

## Field-based Learning: A 'Flipped-Classroom' Approach

### Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to present an evaluation of a teaching intervention that involved the utilisation of range of pedagogic approaches to transform a rather typical didactic module into something more open, discursive and collaborative. The first part of the paper is presented in the voices of the authors, and aims to describe and provide a rationale for the intervention and position each of us in terms of the contributions that we made in its development. The second part of the paper outlines the findings of the evaluation, first focussing on the impacts that students reported the module had on their development and then examining the components of the intervention which supported the students' learnings.

#### *A history of the module (Jake)*

When I inherited Working with Elite Performers (WWEP) it was a disparate affair. The standard model for a Level 7 Cardiff School of Sport module is a weekly series of three hour sessions taught over a 10-week block. WWEP started with an introduction, and then proceeded to bring in experts from a range of disciplinary perspectives to explain how their fields of study related to, or might support, practitioners working with elite athletes. This was, to some extent, linked together with an assessment design that required students to apply at least two different theoretical perspectives to support their work with an athlete of their choosing. Whilst the applied case-study approach appealed to me, the idea of a range of different presenters and theoretical perspectives, did not. It seemed too piecemeal and hap hazard to engage the students and to stimulate their learning in a meaningful way. This contention was supported through informal conversations with the tutors on the module and students who had experienced it.

The development of the module has been iterative, occurring over a number of years. Initially, the applied case-study approach was maintained, but a pedagogical strategy more aligned with problem-based learning was adopted. Students were required to critically consider the theoretical perspectives that were relevant to the given case-studies and research them further. Whilst this early intervention created a shift in students' experience, there were still issues. In particular, that the classroom-based nature of the experience meant that the module continued to lack the 'real-worldliness' for which I was searching. The most recent iteration of the module, was influenced through collaboration with Harry and based on his PhD research. I was struck by the changes in theoretical positioning and understanding of the elite context that Harry had experienced through the ethnographic research approach with which he engaged.

### *The transformative power of fieldwork (Harry)*

As a young researcher, nothing can prepare you for stepping 'into field'. I'd read a number of the 'how to' guides in an attempt to get to grips with the processes and practices of ethnographic research. But in truth ethnography has no recipe of dos and don'ts that can be easily followed. In my transition from undergraduate to postgraduate research I had expected to encounter some challenges that would test my ability to think for myself, and work independently. What I hadn't anticipated was how much I would be changed by the process. Most interesting for me was the significant shift in the intellectual apparatus through which I have come to view and make sense of the world. Not only this, but I experienced a notable change in who I perceived myself to be in relation to the elite sport context I had set out to study.

Like many undergraduate and postgraduate students that choose to study sport, I was once a young performer who harboured ambitions to compete at the highest level. I was competitive, performance-orientated, and held athletes and those who work in elite sport in high-esteem. I had never considered the possibility that the journey towards Olympic Gold could be so Machiavellian. All I was interested in was how to make athletes (not people), through science, perform better. Needless to say my positivistic outlook on the reality and the realities of working in elite sport was somewhat rose-tinted and has since been replaced by a more critical, humanistic positioning on the relationship between people and culture. It was thus at level of ontology and personal reflexivity that I changed principally from the start of my fieldwork to the completion of my PhD thesis, and it was these two learning outcomes – two principles of a 'liberal education' (Côté and Allahar, 2011) – which Jake and I have sought to recapture.

Having provided some context to the ways in which I have changed, a question remains unanswered. What role did fieldwork and engaging in an ethnographic research process play in my learning and philosophic development? As I shall go on to explain, ethnography is a particular style of research that enables the researcher to get behind the scenes of cultural practice and explore group behaviour from the position of an involved insider (Pryce, 1986). However, as Van Maanen (1995, p.2) reminds us, 'ethnography is not a straight forward look, listen and learn procedure'. As a means of gathering information to advance knowledge, ethnographic research is problematic from start to finish. Indeed, from the pragmatics of gaining access to the field, to writing about aspects of cultural experience, ethnography encompasses a series of practical and epistemological trials and tribulations that forces the individual to confront the meaning of subjective experience, and foster a set of research skills that are not otherwise taught. To this end, ethnography relies as much on the social competencies of the researcher, as it does on the application of systematic research techniques. It also requires the researcher to question what others take for granted and to use all of his or her intellectual resources to convert ideas into evidence-based and conceptually informed understandings (Atkinson, 2015). At its heart lies a form of grounded reasoning that I had to learn to trust before I could start to embrace, and to trust meant letting go of previously held perspectives that would have otherwise prevented me from developing in the way that I did. However, before describing how we attempted to

design a pedagogical experience to support such learnings, it seems necessary to provide a brief background on the ethnographic process now set at the heart of the module.

