



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

A major review of stakeholder perspectives on the purposes of primary physical education

Citation for published version:

Ní Chróinín, D, Fletcher, T, Jess, M & Corr, M 2019, 'A major review of stakeholder perspectives on the purposes of primary physical education', *European Physical Education Review*, pp. 1-15.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X19856381>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1177/1356336X19856381](https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X19856381)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

European Physical Education Review

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Title: A major review of stakeholder perspectives on the purposes of primary physical education

Author names and affiliations:

Déirdre Ní Chróinín ^a

Tim Fletcher ^{b*}

Mike Jess ^c

Méabh Corr ^a

^a Department of Arts Education and Physical Education
Mary Immaculate College
Limerick
Ireland

^b Department of Kinesiology
Brock University
St. Catharines, ON L2S 3A1
Canada

^c Moray House School of Education
University of Edinburgh
Edinburgh EH8 8AQ
United Kingdom

*Corresponding author: Tim Fletcher
Department of Kinesiology
Brock University
St. Catharines, ON L2S 3A1
Canada
E: tfletcher@brocku.ca
P: [+1 905 688 5550 x6358](tel:+19056885550x6358)

Author Biographies:

Déirdre Ní Chróinín is Head of the Department of Arts Education and Physical Education and Senior Lecturer at Mary Immaculate College, Ireland

Tim Fletcher is an Associate Professor at Brock University, Canada

Mike Jess is Senior Lecturer at University of Edinburgh, UK

Méabh Corr is a PhD Candidate at Mary Immaculate College, Ireland

Abstract

While there may be some broad agreement about the purposes of primary physical education, there is dramatic variance in how these purposes are prioritised and enacted. Primary physical education consequently focusses on multiple, often competing, priorities. To gain a better understanding of this issue we review how different stakeholders view the purposes of primary physical education. We analysed 95 qualitative studies published between 2000-2017 that focussed on the views of different stakeholders. Across all stakeholders, the main purposes of primary physical education were identified as being physically active and learning physical, social and emotional skills. Teachers and pupils were the most represented stakeholders, while the limited representation of school principals and policy makers was noted. The review indicates a need to examine the perspectives of those underrepresented stakeholders, serving as an entry point for bridge building to shape the future direction of primary physical education.

The Primary Physical Education Landscape

Primary physical education has received renewed attention in the literature, with special issues of *Education 3-13* and the *European Physical Education Review* that focus on primary physical education being published alongside the first *Routledge Handbook of Primary Physical Education*. While these texts showcase innovative practices and provide insights into primary physical education across different contexts, Petrie and Griggs (2018: 397) warn that ‘governments internationally are interested in “exploiting” physical education as a space to achieve a range of political goals’. Discourses related to health (Powell, 2018), sport (Ward, 2018), education (Griggs, 2018) and neoliberalism (Macdonald, 2014) dominate the ‘contested terrain in which primary physical education is situated’ (Griggs, 2018: 45). As governments dictate physical education policy, accusations that physical education is trying to achieve too much across learning domains has led to a field that is ‘increasingly disconnected and fragmented’ (Carse, Jess and Keay, 2018: 498). Confusion has been created and promises made that cannot be kept (Bailey et al., 2009). As such, Lawson (2018: 141) calls for a complete redesign of school-based physical education that requires ‘conceptual clarity and precision’.

At the heart of this contestation evident in health, sport, education and neoliberal discourses (Griggs, 2018), Carse et al. (2018: 487) identify different stakeholders from educational, political, sport, health, commercial and community contexts who hold ‘differing and sometimes contradictory views’ about the purposes of primary physical education. The aim of this review is therefore to achieve some clarity about stakeholders’ views of the purposes of primary physical education. A stakeholder is viewed as an individual, group or organisation with a specific interest or stake with the potential to influence aims, decisions, and actions within a given context (Bryson, 2004).

In addition to defining what a stakeholder is, it is also prudent to consider what is meant by the purposes of physical education. It is challenging to find an agreed upon definition of the purposes of physical education because the perceived benefits and outcomes are shaped by the prominent discourses mentioned previously (i.e. health, sport, education, neoliberal). We believe that major reviews of the value, aims, benefits, and outcomes of physical education offers a succinct way to think about what we mean by purposes. For example, in their major review Bailey et al. (2009) analyse the extent to which claims can be made that physical education and its practices support the achievement of a range of its purported benefits, namely those that address physical, social, affective, and cognitive learning domains. Our view therefore is that the purposes of physical education are tied to the value, benefits and/or outcomes of the subject for its pupils. Yet, while it is common to read researchers' perspectives of the purposes of physical education, it is less common to read the perspectives of other stakeholders. In this review, we ask: What is empirically known about stakeholders' perspectives on the purposes of primary physical education?

There are several potential outcomes that come from conducting this research. First, taking stock of what is known about the perspectives of different stakeholders can help identify commonalities, which, in turn, might allow for more connected thinking and alignment across stakeholder groups. We see this as one way of attending to Lawson's (2018) call for bridge-building across stakeholder groups that he **believes** are necessary in any type of systemic reform or redesign in education. Second, the review may allow important differences to be seen across stakeholder groups, which may highlight how and why ideas about primary physical education are being accepted or rejected by those stakeholders. Drawing from Lawson (2018) again, this outcome may allow particularly teachers and teacher educators to understand, identify and interpret differences in stakeholder priorities so

they may be responded to, and which enable a more intimate involvement in reform and redesign agendas.

Methods

Stakeholder analysis aims to generate knowledge about individuals and organisations ‘to understand their behaviour, intentions, interrelations and interests, and [to assess] the influence and resources they bring to bear on decision-making or implementation processes’ (Varvasovszky and Brugha, 2000: 338). Analysing different perspectives can support in understanding how stakeholders prioritise issues, make decisions and subsequently identify opportunities to influence these decisions (Brugha and Varvasovszky, 2000). Varvasovszky and Brugha (2000) recommend stakeholder analyses consider the aim, time dimension, and context of the analysis. They suggest that stakeholder characteristics such as involvement and interest in the issue, degree of influence or power, position, and the impact of the issue on practice might also be considered. Because we did not collect primary data from stakeholders, this review is not considered a full stakeholder analysis. Instead, we drew on processes and principles from stakeholder analysis to guide the review and gain insight about stakeholders’ perspectives of the purposes of primary physical education. We were also guided by reviews of stakeholders’ perspectives on the role of the primary school in preventing childhood obesity (Clarke et al., 2013) and inclusion in physical education (Qi and Ha, 2012). Specifically, we aimed to gather stakeholders’ perspectives on the purposes of primary physical education. There is no specific time dimension as the authors of papers reviewed might have gathered data from stakeholders with views to the past, present and/or future. We considered the international context of primary physical education, though our implicit focus is on English-speaking countries. Based on their interest, involvement and degrees of influence on the subject of primary physical education, the stakeholders we

identified were teachers, principals, pre-service teachers, teacher educators, policy makers, sport coaches (which we felt represented one type of ‘outsourced provider’), pupils, and parents.

