

## INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the original text directly from the copy submitted. Thus, some dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from a computer printer.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyrighted material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is available as one exposure on a standard 35 mm slide or as a 17" × 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. 35 mm slides or 6" × 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.



300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA



**Order Number 8816359**

**Connections and disconnections between a college methods  
course and elementary classroom teachers' teaching children's  
physical education**

**Royall, Mary Luella, Ed.D.**

**The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1987**

**Copyright ©1987 by Royall, Mary Luella. All rights reserved.**

**U·M·I**

**300 N. Zeeb Rd.  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106**



CONNECTIONS AND DISCONNECTIONS BETWEEN A COLLEGE METHODS  
COURSE AND ELEMENTARY CLASSROOM TEACHERS'  
TEACHING CHILDREN'S PHYSICAL EDUCATION

by

Mary Lu Royall

A Dissertation Submitted to  
the Faculty of the Graduate School at  
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Education

Greensboro  
1987

Approved by

  
Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation  
Adviser

Kate R. Barnett

Committee Members

Marie Riley  
R. H. [unclear]  
R. L. [unclear]

October 2, 1987  
Date of Acceptance by Committee

October 2, 1987  
Date of Final Oral Examination

© 1987

by Mary Luella Royall

ROYALL, MARY LUELLA, Ed.D. Connections and Disconnections Between a College Methods Course and Elementary Classroom Teachers' Teaching Children's Physical Education. (1987) Directed by Dr. Kate R. Barrett. 177 pp.

The purpose of this study was to describe connections and disconnections of four classroom teachers' actual teaching of physical education with the experiences of their college methods course. The qualitative methodology used in this study generated data from three different sources: video- and audiotaped lessons, interviews, and a demographic questionnaire. All four teachers had taken and successfully completed a course in elementary physical education taught by the researcher, the focus of which was derived from the course text, Physical Education for Children: A Focus on the Teaching Process (Logsdon, Barrett, Ammons, Broer, Halverson, McGee, and Robertson, 1977).

The study sought to determine (a) which major areas of the content of a college course taken by classroom teachers were meaningful to them, and therefore remembered and implemented in their physical education teaching; (b) what their philosophy and attitude were regarding elementary physical education; what connections and disconnections they had with the philosophy that was presented to them as a part of their college course; (c) what was included in a typical lesson; and (d) what the strongest influencing factors were that directed what the teachers planned for their students in a physical education setting. Based on the analysis of data, five themes emerged illustrating the major connections and disconnections with the undergraduate methods course



experiences: (a) effect of equipment on the movement responses of children, (b) content of the lesson, (c) development of motor skills, (d) teaching styles, and (e) planning.

Within the limitations of this study it was concluded that no strong connections existed between the undergraduate methods course and the four classroom teachers' teaching of physical education across the majority of the lessons; the connections that existed were limited, inconsistent, and often without clear rationale.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

"For everything there is an appointed season,  
there is a proper time for every project under heaven."

Ecclesiastes 3:1 MLB

### **A time to plant; a time to harvest**

Thank you to all those who helped plant seeds of wisdom. It is my hope you will be pleased with the harvest.

### **A time to work - a time to cast away and bring together**

Thank you to the many persons who helped me to reach my appointed season: the four classroom teachers without whom this work would not have been possible; my dissertation committee and especially my advisor who helped me "bring together" this work. Each has my deepest gratitude and appreciation.

### **A time to keep, and a time to give**

Thank you to the video technician, outside interviewers, typist, transcribers, and editor who gave their time so willingly.

### **A time to cry, and a time to laugh**

Thank you to my friends who cried and laughed with me throughout the process - who understood.

### **A time to sing, and a time to dance**

Thank you to a special network of people who have been ready to sing hallelujah and dance at the "appointed time".

### **A time to keep silent, and a time to speak**

Thank you to three special people, to whom I dedicate this work, who helped me keep silent when I should have and encouraged me to speak out at the appropriate time; who helped me untirely with my work, cried with me, laughed with me, helped me "tear apart" and "put together" in what seemed endless rewrites, encouraged me, believed in me, and knew all along my time and my "appointed season" would.

### **For everything there is a season, a proper time...**

This is my time - let's all shout and sing to the heavens --- It is done!