### *An introduction to ethnography (Harry)*

According to Fetterman (1989, p.129), ethnographic fieldwork is comparable to the adolescent stage of the life-course. He explains that, upon entering the field, 'the fieldworker must learn a new language, new rituals and wealth of new cultural information. Fetterman (1989, p.129) goes on to say that 'this period is marked by tremendous excitement, frustration, and confusion' that he depicts as being part of a holistic learning experience. Like the adolescent entering crisis, the ethnographer enters into a process of open-ended exploration that engages all the senses (see Sparkes, 2009). The ethnographic journey takes the researcher on paths that lead to nowhere. To find a route requires the researcher to follow hunches (Willis, 1978), to pursue detours, and 'get lost in the culture in order to learn its terrain' (Fetterman, 1989, p.138). To feel as though one has been led astray is unavoidable. At times the journey can feel quite overwhelming for ethnography not only involves the physical immersion of the researcher into the field of study, it also demands commitment in a deeper, more reflective sense that witnesses the co-evolution of the researcher and the research project.

This is all very well, but what actually is ethnography? What do ethnographers set out to study, and how do they go about studying it? As a form of social inquiry, ethnography escapes neat definition (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). It does, however, possess a number of distinct methodological features. In terms of a process of fieldwork, ethnography pertains to the longitudinal engagement of the researcher into a group of people – usually a year or more in length. This involves the ethnographer first finding a means of gaining access to the field, and then submitting him/herself to a process of acculturation to move from outsider to insider status. Once on the 'inside', the researcher sets about acquiring knowledge about the people and context s/he has entered via the application of a number of traditional ethnographic techniques. At the centre of the ethnographic method is 'participant-observation' and the compilation of an extensive set of field-notes detailing a selection of events that the researcher has witnessed (Becker, 1958). In addition to these select events, the fieldworker begins to piece together his/ her thoughts and feelings on the data. Thus, alongside data collection, ethnography also involves a simultaneous process of interpretation and analysis from which a tentative picture of the research environment starts to emerge (Parker, 2002; Rock, 2007).

It is not until the final stage of the ethnographic enterprise that this picture is formalised into a written account of the people and culture the ethnographer set out to study. Drawing upon data (in form of field notes, artefacts and interview transcripts), the construction of the ethnographic text involves the synthesis of experience, memories and theoretical ideas into a highly selective, and highly descriptive narrative product that aims to display cultural experience in a way that is both 'true to life, and analytically meaningful (Van Maanen, 1988). Much like fieldwork, the process of writing consists of no standardised procedure or protocol. Instead, it is incumbent on the researcher to find a way of structuring and

expressing their understanding.

### *Scaffolding ethnography into a structured, pedagogical experience (Jake)*

All of that said, the purpose of the module was not to get students to undertake an ethnographic research study, but to use the methodology as a means to develop students' knowledge. The point here is that by actively participating in an ethnographic process, students' learning was necessarily created through their engagement and thinking and not dictated and imparted by us as tutors. The challenges generated by ethnographic framing, especially when undertaken in such a short time frame, required careful pedagogical design and scaffolding to make it both safe(ish) and valuable. Harry and I collectively mused about how this might be achieved within the WWEP module and we met regularly to flesh out some ideas. The key focus was on how we could draw upon and translate the ethnographic process into a structured and scaffolded pedagogical experience.

