et al., 2009) to ensure a shared conceptual understanding of 'vision'. We then reviewed the data from previously published self-studies in which we were involved to examine how our vision of meaningful experiences influenced our respective practices, as well as how our practices had in turn shaped the evolution of our visions. Along a timeline, we each identified significant moments within our own data – typically between 3 and 5 moments – where a vision for meaningful physical education was evident and recorded them

on a template. These moments did not need to be positive and did not need to be resolved – it was acceptable to not have the answer. We then considered the ways in which a vision for teaching was evident in the data using prompts including: What has stayed the same/changed? Why is this example important? How has this changed who you are as a teacher/teacher educator? We kept the dimensions of focus, range, direction (Hammerness, 2001) in mind as we responded to these prompts. A summary of the meaning of each of the three dimensions was provided alongside the analysis template to ensure we all interpreted these terms in the same way.

Second, the completed analysis templates for each of us were placed in a shared online folder. We each reviewed the preliminary analysis of significant moments conducted by each other and identified anything noteworthy as we reviewed. In particular, we sought to identify: 'aha' moments when our respective visions were sharpened or dulled due to a specific situation or experience; descriptions of practice that appropriately captured our individual and collective visions; and moments when we were able to articulate our vision of meaningful physical education to ourselves or others. This task was framed by our shared understanding of vision but also allowed for alternative perspectives to be included. This was particularly important to allow for the range of experience (i.e., beginning and experienced teachers and teacher educators), to be reflected in the analysis.

Third, we all engaged in a SKYPE focus group to discuss our respective visions and our analysis of each other's visions (see Step 2). The SKYPE conversation involved each of us sharing our initial vision and examples from implementation experiences. Others responded in relation to what was similar, different, resonated or jarred by asking questions, seeking clarification, making observations and connections and by comparing experiences. Identification of areas of commonality across our visions and approaches allowed us to consider the extent to which there was a shared vision for practice.

Fourth, we each completed a visioning exercise (Duffy, 2002) by writing a reflective statement in response to the title: 'My vision for teaching school-based physical education'. The purpose of this final visioning activity was to capture learning and any development in vision that had occurred as a result of the interactions described in Steps 2 and 3 above. Analysis of these final vision statements also allowed for direct comparison of vision to support claims related to development of a collective vision.

Data analysis

The final data set for analysis included:

- Individual reviews of our previously generated data, which led to the development of timelines of significant moments (TSMs) (n = 5);

- Transcript of a 1.5 hour SKYPE focus group (FG), and;

- Participants' final vision statement (VS) (n = 5).

One author led the analysis of the complete data set using a thematic approach (Braun and Clarke, 2006) to identify important and interesting patterns to support interpretation of these data. Our rationale for using one author to oversee the process was based on differences in experience analysing qualitative data. At the time of conducting the research three of us were studying for our master's degree. As Cornish, Gillespie and Zittoun (2013) state, the practical challenges of collaborative qualitative data analysis can be heightened due to differences in experience and location, and it was mainly for these reasons and given the purposes of this particular study we felt it would be appropriate for one experienced qualitative researcher to lead the analysis, engaging all of us in the final stages of the analysis as 'member checkers'.

The analysis involved several steps. First, all data were reviewed multiple times to ensure familiarity. Early impressions and reactions were noted for future reference. Given the large volume of data involved, a summary table of each participant's timeline of significant moments was constructed to help keep a sense of the overall data set. Second, segments of

data that were relevant or captured something interesting about the research question were coded by hand – this process represented a theoretical analysis guided by an understanding of 'vision' rather than an inductive line-by-line coding approach. Third, codes were reviewed and, based on their relationship, organised into preliminary categories that represented the role of vision. At this point we decided to organise the data chronologically given the clear and distinct contrast in the role of vision at different points along each or our professional journeys. Therefore, a number of key ideas related to the role of vision were identified at three distinct time points (early, during, now). Fourth, the categories represented in each phase were reviewed for internal coherence and distinctiveness from each other and to home in specifically on the distinct role of vision at each of the time points. A summary of the key messages of each theme was shared amongst all of us as a form of member checking (Creswell and Miller, 2000). The responses supported the overall messages as representative of our individual experiences and provided direction on areas for discussion. Fifth, and finally, we drafted an outline of each theme, ensuring that the illustration of each theme moved beyond description to represent an interpretation of data with connection to the literature and supported by raw excerpts of data. Again, the draft text of the findings was shared amongst all participants to allow for additional reactions, suggestions and direction on interpreting and representing the findings.