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| APPROVAL PAGE.....                             | ii   |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....                           | iii  |
| LIST OF FIGURES.....                           | vii  |
| CHAPTER  |      |
| I. INTRODUCTION.....                           | 1    |
| Statement of the Problem.....                  | 5    |
| Definition of Terms.....                       | 5    |
| Major Assumptions Underlying the Research..... | 7    |
| Scope of the Study.....                        | 7    |
| Significance of the Study.....                 | 8    |
| II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....          | 10   |
| Whose Responsibility?.....                     | 10   |
| Philosophical Positions.....                   | 10   |
| Survey Results.....                            | 13   |
| Classroom Teachers' Competencies.....          | 18   |
| Comparison of Teaching Effectiveness:          |      |
| Classroom Teacher, Specialist.....             | 19   |
| Competencies of Classroom Teachers:            |      |
| Professional Preparation Program.....          | 22   |
| Improving Competencies.....                    | 29   |
| Classroom Teachers:                            |      |
| Perceptions and Attitudes.....                 | 32   |
| Summary.....                                   | 37   |
| III. RESEARCH PROCEDURE.....                   | 40   |
| The Setting.....                               | 41   |
| The Community.....                             | 41   |
| The School.....                                | 41   |
| The College.....                               | 41   |
| Physical Education in the Elementary           |      |
| School (LSPE 318).....                         | 44   |
| Selection of Subjects.....                     | 47   |
| Approval Procedure.....                        | 48   |
| Data Collection.....                           | 50   |
| Videotaping.....                               | 51   |
| Interviews.....                                | 53   |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Questionnaire.....                     | 54  |
| Data Analysis.....                     | 54  |
| Initial Phase.....                     | 55  |
| Final Phase.....                       | 55  |
| IV. RESULTS.....                       | 58  |
| Effects of Equipment on the Movement   |     |
| Responses of Children.....             | 59  |
| Assertions.....                        | 59  |
| Support from Data.....                 | 60  |
| Multiple Equipment.....                | 60  |
| Types of Equipment.....                | 65  |
| Discussion.....                        | 69  |
| Connections and Disconnections.....    | 71  |
| Content of Lessons.....                | 72  |
| Assertions.....                        | 72  |
| Support from Data.....                 | 73  |
| Origin of Content.....                 | 73  |
| Progression of Content.....            | 78  |
| Objectives.....                        | 81  |
| Discussion.....                        | 83  |
| Connections and Disconnections.....    | 85  |
| Development of Motor Skills.....       | 86  |
| Assertions.....                        | 86  |
| Support from Data.....                 | 87  |
| Psychomotor Goals.....                 | 89  |
| Motor Development Knowledge.....       | 90  |
| Practice Time.....                     | 92  |
| Discussion.....                        | 94  |
| Connections and Disconnections.....    | 96  |
| Teaching Styles.....                   | 97  |
| Assertions.....                        | 97  |
| Support from Data.....                 | 98  |
| Decision Making.....                   | 101 |
| Interaction with Students.....         | 106 |
| Role of Teacher.....                   | 108 |
| Discussion.....                        | 108 |
| Connections and Disconnections.....    | 110 |
| Planning.....                          | 111 |
| Assertions.....                        | 111 |
| Support from Data.....                 | 111 |
| Planning.....                          | 112 |
| Correlation of Physical Education with |     |
| Other Subjects.....                    | 115 |
| Factors that Influence Planning.....   | 117 |
| Discussion.....                        | 120 |
| Connections and Disconnections.....    | 124 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS.....          | 126 |
| Summary.....  | 127 |
| Content.....  | 127 |
| Philosophy and Attitude.....                            | 128 |
| Typical Lesson.....                                     | 128 |
| Influencing Factors that Direct Planning...             | 132 |
| Conclusion.....   | 133 |
| Implications.....                                       | 133 |
| Improvement of the Methods Course.....                  | 134 |
| Future Research.....                                    | 135 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY.....                                       | 136 |
| APPENDIX A. OBSERVATIONAL INSTRUMENTS.....              | 146 |
| APPENDIX B. APPLICATION FOR RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION..... | 152 |
| APPENDIX C. REPORT INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS.....        | 154 |
| APPENDIX D. LETTER TO PARENTS.....                      | 157 |
| APPENDIX E. PERMISSION TO VIDEOTAPE TEACHER'S LESSON... | 159 |
| APPENDIX F. PERMISSION TO USE VIDEOTAPE FOR RESEARCH... | 161 |
| APPENDIX G. DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH PROJECT.....        | 163 |
| APPENDIX H. INFORMED CONSENT FORM.....                  | 166 |
| APPENDIX I. INTERVIEW #1 QUESTIONS.....                 | 168 |
| APPENDIX J. QUESTIONNAIRE.....                          | 171 |
| APPENDIX K. COURSE OBJECTIVES.....                      | 176 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure                           | Page |
|----------------------------------|------|
| 1. Data Collection Schedule..... | 52   |

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

In the past, most of the literature about classroom teachers has focused on who should teach children's physical education, the classroom teacher or the physical education specialists, and the competencies of classroom teachers to teach. Those who felt that the classroom teacher should teach elementary physical education pointed to (a) their ability to integrate physical education with other areas of the school, (b) their understanding of individual differences in children, and (c) the opportunity to offer physical education more often than the specialists could (Beck, 1963; Davis, 1931; Rice, 1948; Saurborn, 1950). Those advocating the specialists believed them to be more qualified than the classroom teacher specifically because of their professional preparation (Curtiss & Curtiss, 1946; Manley, 1948). This became a more contemporary issue with a number of status studies and surveys conducted to determine who was actually doing the teaching in elementary physical education (American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1968; Caskey, 1980; Haynes, 1973; Lahann, 1968; Pilson, 1970; Schneider, 1960; Wilcox, 1966). For the most part, it was found that the classroom teacher was responsible for a major portion of the teaching.

The question of competencies of the classroom teacher to teach children's physical education compared with that of the physical education specialist has been a focus of research from the late 1950's to the present. All studies reviewed have supported the conclusion that elementary children taught by physical education specialists performed significantly better on fitness and motor performance tests than children taught by classroom teachers (Clarke, 1971; Hallstrom, 1965; Nestroy, 1978; Ross, 1960; Siff, 1979; Van Wieren, 1973; Workman, 1965; Zimmerman, 1959). Regardless of these findings the reality is "cutbacks in funding and renewed emphasis on academic areas have placed physical education, music, and art in a category of 'non-essential experiences for students'" (National Committee on Excellence in Education, 1983, p.1). Elementary physical education specialists will be part of that cutback. Thus the classroom teacher will have an increased role in the teaching of elementary physical education. The most recent study of employment statistics in public school physical education that supports this notion was conducted by Randall in 1986. Though not directly related to this study, her National Survey in Public School Physical Education points to a national trend toward the reduction or elimination of physical education teaching positions. She stated, "Budgetary constraints, declining enrollments, and population dynamics have been the major causes of this



trend" (p. 23). The statistical data from this survey focused on the elementary and secondary specialist and not the classroom teacher, but perhaps the point Randall (1986) makes that "hundreds of thousands of our nation's elementary school students are being paid a great injustice by the failure of schools to meet their physical needs" (p. 28) is well taken. She cited the inappropriate priorities of the Council on Physical Education for Children (i.e., two secondary specialists for every one elementary specialist) and the National Center for Education Statistics projections of climbing elementary school enrollments as the reasons for her concern.

