

Teacher-Student Relationships in Physical Education Activities in the Context of Inter-Subjectivity

Dingzhou Zhao

Cavite State University, Indang, Philippines
Email: zhaodingzhou@126.com

How to cite this paper: Zhao, D. Z. (2022). Teacher-Student Relationships in Physical Education Activities in the Context of Inter-Subjectivity. *Advances in Physical Education*, 12, 332-348.

<https://doi.org/10.4236/ape.2022.124025>

Received: September 9, 2022

Accepted: October 28, 2022

Published: October 31, 2022

Copyright © 2022 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

Abstract

In physical education activities, the quality of communication between teachers and students directly affects the effectiveness of physical education on campus, the reasonable comprehension of knowledge and skills, and the cultivation of students' moral character. The old norm prevailing in Chinese campus physical education is that teachers lack effective communication with each other and students "passively accept"; the physical education classroom is confined to the traditional "indoctrination theory" and operational skills, and is subject to one-way indoctrination and lack of interactive classroom. The formalism in communication is hostage to the teacher's authority, and students' psychological and non-verbal classroom communication is often neglected. Based on the perspective of Habermas's (2001) interaction theory, the study explores the effective path to optimizing the teacher-student relationship: reconstructing the concept of interactive subjectivity, focusing on effective interaction between teachers and students, rethinking the value of teaching interaction, reconstructing the evaluation of teacher-student interaction, and giving more attention to teaching interaction to realize the rational return of teaching interaction. The ideal state of the physical education classroom teaching interaction paradigm should start analyzing the relationship between the interaction subjects, namely teachers and students.

Keywords

Teacher-Student Interaction, Physical Education Activities, Practical Confusion, Logical Progression

1. Introduction

"Interaction" is a word often used in the workplace, and it has different mean-

ings in different contexts. Interaction in the philosophical sense refers to the social activity in which two or more social subjects with common speech and behavioral abilities exchange information and reach mutual understanding and empathy through the medium of language and symbols. The construction of a harmonious teacher-student interaction relationship has important inspiration and reference significance for teacher-student interaction in current physical education activities in China. According to [Habermas \(2001\)](#), in the process of reaching mutual understanding and consensus, there are two completely different views of “interaction”: one is the understanding of “things”, that is, the mastery of knowledge and information; the other is the understanding of “people” ([Mitchell, Reilly, & Logue, 2009](#)), which also includes emotions and values. In a certain sense, the essence of education is attributed to social interaction actions, and interaction activities are omnipresent in school physical education. Based on the essential attributes of cultural transmission, physical education is essentially a communication activity between teachers and students, and teachers and students use language, movement, and other means of expression to achieve a mutual exchange of ideas and effective communication in classroom practice. The way in which teachers structure the learning environment, the atmosphere, and the relationship with the class and individual students is central to creating positive learning experiences.

Based on the various dilemmas of teacher-student interaction in physical education, this research explores useful paths for optimizing teacher-student relationships based on the phenomenological perspective of inter-subjectivity: reconstructing the concept of interactive subjectivity, focusing on effective teacher-student interaction, reflecting on the value of teaching interaction, reconstructing the evaluation of teacher-student interaction, paying more attention to teaching interaction, and realizing the rational return of teaching interaction.

2. Philosophical Implications of the Normality of Teacher-Student Interaction in Physical Education Activities

The world of life is the main territory of activity in the communication space, where the objective and the subject become one in the social world so the activity of communication forms the source of mutual understanding between individuals. As for how to define the legitimacy of norms, [Habermas \(2001\)](#) argues that there are two general cases in which people recognize and comply with norms. The first situation: people recognize and observe such norms because they think they are worth recognizing. The second: people comply with norms because there is a penalty for violating them, so they are compelled to comply even if they do not recognize them in their hearts. This highlights the difference between “recognized” and “worthy of recognition” in the strict sense ([Wellman, 1985](#)). Acceptance of a standard is a matter of factuality, while acceptability of a standard is a matter of timeliness of the standard. These two types of integration are needed simultaneously in modern society. Jean-Paul Sartre points out that inter-subjectivity is “the inter-

connection and harmonious coexistence of a self-existing person with another self-existing person”, and the negotiation and consensus between subjects becomes an important criterion for judging the legitimacy of interaction. In terms of connotation, inter-subjectivity includes several categories such as cognitive theory, existential theory, social experience view, and moral philosophy. Each field has its communicative form and content, which makes inter-subjectivity show different meanings. Inter-subjectivity at the cognitive level is concerned with the co-communication and sharing of cognition or will with cognitive subjects; inter-subjectivity at the existential level is concerned with the connection and coexistence of existential subjects; inter-subjectivity at the social-practical view is concerned with the equality and interaction of real subjects; inter-subjectivity at the moral philosophy focuses on the moral consensus and public virtue among subjects.