A key concern during the module design phase was related to the need for a clear structure to generate clarity and security for students; what Biggs and Tang (2011) might call constructive alignment. As McMahon and Thakore (2006) suggested, where modules are constructively aligned, there tends to be greater coherence in the programme of learning and an increase in the criticality and depth of student work. To this end, we strove to ensure that our intended learning outcomes drove all aspects of the decision making process related to the module (in terms of overall structure, the in-class activities and assessment). Perhaps, the most important decision we made was to 'flip' the classroom (Rotellar and Cain, 2016). To align classroom experience with the interpretive nature of knowledge generation evident within the ethnographic process. The flipped classroom, created opportunity for students to drive the theoretical aspects of the module. Students were required to bring their field notes and experiences into the classroom to discuss them in their 'research group', with tutors and as a whole class. As such, the students' ideas became the focal point of the classroom experience, allowing them the intellectual freedom to explore their sporting context. Further, they had to make critical judgements about the theoretical perspectives that best explained their observations and advanced their interpretations. We were very aware, however, that for such a high challenge task to be of value there was clearly a need for equally high support (Larkin and Richardson, 2013).

A key issue, then, was how to ensure that both sufficient support was provided, and at the right time, to accelerate students through the ethnographic process. Here, in-class mini-lectures were utilised to develop students' awareness of what was expected of them. These sessions were scaffolded such that learners could acquire the knowledge and skills when they were required. For example, during the early part of the module, Harry drew on both his theoretical and experiential understanding of participant observation in the ethnographic tradition and, in particular, of 'entering the field', to ensure that students could negotiate this challenging and uncertain experience. Similar support was given in relation to the interpretive and writing up processes at later stages of the module. Another crucial support was the formative student presentations, which were similarly timed to

maximise their learning impact. Further, these student-led presentations were linked to the different elements of the written assessment task to ensure that students could see the link between classroom activities and the summative assessment (i.e., constructively aligned). Importantly, these tasks created opportunity for students to receive formative feedback from both tutors and peers as they progressed through the module (Irons, 2007). This approach was designed to test learners through discussing their experiences with others, and consequently progressing their knowledge and interpretations. Overall, the module design marked an effort to create a collaborative learning community, with an openness to sharing ideas and being challenged.

### **A brief methodological interlude**

In order to evaluate the changes made to the module's structure and design, two focus groups were conducted with the 2015/16 WWEP student cohort. Focus groups were organised to capture a blend of voices and perspectives on the module. All students who completed the module (n=9) participated in one of the two focus group sessions. These sessions consisted of five and four participants respectively, and contained one female student in each. An interview guide was used to ensure a level of uniformity in the questions posed across the two focus group interviews (Patton, 2002). However, to enable some flexibility in the interview process, a semi-structured approach was adopted so that personal viewpoints could be probed more effectively (Sparkes and Smith, 2014).

Audio recordings from each of the focus group interviews were transcribed verbatim and the transcripts checked for accuracy. Data was then content analysed for two primary reasons: 1) to understand the impact the module had on student learning and experience, and 2) to explore how the pedagogical structure of the module helped to support the learning process. Data analysis was performed inductively and deductively to allow a set of core themes to be constructed (Sparkes and Smith, 2014). Illustrative quotes were identified and their meaning agreed in collaborative and dialectic fashion. This process was supported by a Microsoft Excel document that was used to group and categorise raw data quotes under a series of representative codes. The analysis revealed a number of key findings which are outlined and discussed in the following section.

### **Evaluation findings**

#### *(1) Impact of the module on student learning and experience*

As previously discussed, the ethnographic research process can lead to feelings of frustration and confusion. Its interpretivist nature places the researcher in a position of vulnerability as they set about identifying and pursuing a number of open-ended lines of inquiry. It is perhaps unsurprising then that when asked to reflect on their learning experiences on the module, students expressed many of these sentiments. Crucially though, students also appeared to recognise the value of the insecurities and vulnerabilities engendered by engaging in a process of ethnographic fieldwork.