Search

Peer-reviewed studies published in English between January 2000 and December 2017 were included. We chose January 2000 as a lower boundary due to the publication of the *Handbook of Physical Education* in 2006 (Kirk, Macdonald and O’Sullivan, 2006). Hunter’s (2006) chapter represented one of the first reviews of primary physical education, addressing literature to the end of the 20th century. Focussing on work conducted from the turn of the century might therefore reduce overlap and provide a better sense of relatively current perspectives of stakeholders. December 2017 was chosen as the upper boundary because we commenced the first phase of the literature search in early 2018, with the analysis ongoing throughout that year. We only included empirical studies reporting qualitative data because we felt that qualitative approaches were best aligned with research questions related to stakeholder perspectives about purposes of primary physical education. For example, like Allender, Cowburn, and Foster (2006) we did not feel that quantitative survey data could appropriately reflect the important contextual, social, and cultural factors that might inform stakeholders’ perspectives, and which shape the discourses around primary physical education. Qualitative studies mainly generate data from focus groups, interviews, observations, open-ended surveys, reflective entries, and visual methods (e.g. draw-and-write or photovoice).

There were three main search phases. Search 1 included scanning two electronic databases, SportDiscus and Education Source, for a combination of terms. Specifically, we looked for combinations of research focus (primary physical education), research methods and stakeholder groups. The specific terms used in Search 1 are presented in Table 1:

	Focus	AND	Methods	AND	Stakeholders
Combination of search terms	Primary OR elementary physical education		Focus Group OR Document OR Photograph OR Observation OR Case Study OR Narrative OR Visual OR Interview OR Qualitative OR Draw and Write		children OR student OR pupil OR pre-service teachers OR professors OR parents OR teacher OR principal OR coach OR physical activity coordinator OR specialist physical education teacher OR academics OR teacher educator OR PHE Canada OR professional organisation OR AfPE OR Shape America OR policy makers OR policy writers OR curriculum writers OR sport organisations OR health promotion bodies OR faculty OR staff

Table 1: Search Terms and their Combinations

Searches 2 and 3 involved additional scans (one other database and a manual search) for studies not appearing in Search 1. In Table 2 results are presented from the three main search phases:

	Initial search	Duplicates	Excluded	Included

	results		papers	papers
Search 1: SportDiscus and Education Source				
No. of papers	1,166	239	801	126
Search 2: Web of Science				
No. of papers	988	210	746	32
Search 3: Manual Search from Citations in Searches 1 and 2				
No. of papers	-	-	-	12
Total No. of Papers:				170

Table 2: Results from three main search phases

Table 2 shows Search 1 yielded 1,166 results, from which 239 duplicates were removed. The remaining 927 studies were screened by title and abstract for inclusion. During this process, 801 studies were excluded, mainly because the articles did not yield empirical data, were not focussed on primary physical education, and/or did not focus specifically on stakeholders' perspectives on the purposes of primary physical education. This led to an initial database of 126 studies. To ensure rigour and limit the number of missed papers, Search 2 was completed using the same search terms as Search 1 but within the Web of Science database. This resulted in 988 studies being identified, of which 210 were duplicates. In comparing the results of Searches 1 and 2, 778 studies were screened based on title and abstract, of which 746 were excluded. As such, 32 new papers were added to the main database. Because the specific language of the search teams might not have been used in the article titles or abstracts, Search 3 involved a forward/backward search of citations in studies in the database, leading to 12 more studies being included. No additional stakeholders were

identified throughout the search process. This led to the final 170 paper database for screening.

Screening and Data Extraction

Titles and abstracts of 170 studies were screened independently to identify those that potentially met the inclusion criteria (i.e. that the paper's focus was on stakeholders' perspectives of the purposes of primary physical education). Based on the inclusion criteria, we independently marked each paper on a spreadsheet as 'green' for inclusion, 'red' for exclusion, and 'orange' if unsure. Papers marked 'orange' and those that were marked differently by the authors (e.g. a paper marked 'green' by three authors and 'red' by one author) were discussed on Skype. In the ensuing discussions we focussed on each author's interpretation of our main research question. This approach was common for papers that addressed, for example, teachers' experiences of implementing an approach to teaching physical education, such as implementing Sport Education or Game-Centred Approaches (GCAs). To continue with this example, if, through outlining a stakeholder's experience of implementation no light was shed on that stakeholder's views of the purposes of primary physical education, the paper was excluded. When no consensus was reached from analysing the title or abstract, we included the paper. This was because we could make a final decision on inclusion/exclusion from reading the entire paper in the final analysis. From the main database of 170 studies and our process for inclusion/exclusion, we retained 126 papers for the main analysis.

Analysis and synthesis: Step 1. Data from these 126 studies were extracted as follows. The full text of each paper was saved to a shared online folder and its details entered in a data extraction form, which included: title, author/s, year of publication, country/region, research question, context and characteristics of stakeholder, theoretical framework, methodology and data collection methods, main findings, and recommendations. Each

study's details were reviewed independently and assessed for eligibility. Any disagreement was resolved through consensus by following the processes engaged in during screening and data extraction (outlined in the previous section). Following data extraction, a further 28 studies were excluded. As with the initial data extraction process, most of these papers were excluded because they did not help us address our research question. For example, several offered exemplars of certain approaches used for primary physical education or considered pupils' attitudes toward peers with disabilities in physical education but did not focus specifically on stakeholders' perspectives of primary physical education. This left a total of 98 papers in the main database. Following a full review of the 98 papers, three more were removed because they did not address the research question. Therefore, 95 papers were included in the final analysis.

Analysis and synthesis: Step 2. Next, we made sense of these data organised by stakeholder. Similar to Sperka and Enright (2018), each paper was assigned a number (1–95) (see Appendix 1) and these numbers have been used within the text (indicated by superscript) to enhance readability. When a paper included multiple stakeholders, each was considered separately. For example, a paper that addressed perspectives of pupils and teachers was included in both the 'pupil as stakeholder' section and the teachers' in the 'teachers as stakeholders' section. For each stakeholder group, data were coded according to the following sub-headings: 1. Demographics: Number of studies, Location, Number of participants, 2. Research focus, 3. Methodologies and data collection methods, 4. Analytic/theoretical frame, 5. Findings about findings related to the purpose of physical education, 6. Similarities and differences across papers, and 7. Anything noteworthy (e.g. noting predominant methodologies, lack of longitudinal studies, attention to certain theoretical frames or absence of others). Similar to other reviews (Hastie et al., 2011; Sperka and Enright, 2018), this coding scheme generated a mini-thematic analysis for each

stakeholder group. Once data for each stakeholder were analysed, we compared all stakeholders for similarities, differences, and omissions.

Trustworthiness

Through our process we aimed to consider how research on stakeholders' perspectives of the purposes of primary physical education was conceptualised and presented, so we might better understand how researchers arrived at their interpretations. Certainly, what we review is actually researchers' interpretations of stakeholders' perspectives on the purposes of primary physical education. It is almost impossible to avoid this shortcoming due to our reliance on peer-reviewed research as data for the review. This point should be considered by readers when judging the trustworthiness of our interpretations of researchers' interpretations. Other factors that might be considered when judging the trustworthiness of the review include the requirement that papers be written in the English language, which has likely resulted in some papers being excluded that may otherwise be relevant. We also acknowledge that in attempting to capture a breadth of perspective that depth of analysis was sacrificed. For example, it could be argued that the high number of papers in the teacher category merited a separate review. We made the decision to present all the stakeholders in one paper in order to share an overall, descriptive picture. We hope that others may use our findings to conduct research that will provide additional depth of insight on some of the gaps identified.