A clear description of our data collection and analytic processes in relation to the research question is central to establishing any trustworthiness in our interpretations and results (Lincoln & Guba, 1986). Using both secondary and primary data sources may add credibility to some of our processes, in part because the results of the analysis of secondary data have been peer reviewed and published. Further, triangulating from multiple sources of secondary and primary data allowed for corroborating and disconfirming sources to be identified. In addition, there were opportunities to verify the interpretations and meanings

made by participants because we each took on dual roles of participant-researcher, being involved in both the data collection and analytic processes. This meant that inaccuracies or misinterpretations could be identified and modified in the analytic and reporting process. Also, given that Jenny and Tom as teacher educators had come to the vision first and introduced it to Karla, Gail and Sara as their supervisors of research and teaching, it was important to promote modes of interaction to work towards a shared vision without imposing a vision on others (Kosnik et al, 2009). For example, Tom and Jenny were conscious of Kennedy's (2006) argument that the collective vision of teacher educators is partial and incomplete because it fails to address all the concerns teachers face in school contexts. With this in mind, tasks and interactions were carefully designed to facilitate all voices being heard as well as building in a critical questioning of our own assumptions to avoid any one message or perspective being taken up without consensus grounded in evidence and experiences. We suggest this resulted in more nuanced analysis of our experiences with consideration of the practicalities and challenges of both teacher and teacher educator contexts.

Findings

To represent our journeys as we developed our visions alongside our physical education practices, findings are presented around three chronological phases: an 'early phase' during which the vision was identified, engaged with and adopted; an 'implementation phase' when we experimented and applied the vision in practice, and; a 'taking stock' phase of progress to date through reflection on and articulation of our current visions for teaching physical education. Within each of these three phases we identify the ways that our individual and collective visions influenced practice and that practices, in turn, informed the development of our visions in a recursive manner. Findings are illustrated using Hammerness' (2001; 2003;

2006) dimensions of vision (focus, distance, range) and presented using data from TSMs, FGs and VSs.

Early phase: adopting a new vision

Encountering a clearly focused idea of an ideal type of physical education expressed by Kretchmar (2000; 2006; 2008) was the spark that ignited our initial engagement with meaningful physical education. Here we share three circumstances and conditions that influenced how we took up a vision for primary physical education based on meaningful experiences individually and collectively.

First, all five of us were attracted to the focus of Kretchmar's (2000; 2006; 2008) writing and found his vision of meaningful physical education to be compelling. Tom and Jenny encountered this primarily through reading Kretchmar's work and imagining the possibilities this might hold for their physical education teacher education (PETE) practices, while Karla, Sara and Gail's encounters came through a combination of reading Kretchmar's work and participating in or observing Tom and Jenny's PETE practice. In the focus group, Gail shared: 'I loved it from the time it was explained and it caught my attention straight away,' and Sara explained: 'My first exposure to meaningful experiences was in Tom's class as a PETE student, and that was really where I guess I started to develop a vision for it'. Kretchmar's vision provided a clear image of what we hoped 'could be or might be' (Hammerness, 1999, p.4) in our physical education teaching. Kretchmar's (2000; 2006; 2008) descriptions of meaningful physical education provided a clear enough focus to allow all of us to identify problems with the current forms of physical education we were engaged with, supporting Shulman and Shulman's (2004) suggestion that formulation of a new vision is often related to dissatisfaction with the status quo. For example, Jenny explained:

> I was very attracted to descriptions of the possibilities for the effect of outcomes
>
> in physical education and how that might happen… what attracted me to this was

the possibility of not trying to meet multiple goals at the same time and work on

one thing and do it well (FG).

Clarity of vision was further enhanced by a literature review (Authors, 2017) that

provided direction on how we could structure our approach by using features of

meaningful physical education: social interaction, challenge, motor competence, fun,

delight, and personally relevant learning.