*Steve: Yes, I found it quite frustrating, because there aren't any straightforward answers – but of course that's part of the process, although at the time I was tearing my hair out!*

*Jess: It's like the more confused we were, the happier you were!*

*Steve: But I mean, that was part of the process. I think it would be quite interesting if you did a module evaluation every 3 weeks. I think you'd probably see – anger, despair, frustration to 'Ah, enlightenment!' – and I think that's been deliberate. I can see why the module is deliberately lacking structure in some respects – or gives the impression of lacking structure. It kicked us into gear and I can see that now.*

Here, Steve makes a connection between the module's design and the emotions that featured as part of his experience. Interestingly, despite Steve's awareness of the type of learning the module had created, his use of the word 'structure' suggests that he had not been able to distinguish clearly between content, and pedagogical design. Indeed, from a practitioner's perspective, the module contained a definitive structure that was used to scaffold and support student learning towards the learning outcomes. However, outside of what Steve and his peers were perhaps used to, this structure was not based on a schedule of didactic, knowledge-based lectures. Rather, drawing on the principle of the 'flipped classroom', lectures were used as forums for discussion and collaboration which appears to have created the 'impression' of a lack of structure, as Steve's comments illuminate. Nevertheless, regardless of the difficulties students might have had interpreting the pedagogy underpinning the module, over its course they came to appreciate the learning experience to which they had been exposed.

*Ian: I think you said, 'if you're uncomfortable that's OK because once it's all done and dusted we'll be able to look back and be like – WOW, what an experience! But you can't get there without feeling uncomfortable on the way'. Don't change that! Future generations are going to hate me for saying that – but don't change it!*

The key finding in this passage is not that the learners experienced uncertainty and discomfort, rather, that they came to accept, and even embrace, it as part of the learning process. Whilst they found the investigative element of the module challenging, and at times uncomfortable, they were also able to articulate a number of important outcomes emanating from the experience that had benefits to their future professional practice.

*Richard: I think fieldwork makes you look at things completely differently. It opens your mind up a lot in terms of the way people do things. I don't know about the rest of you [peers], but it's made me think about what I'm doing in my own context and practice, and whether the things that other people do can help.*

The open-mindedness to which Richard is referring is a theme that featured strongly within the data. It is also a component of the ethnographic research process that requires the fieldworker to suspend prior (conceptual) judgement, and develop understanding from the ground up (Willis, 1978). This notion of developing an open-mind and being flexible to alternative ways of understanding and making sense of the world was most powerfully revealed in the experiences of Jess, a Sports Science student who stated.

*Jess: The confusion was good confusion. It wasn't frustrating form me. It was – I can't explain it properly. I suppose I learned more about myself, as a person. I know that sounds deep, but I'm very closed normally but it [the module] made me look at things from a different perspective, which was nice. I have come to realise how important relationships are with people. It's not just about how much knowledge we [as practitioners] have on the subject but other things as well.*

Jess was the only Sports Science student in the 2015/16 cohort to complete the module following an exodus of her peers after the introductory lecture. During this lecture, the nature of the module was explained in detail, alongside the methodology students would be using. What was presented to a learner like Jess was an alternative means of developing knowledge linked to an entirely new set of philosophical and theoretical perspectives. Whilst this was at first difficult for her and her peers to comprehend, Jess' commitment to the module both challenged and developed her way of thinking. Indeed, she went on to reflect:

*Jess: It's opened my mind. Whereas science is all about learning facts and reciting them, basically it's [fieldwork] has taught me to think outside the box. Sometimes things are not what they seem, you know?*

It is understood that personal ontology is the starting point to the development of one's professional practice (Gilbourne and Richardson, 2006). The beliefs that underpin the way we view the world can both enable and constrain our ability to take notice, to think critically and to act in ways that are appropriate and effective. Thus, the philosophical foundations of our knowledge – whether as researchers, teachers or coaches – dictates not only how we understand practice, but also the way we engage with it (Denison, 2007). If this is so, furthering one's professional practice requires means of moving away from previous ways of knowing, and gaining access to new understandings. Contributing his views on the affect fieldwork had on his learning and development throughout the module, Neil added:

*Neil: Going out there, gathering field notes and then trying to understand them has definitely changed me. It has definitely given me new knowledge and a new understanding of how you can go about looking at coaching, how you can write and think about it more academically. It's been really good...*

In summary, when asked to reflect upon their learning and experience within the module, students expressed confronting a range of emotions as a result of engaging in a process of ethnographic fieldwork. Most importantly, though, students came to recognise and to value these emotions as part of a wider learning experience from which they developed personally and professionally. Despite being uncomfortable by the process, stepping into an environment with the task of exploring it critically helped students develop an open-mind and to question their own approaches to practice. For some, this also meant challenging the theoretical and philosophical underpins of their knowledge that had broader implications on their identities as learners. These outcomes did not, however, occur by chance. The pedagogical design of the module, as the data has already started to allude, was

fundamental in supporting and enabling students to reap the multiple learning benefits of engaging in a process of ethnographic fieldwork within a highly restrictive time frame.