Despite these limitations, there were several steps taken to strengthen the review process. For instance, the team approach added rigour to the analysis because judgement is a critical component of stakeholder analysis (Varvasovszky and Brugha, 2000). Also, our respective backgrounds and areas of expertise indicated an 'insider' status in terms of primary physical education, which allowed us to draw on our experiences when considering contextual and cultural factors (Varvasovszky and Brugha, 2000). We heeded the advice of

Varvasovszky and Brugha (2000) in recognising our own roles, perspectives and potential biases as ‘insiders’ with investment in influencing the future direction of primary physical education. For example, we considered how the broader physical education landscape, the levels of influence of particular stakeholder groups, and various priorities may have shifted across the temporal period of the review. Again, the value of a team-based approach was useful in how our interpretation of findings was shaped by discussion and debate of the evidence within the data. The large number of papers and participants included in this review also gives confidence in the findings.

Findings and Discussion

Table 3 presents an overview of each stakeholder group represented, the number of papers and research participants in each group and the location of studies. Within the findings about findings, we include relevant themes. Because teachers, pre-service teachers, and teacher educators are all involved in teaching practice, we have listed them consecutively, followed by pupils, principals, and parents. Teachers (64) and pupils (31) are the most represented, while parents, principals, and teacher educators are largely underrepresented in comparison. Policy makers and outsourced providers (e.g. coaches) are not represented. Most studies were conducted in Canada and the USA (n=54) followed by Europe (n=39). The scarcity of papers from Asia and Africa is likely affected by the criterion of papers being in English.

Stakeholder	Number of studies	Number of participants	Location (no. of studies)
Teacher	64	>3621 *	Canada/USA (28) Australia/New Zealand (11) UK (11) Rest of Europe (10) Africa (1) Asia (3)
Pre-service teacher	13	750	Canada/USA (6) Australia/New Zealand (3)

			Rest of Europe (3) Asia (1)
Teacher educator	1	25	Canada/USA (1)
Pupils	31	>2355 *	Canada/USA (14) Australia/New Zealand (3) UK (6) Rest of Europe (7) Asia (1)
Principal	4	>42 *	Canada/USA (2) UK(1) Africa (1)
Parents	4	54	Canada/USA (3) UK (1)
Total 6	Total 95 (some papers include more than one stakeholder)	Total >6852	Totals Canada/USA (54) Australia/New Zealand (17) UK (18) Rest of Europe (21) Africa (2) Asia (4)

Table 3: Overview of Stakeholder representation. * The number of participants was not included in all papers. The number presented is the minimum the authors deduced from the information analysed.

In the following sections we present the analysis of each stakeholder's perspectives of the purposes of primary physical education, incorporating a brief overview of the profile of the studies and findings about findings.

Teachers

There were 64 studies addressing teachers' perspectives of the purposes of primary physical education. These included 44 focussed on the teacher alone while 20 included teachers' perspectives alongside those of pupils, principals or parents. Thirteen focussed on classroom teachers' experiences of professional development, while all others related to teachers' practices that addressed the quality of teaching and learning. These included

teachers' perspectives on the purposes and practices of physical education, their experiences of implementing an innovation, and the challenges of particular contexts (e.g. urban schools). Most studies used interviews and focus groups with teachers as a primary data source (n=60). Observation of teaching, open-ended questionnaires, drawings and photographs, written reflections, and document analysis provided additional data sources. Significantly, conversations with teachers about their perspectives and experiences are the dominant data source, indicating a willingness to promote teachers' voices in research related to the purposes of primary physical education.

Findings about findings. Based on the focus of each study, the 64 papers were organised thematically into three sub-themes. The prevalence of certain foci supported sub-theme development. For example, half of the papers (32) addressed teachers' perspectives on the purposes of physical education based on either the practices they employed or the barriers they faced in achieving those purposes. A number of papers (19) focussed on the use of professional development or pedagogical innovations (13) to inform teachers' perspectives on the purposes of primary physical education. Our interpretation of innovation is that it represents practices that diverge from those described as 'traditional' (e.g. multi-activity programming focussed on learning sport techniques).

Practices and purposes. Thirty-two studies directly addressed teachers' perspectives on the purposes of primary physical education ^(6, 8-12, 26, 42, 44, 46, 47, 49, 53, 54, 60-63, 67-69, 71-73, 75, 76, 82, 85, 91-93, 94). Most teachers identified physical education as a place for learning about and through physical activity participation. Many emphasised being physically active and involved ^(6, 9, 10, 47, 53, 63, 68, 69, 75, 76, 85, 91, 93, 94), learning physical skills ^(12, 46, 53, 60, 63, 67, 68, 71, 72, 76, 92) and also social and emotional skills ^(46, 53, 54, 63, 68, 76, 92, 94). For example, qualities such as playing fairly, getting along with and helping others ⁽⁹²⁾, and enjoyment of physical activity participation ⁽⁵³⁾ were cited. Other purposes identified included the achievement of holistic ⁽⁴⁹⁾

and health and fitness benefits ^(26, 68), playing games ⁽⁴⁴⁾, and enjoyment ⁽²⁶⁾. Teachers recommended that physical education practices should be flexible to promote participation in different environments (e.g. urban schools ⁽⁴⁴⁾) and with different populations (e.g. children with disabilities ^(46, 91)).

Alongside the purposes of primary physical education, teachers also identified barriers to achieving those purposes. The barriers included the low status and priority of physical education ^(47, 61, 73), lack of support and resources ^(8, 26, 44, 47), time ⁽⁶²⁾, and challenges related to management and instructional issues such as culturally and contextually relevant teaching ^(44, 82). Using coaches to replace classroom teachers was criticised by many teachers because they felt learning was neglected and it promoted a narrow view of physical education-as-sport ^(42, 53, 69).

Continuing professional development (CPD). To achieve the purposes many teachers identified in the previous sub-theme, 13 studies ^(2, 5, 7, 43, 45, 50, 51, 55, 56, 65, 70, 74, 95) focussed on the ways CPD informed teachers' perspectives of the purposes of physical education. Following CPD, teachers more strongly identified physical education as a space for learning ⁽⁶⁵⁾ and expressed a commitment to improve children's physical education experiences ^(70, 74). Areas of priority articulated by teachers included children's health and physical activity levels ^(2, 51), physical skill, and positive affect ⁽⁵¹⁾. However, some teachers expressed caution about the sustainability of CPD initiatives that lack the ongoing support needed to embed changes to practice ^(7, 43, 56). Overall findings suggest that CPD can influence teachers' knowledge and understanding of the purposes of physical education, particularly in relation to improving the quality of teaching and learning.

Innovation. There were 19 studies ^(13, 25, 48, 57-59, 64, 77- 81, 83, 84, 86-90) focussed on ways pedagogical innovations could support teachers to achieve the purposes of primary physical education. Teachers' experiences of implementing curriculum models or similar (e.g.

physical literacy) enabled them to more readily realise physical education as a time for learning^(78, 80, 83, 86, 87, 89, 90). Areas of learning identified as a result of engagement with an innovation included social and personal skills^(48, 79), psychomotor skills^(48, 79), increased physical activity involvement and fitness^(58, 59, 84), and enjoyment of physical activity^(57, 83, 88). Increased attention to assessment also reinforced these ideas^(64, 77, 81), although an understanding of the subject-specific nature of assessment is needed to ensure intended outcomes⁽¹³⁾. These findings suggest innovation in physical education can help teachers see the achievement of several learning outcomes (across domains) as a main purpose of primary physical education.