Inter-subjectivity provides a new perspective on the ethical relationship between teachers and students in physical education: highlighting the dual subjectivity of teachers and students in physical education activities, emphasizing the interactivity of the physical education process, and focusing on the multidimensionality of physical education evaluation. Therefore, the evaluation of teachers' communication effects on students' physical education activities can be translated into three levels: whether the communication content is sincere, whether the communication discourse is true, and whether the communication direction is correct. These three dimensions, in turn, are coupled (coupling) with [Habermas's \(2001\)](#) theory of communicative action (four categories: purposive action, normative action, repertoire action, and communicative action).

3. Current Dilemmas Facing Teacher-Student Relationship in Physical Education Activities

The world of life in the Habermasian theoretical perspective, based on traditional culture and symbolic systems, respectively, is both about social institutions and the nature of society, and about the freedom of individuality, individual orientation and the unity of the ontology of the self. Teacher-student communication in physical education activities must be characterized by three aspects: the content attributes of communication, the discourse of communication as a medium, and the interaction must be purposeful. With the continuous change of disciplines in the field of physical education, the effective interaction between teachers in the process of physical education is an important prerequisite and guarantee of efficient education. The current dilemma of teacher-student communication in traditional physical education is mainly highlighted in several aspects.

3.1. Unilateralisation of Teacher-Student Interaction in Physical Education

The unilateralisation of interaction in the PE classroom is reflected in the singularity of the form of interaction and the unilateralisation of the teaching and

learning process.

1) The singularity of the form of interaction

The subjects of classroom teaching interaction are diversified, i.e. all teachers, students and student groups involved in classroom teaching activities are the subjects of teaching interaction and should participate in the process of interaction independently, actively and fully. Based on this, the types of classroom teaching interactions can be divided into: interactions between teachers and individual students, interactions between teachers and student groups, interactions between teachers and the whole class, interactions between individual students, interactions between individual students and student groups, interactions between individual students and the whole class, interactions between student groups, and interactions between student groups and the whole class. However, in actual classroom practice, the “point-to-point” interaction between the teacher and the whole class is dominant, followed by the “point-to-point” interaction between the teacher and the individual students. The remaining types of interaction were mostly marginalised. The rich educational resources that should be created by interaction cannot be explored, and classroom teaching becomes dull and rigid.

2) Unilateralisation of the teaching interaction process

In the process of classroom interaction, both teachers and students are active and conscious subjects of interaction. Classroom teaching interaction is not a unilateral activity, but a bilateral and multilateral process of communication, exchange and dialogue between the subjects of interaction on an equal footing. However, in classroom teaching practice, some teachers are used to seeing themselves as the “authority” of knowledge and the main subject of teaching, and they are keen to instill knowledge into students, enjoying full autonomy, choice and decision making, and rarely considering students’ interaction needs and willingness to interact. Students do not have the right to choose the form, time and content of classroom interaction, and can only passively enter the situations arranged by teachers to receive knowledge and education. The interaction between subject and subject is alienated into the indoctrination of the subject to the object, and students are objectified. Most students cannot actively, actively and freely participate in classroom teaching interaction, and the classroom teaching interaction process shows a tendency of unilateralisation.

Deeply influenced by the traditional Chinese concept of teacher-student, the unilateral interaction behavior between teachers and students in physical education activities is also common. The root cause of this is not only the whole community but also the school, especially students tend to regard teachers or coaches as an absolute and untouchable “authority” because teachers are the embodiment of students’ absolute knowledge (Ginns, Kitay, & Prosser, 2008). Students, who are relatively lacking in knowledge, are accustomed to teachers’ teaching and passive learning, but they are still one-way activities with teachers as the starting point, and the situation of passive acceptance by students has not

been fundamentally improved, and students lack the space and time for independent thinking. In this way, along with the decline of the teacher's sense of subject interaction, the subject position of students in physical activity is disregarded and unconsciously put into an object position by the teacher, making the conversation and interaction between the teacher and students become completely self-talk with the teacher's one-sided conversation; the teacher becomes the absolute manipulator in the education and teaching process, while students become passive absolute receivers, so that the teacher and students become the absolute manipulator of the educational process, while the students become the passive and absolute receivers. According to Habermas (2001), true interaction occurs in the process of interaction between educational subjects, which is sincere communication and dialogue between each other. In an ideal conversation situation, "everyone has the right to intervene in the conversation and no one has the exclusive opportunity to speak as a basis for freedom, equality, truth, and justice" (Mitchell, Reilly, & Logue, 2009). Moreover, because of the injustice of the teacher's personality, also inevitably leads to the inability of all teachers to pour the self-worth of their true personality into their teaching, and the dislocation of the proper ethical relationship between teachers and students in physical education, which results in the distortion of the teacher's personality in the teaching scene. As a result, students have no right to assume, explain, infer, question, and reflect on the teacher's words and cannot fully represent their personal feelings, likes and dislikes, and will. Under such circumstances, it is impossible for the campus living space to form a democratic public living space and to promote the healthy development of student's character and physical and mental integrity.