## *(2) How the structure of pedagogical experience supported the learning process*

Alongside the investigative element of the module, a key feature of the pedagogical intervention was focused on developing coherence through constructive alignment (Biggs and Tang, 2011). This was something noticed by the students, as reflected in the following quote:

*Ian: I think it flows really nicely. Each week links to the following week whereas, in other modules, you dismiss the thing you've done the week before. In this module, everything seems to combine throughout the whole thing.*

The sense of progression promoted by the module's structure was further reflected in the following exchange between Daisy, Ross and Ben:

*Daisy: Progression was made every week whereas, in some modules, you just write stuff down and think you've learned something, but....*

*Ross: It's not meaningful....*

*Daisy: Yeah, like, every week [in WWEP] there was a task set and you just felt each session that you were accomplishing something.*

*Ben: I think in each session you were thinking more and more about what you'd seen, rather than just taking notes about things you are being taught.*

The data suggests that students seemed to appreciate the progressive nature of the module, and that there were particular tasks set (linked to their assignment) that both supported and furthered their learning. As Daisy and Ben went on to reflect:

*Daisy: [The presentations] directed us and helped us to find our way really. They [presentations] made sure we were hitting deadlines and developing our ideas through group reflection and discussion. They [presentations] just made sure we were on the right track, which was the main thing for me.*

*Ben: For me, they helped to make sense of what we'd found. Rather than just getting a load of notes, the presentations made you start to slowly think about what you're going to write about.*

The presentations were clearly perceived by students to serve as more than just a means of reporting what they had done. There was a sense that each of the presentations allowed students to reflect and to move their learning forward, through sharing their ideas and gaining feedback from both tutors and peers.

*Steve: When you went in [to present] you were a bit like 'Arrrgghhh, OK, I don't really know where I'm going to go with this'. But the presentations and the conversations that followed allowed you to think 'OK, right I'm getting somewhere with this'. By the*

*end [of the process] you're like 'Yes, this is where I want to be...' and you can actually see where you're going to end up with it [the assignment].*

A similar perspective was shared by another student, Ian:

*Ian: The timing of the presentations has been key. What we needed to do for each presentation moved you on slightly, without leaving things behind. And [the tutors'] input was really useful. Just the little things like the emails Jake sent at the end of the lectures – just little probes. It wasn't like 'Do this.' It was like, 'Have a think about this. Have a read of that. Go away and think about...' It made a lot more sense and it was helpful.*

These perceptions, widely shared amongst the group, highlighted the importance of both the order and timeliness the presentations, as well as the discussion, and formative feedback they stimulated. In so doing, they created an atmosphere of collaboration, whilst helping students to develop confidence in their lines of inquiry. Due to the clear links between the in-class activities, the formative presentations and the summative assessment, students felt that their learning was supported throughout the entire course of the module. According to Steve:

*Steve: There have been other modules where we haven't had the formative feedback in the same way, and by the time it's come to writing an assignment I've been miles off the mark. So I think it was quite nice the fact that there were little nudges along the way. Just those short chats and the reflection that came from them. They definitely helped shape things the right way. I think they helped me to avoid a potential car crash with my essay.*

Because students were responsible for generating much of the lecture content through their presentations and in-class discussions, the nature of the classroom experience was transformed. This version of a flipped classroom approach was highly valued by students, as exemplified in the following extract:

*Ross: I find sometimes sitting in a classroom and taking notes off the slides helpful, but if you were to do it for this module, I don't reckon it would have worked. It's good to get out there [into the field], come back and engage in conversations with other people about their experiences, and then building on that by talking with you guys [the tutors] which encouraged us to critically analyse what we were thinking and doing.*