Second, the distance between Kretchmar's (2000; 2006; 2008) vision and our

respective practices at the time of engagement was close enough to place the vision within

reach, providing both motivation and inspiration (Hammerness, 2003). Aspects of meaningful

experiences as outlined by Kretchmar resonated with aspects of our current practices in ways

that allowed us to make connections with priorities and strategies already in place. For some,

there was a relatively close distance between vision and current practice, which led to a

refocusing rather than a radical rethinking. For example, Tom said: 'we were probably

already doing a lot of these things before it became prominent, we came to those realisations

that, "okay, this fits with my ideas, it's maybe a little bit of a tweaking or not much tweaking

at all"… without having to totally overhaul a lot of the things that we were already doing'

(FG). This recognition of some pre-existing practices that aligned with aspects of the vision

made the distance shorter, making it easier to adopt an overall vision of meaningful physical

education. For others the vision was attractive, but a larger distance between vision and

current practice raised uncertainties. Sara explained:

> I started to think "this is what I want do with my students, but I have no idea
>
> how", and -- I was teaching at that time -- I don't think I was doing anything
>
> remotely close to any of the things that I think of now as facilitating meaningful
>
> experiences (FG).

The discrepancies in distance might in some ways be attributed to the respective amounts of teaching experience each of us had. Even when the distance between the vision and current practice was large, the overall vision provided a set of images that were relatable enough and potentially attainable. The attractiveness of the overall vision was particularly important in helping to motivate us towards implementation in areas where direction on how to proceed was less clear.

Third, each participant's personal circumstances provided impetus for them to pursue inquiry around ways in which beliefs about meaningful physical education aligned with their own practice. Also, the context in which each individual was working provided the freedom and flexibility for them to experiment with their practice, for example, Sara said: 'in the school that I teach in, I really have the freedom to do what I want within reason, obviously. There was nothing really that I felt limited my ability to be able to do this' (FG). Hence, the initial goal adopted by each of us towards meaningful physical education was focused specifically on our immediate contexts, suggesting that our range of vision started very narrowly, focused on one cohort in one unit of work.

Hammerness's (2003) dimensions of vision are clear in our analysis of this phase of our research. Specifically, we show how interrogating focus and distance was central to helping us get a sense of how we stood individually and collectively in relation to the vision and our respective practices. As a result, this phase of the process enabled us to identify what was needed to have the vision realised in practice.

Implementation phase: the vision in practice

A vision for meaningful physical education played a role as both a guide and measure of practice (Hammerness, 2001) in supporting our developing practices through experimentation with and application of concepts related to meaningfulness. Sometimes, the focus of the vision was clear but actions to achieve the vision were less so. In these instances we used a

trial and error approach, a best guess based on our growing understanding of meaningful physical education. Gail explained:

> A big thing for me was that trial and error. I like getting things right straight away, but I learned with this that it's all trial and error and you actually learn more from your mistakes than when you get it right straight away (FG).

The demands of a vision for meaningful physical education led to disruption of previous assumptions that required reconciliation with our evolving vision. For example, Sara outlined how reference to her overall vision helped her: 'when that prioritization conflicted with my own ideas and experiences… I had to make a choice to hold to my decision to prioritize meaningful experiences when I was a bit unsure' (TSM). As we became more practiced at planning and implementing pedagogies aligned with our vision we came to better appreciate how the features of meaningful physical education supported implementation. Karla explained, 'I learned quite quickly that within the lesson the features did not stand alone but were integrated and fostered one another' (TSM). As we grew more comfortable with the overall approach the clarity of focus sharpened and pedagogies aligned with this focus became more embedded in practice. Tom shared how aligning his vision with practice involved an iterative process:

> I think I go back and forth between the two. I think that sometimes my practice is helping me refine my vision, sometimes my vision is helping me refine and experiment with practice, and it goes back and forth; it's not all one way.… (FG).

Having access to both big picture ideas and more specific pedagogies aligned with the vision guided our implementation of the vision in ways that were grounded in our everyday realities of physical education practice (McElhone et al., 2009).