3.2. Vulgarization and Utilitarian Nation of Teacher-Student Interaction Methods

The teacher-student relationship covers many levels, and the methods of interaction between teachers and students should also be diversified. In physical education teaching activities, the main place of communication between teachers and students is specified as the classroom or training field, and the main method of communication between teachers and students is one-to-many communication between "individual-group". The original intention of this kind of teaching interaction is just the theory of knowledge indoctrination. However, it is undeniable that the teaching of physical education skills is different from the teaching methods of other subjects in the curriculum, with more emphasis on motor memory and operability training, more emphasis on the use of hands and brains, and more emphasis on the unity of learning and practice, more emphasis on the training of practical skills and practical working ability, and insistence on "learning by doing". In today's campus sports activities, the ethical relationship between teachers and students is loose and distorted: due to the influence of social malpractices, the motivation and behavior of teachers are increasingly utili-

tarian. For example, teachers perfunctory to the school's daily educational management, adhering to the rules, not enough investment in educational energy, not enough attention to what students think, want and need, but very little time to communicate with students outside the classroom; some teachers expect to get better results from students, teaching subjectively to please students, but do not dare to strictly restrict students; even students' merit assessment, employment and other aspects of work have different degrees of the brand of interest transactions.

3.3. Single and One-Sided Evaluation of Teacher-Student Interaction

Classroom evaluation includes both the teacher's evaluation of the explicit factors of basic knowledge and skills mastery and the student's evaluation of the implicit factors of the teacher's emotions, attitudes, and values in the classroom. This "subject-subject" evaluation is an important reflection of the correctness of the educational interaction between the two sides so that both teachers can effectively adjust their classroom practices and teaching situations so that the classroom can be gradually improved and perfected in the evaluation, and learners can gradually develop in the teacher's judgment, and the teachers themselves can also develop professionally. The reality is that student assessment is often "dislocated" and "distorted," to the extent that it weakens its intended function. By the same token, students' evaluation channels for teachers have become narrower due to the authority of teachers, and they do not and do not want to express their true feelings about teachers, which means that feedback from teacher-student interaction in the classroom has lost its value. However, the assessment that seems to have the desired effect has little effect, and the assessment of teacher interaction is often one-dimensional or one-sided, which is not conducive to the establishment of a more harmonious teacher-student relationship or teachers' professional growth.

4. Considering the New Teacher-Student Relationship in the Physical Education Classroom from the Perspective of Inter-subjectivity

4.1. From "Subjectivity" to "Inter-subjectivity"—A Logical Transmutation of Inter-subjectivity

Inter-subjectivity also began to appear in the field of political philosophy, and Husserl used the concept of inter-subjectivity for the first time. His phenomenology takes intentionality as the object of construction and finally returns to a priori itself. To avoid personal egoism, he also advocated the doctrine of the temporality of the human subject. For the first time, he affirmed the existence of the human subject and pointed out that each human being has its own experience and its world phenomena, but this world "is not the product of my synthesis, but only a world external to me, a world of interactive subjectivity, and a

world that exists for each person here. The proposed doctrine of the interacting subject clarifies two fundamental “lexical” issues: first, the “inter-subjectivity” relation, i.e. how to perceive another subject when “I” am the subject, and whether The first is the “inter-subjectivity” relationship, i.e. how to perceive another subject when “I” am the subject, whether it is “I and you” or “I and he”, and the second is whether there is sharing among subjects. “Inter-subjectivity” is a kind of cognitive “sharing”, which is the communication and interaction between the “self” and “other self” interaction. In Husserl’s case, inter-subjectivity has only a perceptual meaning, aiming at solving the problem of how the perceptual a priori object “we” can exist. Husserl gives the existence of others by the a priori self, while the experience of others is given as an attachment, which does not translate into the original experience of oneself. The “co-perception” and “co-presence” that occur between the “self” and the “other” as an intentional achievement has a priori certainty and reality. Within the framework of this a priori phenomenological meaning, both subjective consciousness, and empirical models are interrogated: theoretically, the mere “subject-object” or “subject-mediator-object” model is not a model of subject-object, but a model of subject-mediation. From a theoretical point of view, the simple “subject-object” or “subject-mediator-object” model is feasible when dealing with the question of human-nature and human-object relations, but when dealing with the question of interpersonal relations between people, the dilemma of “others are not objects” arises. However, Husserl’s theory of inter-subjectivity, which is based on the “a priori ego”, cannot overcome the egoistic tendency of his system, which stands on a non-utilitarian, irrelevant, and non-historical position, and looks at the binary boundary between the cognitive subject and the cognitive object in the subjectivity mode of thinking. Thus, it creates a division and opposition between subject and object, as well as a crisis in man and man, man and society, and thus a two-way ego.