The change of classroom dynamic had some important consequences for the students' interactions with each other. One such impact was the way in which students reported that they became responsible for developing their own and other's insights through peer collaboration. This is demonstrated in the following conversation between Ian and Steve:

*Ian: I think it was talking to everybody else. They [peers] came up with different ideas and really challenged what you'd gone and seen.*

*Steve: And when we were going through each other's work, we were looking at it going 'this is good, that needs developing....*

*Ian: Taking it apart [laughter]...*

*Steve: Well no, it was a case of looking at it and going 'Ah, yes – I see where you are going with this'. Sometimes you can get an idea in your head when you start writing, but then when you read or hear about someone else's work you kind of go 'Oh! That's a really good idea too!'. So we were all sort of mashing the best bits of our essays together to try and get out what we were thinking...*

Outcomes associated with involving students as partners within the formative feedback process, seemed to support the positive view of this approach forwarded by Fluckiger *et al.* (2010). Not only did students report that the time taken to review each others work contributed to their personal progression, but also that it contributed to a productive classroom environment (Fluckiger *et al.*, 2010): Discussing the collaborative aspect of the module, Jess and Neil highlighted:

*Jess: It kind of makes you a little bit more mature in the sense of being open with everyone and critical. That's the difference between my undergraduate course and this. Undergraduates are kind of nervous of giving people their work and getting them to look at it....*

*Neil: It can be a bit 'school playground' can't it?*

*Jess: Yeah – so for me you've got to be open and mature throughout the whole thing [module]*

Whilst openness and maturity is to be expected at Level 7, there was a sense that through the design of the module students were supported in developing these characteristics, so essential for learning.

*Tom: [In this module] you've got to be open to criticism from people. You've got to be open to their opinions and working together. You can't really afford to be nervous about getting up in front of the class and presenting your ideas. You've just got to be open and honest. And I think that's what kind of makes you better as a learner.*

The openness and honesty referred to in the data was fundamental to the sense of collaboration and community that was built through every facet of the module, including the development of the assessment criteria. Students noted, although equivocally, that they appreciated being involved in creating the expectations attached to the assignment, as illustrated by Daisy and Ben.

*Daisy: I think giving us a say in the marking criteria for the essay and things has been beneficial for me.*

*Ben: I agree. Because we've had a bit of ownership of that it's given me a really good understanding of what it is I have to do.*

As a consequence of engaging students as partners, a sense of agency within their learning process seemed to develop. Indeed, when asked about their learning experience in the module, Ian, Richard and Neil had the following to say:

*Ian: I wouldn't say it [the module] was driven by you guys. I wouldn't say that you've lectured us. We've kind of lectured ourselves in a way.*

*Richard: It was quite experimental [experiential], wasn't it?*

*Neil: Yes, I suppose it's kind of good that you dropped us in it and we've learnt in that way.*

Of course, despite the perception held by the students, we were not all equal partners. This is not to downplay the importance of the student-led nature of the classroom experience, the peer feedback processes, and the opportunity students were given to shape aspects of the module. But ultimately, the structure of the module and its constituent components were formed by our (the tutors') decisions. One such example relates to the authority generated by our positions, and the way students were subsequently prepared to use our examples to support and scaffold their approach to both fieldwork and writing. In particular, Harry's examples of his ethnographic work appeared to direct students' sense-making:

*Ross: I think alongside the example stuff, being shown your [Harry's] experiences of fieldwork and how it can be done was really beneficial as it made it clear what was expected.*

*Tom: And the examples were given at each stage, so when it came to writing the descriptive stuff, I knew what to do. I had never had to do that in an assignment before so it was something completely different – a new skill I suppose. But the examples used were simple and easy to understand.*

A key feature of the module design that shaped students' learning experiences in the ways expressed, were well-considered scaffolds implemented throughout its 10-week course. These scaffolds provided students security in their engagement, and allowed them the confidence to take risks and to think and act independently. From the focus group data, there was a sense that the combination of well-aligned pedagogical strategies were at play in effectively steering students from the uncertainty endemic at the start of the ethnographic process towards greater security and knowledge generation by the end of the module.