The features of meaningful physical education (Authors, 2017) were also important as a measure of practice (Hammerness, 2001; Shulman and Shulman 2004): both a checklist to

reference on-the-spot decisions against as well as a tool to consciously reflect in-action. Of course, not all questions and issues that arose were resolved. For example, Jenny struggled with Kretchmar's (2006) description of personal playgrounds – the 'special' places and spaces that provide a context for meaningful movement. According to Blankenship and Ayers (2010), these types of playgrounds are developed and not found, which makes it difficult to aim for the development of personal playgrounds in individual physical education lessons or units. Jenny acknowledged how her vision helped 'place boundaries around what is important to me and to divide up a complex and multifaceted issue in ways that allow us to deal with it without being overwhelmed' (TSM).

Development of our vision and our practices resulted in, and was directly connected to, complimentary changes to our respective 'selves in practice'; who we were as physical educators and what was most important to us as teachers and/or teacher educators. For example, Karla explained how a vision for meaningful physical education

> … has given me a language to help make this realization in my practice. I find myself realizing what is important to me… [it has] enabled me to align myself as a social constructivist and recognize just how big of a role social interaction plays in all of my lessons' (TSM).

The vision for meaningful physical education allowed for flexible implementation by each physical educator. Many aspects of our approaches were common but we each took up and emphasised different features based on the requirements of our courses, our contexts and the needs and interests of the participants we were teaching. Jenny described 'being able to articulate a clear purpose and act consistently in line with this goal makes me feel good, makes me feel powerful' (TSM). Regardless of context, alignment of our practices with our core values, as well as increasingly successful implementation of vision across time resulted

in a greater clarity of vision, confidence in decision-making, congruence of practice and an increased sense of authenticity as educators.

We all acknowledged a change to our vision and practices as physical educators. Again, Hammerness's (2003) framework proved helpful in understanding and identifying the ways our vision and practices were changing, however, in the second phase the dimensions of distance and range stood out. For example, our changes in implementation led (mostly) towards more flexibility in our decision-making in response to the quality of our pupils' experiences and more democratic, student-centred approaches. Also, the features of meaningful physical education provided a means to interpret and judge the distance between vision and our practices on a daily basis. Reduction of the distance between practice and vision was reflected in our 'being able to explain and express those ideas *in action'* (Tom, TSM) as well being able to articulate these ideas with conviction. One example of this change was in our increased range of vision.

It is noteworthy that this increase in range is a relatively recent development for most of us, and we suggest to others that an increase in range develops once the vision is well-established in one context first. As a vision for meaningful physical education became firmly embedded and changed who we were as teachers and teacher educators, its influence coloured both our thinking and approaches in other areas outside the original context.

Taking stock phase: a consolidated vision in practice

Following a relatively extended period of implementation as well as purposeful sharing and dissemination of our practices and research on meaningful physical education, we are in a position to individually and collectively articulate a clear vision for meaningful physical education. Vision has played an important role in supporting us to develop and embed new approaches aligned with the vision (Hammerness, 2001). The impact of vision on practice has become more marked through increased clarity of focus, closing of distance

between vision and practice, and an increase in range. This has come as a result of implementing the vision across time in concert with processes of reflection (supported by self-study). Holding a clear vision continues to support and sustain aligned practices in a number of ways, even when aspects of our respective practices differ. For example, we each believe that teaching and teacher education practices are inherently different, due in large part to the different profiles, needs and interests of learners in each context. Yet, our individual and collective visions showed strong overlap and coherence.

 In the final vision statements we all outlined a clear and sharply defined vision, expressed primarily through description of the quality of student experience and associated pedagogies. The features of meaningful physical education framed articulation of our vision in action. Karla explained: 'it's always that filter for me to make my decisions; kind of that foundation for my own teaching now' (FG). Sara also expressed commitment to the approach: '…hands down to me, this is my teaching philosophy, and I'm sure it'll change. I don't think it's complete in my own thinking, but definitely something I want to continue to bring into my teaching' (TSM). Being able to articulate a vision for teaching physical education has created a strong sense of ownership and purpose related to what is most important to us in teaching physical education (Duffy, 2002; Parsons and LaCroix, 2013). Gail described:

> You have to lose some things to gain others. You might have to reduce
> competition in order to gain a more meaningful experience. I didn't mind reducing
> the competition if it meant the children are going to enjoy it more or going to take
> part more. Kind of like a catch-22 for me.