Based on an ontological perspective, Heidegger introduced the idea of “co-presence”. At the turn of Heigl’s thinking, he understands the world as having two forms of co-presence: an alienated co-presence in a state of sinking, in which the individual has been swallowed up by the group, and a transcendental co-presence in which the individual has a free relationship with other individuals. Because of this sharedness, the world has always been a world shared by oneself and others. This world of being is also the common world (Pot, Whitehead, & Durden-Myers, 2018). To be “between” is to live together with others, and to live within the common world of others is also to be in the common world. From this, we can find that inter-subjectivity is not anti-subjective or anti-individual, but a reaffirmation and breakthrough of other subjects, a universalization of individuality, and a natural way of existence. The proposal of inter-subjectivity clarifies the relevant nature of inter-subjectivity more clearly and is a breakthrough in the subject-object relationship. The study of inter-subjectivity also reveals the inadequacy of teaching in the real situation,

that is, it is easy to produce the phenomenon of “too much” and “not enough” without inter-subjectivity. In the study of inter-subjectivity, the principles of teaching and inter-subjective relations are emphasized, and the subject here is not objective, but an actual subject, an interactive subject embodied in interpersonal activities, which becomes objective only in the process of interpersonal interaction.

Phenomenologists argue that there is no one objective way of viewing the world. The real world, especially the ideological, cultural, and spiritual social phenomena, is no longer regarded as objective, but as the existence of the subject, and the coexistence, parity, and communication between the subject and the object subject are confirmed. Second, the epistemology of inter-subjectivity also changes the basic meaning of the philosophical type of “existence”. It points out that “existence” is not the consciousness or objectivity of the subject, but the coexistence between subjects (Barnett & Guzmán-Valenzuela, 2017). The traditional philosophical concept of “existence”, whether objective or subjective, cannot be separated from the dualism of subject-object unity and opposition. The ontological technical specification of inter-subjectivity is a breakthrough from the reality of the unified subject-object opposition. Thirdly, inter-subjectivity, which refers to a certain characteristic displayed between subjects through interaction, is the relevance, interaction, cognition, and accommodation between subjects and subjects. The development from subjectivity to inter-subjectivity is not a denial of the individual subject, but a correction of the over-expanded individual subject, thus reaching the succession and transcendence and renunciation of the individual subject. From the category of inter-subjectivity, it tries to separate and integrate the contradictory relationship between human and human, between human and nature, and between human and self, which puts forward a new vision for people to correctly understand and deal with the problem of the relationship between subject and object, and between subject and subject, and at the same time provides a necessary rationale for people to correctly understand and grasp the integration of multiple subjects in sports activities in theory.

4.2. From “Mutual Knowledge” to “Consensus”—The Natural Logic of Teacher-Student Interaction in Physical Education Activities

The inter-subjective mode of thinking changes the traditional one-way mode of thinking that starts from the subject’s consciousness and starts from the concept of decentering, forming a mode of equality, dialogue, and symbiosis among subjects, which can more effectively deal with interpersonal relations between people and society, people and people, groups and groups, etc. in the context of the current social era. In fact, in the act of teaching physical education, it is important to have a common understanding of the relationship between people and society. In fact, in the act of teaching physical education, the interaction between teachers and students also requires “mutual knowledge” and “consen-

sus”. Inter-subjective education is the abandonment of the teacher’s autonomous, dominant-dependent teaching behavior, and the realization of an interactive, democratic-equal teaching relationship with the master, which is the abandonment of individual subjectivity education. To understand inter-subjectivity from the perspective of communication means, in fact, the formation of a dialogue involving comprehensibility between the two subjects of communication, as well as a relationship of genuine mutual recognition and understanding between them. It includes not only the mutual knowledge of both subjects, i.e. “mutual knowledge”, but also the same knowledge of each subject about the same thing, i.e. “consensus”, and no subject’s consciousness can be formed in isolation, and ideas are always formed gradually in interaction. Based on the perspective of communication and behavior theory, [Habermas \(2001\)](#) believes that inter-subjectivity is the process of interpersonal communication in which individuals can communicate with each other about real-world matters and establish a connection with themselves as participants from the perspective of others, resulting in mental communication. The “subject” in inter-subjectivity is a “common subject” that crosses itself and embraces all parties of the subject, and is a subject-object relationship with the “other” and forms a subject of exchange. The inter-subjective understanding and observance of communicative norms and forms of thinking between subjects, and from the mutual recognition and acceptance of binding between subjects.