### **Evaluation summary and conclusions**

The findings of the module evaluation provide support for the use of open-ended, investigative fieldwork to stimulate student learning. It is, however, clear that aligned to this approach, students benefitted from carefully scaffolded pedagogical support in the form of constructively aligned presentations, peer-feedback and collaboration opportunities. That said, despite what was a positive experience for the students and us as tutors, there are some caveats worth sharing. A key consideration is that WWEP is a bespoke module – not

something that could be lifted off of the shelf and applied to different student population, with different tutors. It was, for example, only through Harry's involvement that we were able to successfully integrate the ethnographic framing. Harry's experiences positioned him, in terms of credibility and knowing, in such a way that he was able to empathise, support and guide students through the uncertainties they experienced through the module. Despite the careful planning and support available, only one (Jess) of the non-coaching, scientifically orientated students that started the module completed it. It is clear from this that the pedagogical approaches and ontological perspectives utilised within the module are not for everyone. An explanation could reside in the notion of pedagogical socialization. In other words, the module was so far from some students' previous learning experiences that they were not prepared to engage, or could not see the value in doing so. In some ways this was a shame, as the sports science student who did complete the module reported that she gained new and beneficial perspectives to understanding applied practices in the context of elite sport. The key point here is that all involved in the module need to value the interpretivist knowledge created via the ethnographic process. Harry and I clearly do, but even so, there were still challenges to face. The use of fieldwork required us to trust students to act responsibly and ethically when entering the field and to trust that they would generate content that could form the focus of the in-class activities (within the flipped classroom). The consequent shift in role for the lecturer was both exciting and disconcerting, requiring a skill set focused as much on responding to and building on students' in-class offerings, as pre-planned interventions. To this end, we are pleased to report that we too have learnt and developed greatly from the process and from the students we have had the pleasure of working with.

## References

- Atkinson, P. (2015). *For Ethnography*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Becker, H. S. (1958). Problems of inference and proof in participant observation. *American Sociological Review*, 23(6), 625-660.
- Biggs, J. and Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching For Quality Learning At University* (4th ed). Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Côté, J. E. and Allahar, A. L. (2011). *Lowering Higher Education: The Rise of Corporate Universities and The Fall of Liberal Education*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Denison, J. (2007). Social theory for coaches: A Foucauldian reading of one athlete's poor performance. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, 2(4), 369-383.
- Fetterman, D. M. (1989). *Ethnography Step-by-Step*. London: Sage.
- Gilbourne, D. and Richardson, D. (2006). Tales from the field: Personal reflections on the provision of psychological support in professional soccer. *Psychology of Sport & Exercise*, 7(3), 325-338.
- Hammersely, M. and Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. London: Routledge.

- Irons, A. (2007). *Enhancing Learning through Formative Assessment and Feedback*. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis.
- Larkin, H. and Richardson, B. (2013). Creating high challenge/high support academic environments through constructive alignment: Student outcomes. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18(2), 192-204.
- McMahon, T. and Thakore, H. (2006). Achieving constructive alignment: Putting outcomes first. *The Quality of Higher Education (Aukštojo Mokslo Kokybė)*, 3, 10-19.
- Parker, A. (2002). Pressures, problems and the PhD process: tales from the 'training ground'. In G. Walford (Ed.), *Doing a Doctorate in Educational Ethnography* (pp. 119-134). Oxford: JAI Press.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Pryce, K. (1986). *Endless Pressure: A Study of West Indian Life-Styles in Bristol*. Bristol: Bristol Classic Press.
- Rock, P. (2007). Symbolic interactionism and ethnography. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland, and L. Lofland (Eds.), *Handbook of Ethnography* (pp. 11-25). London: Routledge.
- Rotellar, C. and Cain, J. (2016). Research, perspectives, and recommendations on implementing the flipped classroom. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 80(2), 1-9.
- Sparkes, A. C. (2009). Ethnography and the senses: challenges and possibilities. *Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise*, 1(1), 21-35.
- Sparkes, A. C. and Smith, B. (2014). *Qualitative Research Methods in Sport, Exercise and Health: From Process to Product*. London: Routledge
- Van Maanen, J. (1995). An end to innocence: the ethnography of ethnography. In J. Van Maanen (Ed.), *Representation in Ethnography* (pp. 1-35). Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.
- Willis, P. (1978). *Profane Culture*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.