The involvement of over 3000 teachers in 64 research papers suggests that the voices of practicing primary teachers are strongly represented in the literature. Despite the variety of foci in the papers, there is some consistency in teachers' perspectives of the purposes of primary physical education. Specifically, physical education was identified as an enjoyable, physically active learning time where children can learn skills for their physical, social, and emotional development. There was, however, little mention of cognitive skills. Teachers face numerous challenges in achieving these identified purposes, including lack of knowledge, support, resources, time, and professional development. A level of intervention (e.g. an innovation or CPD) appears to magnify and crystallise the purposes of physical education identified by teachers and emphasise the importance of the quality of teaching and learning. The extent of the challenges described by teachers, however, indicates that having a clear purpose is necessary but not sufficient for quality experiences for pupils. The extent of intervention indicates that teachers' experiences are still being shaped by a search for ways to work towards better alignment between the purposes and practices of physical education.

Pre-service Teachers

Pre-service teachers' (PSTs) perspectives on primary physical education were addressed in 13 studies^(14-24, 52, 76). Of note, 11 of those looked at the perspectives of generalist teachers while the remaining two considered specialist teachers (both in the United States). This is perhaps indicative of the trend toward generalist teachers of primary physical education around the world (Blair, 2018). The main data sources were semi-structured individual interviews and written reflections. Across these studies, there was a strong emphasis on PSTs' beliefs about physical education. In particular, attention was given to their experiences of learning about and engaging in practices that align or misalign with their beliefs^(20, 21, 76), as well as considering ways to disrupt their beliefs^(15, 17, 22-24, 52). Others focussed on PSTs' identities as physical education teachers, and ways in which their coursework and practicum led them to think differently about themselves and their roles as physical education teachers (e.g. from sports coach to curriculum implementer)^(14, 16, 18, 19, 21).

Findings about findings. All 13 studies examine PSTs' perspectives on the nature and purposes of primary physical education. Four studies^(20, 21, 23, 76) focussed specifically on PSTs' beliefs about the nature and purposes of primary physical education. These studies reported generally favourable outcomes in that PSTs tended to view physical education as an important part of the primary curriculum and pupil experience. Nine of the 13 studies^(14-21, 52) described PSTs' experiences of physical education from the time they were pupils in schools. Many experienced a traditional, sports-based or multi-activity form of physical education and recalled experiences of humiliation, embarrassment, discomfort, or alienation^(14, 15, 21, 76). However, others with strong sporting backgrounds tended to view their experiences positively, albeit often conflating physical education with youth sport^(14, 23, 76).

Physical education teacher education (PETE) coursework often helped PSTs think about, see, and do physical education differently from their prior experiences^(14-20, 22, 24, 52). Participants mostly echoed the espoused emphases of PETE programmes, viewing physical

education as a holistic, educative learning area, expressing an emphasis on effort and participation. For example, in one study ⁽²¹⁾ PSTs shifted from thinking about physical education-as-sport to physical education-as-educational subject. Several papers noted a misalignment between coursework and practicum experiences ^(16, 18), which highlights the need for school-university partnerships where there is a coherent vision of physical education. Furthermore, only one longitudinal study ⁽⁷⁶⁾ tracked PSTs beyond graduation. More studies of this longitudinal nature are needed to help better understand PETE's degree of influence related to the purposes of primary physical education. There is also scope to develop deeper understanding of how PSTs are socialised into physical education and the strong socialising factors and discourses in today's society that shape PSTs' thoughts about the purposes of physical education.

Teacher Educators

Only one study ⁽³⁾ generated data from teacher educators about their perspectives on the purposes of physical education, focussing on online physical education. Participants in Daum and Woods' (2015) study rejected the use of online approaches to primary physical education, deeming it unsuitable to the development of motor skills. The absence of teacher educator voices about the purposes of physical education is striking, particularly as teacher educators are often identified as the lynchpins of educational reform and quality teaching practice (Goodwin and Kosnik, 2013). Analysing their perspectives on the purposes of primary physical education may be helpful in identifying competing, congruent, or consistent purposes, which can provide a platform for debate and striving toward a coherent agenda.

Pupils

There were 31 studies ^(27-41, 77-89, 90-92) addressing pupils' perspectives on primary physical education. Of these, 15 focussed specifically on pupils' perspectives, while another 16 focussed on pupils alongside teachers and/or parents. Several sought pupils' perspectives

on ways physical education led to engagement in healthy behaviours, such as physical activity participation, sport involvement, and healthy eating ^(28, 40, 90). Five studies addressed the physical education experiences of pupils with various types of disability ^(27, 32, 39, 80, 91). In line with numerous teacher studies, many inquiries addressed pupils' experiences of interventions, such as district- or nation-wide programmes ^(36, 81, 92), integration with other subjects ^(41, 77, 78, 86) and motivational climates ^(34, 88). A large number focussed on how pedagogical models contributed to the ways pupils came to experience or see value in physical education ^(29-31, 33, 34, 36, 83, 84, 87, 89, 79). The most commonly studied model was Sport Education ^(33, 34, 36, 83, 84, 87, 89) followed by GCAs ⁽²⁹⁻³¹⁾.

From these studies, 22 generated multiple forms of qualitative data from or 'on' pupils; there were, however, no studies representing research done 'with' pupils. The triangulation of multiple forms of data generated by children is important, as this helps build trustworthiness and minimise the possibility that pupils were telling researchers what they believe should be heard. The main data sources were semi-structured individual and focus group interviews, observations of pupil participation, pupil drawings, artefacts and work samples, and photos by pupils. It is worth noting the dominant role of pupil interviews, where researchers have tried to access and represent pupil voices. There remains potential for interviews to be conducted in other ways, where, for example, pupils might interview each other, leading to more authentic types of pupil-led inquiries. Also interesting is the role of other 'non-conventional' approaches to data collection that may be particularly suited to children (e.g. drawings). The value of including children in the research process has been highlighted recently by several other researchers (e.g. Enright and O'Sullivan, 2012), particularly in acknowledging children as experts of their own lived experiences and giving them agency in the research process. Enright and O'Sullivan (2012) highlighted the benefits of participatory methods not only for the participants but also for their research. Despite the

clear potential benefits of these approaches, there are also myriad ethical considerations that researchers need to be mindful of when working with children.

Findings about findings. These studies shed light on how pupils experience primary physical education, and how those experiences help them describe and make sense of its purpose to their education and lives. Pupils valued physical education as a fun time ^(31, 83, 88) to engage in physical activity ^(33, 34), learn new things ⁽⁸³⁾, and make connections to other classroom activities ⁽⁴¹⁾ and their lives outside school ⁽⁹⁰⁾. It also provided opportunities to learn social and emotional skills needed for effective collaboration and teamwork ^(36, 79, 84). Curriculum models helped children see new value in physical education learning ⁽²⁹⁻³¹⁾ through approaches that provide autonomy-supportive conditions, and fostered authentic and/or structured play situations.

It is encouraging to observe many examples of pupils' views of primary physical education using diverse qualitative methods. Although many studies provided insights into pupils' experiences of a specific aspect of physical education (e.g. a particular innovation), few studies, with the exception of some conducted on children with disabilities ^(27, 32, 91), provided overall descriptions of pupils' perspectives on the purposes of physical education. For example, we did not locate studies that have revisited ideas from Carlson's (1995) seminal paper on pupil alienation, where a spectrum of opinions might have been generated. For instance, we do not know if many pupils feel the purpose of primary physical education is to humiliate or alienate children, and we did not locate studies where pupils could not identify any clear purpose because they view physical education as irrelevant or meaningless. We suggest therefore a need for deeper consideration of the general perspectives of pupils across contexts about their experiences, their learning, and their enjoyment in primary physical education. In addition, when content was considered, most studies focussed on traditional team or games units, and there was limited pupil voice about other content areas.