The above analysis leads to the fact that the inter-subjective association of teachers and their subjectivity is formed in the spontaneous mutual objectivity of association with teachers. Teachers and students, both as subjects of cognitive and practical human services, are also subjects of objects of services. The social relations formed between the subject of research as a cognitive and practical person, and the university student as the subject of the object of research with each other are the social relations between the subjects of research, and the subject established and enhanced in the relations between the subjects of teachers is the inter-subjectivity of teachers ([Goodnough, 2010](#)). A teaching process is an act of bilateral activity, which refers to the process of interaction between teacher and student subjects to achieve information communication and emotional interaction. Teachers lead learners in the basic knowledge and communication skills they must understand and guide them to form correct values; while learners in the process of interaction with teachers also promote the development of teachers themselves, and the pursuit of inter-subjectivity is the proper meaning of education. The subjectivity of the teaching process reflects both the teacher as the objective subject and involves the active cooperation of the students so that the overall effect of the best state is achieved. Specifically, changing the model of physical education is never a matter of attributing the curriculum exclusively to the subjectivity of the teacher or the student, but rather a way of communication, mutual assistance, dialogue, and understanding in the context of respect and awareness of the other on both sides.

5. Reconstructing the Development of the Teacher-Student Relationship in Physical Education under the Perspective of Interaction

The teacher-student relationship should be interdependent and co-existing, and teachers and students should be an organic whole with mutual influence and high integration (McAlpine, Weston, Timmermans, Berthiaume, & Fairbank-Roch, 2006). Based on inter-subjectivity, the core of the paradigm change of physical education is to emphasize the interaction between teachers and students in teaching activities, i.e. interactive subjectivity, and to re-examine teachers and students as two subjects of physical education practice are undoubtedly the premise of the best synergy of multiple subjects in the new era of physical education curriculum reform. Along with the “new curriculum reform” practice, highlighting “student development as the center” is more reflective of the two-way relationship between teachers and students. It aims to emphasize students’ emotions and demands, fully mobilize students’ initiative and enthusiasm for learning, cultivate students’ spirit of innovation and exploration, help students learn to learn, enhance and develop learning effectiveness and learning ability, and encourage students’ independence and comprehensive development. The teacher’s communication in the perspective of Habermas’s (2001) interaction theory is a “subject-subject” relationship of “co-presence”. Only when they both become their subjects can they know and influence each other, and only when they both become each other’s subjects can they accept each other’s knowledge and influence. Without the presence of teachers, the teaching relationship is a catch-22; without the presence of students, teachers also lose the basis and value of their existence. In the real teaching scenario, teacher communication and classroom teaching should be accompanied by each other, mutually generated, multi-directional interaction, and dynamic generation. To return to the most genuine teacher-student communication, we must abandon the “I and he” relationship and reconstruct the “I and you” teacher-student interaction, to pursue the value of teacher-student communication in life itself.

5.1. Reviewing the Value of Interaction and Reconstructing a New Inter-Subjective Interaction Teacher-Student Relationship

Although the interactive education and teaching mode of “teacher-led-student subject” has obvious advantages, it has obvious drawbacks and shortcomings, which are mainly reflected in the following: firstly, although the status of students is gradually improved, teachers still take knowledge and ability as the core to establish the teacher-student relationship, which also means that the educational significance of interaction with teachers is limited. The limitations of the educational significance of student interaction with teachers; second, because of the blockage of teachers’ consciousness and the objective existence of teachers’ personality non-authenticity in the teaching context, which greatly limits the human and spiritual cultivation of teachers’ teaching process; third, because the balance

between teachers' dominant position and students' dominant role cannot be maintained, which means that students either slip back into teachers' role of student management and domination due to the emphasis on teachers' Third, the balance between the dominant role of the teacher and the dominant role of the students cannot be maintained, which means that students either slip back into the dominant role of the teacher because of the emphasis on the teacher's role, or the teacher's role is diluted so that the teacher's dominance over students is greatly dissolved. The teacher-student relationship is still an "I-other" relationship.