In some cases, the approach now defines our foundational approach to teaching. For example, Gail said: 'I was using meaningful approach in my coaching without even thinking

about it' (FG). Gail and Sara have also begun to use meaningful experiences to help make pedagogical decisions in other subject areas, such as music and visual art. Gail explained:

> I find I'm using it in every setting, not just PE. I'm bringing it into drama, I'm
>
> bringing it into oral language, I'm bringing it into Irish, and since I've had my
>
> own classroom, I can see how it just clicks and I love using it not just in the PE
>
> classroom (FG).

Continued implementation in practice has provided further evidence of success and resulted in reinforcement of commitment to the vision and greater confidence in overall teaching practice. Tom further explained:

> Being able to express, articulate and enact a vision of teaching in PE or PETE
>
> leads to greater confidence in what you are doing because you are able to
>
> demonstrate that your actions align with your beliefs in a coherent way (TSM).

Awareness and articulation of vision has resulted in feelings of integrity and empowerment (Turner, 2006) that have enhanced our practices. This is not to imply that the limits of our ideals of the overall vision have been reached in our practices. Rather, we suggest that we are each in a continual process of narrowing the distance between this ideal vision and our practices that may well take a lifetime. We all identified aspects of the vision and its implementation that we had not yet resolved related to the focus and range of the vision. For example Sara shared 'I'm still a little bit stuck on the how, in some ways. The features are a huge part of how I do that, I just don't know if I am…bringing it to the max. I would say I'm not' (FG). We all expressed openness to further developing both practice and vision in teaching physical education.

Vision has also provided a framework and language to share our practices in ways that have allowed us to explore and work towards a shared vision (Shulman & Shulman, 2004) of meaningful physical education. Our sharing forum provided a space to ask

questions, seek clarification and share different solutions to common problems that arose, and find resonance in the practices of others; for example, 'I can relate to that perfectly because…' (Tom, FG) and 'I'm here smiling because…' (Jenny, FG). Karla explained how sharing her experience and discussing it with others has enabled her to 'explicitly pinpoint things that I genuinely believe now. I find that writing it is much easier now, because I'm more aware of what I actually believe' (FG).

The tone of these interactions was inquiry-oriented and intended as a generative process. For example, Jenny wrote:

What I have focused on here are questions that have been raised over time that are still issues as we go forward. Some of these are questions I raised along the way that never got figured out. Others are emerging as we proceed. I am hoping that we might collectively bounce some of these around – not to get an 'answer' but perhaps to identify possible directions and ways forward… (TSM)

In summary, it is important for physical educators to be able to take stock and articulate the relationship between their vision and practices. How and with whom the articulation occurs will depend on the contexts, however, we demonstrate the value of embarking on the development and articulation of a vision within communities of practitioners who value and are open to dialogue in an inquiry-oriented setting.

Conclusion

The purpose of this research was to explore how the idea of meaningful experiences could serve as a vision for teaching physical education at a time when there is perceived fragmentation in the field (Ennis, 2017; Lawson, 2018; Quennerstedt, 2018). As explained previously, we do not feel there is a best type of physical education, however, student learning, physical education teaching, and PETE may be better aligned when provided with coherent frameworks. We have shown how a vision for physical education based on

meaningful experiences may serve as one such coherent framework to achieve a range of the subject's aims. In addition to providing empirical evidence of the application of a 'broad' vision for physical education, we suggest that this research adds to work done by, for example, MacPhail et al. (2013) and Enright and O'Sullivan (2010) by serving as an exemplar of how to describe a vision and identify the challenges of enacting it in practice. Moreover, we have demonstrated how a vision based on meaningful experiences can transfer from PETE to physical education teaching, serving to narrow rather than widen the gap between the aims of practitioners in both contexts. We understand that our data set is generated from a small set of participants, all of whom closely connected in the work we have previously done; this suggests there is scope to examine different visions with more diverse groups of participants, particularly to identify ways in which vision and practice work and are modified as a result of iterative and collaborative processes.