A renewed focus should be placed on gathering primary pupils' perspectives of the purposes of physical education and its value to their lives when they experience a breadth of content areas.

Principals

Only four studies ^(2, 25, 26, 66) included primary principals' perspectives of physical education. Through interviews, these studies focussed on how primary physical education is, and can be, supported and funded. The main finding from these studies is that increased support and funding can result in shifts in prioritisation of physical education and subsequent improvements in how it is taught. The main purpose of physical education identified by principals was a focus on health benefits for children through access to regular physical activity. The priorities for primary physical education that can be extrapolated from these studies relate to provision of a range of activities, and more inclusive activities through the purchase of equipment and increased time spent on physical education. Only one ⁽⁶⁶⁾ study considered the principal's role in shaping how curriculum is implemented or aligned with the purposes of primary physical education. Findings reveal that primary physical education is not a priority, highlighting numerous barriers related to time, personnel and resources. Given the acknowledgment of the influence of principals on the priorities and practices within schools (Orphanos and Orr, 2014), the principal as stakeholder in primary physical education merits urgent attention.

Parents

Four studies ^(1, 4, 91, 92) examined parents' perspectives on aspects of physical education through interviews. Parents saw the value of physical education in contributing to physical, social, and emotional development in children ⁽⁹²⁾. Several parents also valued the opportunity for children to be physically active ^(1, 92) in inclusive ways ^(1, 91). In one study ⁽⁴⁾ parents used the school's grading system for physical education to infer that the subject was

‘non-academic’, which translated to a lower perceived value of physical education. From these few studies, parents did not appear to be invested in knowing about or learning about their child’s physical education experience. The role of schools and teachers in advocating for physical education with parents seems to merit further investigation to explore how this might lead to greater investment, interest, and valuing of physical education.

Taken together, the studies represent the voices of only 38 parents from 2 countries (US and Canada). Given the role of parents in children’s education and the influence they impart on children’s educational decision-making (e.g. course selection if and when physical education becomes elective) it is important to hear more from this group in different contexts and cultures.

Conclusion: Towards a Research Agenda

The aim of this review was to identify and synthesise stakeholders’ perspectives on the purposes of primary physical education, presenting a descriptive analysis of the current state of the field. Across the six stakeholder groups there was some agreement on a small number of purposes of primary physical education, particularly in relation to being physically active, and learning physical, social, and emotional skills. Within this, however, we note the absence in recognising how physical education can support learning cognitive skills. Certainly, the focus on ‘skills’ themselves was a prevalent pattern and it could be argued that this focus carries implications for how other purposes are or are not addressed (Thorburn, 2018), and for the types of purposes that are privileged. For example, what we see as legitimate purposes of primary physical education expressed elsewhere, such as learning to value the cultural role movement plays in societies (Penney and Dinan Thompson, 2018) or to develop socio-critical consciousness were largely absent. With that said, several patterns across the data are encouraging, indicating some consensus on the main purposes of primary

physical education. These purposes also seem to fit within the dominant overarching discourses related to purpose: health (Powell, 2018), sport (Ward, 2018), education (Griggs, 2018) and neoliberalism (Macdonald, 2014). A narrowing of focus from these wider discourses to concentrate on learning in physical education as a holistic endeavour that has application to pupils' lives inside and outside of school may help to better align the purposes of primary physical education with its practices. To be clear, we are not arguing for a 'one-size-fits-all' approach to primary physical education (Kirk, 2010), however, recognising commonly held views on how to achieve these purposes in ways that are contextually relevant might then help to promote dialogue across stakeholder groups and reduce current fragmentation of understanding and purpose in primary physical education.

The findings highlight that not all voices are being heard in shaping the purposes of primary physical education. All key stakeholders should have the opportunity to make a contribution to the development of a shared vision (Jess and Keay, 2018). This is not to suggest that all stakeholders should have equal input or that all purposes should carry equal weight; however, inviting contributions from a wider range of stakeholders may lead to a richer set of perspectives to contribute to shaping new ideas about the nature and purposes of primary physical education based on the needs and interests of pupils. We suggest that a focus should be placed on including stakeholders whose voices are currently limited (e.g. parents, principals and teacher educators), and those voices that are completely absent (i.e. policy makers and wider interest groups such as sport and health organisations). Given the influence policy makers have in creating physical education curriculum guidelines which have the potential to shape the nature of what physical education may look like in primary schools, it is crucial to hear their voices so they may be critiqued, and spaces of agreement and disagreement with other stakeholder groups may be identified. In analysing and paying attention to the perspectives and relative influence of each stakeholder, Varvasovszky and

Brugha (2000) recommend considering the following characteristics: involvement in the issue; interest in the issue; influence/power; position; impact of issue on actor. The underrepresented stakeholders in this review score high in these characteristics, yet we understand little of their perspectives. Given their influence noted elsewhere (Orphanos and Orr, 2014), we see particular value in conducting research within and across contexts to understand the perspectives of principals and policy makers, and how they might be influenced to best compliment the purposes of primary physical education.

Carse et al. (2018) propose that cross-stakeholder dialogue is needed to design, articulate and share a clear vision for primary physical education. Our findings indicate a level of consistency of purpose as a potential springboard from which to initiate conversations, particularly with the underrepresented stakeholder groups. These findings may provide a shared language to spread coherent messages across stakeholder groups. In particular, consistency of purpose in teachers' perspectives may provide a starting point from which to build dialogue with other stakeholders.

Both Lawson (2018) and Carse et al. (2018) identify collaboration across stakeholders as one important way to shape the future of physical education. Our review indicates that, regardless of purpose, there continues to be a significant gap between the identified purposes of primary physical education and the resources and support needed to achieve these outcomes with high quality practices. While innovations and CPD for teachers seem to enhance a sense of focussed purpose, a lack of knowledge, support, resources, time, and professional development all conspire to hamper achievement of purpose in physical education. In light of the fact that stakeholders can have a significant influence on decision-making processes by how they take up and implement ideas, better understanding of positioning, influence and resources (Varvasovszky and Brugha, 2000) across stakeholders may help to lever new resources and better direct available resources to align with the

purposes of primary physical education. Again, parents, principals and policy makers are key stakeholders that merit attention in this regard.

These findings provide important description and general insight into what is known about some stakeholders' perspectives on the purposes of primary physical education. The commonality of focus, with emphasis on physical activity participation to promote children's physical, social, and emotional learning, can provide a starting point to achieve coherence across stakeholder groups. The review also highlights gaps in what is known from the perspective of some important stakeholders including principals, sport coaches/outsourced providers, and policy makers. Attention to the perspectives of all key stakeholders is recommended to capitalise on the potential influence and resources of all stakeholders and promote better alignment between the purposes and practices of primary physical education.