The connotation of inter-subjective teacher-student communication aims to achieve the interactive influence on the teacher's personality through the psychological communication and thought communication between teachers and students, to achieve the harmonious development of the relationship between teachers and students to achieve a better teaching effect. Physical education activities should be designed to vary in complexity to meet the needs of all learners, to match their previous experience or physical ability. This can also include a game-based approach where there is room for individual variation. Each learner is at a different place in their physical literacy journey and learning needs to be personalized as much as possible. Everyone, including the teacher, can do their cognition and reflection as self-subjects, and can also cognize, communicate and share themselves with the other subject and their subjects. Teachers and students, whether as self-subjects or object-subjects, are working diligently and spiritedly to express themselves, communicate, and show their learning experiences to each other. According to Jaspers, the essence of education is "a tree shaking another tree" and "a cloud pushing another cloud". Jaspers' metaphor tells us that education is a dynamic process and that the essence of this dynamic process lies in "spiritual communication". The only conversation is the true path to finding the truth and the white ego, and the only way for teachers to accomplish the transformation of the soul is through a teaching method driven by the spirit of conversation. Therefore, the real value of education lies in the activity of interaction between educational subjects. Therefore, the teacher-student relationship under the theory of interaction treats "interaction" as the most basic social activity, and pursues the inter-subjectivity between teachers and students to achieve effective understanding and communication between them. The language-mediated dialogue is a prerequisite for a normal teacher-student relationship, emphasizing normal dialogue and effective communication between the subjects of the teacher-student relationship. Teachers and students open up their inner worlds to each other, making the communication process break through the traditional cognitive process and turn into a process of participation, immersion, simulation, and construction of the teacher's entire personality level. Singh, Uijtdewilligen, Twisk, Van Mechelen, and Chinapaw (2012) found evidence that participation in physical activity is positively related to academic performance in young people.

At the same time, the teacher-student relationship from the perspective of interaction theory also emphasizes the supportive role of the relational object in the teacher-student relationship. With the advent of the era of network information technology and the flourishing of cyberspace, the concept, mode, manner, and method of teaching in contemporary physical education classrooms have all undergone essential changes. Classroom interaction should be a process of multi-subject exchange activities, a two-way communication activity that allows learners to be changed by the teacher as well. Teachers are not the only transmitters of knowledge, and students are not only the receivers and acquirers of knowledge. Teachers and students should establish a new partnership of democracy, cooperation, and communication, and establish a relationship between teaching subjects and communities that encourage each other and teach each other, and at the same time make efforts to create conditions to explore the ideal structure of teaching subjects and the communicative teacher-student relationship.

5.2. Doing and Learning Together, Improving the Way of Teacher-Student Teaching Interaction

In the real physical education classroom, what students need to know is a complex of multidimensional knowledge and ability, not only involving sports knowledge and practical operation ability but also cultivating students' high moral and cultural qualities. Therefore, teachers and coaches must choose teaching methods that take into account both theoretical knowledge and practical guidance, and ensure that students can understand theoretical knowledge well while developing their overall comprehensive use skills. For this reason, classroom teaching integrates "teaching, learning, and doing" in the process of physical education. Under the guidance of specific course objectives, teachers explain theoretical knowledge and demonstrate movements, students can concentrate more on classroom teaching, and interactive communication is formed between teachers and students. Students can use the equipment according to the classroom teaching, in the knowledge is easier to grasp at the same time, and can be faster to master the technical action elements. At the same time, students have their positive attitudes and ways of thinking and feeling, a "complete" person seeking self-development, and inter-subjective interactions between learners and students occur, in which only with the acquisition of appropriate knowledge reserves and skill standards, learners can more effectively realize the cognitive meaning of this process, only after acquiring the appropriate knowledge and skills standards can learners achieve more effective independent construction of cognitive meaning.

In the rapidly changing information society, we need to reflect deeply on the traditional concept of teachers, the concept of "respect for teachers" is not bad in itself, but to explore the issue of students' blind obedience to teachers' power and teachers' suppression of students' independent personality context, in the context of students' independent personality development and the survival value of

independent thinking are facing a crisis. In this context, we need to think more rationally when the development of students' autonomy and the value of independent thinking are at stake. Changing teachers' roles, cultivating more open concepts of physical education and knowledge, expanding teachers' knowledge perspectives, and leading "the use of hands and brains, and the unity of doing and learning" will promote teachers' guidance of the problems in teacher-student interaction into students' comprehensive development, broaden their understanding of the purpose, value, and meaning of teaching, and thus enhance teachers' understanding of physical education and teaching wisdom. This can broaden the understanding of the purpose, value, and meaning of teaching and thus enhance teachers' understanding of physical education itself and the gain of teaching wisdom.