The dimensions of vision provided a framework that has helped us illustrate how, across time, changes in focus, direction and range of vision have influenced our teaching of physical education to emphasise meaningful experiences (Hammerness, 2003). Taking the time to test how pedagogies aligned with aspects of the vision was central to a gradual process of increased clarity of vision. The similarities in our experiences of implementing the vision, overcoming similar challenges, and sharing similar successes allows us to conclude that, overall, we hold a shared vision, both in focus and how it is implemented in practice. Our written articulations of vision have much in common, using a similar language and expressing similar priorities. With that said, we acknowledge that given the central role Jenny and Tom played in introducing meaningful experiences to Karla, Gail and Sara, this is perhaps not surprising. However, through these processes we identified a number of 'benchmark' pedagogies we all used that represented our collective understanding of how to implement a meaningful approach (for instance, modifying activities according to individual

student interests and needs, providing opportunities for students to make choices, using reflection and goal-setting). Also, the centrality of student experience and emphasis on their involvement in decision-making is common. It is important to emphasise, however, that we did not all implement our visions using identical pedagogies. There were differences in emphasis placed on particular features of meaningful physical education by some participants, such as identifying social interaction as the anchor feature or prioritising challenge and motor learning. These differences were not of a scale to suggest a different vision, however, but rather suggest a flexibility of response to context, as well as the needs and interests of participants. This also led to a complimentary narrowing of distance between practice and vision.

Findings also provide an illustration of Shulman and Shulman's (2004) model of teacher development, and perhaps serve as an exemplar which others may wish to consult in order to engage in their own processes of describing and enacting a vision of physical education. The first two steps of the model, teachers being ready (vision) and willing (motivation) are reflected in findings from the 'early phase' of our engagement with the vision. We encountered the right set of circumstances that moved us forward into an 'implementation phase' which echoes the third step of Shulman and Shulman's (2004) model, being able, which relates to opportunities to engage and practice and understanding. For us, this was the longest phase and the most challenging as it represented experimenting with a vision we were ready and willing to implement, even though practical guidance on implementation was lacking. Step four, reflection, was embedded in our processes as part of the self-study research we were all engaged in. Finally, both steps four and five, community (Shulman and Shulman, 2004) are represented in our third phase 'taking stock' in which we reviewed and evaluated but also learned from our experiences. The clarity of vision expressed in final vision statements demonstrates how engagement with, reflection on, and articulation

of vision following conclusion of the self-study processes supported a further clarification of vision alongside an affirmation of understandings of meaningful physical education through identification of common practices and experiences. These sharing processes resulted in renewed commitment to the vision and lead us towards a shared vision of practice (Hammerness, 2001).

Shulman (in Hammerness, 2006, foreword, p.ix) describes vision as a 'socially transferred attribute'. Our story is an example of how articulation of a powerful vision was socially transferred to us through the work of Kretchmar (2000; 2006; 2008). Moreover, it served as a way for teacher educators to transfer ideas to prospective and practicing teachers. Engaging in the processes of describing and examining a vision in a collective endeavour brought our individual and collective practices closer to this vision. This suggests that vision should be an important consideration for those who seek to promote innovation and reform (Hammerness, 2006) in physical education and PETE, and in particular, in introducing new teachers and teacher educators to ways they can better align what they *want* to do and what they *can* do in teaching (Kennedy, 1999; McDonald, et al., 2013). In conclusion, we highlight the value of paying attention to the role of vision in promoting and supporting physical educators across contexts and career stages, individually and collectively, in developing and sustaining innovation in their practice.

References

Authors. (2015). *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education.*

Authors. (2016). *Studying Teacher Education.*

Authors. (2017). *Quest*.

Authors. (2018a). *Curriculum Studies in Health and Physical Education*.

Authors (2018b). *European Physical Education Review*.

Authors. (2018c). *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*.

Authors (2018d). *PE Matters.*

Berry, A. (2009). Exploring Vision in Self-Study. *Studying Teacher Education*, 5:2, 159-162

Blankenship, B. T., & Ayers, S. F. (2010). The role of PETE in developing joy-oriented
    physical educators. *Quest*, *62*(2), 171-183.

Bransford J., L. Darling-Hammond, and P. LePage (2005) *Introduction*. In: Darling-
    Hammond, L. and J. Bransford (Eds). Preparing Teachers for a Changing World:
    What New Teachers Should Know and Be Able To Do. (Pp.1-390. Jossey Bass: San
    Francisco.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research
    in psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101.