Specific to this study is a mandate by the Governor of the State and the State Council of Higher Education that the undergraduate degree in elementary education be abolished and all elementary education majors be granted liberal arts degrees in specific subject areas. The State Council at this time has not adequately defined liberal arts degrees to colleges nor has it determined what professional education courses will be required for state certification. The net result is a threatened physical education curriculum at New Castle College<sup>1</sup> with possible cutbacks of physical education

---

<sup>1</sup> The names of all people, institutions, and locations have been changed in order to assure anonymity for those participating in the study.

specialists or total elimination of physical education programs taught by specialists from the public school systems in the state. This situation places increased responsibility on the classroom teacher who is traditionally required to take only one three-credit course in elementary physical education (Cochran, 1982; Haynes, 1973; Schwarz, 1983; Smith, 1964). Before this alternative can be considered, it is important to determine what classroom teachers believe they can do in physical education, what they are willing to do, and ultimately, how effective they are in planning and implementing a course of study appropriate for the developmental age of the children with whom they work.

There exists little research which has described what elementary classroom teachers know or do in terms of physical education instruction. Only one study has been conducted which followed classroom teachers from a college methods course into teaching experiences in elementary physical education (Smith, 1964). Therefore, this study follows four New Castle College elementary classroom teachers from their undergraduate physical education methods course to their first teaching experiences. It describes the connections and disconnections of these classroom teachers' actual teaching in physical education with their undergraduate course experience.

### Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this research was to describe the connections and disconnections of four classroom teachers' actual teaching in physical education with the course experiences of their college methods course. More specifically, the investigation sought to answer the following questions:

1. Which major areas of content of a college course taken by classroom teachers were meaningful to them and therefore remembered and implemented in their physical education teaching?

2. What were the classroom teacher's philosophy and attitude regarding elementary physical education; what connection or disconnection did they have with the philosophy that was presented to the teachers as a part of the college methods course?

3. What was included in a typical physical education lesson taught by the classroom teacher and what were the connections or disconnections of the lesson with the practical experiences in the college methods course?

4. What were the strongest influencing factors that directed what classroom teachers planned for their students in a physical education setting?

### Definition of Terms

For the purpose of interpretation, the following meanings were designated for terms used in this study:

Classroom Teachers: Persons who have graduated from an accredited college or university such as New Castle College with a degree in elementary education and who hold a state teaching certificate.

Physical Education for Elementary Schools: Planned, responsible, educational programs in elementary schools which:

provide experiences that improve the ability of the learner to: (a) Move skillfully demonstrating versatile, effective, and efficient movement in situations requiring either planned or unplanned responses; (b) Become aware of the meaning, significance, feeling, and joy of movement both as a performer and as an observer; (c) Gain and apply the knowledge that governs human movement. (Logsdon & Barrett, 1977, p.17)

LSPE 318 Physical Education in the Elementary School: A course which was taught between 1980 and 1984, required of all New Castle College elementary education majors prior to their student teaching experience and included the philosophy, content, methods, and materials of teaching elementary physical education, K-6. Topics included motor skill development, teacher behavior, and lesson planning.

Connections: The verbal, nonverbal, and written behaviors of four classroom teachers examined through videotape observations, questionnaires, and interviews which show a logical relationship to the content and experiences of the undergraduate methods course.

Disconnections: The verbal, nonverbal, and written behaviors of four classroom teachers examined through videotape observations, questionnaires, and interviews which show no

relationship to the undergraduate methods course.

Standardized Open-ended Interview: "A set of questions carefully worded and arranged with the intention of taking each respondent through the same sequence of questions with essentially the same wording" (Patton, 1980, p.198).

General Interview: "A basic outline of questions asked to assure all relevant topics are covered for each respondent" (Patton, 1980, p. 198).

Microethnography: Videotape and auditory recordings of events in the field (Erickson, 1986).

#### Major Assumptions Underlying the Research

The following assumptions were fundamental to this study. They reflect premises accepted as given and therefore will not be examined as part of the investigation.

1. There was sufficient consistency in the New Castle College methods course objectives and content, as offered between 1980 and 1984, to permit comparisons among all the subjects.

2. What was taught in the New Castle College undergraduate elementary school methods course could be implemented in the public schools by elementary classroom teachers.

#### Scope of the Study

The boundaries of the research were established by the following factors:

1. Subjects for this study were four elementary school

classroom teachers who had completed an undergraduate elementary school physical education methods course taught by the researcher at New Castle College between fall 1980 and fall 1984. All were teaching in the same public school system and had received a grade of "B".

2. The primary data were collected by means of microethnographic techniques which generated data from three different sources: video- and audiotaped lessons, interviews, and a demographic questionnaire.

3. The major focus of the study was to describe the connections between four classroom teachers' teaching of physical education and experiences they received in their undergraduate methods course in elementary physical education.

#### Significance of the Study

This study is exploratory in nature and describes what four selected elementary classroom teachers did in an elementary physical education setting, what they believe about physical education, and what they remembered from their New Castle College undergraduate methods course. Data obtained from this study provide information not previously collected about New Castle College students and their classroom teaching experiences in a physical education setting. The information obtained (a) describes how elementary classroom teachers attach meaning to elementary physical education content as presented during the

undergraduate methods course, (b) describes what classroom teachers are able to remember from the undergraduate elementary physical education methods course and implement in physical education lessons for their children, (c) clarifies what should be expected of classroom teachers in an elementary school physical education setting, and (d) adds to the knowledge regarding elementary school physical education pedagogy which will be helpful in strengthening the professional preparation of classroom teachers at New Castle College.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Literature selected for review focused specifically on the classroom teacher and is presented in three major sections. The review begins by examining the question of who should teach elementary physical education, the classroom teacher or the specialist. Next, literature is reviewed that focuses on the question of classroom teachers' competencies examining first, a comparison of the teaching effectiveness of the classroom teacher and the specialist; second, the competencies of classroom teachers as identified through professional preparation programs; and third, improvement of classroom teachers' competencies. The third and final section contains a review of studies related to classroom teachers' perceptions and attitudes about elementary school physical education.