5.3. Reconstructing Multiple Evaluation Discourse System Based on Inter-Subjectivity Perspective

According to Habermas (2001), the process of development of human cognition is from the self-centered view of life to the cognitive pluralistic view of life. Based on the situation of the times of value pluralism, the interaction between subjects and subjects is dynamic, independent, and differentiated. Therefore, in the classroom teachers need to change the fixed criteria of judgment, pay attention to the differences among students, and value the generation of value diversity. Multiple evaluation mechanisms need to be based on an inter-subjective perspective and the construction of a discourse system that facilitates the implementation of educational evaluation. The establishment of communicative relations must rely on the realization of linguistic activities, and the obstruction or distortion of linguistic activities can cause the irrationality of communication. The system of linguistic symbols on the surface of discourse reflects the objective conditions of certain symbols, concepts, linguistic forms, and tones, and behind it is both a system of values and the objectivity of a certain subject's consciousness, emotions, and will. Different subject perspectives will inevitably produce different value judgments, such as one-sided emphasis on the dominant position of the teacher, which will also inevitably result in logical contradictions of discourse in the process of value judgment, thus producing a teaching behavior dilemma.

Discourse is created by human beings, but it dominates their social activities at all times. "Language is a labyrinth of divergent paths" Foucault (2001) emphasized that because of the implicit suppression of "power", discourse, which is called an ideational system, often becomes a "violence imposed on things". The violence is imposed on things. To avoid such suppression and conflict, the establishment of a pluralistic assessment system should be considered from an inter-subjective perspective, focusing on the interaction between teachers and students and making it clear that teachers and students are the subjects of the relationship between them. Assessment of physical education is also a process of value assessment and problem identification. Both teachers and students regard them-

selves and each other as subjects, making a mutual subject relationship between the speaker and the listener, and only then does the teacher-student relationship truly form a subject position and sexual relationship, and only then does physical education truly establish the subject position of students.

1) In terms of student assessment, teachers face diverse cultural differences and cultural conflicts, flexibly use teaching methods and strategies and constantly update cultural concepts and reflective assessment in practice. Put the assessment focus on a comprehensive examination of student's practical skills, teaching activities, physical and mental education quality, creativity, etc.

2) In terms of teacher evaluation, an educational feedback system can be formed with the main body of teachers, where students and teachers can give objective and realistic suggestions to teachers' problems in the process of physical education teaching based on mutual recognition of each other's legitimacy status so that teachers can adjust classroom teaching more effectively and optimize classroom teaching effects. In the most ideal situation, students are both active participants in the practice of physical education courses, good partners between physical education teachers and other subjects of educational practice, and active developers of physical education teaching resources. The important subject position of students in the process of physical education practice becomes more prominent.

3) To prevent students' assessment results from being "distorted" due to their personalities or other reasons, community assessment mechanisms can be introduced at an appropriate time, and third-party organizations or community intermediary assessment organizations can be commissioned to form a diversified assessment mechanism with the participation of all parties in the community. Such multi-level and inter-subjective mutual assessment objectively strengthens the communication and dialogue between teachers and students, promotes the physical and mental development of students, and the sustainable generation of teachers' teaching experience, thus realizing the "integration and coexistence" of teachers and students in the true sense.

6. Remark and Reflection

Physical education is originally intended to be a process of interaction between social subjects and achieving recognition of their own identity, as well as a philosophy of cultivation that approaches the ethical spirit of the human being through the method of physical and mental interaction. Teachers and students achieve self-identity in physical education activities, fully consider the relationship of equality, communication, sharing, and co-progression between teachers and students, and establish a community of empathic mutual knowledge with each other, in educational physical education courses that are directly close to the body through experience and practice. Inter-subjective relationships between teachers and students in physical education activities are more conducive to mobilizing students' mastery of learning attitudes and improving teaching effec-

tiveness. Hansen, Lavery, and Varrato (2020) argued that philosophers, scholars of teaching, teacher educators, and teachers all have an indispensable custodial or stewardship role to play in education. In the perspective of intersubjectivity, there is no independent central subject, because all subjects are in their special position of irreducible and irreplaceable, inter-subjective state of equality and dialogue. In the teacher-student relationship, there is no isolated “teacher-student” as a single subject, because each subject is a subject in a social relationship, and the relationship between subjects is also “harmonious but different”.