References

- Allender S, Cowburn G and Foster C (2006) Understanding participation in sport and physical activity among children and adults: a review of qualitative studies. *Health Education Research* 21: 826-835.
- Bailey R, Armour K, Kirk D, et al. (2009) The educational benefits claimed for physical education and school sport: an academic review. *Research Papers in Education* 24: 1-27.
- Blair R (2018) The deliverers debate. In: Griggs G and Petrie K (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Primary Physical Education*. New York: Routledge, pp. 75-87.
- Brugha R and Varvasovszky Z (2000) Stakeholder analysis: a review. *Health Policy and Planning* 15: 239-246.
- Bryson JM (2004) What to do when stakeholders matter. *Public Management Review* 6: 21-53.
- Carlson TB (1995) We hate gym: Student alienation from physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education* 14: 467-477.
- Carse N, Jess M and Keay J (2018) Primary physical education: Shifting perspectives to move forwards. *European Physical Education Review* 24: 487-502.
- Clarke J, Fletcher B, Lancashire E, et al. (2013) The views of stakeholders on the role of the primary school in preventing childhood obesity: a qualitative systematic review. *Obesity Reviews* 14: 975-988.
- Enright E and O'Sullivan M (2012) 'Producing different knowledge and producing knowledge differently': rethinking physical education research and practice through participatory visual methods. *Sport, Education and Society*, 17: 35-55.

- Goodwin AL and Kosnik C (2013). Quality teacher educators= quality teachers?
Conceptualizing essential domains of knowledge for those who teach teachers.
Teacher Development 17: 334-346.
- Griggs G (2018) Educational discourses and primary physical education. In: Griggs G and Petrie K (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Primary Physical Education*. New York: Routledge, pp. 40-48.
- Griggs G and Petrie K (eds.) (2018) *Routledge Handbook of Primary Physical Education*. New York, Routledge.
- Hunter L (2006) Research into elementary physical education programs. In: Kirk D, Macdonald D and O'Sullivan M (eds.) *The Handbook of Physical Education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 581-595.
- Kirk D (2010) *Physical Education Futures*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Kirk D, Macdonald D and O'Sullivan M (eds.). (2006). *Handbook of Physical Education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lawson HA (2018) *Redesigning Physical Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Macdonald D (2014) Is global neo-liberalism shaping the future of physical education?
Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy 19: 494-499.
- Orphanos S and Orr MT (2014) Learning leadership matters: The influence of innovative school leadership preparation on teachers' experiences and outcomes. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership* 42: 680-700.
- Penney D and Dinan Thompson M (2018) Curriculum drivers. In: Griggs G and Petrie K. (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Primary Physical Education*. New York: Routledge, pp.51-60.

- Petrie K and Atkins D (2018) Primary physical education in Aotearoa New Zealand. In: Griggs G and Petrie K. (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Primary Physical Education*. New York: Routledge, pp.271-284.
- Petrie K and Griggs G (2017) Introduction to Special Issue on Primary Physical Education. *European Physical Education Review* 24: 397-399.
- Powell D (2018) Primary physical education and health. In: Griggs G and Petrie K. (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Primary Physical Education*. New York: Routledge, pp. 9-19.
- Qi J and Ha AS (2012) Inclusion in Physical Education: A review of literature. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education* 59: 257-281.
- Sperka L and Enright E (2017) The outsourcing of health and physical education: A scoping review. *European Physical Education Review* 24: 349-371.
- 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.
- Varvasovszky Z and Brugha R (2000) How to do (or not to do) A stakeholder analysis. *Health Policy and Planning* 15: 338-345.
- Ward G (2018) Moving beyond sport in primary physical education. In: Griggs G and Petrie K. (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Primary Physical Education*. New York: Routledge, pp.20-39.

Appendix 1: Papers included in the major review (n=95)

Number	Stakeholder	Full reference
1	Parents	An J and Hodge SR (2013) Exploring the meaning of parental involvement in physical education for students with developmental disabilities. <i>Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly</i> 30: 147-163.
2	Principal; teacher	Thompson HR, Haguewood R, Tantoco N, et al. (2015) Lessons learned: a strategic alliance to improve elementary physical education in an urban school district. <i>Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action</i> 9: 363-370.
3	Teacher Educator	Daum DN and Woods AM (2015) Physical education teacher educator's perceptions toward and understanding of K-12 online physical education. <i>Journal of Teaching in Physical Education</i> 34: 716-724.
4	Parents	Sheehy DA (2006) Parents' perceptions of their child's 5th grade physical education program. <i>Physical Educator</i> 63: 30.
5	Teacher	Carse N (2015) Primary teachers as physical education curriculum change agents. <i>European Physical Education Review</i> 21: 309-324.
6	Teacher	Chung L, Cruz A and Kam KWK (2012) Serving PE Teachers' Views on the Interface of Primary and Secondary School PE in Hong Kong. <i>Asian Journal of Physical Education & Recreation</i> 18.
7	Teacher	Cothran DJ, McCaughtry N, Kulinna PH, et al. (2006) Top-down public health curricular change: the experience of physical education teachers in the United States. <i>Journal of In-service Education</i> 32: 533-547.
8	Teacher	Daly C and Edwards A (2001) The road more travelled: a narrative look at the working conditions of itinerant physical education specialists in Queensland state primary schools. <i>New Zealand Physical Educator</i> 34: 65.
9	Teacher	Jin A (2013) Physical education curriculum reform in China: a perspective from physical education teachers. <i>Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy</i> 18: 15-27.
10	Teacher	Lynch T (2017) How does a physical education teacher become a health and physical education teacher? <i>Sport, Education and Society</i> 22: 355-376.
11	Teacher	Odum M, Outley CW, McKyer ELJ, et al. (2017) Weight-Related Barriers for Overweight Students in an Elementary Physical Education Classroom: An Exploratory Case Study with One Physical Education Teacher. <i>Frontiers in Public Health</i> 5: 305.
12	Teacher	Rainer P and Cropley B (2015) Bridging the gap—but mind you don't fall. Primary physical education teachers' perceptions of the transition process to secondary school. <i>Education 3-13</i> 43: 445-461.

13	Teacher	Park Y (2017) Examining South Korea's Elementary Physical Education Performance Assessment Using Assessment Literacy Perspectives. <i>International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education</i> 10: 207-213.
14	Pre-service teacher	Fletcher T (2012) Experiences and identities: Pre-service elementary classroom teachers being and becoming teachers of physical education. <i>European physical education review</i> 18: 380-395.
15	Pre-service teacher	Fletcher T, Mandigo J and Kosnik C (2013) Elementary classroom teachers and physical education: Change in teacher-related factors during pre-service teacher education. <i>Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy</i> 18: 169-183.
16	Pre-service teacher	Fletcher T and Kosnik C (2016) Pre-service primary teachers negotiating physical education identities during the practicum. <i>Education 3-13</i> 44: 556-565.
17	Pre-service teacher	Garrett R and Wrench A (2008) Connections, pedagogy and alternative possibilities in primary physical education. <i>Sport, Education and Society</i> 13: 39-60.
18	Pre-service teacher	Kell S (2017) Student Teachers' Perceptions of Teaching Elementary Physical Education. <i>Physical and Health Education Journal</i> 83.
19	Pre-service teacher	Lee O and Jo K (2016) Preservice Classroom Teachers' Identity Development in Learning to Teach Physical Education. <i>The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher</i> 25: 627-635.
20	Pre-service teacher	Matanin M and Collier C (2003) Longitudinal analysis of preservice teachers' beliefs about teaching physical education. <i>Journal of Teaching in Physical Education</i> 22: 153-168.
21	Pre-service teacher	Ní Chróinín D and Coulter M (2012) The impact of initial teacher education on understandings of physical education: Asking the right question. <i>European Physical Education Review</i> 18: 220-238.
22	Pre-service teacher	Sutherland S and Stuhr PT (2014) Reactions to implementing adventure-based learning in physical education. <i>Sport, Education and Society</i> 19: 489-506.
23	Pre-service teacher	Tsangaridou N (2008) Trainee primary teachers' beliefs and practices about physical education during student teaching. <i>Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy</i> 13: 131-152.
24	Pre-service teacher	Tsangaridou N and Polemitou I (2015) Exploring pre-service classroom teachers' reflections on teaching physical education. <i>European Physical Education Review</i> 21: 66-82.
25	Principal and teacher	Elliott S, McCollum S, Colquitt G, et al. (2013) Perceptions of the Impact of a PEP Grant on Elementary Physical Education Programs in One School District. <i>Physical Educator</i> 70: 429.
26	Principal and teacher	Taukeni S (2015) Support mechanisms to implement physical education syllabus in the Lower Primary Phase in Namibia. <i>African Journal for Physical Health Education, Recreation and Dance</i> 21: 416-425.