#### Whose Responsibility?

##### Philosophical Positions

Many articles written from the early 1930's to the mid-1960's reflect the profession's dilemma about who should teach children's physical education, the classroom teacher or the specialist. While authors made it clear that the role of the classroom teacher in elementary physical education is central, or "key" as expressed by Beck in 1963, the basic



position advocated by the majority of authors is best represented by Saurborn's position, who in 1950 stated:

It is not a matter of either classroom teacher or the specialist, ...it becomes a matter of both--of classroom teacher and specialists. Both have contributions to make.... It must be a cooperative venture to obtain the best results in terms of children. (p. 114)

Personnel suggested to help the classroom teacher were consultants, supervisors, or physical education specialists (Buehler, 1961; Drew, 1961; Jones, 1961; Hill, 1961). This concept and role of a resource person were not totally new, as Manley (1948) had described earlier when she suggested that:

She might teach the physical education classes and relieve the classroom teacher for a much-needed long breath, and still let the classroom teacher see the children at play during free play period, or she might help the classroom teacher who wants to teach her own physical education classes and only take over the teaching in situations where the teacher feels inadequate. (p. 335)

Support for classroom teachers' being the prime instructional agent in physical education point to (a) their ability to integrate physical education with the total school program, (b) their familiarity with individual differences in children, and (c) the fact that they would be teaching 25-30 students per day where the specialist would be having from 8-12 different classes for the same time period making it impossible to meet students' "real needs" (Curtiss & Curtiss, 1946; Rice, 1948; Saurborn, 1950).

While the cooperative nature of this relationship seemed to be the preferred position, writers often made a

point to outline the advantages and disadvantages of each. For example, in highlighting the advantages of having the classroom teacher responsible for physical education instruction, Saurborn (1950) stated:

The classroom teacher 1. knows her children, their needs and interests, 2. has the opportunity to plan time schedules in terms of needs of group, 3. can tie physical education activities into other phases of the curriculum, 4. can see activity as a part of the child's whole day, 5. is the new adult to whom a little child has adjusted, 6. knows when her group is ready for the more highly organized kind of group living required for games. (p. 114)

And in relation to the specialist, Saurborn pointed out:

1. [They have] the training, equipment, and space for satisfying activity needs of children, 2. [they have] the training and point of view which will, within limits of her situation, assure a child of adequate time for physical education activity, 3. [they have] the background and training in activity, which could supplement and widen the scope of other phases of the curriculum, 4. [they have] the scientific training to understand scope, effect, and results of activity, 5. [they have] the medium of activity--the medium for making contact with children--for helping children make contacts with one another, with grown-ups, 6. [they do] not have the space limitations of the classroom. (p.114)

While it was clear that authors saw advantages for both the classroom teacher and the specialist to be involved with the physical education program, Davis (1931), who advocated having the classroom teacher teach physical education, described four reasons for the difference in philosophical positions over who should teach physical education in the elementary schools. First, in the past, physical education has been:

considered a special subject; second, because of this, even in the teacher training institutions, elementary school teachers have not been familiar with modern physical education; third, there are some physical educators who still hold that physical education demands a specific set of teaching techniques; fourth, many school principals and superintendents have not understood the place of physical education in the child's life and therefore have treated it as another "accessory". Such an understanding has been due to a lack of adequate training and experience. (p. 29)

Advocates of the specialist's teaching physical education point to the lack of preparation of the classroom teacher to teach physical education (Curtiss & Curtiss, 1946). Likewise, as Saurborn (1950) pointed out, the specialist may not be the "person who enjoys doing vigorous motor activity with children". And in 1961, 30 years after Davis' comments, Duncan and Carruth, viewing the classroom teacher-specialist question as an issue to be resolved, suggested: "The controversy of specialists vs. classroom teacher has long been with us; perhaps it is time to end the discussion and promote (1) physical education for all elementary children (2) taught by qualified personnel" (p. 8). Even today with 26 additional years of information amassed on elementary physical education, there is still a great concern regarding the elementary physical education programs and who should teach in these programs.

#### Survey Results

In addition to a preponderance of written philosophical positions regarding who should teach children's physical education, a number of surveys and

questionnaires have been directed towards similar questions. These studies fall into three areas: (a) the feelings and attitudes of classroom teachers, (b) the status of physical education in elementary schools, and (c) the distribution of classes taught exclusively by classroom teachers and those taught with the assistance of specialists.

Donnelly, in 1958, developed a simple checklist to determine how classroom teachers felt about elementary physical education. The checklist was administered to 150 classroom teachers, grades 1 through 6, in 7 schools in 4 towns. There were no specialists in any of the schools.

The data revealed that, of the 138 teachers who responded, 127 felt that:

1. they had responsibility for physical education for their children;
2. they did not want the specialist to teach their children all of the time even though they wanted the help of a specialist in physical education;
3. they felt recess or unsupervised play was not enough for children.