Cornish, F., Gillespie, A., and Zittoun, T. (2013). Collaborative analysis of qualitative data.
    In U. Flick (Ed.). *The Sage handbook of qualitative analysis.* (pp. 79-93). Thousand
    Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W., and D. L. Miller. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. Theory
    into practice, 39(3), 124-130.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful Teacher Education: Lessons From Exemplary
    Programs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L., J. Banks, K. Zumwalt, L. Gomez, M. G. Sherin, J. Griesdorn, and L. Finn. (2005). Educational Goals and Purposes: Developing a Curricular Vision for Teaching. In Darling-Hammdond, L. and Bransford, J. (Eds.) *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World: What Teachers Should Learn and Be Able To Do*. Jossey Bass: San Francisco.

Duffy, G. G. (2002). Visioning and the Development of Outstanding Teachers. *Literacy Research and Instruction, 41*(4), 331-343.

Ennis, C. D. (2006). Curriculum: Forming and Reshaping the Vision of Physical Education in a High Need, Low Demand World of Schools. *Quest, 58*(1), 41-59.

Ennis, C. D. (2017). Educating Students for a Lifetime of Physical Activity: Enhancing Mindfulness, Motivation, and Meaning. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 88(3), 241-250.

Enright, E., & O'Sullivan, M. (2010). 'Can I do it in my pyjamas?' Negotiating a physical education curriculum with teenage girls. *European Physical Education Review*, *16*(3), 203-222.

Green, K. (2002). Physical Education Teachers in Their Figurations: A Sociological Analysis of Everyday' Philosophies'. *Sport, Education and Society, 7*(1), 65-83.

Hammerness, K. (1999, April). *Visions of Delight, Visions of Doubt: The Relationship Between Emotion and Cognition in Teachers' Vision*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Montreal, April 1999.

Hammerness, K. (2001). Teachers' Visions: The Role of Personal Ideals in School Reform. *Journal of Educational Change, 2*(2), 143-163.

Hammerness, K. (2003). Learning to Hope, or Hoping to Learn? The Role of Vision in the Early Professional Lives of Teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 54*(1), 43-56.

Hammerness, K. (2006). Seeing Through Teachers' Eyes: Professional Ideals and Classroom Practices, Vol. 46, Teachers College Press.

Hammerness, K., L. Darling-Hammond, J. Bransford, D. Berliner, M. Cochran-Smith, M. McDonald, and K. Zeichner, K. (2005). How Teachers Learn and Develop. In Darling-Hammond, L. and J. Bransford, (Eds.) *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. Jossey Bass: San Francisco.

Kennedy, M. M. (1999). The Role of Preservice Teacher Education. In Darling-Hammond, L. and G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the Learning Profession: Handbook of Policy and Practice*, 54-85. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Kennedy, M. M. (2006). Knowledge and Vision in Teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(3), 205-211.

Kirk, D., 2009. *Physical education futures*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Kosnik, C., and C. Beck. (2009). *Priorities in Teacher Education: The 7 Key Elements of Pre-Service Preparation*. London, UK: Routledge.

Kosnik, C., and C. Beck. (2011). *Teaching in a Nutshell: Navigating Your Teacher Education Program as a Student Teacher*. London, UK: Routledge.

Kosnik, C., C. Beck, Y. Cleovoulou, and T. Fletcher. (2009). Improving Teacher Education Through Longitudinal Research: How Studying our Graduates Led us to Give Priority to Program Planning and Vision for Teaching. *Studying Teacher Education, 5*(2), 163-175. doi:10.1080/17425960903306880

Kretchmar, R. S. (2000). Moving and Being Moved: Implications for Practice. *Quest, 52*(3), 260-272. doi:10.1080/00336297.2000.10491714

Kretchmar, R. S. (2001). Duty, Habit, and Meaning: Different Faces of Adherence. *Quest, 53*(3), 318-325. doi:10.1080/00336297.2001.10491748

Kretchmar, R. S. (2006). Ten More Reasons for Quality Physical Education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 77*(9), 6-9.

Kretchmar, R. S. (2008). The Increasing Utility of Elementary School Physical Education: A Mixed Blessing and Unique Challenge. *The Elementary School Journal, 108*(3), 161-170.

Lawson, H. A. (2018) *Redesigning Physical Education*. New York: Routledge.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1986). But is it rigorous? Trustworthiness and authenticity in naturalistic evaluation. *New directions for program evaluation*, (30), 73-84.