From a phenomenological perspective, physical education should consider the holistic nature of its impact on the individual, even though it encompasses a multitude of interactions from physical activities, courses, modules and programmes, and workplaces over a number of years. The net result of these interactions and experiences should result in individuals having a distinctive view of physical activity and, more importantly, a view that values and desires lifelong physical activity and reflects positively on their whole physical education experience.

In the real physical education field, the teacher-student relationship under the perspective of interaction theory is a “subject-subject” relationship; the teacher-student relationship and physical education activities should be accompanied by each other, mutually generated, multi-directional interaction and dynamic. The teacher-student relationship and physical education activities should be accompanied by each other, mutually reinforcing, multi-directional and dynamic. The proposed inter-subjective teacher-student relationship in the physical education curriculum will break through the problem of the alienation of the subject itself, maintaining the basic characteristics of the individual student as a subject, while at the same time focusing on the relevance, symbiosis, and wholeness of the subject. To strengthen the comprehensive understanding and reasonable construction of new inter-subjective teacher-student interpersonal relationships in campus physical education activities, and help the continuous promotion of campus physical education reform and development.

7. Limitations of the Research

The focus of these projects was to provide students and teachers and each other with information about creating a supportive subjective relationship and to guide them in successfully integrating theory and practice. We concluded that most teachers and students were able to create such relationships (Steins & Behravan, 2017). However, we never planned to analyse the data on the subject of teacher-students. As a result, the context of these reports was very different. Otherwise, a meta-analysis would have been possible. The advantage of this disadvantage is that the impressions of the teacher-students are very specific and rich. Thus, we avoid “the loss of important evaluation details across time and space...” (Bergstrom & Taylor, 2006: p. 351). Furthermore, databases are not sufficient. The analysis of all available reflection reports was indeed time-consuming and had to

take into account project-specific changes. Finally, these data are highly subjective. They are entirely self-reported by the teacher-student and it is impossible to say more than that the observed learning effects are subjective impressions.

Note from the Contributor

Dingzhou Zhao is a Ph.D. candidate at the Cavite State University of the Philippines. His research interests include teacher identity and physical education.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

- Barnett, R., & Guzmán-Valenzuela, C. (2017). Sighting Horizons of Teaching in Higher Education. *High Education*, 73, 113-126. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-016-0003-2>
- Bergstrom, J. C., & Taylor, L. O. (2006). Using Meta-Analysis for Benefits Transfer: Theory and Practice. *Ecological Economics*, 60, 351-360. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2006.06.015>
- Foucault, M. (2001). *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of Human Sciences*, Translated by Mo Weimin. Shanghai SDX Joint Publishing Company.
- Ginns, P., Kitay, J., & Prosser, M. (2008). Developing Conceptions of Teaching and the Scholarship of Teaching through a Graduate Certificate in Higher Education. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 13, 175-185. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13601440802242382>
- Goodnough, K. (2010). The Role of Action Research in Transforming Teacher Identity: Modes of Belonging and Ecological Perspectives. *Educational Action Research*, 18, 167-182. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09650791003740725>
- Habermas, J. (2001). *On the Pragmatics of Social Interaction: Preliminary Studies in the Theory of Commutative Action*, Translated by Barbara Fulner. The MIT Press.
- Hansen, D. T., Laverty, M. J., & Varrato, R. (2020). Reimagining Research and Practice at the Crossroads of Philosophy, Teaching, and Teacher Education. *Teachers College Record*, 122, 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146812012200401>
- McAlpine, L., Weston, C., Timmermans, J., Berthiaume, D., & Fairbank-Roch, G. (2006). Zones: Reconceptualizing Teacher Thinking about the Action. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31, 601-615. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600923426>
- Mitchell, S. N., Reilly, R. C., & Logue, M. E. (2009). Benefits of Collaborative Action Research for the Beginning Teacher. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 344-349. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2008.06.008>
- Pot, N., Whitehead, M. E., & Durden-Myers, E. J. (2018). Physical Literacy from Philosophy to Practice. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 37, 246-251. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2018-0133>
- Singh, A., Uijtewilligen, L., Twisk, J. R., Van Mechelen, W., & Chinapaw, M. M. (2012). Physical Activity and Performance at School: A Systematic Review of the Literature Including a Methodological Quality Assessment. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, 166, 49-55. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archpediatrics.2011.716>
- Steins, G., & Behravan, B. (2017). Teacher-Student-Relationships in Teacher Education:

Exploring Three Projects of Knowledge Transfer into Action. *Psychology*, 8, 746-770.

<https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2017.85048>

Wellman, H. M. (1985). The Origins of Metacognition. In D. L. Forrest-Pressley, D. Mackinnon, & T. G. Waller (Eds.), *Metacognition, Cognition, and Human Performances* (pp. 1-31). Academic.