Almost two-thirds of these teachers expressed a need for some kind of curriculum guide to carry on their program, and 99 felt a need for specialist help on a regular basis. Donnelly (1958) emphasized that the research design and results of this study would justifiably raise questions in

the mind of the reader which she hoped would stimulate additional follow-up research. Her main point, although realizing the study represented only a sampling of classroom teachers, was that classroom teachers seemed to realize the physical education needs of elementary children and were dedicated to seeing them met (p. 80). As a study, its main purpose appeared to be an effort to pull together two professional groups, the classroom teacher and the physical education specialist, as her last statement so aptly pointed out:

We must concentrate our professional efforts on examination of ways in which we can learn to work more effectively, more in harmony, with the person who has the major responsibility for the total daily program of the elementary school child and who is eager to discharge this responsibility to co-operation with others. (p. 80)

Little did Donnelly know how pertinent that statement would be even in the 1980's.

In a questionnaire administered by Schneider (1959), 40% of the respondents (N=77) saw a:

Trend toward greater cooperation of the classroom teacher and the person providing the assistance for the classroom teacher....The major factors influencing this trend were the changing philosophy of elementary education, and better programs of inservice education. (p. 104-105)

In agreeing with Donnelly's position for greater cooperation with the specialist, Schneider (1959) recommended how this might be accomplished. She stressed that:

The classroom teacher should be present whenever the special teacher teaches the class. When they work together the special teacher should not be expected to

assume all of the responsibility for direct teaching. The specialist should have opportunities to observe the classroom teacher conduct the class so that constructive suggestions may be offered for consideration. (p. 105)

In addition to surveys focused on classroom teachers' attitudes toward children's physical education and how classroom teachers and specialists might work together more effectively, a number of surveys were administered to determine who was actually doing the teaching, or held direct responsible for children's physical education. Findings from six such surveys will be briefly given.

Wilcox (1966) surveyed 53 schools in Northeast, Ohio, and found an almost even distribution of physical education classes taught by the classroom teacher, specialist, or a combination of the two. Out of 52 schools responding, classroom teachers were responsible for physical education instruction at the 4th and 5th grades 35% of the time, 36% employed a physical education specialist, and 29% indicated that a combination of specialist and classroom teacher was used (p. 61).

Respondents to the Elementary School Physical Education survey conducted by the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation in 1968, reported that classroom teachers in 159 systems out of 229, representing 41 states, were required to teach physical education when the specialist did not (p. 4). Most schools were found to use both the specialist and the classroom

teacher.

The 1968 Lahann's study found 14 to 19% of the schools surveyed in the state of Iowa used specialists to assist the classroom teacher in physical education (p. 95). A greater percentage of the intermediate grades than primary grades were taught by a specialist. "The classroom teacher taught physical education in 73% of the schools that had physical education in kindergarten" (p. 94).

Pilson's (1970) questionnaire which investigated the Status of Physical Education in Public Elementary Schools of Rhode Island found that 86% of the public schools (N=290) in that state offered regular classes in elementary school physical education. According to her study, however, 40% did not meet minimum time requirements. She found that the classroom teacher was required to provide instruction to all classes in 16% of the schools and provide physical education experiences on the days the specialist was not present in 44% of the schools (p.36).

The physical education survey in Illinois published by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (Terkell, Deutsch, & Noak, 1970) found that 96 out of 288 school systems used supervisors or consultants to plan curriculum for the purpose of assisting the classroom teachers to improve their teaching (p. 24).

Caskey (1980) surveyed 50 states and the District of Columbia to determine the extent to which public schools

used elementary classroom teachers to teach physical education. In 1979, the results indicated that in 47,533 elementary schools in 43 states, 62% of the schools have classroom teachers teaching physical education, without assistance from the specialist.

While these surveys add an important dimension to the growing body of knowledge about elementary physical education and document the extent to which the specialist or the classroom teacher instructs in physical education programs across the United States, they do not tell us what is actually happening in the classroom.

#### Classroom Teachers' Competencies

This section of the review of literature will examine research studies focused on the classroom teacher's teaching physical education. Of this body of research, dating from the mid-1920's to the present, most have focused primarily on the topic of teacher competencies and specifically in three major areas: (a) comparison studies of the teaching abilities of classroom teachers and specialists, (b) competencies of classroom teachers identified as part of professional preparation programs, intervention strategies, and teaching techniques, and (c) perceptions and attitudes of classroom teachers toward physical education.

#### Comparison of Teaching Effectiveness: Classroom Teacher, Specialist

Interest in the teaching effectiveness of classroom teachers in physical education has led to studies comparing



the performance outcomes of students taught by elementary physical education specialists and those taught by classroom teachers. Eight studies have been conducted over the past 25 years, all supporting the conclusion that elementary children taught by physical education specialists exhibit significantly better fitness and motor performance levels than those taught by the classroom teacher (Clarke, 1971; Hallstrom, 1965; Nestroy, 1978; Ross, 1960; Siff, 1979; Van Wieren, 1973; Workman, 1965; Zimmerman, 1959). Three of these studies reported significantly better student performance scores when the specialist's expertise was combined with the classroom teacher's abilities (Hallstrom, 1965; Siff, 1979; Van Wieren, 1973). The Ross study reported variation in the findings as determined by the sex of the child: girls taught by the specialist demonstrated superior performance in the standing broad jump and the short potato race while non-specialist-taught boys showed superiority in the same two events. Findings from two more recent studies (Hennessey, 1984; Smith, 1981), on the other hand, were in contradiction to this consistent result. In relation to fitness and motor skill performance of children taught by a physical education specialists, Hennessey and Smith reported no significant difference in achievement scores of students taught by classroom teachers.