Loughran, J. (2006). *Developing a pedagogy of teacher education.* New York, NY: Routledge.

MacPhail, A., Tannehill, D., & Karp, G. G. (2013). Preparing physical education preservice teachers to design instructionally aligned lessons through constructivist pedagogical practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *33*, 100-112.

McDonald, M., E. Kazemi, and S. S. Kavanagh. (2013). Core Practices and Pedagogies of Teacher Education: A Call for a Common Language and Collective Activity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *64*(5), 378-386.

McElhone, D., H. Hebard, R. Scott, and C. Juel. (2009). The Role of Vision in Trajectories of Literacy Practice Among New Teachers. *Studying Teacher Education, 5*(2), 147-158. doi:10.1080/17425960903306682

McEvoy, E., P. Heikinaro-Johansson, and A. MacPhail. (2017). Physical Education Teacher Educators' Views Regarding the Purpose(s) of School Physical Education. *Sport, Education and Society, 22* (7), 812-824. doi:10.1080/13573322.2015.1075971

O'Sullivan, M. (2014). *Where We Go From Here: Developing Pedagogies for PETE and the Use of Self-Study in Physical Education and Teacher Education*. In T. Fletcher and A. Ovens (Eds.), Self-Study in Physical Education Teacher Education Exploring the

interplay of practice and scholarship (e book) Self-Study of Teaching and Teacher

Education Practices Volume 13 (pp. 169-180). Dordrect Springer.

Parsons, S. A., and L. La Croix. (2013). A Vision within a Classroom of Her Own: The Case

of Ann. *Teacher Educators' Journal, 20*, 57-73.

Quennerstedt, M. (2018, July). *Physical education and the art of teaching: Transformative

learning and teaching in physical education and sport pedagogy*. Cagigal Scholar

Lecture presented at the AIESEP World Congress, Edinburgh, UK.

Ritter, J. K. (2009). Developing a Vision of Teacher Education: How My Classroom Teacher

Understandings Evolved in the University Environment. *Studying Teacher Education,

5*(1), 45-60.

Samaras, A. P. (2010). *Self-Study Teacher Research: Improving Your Practice Through

Collaborative Inquiry*: Sage.

Shulman, L. S., and J. H. Shulman. (2004). How and What Teachers Learn: A Shifting

Perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 36*, 257–271.

Thorburn M. (2018). John Dewey, subject purposes and schools of tomorrow: A centennial

reappraisal of the educational contribution of physical education. *Learning, culture

and social interaction*, *19*, 22-28.

Turner, J. D. (2006). "I Want to Meet My Students Where They Are!" Preservice Teachers'

Visions of Culturally Responsive Literacy Instruction. In *55th yearbook of the

National Reading Conference* (Vol. 55, p. 309). Oak Creek, WI: National Reading

Conference.

Vaughn, M. (2015). Adaptive Teaching: Reflective Practice of Two Elementary Teachers'

Visions and Adaptations During Literacy Instruction. *Reflective Practice, 16*(1), 43-

60.

Vaughn, M., and B. Faircloth, B. (2011). Understanding Teacher Visioning and Agency During Literacy Instruction. 60th yearbook of the Literacy Research Association, 156-164.

Vaughn, M., and S. A. Parsons. (2012). Visions, Enactments, Obstacles, and Negotiations: Case Studies of Two Novice Teachers Enrolled in a Graduate Literacy Course. *Journal of Reading Education, 38*(1), 18-25.

Zeichner, K. (2007). Accumulating Knowledge Across Self-Studies in Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(1), 36-46.

Table 1

Participant involvement in previously published self-studies

Published self-study	Participants from the current research	Role at the time of the self-study
Authors (2015)	Jenny	Teacher educator
	Tom	Teacher educator
Authors (2016)	Jenny	Teacher educator
	Tom	Teacher educator
Authors (2018a)	Jenny	Teacher educator
	Tom	Teacher educator
	Karla	Teacher educator
Authors (2018b)	Sara	Teacher
	Tom	Teacher educator
	Jenny	Teacher educator
Authors (2018c)	Jenny	Teacher educator
	Tom	Teacher educator
Authors (2018d)	Gail	Teacher
	Jenny	Teacher educator
	Tom	Teacher educator