27	Pupils	Goodwin DL and Watkinson EJ (2000) Inclusive physical education from the perspective of students with physical disabilities. <i>Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly</i> 17: 144-160.
28	Pupils	Banville D, Kulinna PH, Dyson B, et al. (2017) Feeling refreshed: Aotearoa/New Zealand students' perspectives of the role of healthy behaviours in schools. <i>European Physical Education Review</i> 23: 41-59.
29	Pupils	Fry JM, Tan CWK, McNeill M, et al. (2010) Children's perspectives on conceptual games teaching: A value-adding experience. <i>Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy</i> 15: 139-158.
30	Pupils	Georgakis S and Light R (2009) Visual data collection methods for research on the affective dimensions of children's personal experiences of PE. <i>ACHPER Australia Healthy Lifestyles Journal</i> 56: 23.
31	Pupils	Gray S, Sproule J and Wang CJ (2008) Pupils' perceptions of and experiences in team invasion games: A case study of a Scottish secondary school and its three feeder primary schools. <i>European Physical Education Review</i> 14: 179-201.
32	Pupils	Kurková P and Nemcek D (2016) Attitudes of students with disabilities towards physical education lessons: reasons for their indifference and preference for leisure time activities. <i>Journal of Physical Education and Sport</i> 16: 222.
33	Pupils	MacPhail A, Kinchin G and Kirk D (2003) Students' Conceptions of Sport and Sport Education. <i>European Physical Education Review</i> 9: 285-299.
34	Pupils	MacPhail A and Kinchin G (2004) The use of drawings as an evaluative tool: students' experiences of sport education. <i>Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy</i> 9: 87-108.
35	Pupils	Mandigo JL and Holt NL (2006) Elementary students' accounts of optimal challenge in physical education. <i>Physical Educator</i> 63: 170.
36	Pupils	Pill S (2010) Student reflections of sport education in one urban Australian primary school. <i>Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education</i> 1: 29-36.
37	Pupils	Prusak KA, Davis T, Pennington TR, et al. (2014) Children's perceptions of a district-wide physical education program. <i>Journal of Teaching in Physical Education</i> 33: 4-27.
38	Pupils	Ramos NC and McCullick BA (2015) Elementary Students' Construct of Physical Education Teacher Credibility. <i>Journal of Teaching in Physical Education</i> 34: 560-575.
39	Pupils	Suomi J, Collier D and Brown L (2003) Factors affecting the social experiences of students in elementary physical education classes. <i>Journal of Teaching in Physical Education</i> 22: 186-202.
40	Pupils	Tannehill D, MacPhail A, Walsh J, et al. (2015) What young people say about physical activity: the Children's Sport Participation and Physical Activity (CSPPA) study. <i>Sport, Education and Society</i> 20: 442-462.

41	Pupils	Chen W, Cone TP and Cone SL (2011) Students' voices and learning experiences in an integrated unit. <i>Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy</i> 16: 49-65.
42	Teacher	Jones L and Green K (2017) Who teaches primary physical education? Change and transformation through the eyes of subject leaders. <i>Sport, Education and Society</i> 22: 759-771.
43	Teacher	Atencio M, Jess M and Dewar K (2012) 'It is a case of changing your thought processes, the way you actually teach': implementing a complex professional learning agenda in Scottish physical education. <i>Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy</i> 17: 127-144.
44	Teacher	Barnard SD, McCaughtry N, Martin JJ, et al. (2006) Teachers' Perspectives on the Challenges of Teaching Physical Education in Urban Schools. <i>Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport</i> 77: A50-A50.
45	Teacher	Coulter M and Woods CB (2012) Primary teachers' experience of a physical education professional development programme. <i>Irish Educational Studies</i> 31: 329-343.
46	Teacher	Combs S, Elliott S and Whipple K (2010) Elementary Physical Education Teachers' Attitudes towards the Inclusion of Children with Special Needs: A Qualitative Investigation. <i>International Journal of Special Education</i> 25: 114-125.
47	Teacher	Dwyer JJ, Allison KR, Barrera M, et al. (2003) Teachers' perspective on barriers to implementing physical activity curriculum guidelines for school children in Toronto. <i>Canadian Journal of Public Health/Revue Canadienne de Sante'e Publique</i> : 448-452.
48	Teacher	Dyson B (2001) Cooperative learning in an elementary physical education program. <i>Journal of Teaching in Physical Education</i> 20: 264-281.
49	Teacher	Dyson B, Gordon B, Cowan J, et al. (2016) External providers and their impact on primary physical education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. <i>Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education</i> 7: 3-19.
50	Teacher	Elliot DL and Campbell T (2015) 'Really on the ball': exploring the implications of teachers' PE-CPD experience. <i>Sport, Education and Society</i> 20: 381-397.
51	Teacher	Faucette N, Nugent P, Sallis JF, et al. (2002) "I'd Rather Chew on Aluminium Foil:" Overcoming Classroom Teachers' Resistance to Teaching Physical Education. <i>Journal of Teaching in Physical Education</i> 21: 287-308.
52	Pre-service teachers	Garrett R and Wrench A (2007) Physical experiences: primary student teachers' conceptions of sport and physical education. <i>Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy</i> 12: 23-42.
53	Teacher	Gordon B, Cowan J, McKenzie A, et al. (2013) Primary school physical education in Aotearoa/ New Zealand: The voices of teachers. <i>New Zealand Physical Educator</i> 46: 9.