Critiquing these earlier studies, Placek and Randall (1986) speculated "that most of these studies reflected a

substantial limitation in research design, [noting that] skill-related components of fitness are partially determined by hereditary predispositions" (p. 158). Another limitation which they suggested had impact on the performance scores was the lack of consideration for the influence of practice on skill-related fitness aspects. Besides not recognizing the importance of practice, in the case of the Ross (1960) study, the findings were considered limited by the failure of the researcher to recognize the influence of a supervisor who directed both the specialists and the nonspecialists. Likewise, clouding the Zimmerman (1959) study was the fact that the special teachers used were former classroom teachers without professional preparation in physical education. As a final limitation, Placek and Randall (1986) pointed out no effort was made to identify any differences in out-of-school sports experiences between boys and girls.

Speaking on the limitations of comparison studies between specialists and nonspecialists in general, Placek and Randall (1986) pointed to the disappointing results of both teacher comparisons and process-product research to provide results that could be used by teachers to improve teaching effectiveness. In an effort to control variables which affect the results of valid and reliable measures of student achievement and recognizing the difficulty of attaining such measures in physical education skills, Placek

and Randall (1986) postulated that a process measure such as ALT-PE [Academic Learning Time in Physical Education] might offer a viable way with which to study teaching effectiveness. The subjects chosen for their 1986 ALT-PE, study were 7 physical education specialists and 13 classroom teachers. The specialists selected for the study were matched, in terms of racial composition and size of school student enrollment, to four elementary schools in which nonspecialists taught physical education (p. 159). Each of the teachers in the study was observed two to three times for about 30 minutes each. The observation instrument used in this study was the revised ALT-PE system developed by Siedentop, Tousignant, and Parker (1982, p. 160). No difference was found in measures of ALT-PE between the specialists and classroom teachers. "The results indicated that although specialists may select more appropriate learning activities, knowledge of content may not be the most significant variable in organizing for maximized student participation and success" (p. 157). Placek and Randall (1986), in reflecting on their study's quality, pointed to a limited data base, a need for continued research in intervention, along with process-product research to give their finding substantial creditability. Both researchers call for more research to firmly establish a link between ALT-PE and student learning as taught by the classroom teacher or the physical education specialist.

Another approach to the comparison of elementary physical education specialists' and the classroom teachers' effectiveness was conducted by Twa (1982) through an examination of verbal and nonverbal teaching behaviors. The purpose of this study was to observe and compare the verbal and nonverbal behavioral differences between 12 elementary physical education specialists and 12 nonspecialists [classroom teachers] using a modified version of the Rankin Interaction Analysis System (Twa, p.29). Results showed no statistically significant difference between the frequencies of teaching behaviors used by the generalist (N = 6315) and those used by the elementary physical education teachers (N = 6429). When classroom teachers' interaction patterns were analyzed, however, a difference was noted. The specialists were "characterized by the use of movement-to-practice skill. The generalists' interaction pattern is characterized by the use of teacher talk" (p.55).

Competencies of Classroom Teachers:  
Professional Preparation Programs

In the course of viewing teaching effectiveness, professional preparation programs invariably come under scrutiny. Those studies which were most directly related to the focus of this research fall into three major categories: professional preparation programs and course offerings (Jameson, 1930; Gabbard & Miller, 1986; Sefzik, 1983; Toro, 1974); classroom teachers' competencies and knowledge

(Cochran, 1982; McCutchen, 1978; Smith, 1964); and improvement of classroom teachers' competencies (Darlington, 1977; Davis, 1978; Haynes, 1973; Patterson, 1955; Schwarz, 1983).

One of the earliest studies examining physical education preparation for the elementary school teacher focused on the content and required course offerings of 22 state teachers' colleges and normal schools (Jameson, 1930). This study was a descriptive analysis of organization and content of courses in physical education offered during the 1926-27 academic year to women preparing to be general elementary and junior high school classroom teachers. The purpose of the study was to "discover common practices" and make recommendations regarding content and organization of courses for the institutions participating in the study (p.3). Observation and participation in activities with children without full responsibility, and practice teaching were found to be desirable in the training of classroom teachers to teach elementary physical education. Only 55% of the 22 institutions in the study made use of observations as a method of preparing classroom teachers (p.85). Results showed that 23% of the colleges in the study provided only one observation and 14% provided two observations. Practice teaching experiences for classroom teachers at small institutions without major departments was conducted more frequently (78%) than any other. No large institution

provided practice-teaching experiences for classroom teachers (p. 91). Only 36% of the institutions in the study provided any other type of participation outside of the regular practice-teaching experience (p. 93). There was no true differentiation of course work for kindergarten-primary students as compared to upper elementary. Reviewing the content of courses across the 22 institutions, a great lack of uniformity was evident, and based on these findings recommendations for improvement in the physical education preparation of elementary teachers were suggested.

In addition to this early investigation of professional preparation programs, two more recent studies have looked at course offerings and guidelines for quality programs in elementary school physical education: Gabbard and Miller in 1986 and Toro in 1974. The Toro (1974) study was designed for the purpose of establishing professional preparation guidelines in physical education for classroom teachers in the schools of Puerto Rico. To guide the study's direction, three subproblems were addressed for the purpose of establishing a framework from which these guidelines would be developed: (a) investigation of the status of state certification of classroom teachers, (b) investigation of the status of elementary physical education in Puerto Rico, and (c) determination of the generally accepted criteria and guidelines for quality physical education programs in elementary schools in the United States (pp.

133-134). Regarding the quality of elementary physical education programs in the United States, Toro (1974) found trends towards the reduction of general requirements for certification of teachers along with few states requiring on-the-job experience. Up until 1968, she found that no state had established performance standards requiring a classroom teacher to demonstrate competence (1974, p. 62). These findings are reminiscent of the 1930 study by Jameson who found lack of course uniformity and little practice teaching across the 22 state teachers' colleges and normal schools examined.

In the Gabbard and Miller (1986) study, 163 colleges and universities were surveyed to determine course offerings related to physical education for children. "Information was derived from each institution through an analysis of the course description section of the institution's latest catalog, or related materials. The characteristics of each course were categorized into six areas: elementary physical education methods, motor development, games/sport, dance/rhythms, gymnastics, and other" (p.247). No distinction was made regarding courses that were designed specifically for classroom teachers or physical educators. The findings suggested that many colleges and universities provide a single elementary methodology course, carrying either 2 or 3 credit hours, taught for both classroom teachers and physical education specialists with no

difference in content emphasis. Regarding course content, Gabbard and Miller (1986) found that course work included movement for young children, movement education, development of perceptual motor programs, analysis of basic movement skills for children, and elementary improvisation (p. 249), in contrast to the 1930 Jameson study which found course-work emphasis on folk and social dance, low organization games, gymnastics and competitive sports (p. 96). Clearly, specific references to movement in course work have signaled a change in the focus of the curriculum since the 1930's. For the Gabbard and Miller (1986) study research must be viewed carefully as they identified course content from catalog descriptions leaving open the possibility of interpretation error.

In examining the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs in six areas of competency as perceived by elementary school teachers, Sefzik (1983) used a sample of 390 elementary teachers from 200 randomly selected elementary schools in Texas. The study encompassed a wide scope of competencies, including discipline, evaluation, methods, and human relation skills in eight specific subject areas, one of which was physical education. Findings suggested that the teachers perceived themselves only moderately prepared to teach in this area of the curriculum. Related to the special area, Sefzik's classroom teachers perceived their preparation to be better



in basic skills [reading, mathematics, language arts] than in the special subject areas with physical education receiving the lowest overall rating (p.75). Based on these perceptions, Sefzik (1983) recommended that art, music, and physical education teachers be given a course of study that will give them an idea of what is covered in the regular classroom, [noting] that, "such knowledge could help them design activities that would be coordinated with regular studies" (p. 195).

Hamilton (1981) conducted research which had a twofold purpose: (a) to survey state requirements for certification of elementary classroom teachers and physical educators, and (b) to determine the percentage of specialists or specialist assistants working with classroom teachers. Hamilton (1981) surveyed three randomly selected states in each of six districts of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (formerly the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation). Working with or assisted by a physical education specialist seemed to be the normal pattern, with 58% of the classroom teachers reporting that they had received such help (p. 86). Over 20% of the classroom teachers reported they had never had a course in elementary physical education, while 34% of the physical education specialists reported they were inadequately prepared to teach elementary students (p. 90-91).

Cochran (1982) investigated the relationship of elementary classroom teachers' professional preparation and personal background with their feelings of adequacy to teach physical education. Although the study focused on feelings and attitudes, important to this section of the literature review was the influence that professional preparation had on these attitudes. From Cochran's study, it was concluded that the amount of formal college training elementary classroom teachers have affects in favorable ways their confidence level and their attitude toward teaching elementary physical education.

Taking a different perspective, but still interested in the classroom teacher's competency, McCutchen (1978) surveyed 14 experts in the area of children's dance for the purpose of identifying knowledge and skills needed by elementary classroom teachers for teaching creative dance. Experts in the field of children's dance were of the opinion that knowledge about children and understanding how to instruct them were the most important things classroom teachers needed to know to be successful in teaching creative dance.

Of particular relevance to this investigation is the Smith (1964) study that examined the competence of first-year graduates prepared in elementary education to teach physical education. Data were obtained from observations, interviews, and diaries recorded by the participating

teachers. "The largest percentage of problems of the group related to practices dealing with program content in physical education" (p. 184). As a result of these findings, strategies for the improvement of the Newark State College curriculum in physical education were developed, including "attention to program content, emphasizing a child-centered program, examining methods used in teaching prospective teachers, giving a firm foundation in fundamental skills of movement....and helping the prospective teacher understand progression of materials" (p.210).

#### Improving Competencies

Four studies have been identified which focused specifically on improving the competencies of classroom teachers teaching physical education (Darlington, 1977; Haynes, 1973; Patterson, 1955; Schwarz, 1983). Patterson (1955) conducted a study to identify and describe preservice experiences that were perceived to help elementary classroom teachers do a better job of teaching physical education to their children. The top-ranked order of experiences were "taking classes in child growth and development, planning and organizing physical education activities, and relating physical education activities to children's needs, interests, and abilities (p. 189).

Using 50 elementary education majors enrolled in a required course entitled Physical Education in the

Elementary School, Darlington (1977) conducted a study in the area of self-concept in order to determine the extent to which practical experiences in teaching physical education can be effective in improving the self-concept of preservice elementary education majors. The teachers received a pre- and posttest of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and during the interim participated in a clinical experience at a public elementary school for 30 minutes, 2 days per week for 6 weeks. There were no positive changes found in self-concept as a result of the physical education practical experiences (p.44). It should be noted that changes in self-concept are a slow process and may show little or no change over the time-frame of one course. There was no consideration given to past negative physical education experiences which by their influence might block possible change.

An extensive study of the impact of consultant assistance and elementary teachers' attitudes toward elementary school physical education was conducted by Haynes in 1973. A comparison of attitudes of classroom teachers with attitudes of teachers assisted by the physical education specialists was made. In a North Carolina state-wide sample, two groups, each comprising 119 elementary schools, were compared. One group represented schools with physical education consultant assistance available to teachers, and the second group represented schools where

this assistance was not provided; the classroom teacher taught physical education alone. The instrumentation for this study was a four-part survey: (a) a check-list to obtain background information from the teachers; (b) three scales to determine classroom teachers' attitudes toward physical activity; (c) Physical Education Professional Questionnaire for Classroom Teachers adapted for Nokken (1971); and (d) open-ended questions asking classroom teachers to comment on problem areas (p. 2). Conclusions for this study were the following:

1. There was little evidence to indicate that in-service assistance provided for classroom teachers by specialists improved teacher attitudes toward elementary school physical education.