54	Teacher	Grenier M (2006) A social constructionist perspective of teaching and learning in inclusive physical education. <i>Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly</i> 23: 245-260.
55	Teacher	Harris J, Cale L and Musson H (2011) The effects of a professional development programme on primary school teachers' perceptions of physical education. <i>Professional Development in Education</i> 37: 291-305.
56	Teacher	Harris J, Cale L and Musson H (2012) The predicament of primary physical education: A consequence of 'insufficient'ITT and 'ineffective'CPD? <i>Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy</i> 17: 367-381.
57	Teacher	Kinchin GD, MacPhail A and Ní Chroinin D (2012) Irish primary school teachers' experiences with Sport Education. <i>Irish Educational Studies</i> 31: 207-222.
58	Teacher	Kloeppel T, Stylianou M and Kulinna PH (2014) Physical Education Teachers' Fidelity to and Perspectives of a Standardized Curricular Model. <i>Physical Educator</i> 71: 93.
59	Teacher	Martin MW, Martin S and Rosengard P (2010) PE2GO: Program evaluation of a physical activity program in elementary schools. <i>Journal of Physical Activity and Health</i> 7: 677-684.
60	Teacher	Morgan P and Hansen V (2007) Recommendations to improve primary school physical education: Classroom teachers' perspective. <i>The Journal of Educational Research</i> 101: 99-108.
61	Teacher	Morgan PJ and Hansen V (2008) The relationship between PE biographies and PE teaching practices of classroom teachers. <i>Sport, Education and Society</i> 13: 373-391.
62	Teacher	Morgan PJ and Hansen V (2008) Classroom teachers' perceptions of the impact of barriers to teaching physical education on the quality of physical education programs. <i>Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport</i> 79: 506-516.
63	Teacher	Morgan PJ and Hansen V (2008) Physical education in primary schools: Classroom teachers' perceptions of benefits and outcomes. <i>Health Education Journal</i> 67: 196-207.
64	Teacher	Ní Chróinín D and Cosgrave C (2013) Implementing formative assessment in primary physical education: teacher perspectives and experiences. <i>Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy</i> 18: 219-233.
65	Teacher	Petrie K (2010) Creating confident, motivated teachers of physical education in primary schools. <i>European Physical Education Review</i> 16: 47-64.
66	Principal	Rainer P, Cropley B, Jarvis S, et al. (2012) From policy to practice: the challenges of providing high quality physical education and school sport faced by head teachers within primary schools. <i>Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy</i> 17: 429-446.
67	Teacher	Romar J-E and Frisk A (2017) The Influence of Occupational Socialization on Novice Teachers' Practical

		Knowledge, Confidence and Teaching in Physical Education. <i>Qualitative Research in Education</i> 6: 86-116.
68	Teacher	Sherman CP, Tran C and Alves Y (2010) Elementary school classroom teacher delivered physical education: Costs, benefits and barriers. <i>Physical Educator</i> 67: 2.
69	Teacher	Smith A (2015) Primary school physical education and sports coaches: Evidence from a study of school sport partnerships in north-west England. <i>Sport, Education and Society</i> 20: 872-888.
70	Teacher	Thorburn M, Carse N, Jess M, et al. (2011) Translating change into improved practice: Analysis of teachers' attempts to generate a new emerging pedagogy in Scotland. <i>European Physical Education Review</i> 17: 313-324.
71	Teacher	Tsangaridou N and O'Sullivan M (2003) Physical education teachers' theories of action and theories-in-use. <i>Journal of Teaching in Physical Education</i> 22: 132-152.
72	Teacher	Chen W (2005) Examination of curricula, teaching practices, and assessment through National Standards. <i>Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy</i> 10: 159-180.
73	Teacher	Chen W (2006) Teachers' knowledge about and views of the national standards for physical education. <i>Journal of Teaching in Physical Education</i> 25: 120-142.
74	Teacher	Whipp PR, Hutton H, Grove JR, et al. (2011) Outsourcing physical education in primary schools: Evaluating the impact of externally provided programmes on generalist teachers. <i>Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education</i> 2: 67-77.
75	Teacher	Simpson K and Mandich A (2012) Creating inclusive physical education opportunities in elementary physical education. <i>Physical and Health Education Journal</i> 77: 18.
76	Pre-service teacher and teacher	Ní Chróinín D and O'Sullivan M (2016) Elementary classroom teachers' beliefs across time: learning to teach Physical Education. <i>Journal of Teaching in Physical Education</i> 35: 97-106.
77	Teacher and pupils	Ó Ceallaigh T, Ní Mhurchú S and Ní Chróinín D (2017) Balancing content and language in CLIL: The experiences of teachers and learners. <i>Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education</i> 5: 58-86.
78	Teacher and pupils	O'Connor A, Mulcahy C, Ní Chróinín D and Murtagh E (2011) Assessment tools in primary physical education: enhancing teaching and learning, <i>Primary Physical Education Matters Journal</i> , 6(1): xviii- xx.
79	Teacher and pupils	Dyson B (2002) The implementation of cooperative learning in an elementary physical education program. <i>Journal of Teaching in Physical Education</i> 22: 69-85.
80	Teacher and pupils	Grenier M, Collins K, Wright S, et al. (2014) Perceptions of a disability sport unit in general physical education. <i>Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly</i> 31: 49-66.

81	Teacher and pupils	James A, Griffin LL and France T (2005) Perceptions of assessment in elementary physical education: A case study. <i>The Physical Educator</i> .
82	Teacher and pupils	James AR and Collier D (2011) An ecological examination of an urban sixth grade physical education class. <i>Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy</i> 16: 279-293.
83	Teacher and pupils	Kinchin GD, MacPhail A and Ni Chroinin D (2009) Pupils' and teachers' perceptions of a culminating festival within a sport education season in Irish primary schools. <i>Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy</i> 14: 391-406.
84	Teacher and pupils	Layne TE and Hastie PA (2016) Analysis of teaching physical education to second-grade students using sport education. <i>Education 3-13</i> 44: 226-240.
85	Teacher and pupils	Lyngstad I, Hagen P-M and Aune O (2016) Understanding pupils' hiding techniques in physical education. <i>Sport, Education and Society</i> 21: 1127-1143.
86	Teacher and pupils	Ni Chroinin D, Ní Mhurchú S and Ó Ceallaigh T (2016) Off-balance: the integration of physical education content learning and Irish language learning in English-medium primary schools in Ireland. <i>Education 3-13</i> 44: 566-576.
87	Teacher and pupils	Wahl-Alexander Z, Curtner-Smith M and Sinelnikov O (2016) Influence of a purposefully negotiated season of sport education on one teacher and his pupils. <i>European Physical Education Review</i> 22: 450-464.
88	Teacher and pupils	Xiang P, McBride RE and Solmon MA (2003) Motivational climates in ten teachers' elementary physical education classes: An achievement goal theory approach. <i>The Elementary School Journal</i> 104: 71-91.
89	Teacher and pupils	Layne T and Hastie P (2012) Student and teacher responses to a high education climate education in sport education season. <i>PHEnex Journal</i> 4:1-13.
90	Teacher and pupils	Ennis CD (2008) Examining curricular coherence in an exemplary elementary school program. <i>Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport</i> 79: 71-84.
91	Teacher, pupils, parents	MacMillan F, Kirk A, Mutrie N, et al. (2015) Supporting participation in physical education at school in youth with type 1 diabetes: Perceptions of teachers, youth with type 1 diabetes, parents and diabetes professionals. <i>European Physical Education Review</i> 21: 3-30.
92	Teacher, pupils, parents	DeCorby K, Halas J, Dixon S, et al. (2005) Classroom teachers and the challenges of delivering quality physical education. <i>The Journal of Educational Research</i> 98: 208-221.
93	Teacher	Bryan RR, McCubbin JA and Mars Hvd (2013) The ambiguous role of the paraeducator in the general physical education environment. <i>Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly</i> 30: 164-183.
94	Teacher	Brooks C and Dinan Thompson M (2015) Insiderness and outsidership: An autoethnography of a primary physical

		education specialist teacher. <i>European Physical Education Review</i> 21: 325-339.
95	Teacher	Elliot DL, Atencio M, Campbell T, et al. (2013) From PE experiences to PE teaching practices? Insights from Scottish primary teachers' experiences of PE, teacher education, school entry and professional development. <i>Sport, Education and Society</i> 18: 749-766.