2. School size was not an important factor in determining classroom teachers' attitudes toward physical education.

3. Classroom teachers felt that physical education was important.

4. There were relationships found when comparisons of classroom teachers' attitudes and their individual characteristics were made [sex, age, experience, grade level taught]. More favorable attitudes were found with males, young, teachers, less experienced teachers, and those teachers who had extensive professional preparation.

5. Problem areas for classroom teachers in physical

education instruction included the facilities, equipment, limited preparation and inservice assistance (pp. 184-185).

It is universally accepted that there is a need to encourage classroom teachers to increase the quality and amount of time spent with their children in physical education settings. Schwarz (1983) devised a study with the intent of increasing the incidence of physical education lessons taught by second grade classroom teachers. He used a "package intervention" (p.102) with the hope of producing desirable change in behavior and interest in physical education teaching.

The package intervention consisted of scheduling a specific time during which the classroom teacher could conduct a physical education lesson, the use of praising and prompting by the principal to encourage teachers to conduct physical education lessons, and the provision of in-depth lesson plans by the investigator. (p.102)

This study illustrated that classroom teachers will increase their incidences of physical education instruction when scheduled for a specific time, when they are aware that principals feel what they are doing is important, and when they are provided in-depth lesson plans to follow (p. 108).

#### Classroom Teachers: Perceptions and Attitudes

Most of the perception and attitude studies have dealt only with the classroom teacher and have not attempted to make comparisons with the physical education specialists, as was the case in many of the classroom teachers/specialist competencies studies. Many of these studies were designed

to measure areas of self-concept or to ask direct questions of classroom teachers regarding their feelings, perceptions, or attitudes about elementary physical education and their role in its teaching.

Nokken (1971) developed a two-part questionnaire for the purpose of identifying significant relationships between elementary classroom teachers' feelings of personal adequacy and their teaching physical education. The questionnaire was administered to 361 classroom teachers to determine their attitudes, self-concept, and classroom practices. Elementary teachers in this study felt that physical education was an important part of elementary students' educational experience, but that physical education classes should be taught by a special teacher. Of those teachers responding, younger teachers, to a greater degree than older teachers (though they had the necessary abilities for teaching), and men felt more qualified to teach than did the women (p. 109). Unlike Nokken (1971), Cochran (1982) found "the sex of classroom teachers had no significant relationship with either feelings of adequacy to teach or attitudes towards physical education" (p. 65). In the Nokken (1971) study, gymnastics and track and field were the activities that they felt least able to teach adequately (p. 109).

Two studies, Anderson (1973) and Slater (1966), investigated the relationship of classroom teachers'

general education and physical education philosophical beliefs. Both studies used "A Professional Checklist of Underlying Philosophical Beliefs" and "A Checklist of Underlying Philosophical Beliefs Toward Physical Education" (Anderson, 1973, p. 14). Slater (1966), using the two aforementioned checklists with elementary school teachers in Nelson, British Columbia, found that the majority of the teachers did relate their basic professional philosophical beliefs to their beliefs in the area of elementary physical education (pp. 75-76). Anderson (1973), having administered the same questionnaire to 42 elementary school teachers in Missouri, found they did not reflect a consistency in their professional philosophical and physical education philosophical beliefs (p. 62), a conclusion which was in disagreement with Slater (1966). Anderson (1973) pointed to two possible reasons for the lack of consistency in results of the two studies: regional differences and changing attitudes of classroom teachers since the Slater study (p. 16).

Perceptions of how elementary classroom teachers viewed their role in the teaching of elementary physical education was the focus of the Phillips (1967) study. The sample of 177 experienced classroom teachers in Ohio completed an inventory to determine their perceived role in elementary physical education. The following are conclusions from the Phillips (1967) investigation:



1. Classroom teachers tended to regard elementary physical education as a very important and essential factor in the total school curriculum.

2. Classroom teachers clearly perceived their role in teaching elementary physical education as important to gaining a better understanding of student needs.

3. Classroom teachers expressed mixed opinions regarding the role of the teacher and the physical education specialist; 44% agreed that elementary physical education could be successfully taught by the physically unskilled classroom teacher.

4. Younger teachers (up to 35) and older teachers (over 50) showed more favorable attitudes toward elementary physical education than did the middle age group (35-50).

5. Those teachers with 1-10 years and over 30 years of teaching experience tended to show more favorable attitudes toward elementary physical education.

6. Sex and grade level did not appear to influence attitudes toward elementary physical education.

7. Personal experience in physical education tended to affect attitudes and perception of role in teaching elementary physical education (pp. 94-96). Sixty-two percent reported that physical education activity courses participated in at college helped improve their skills and attitude (p. 83).

Cochran (1982), in addition to reviewing professional

preparation programs, found that classroom teachers' attitudes were influenced by (a) their personal participation in physical education, (b) their estimate of their own physical education abilities, (c) their perception of the school administrator's attitude toward physical education, and (d) the effect of inservice education (pp. 58-59).

A most recent study and one also focused on classroom teachers' perceptions of physical education was completed by Brumbaugh (1987) in which she used semi-structured, open-ended interviews and a questionnaire with five classroom teachers for the purpose of describing how these teachers perceived elementary physical education and how these perceptions influenced their physical education teaching. Among her findings, Brumbaugh (1987) found the "earlier physical education experiences were critical factors influencing how these classroom teachers perceived physical education" (p. 224). The five classroom teachers in the Brumbaugh (1987) study associated successful movement experiences with confidence (p.228), as did teachers in the Cochran (1982) and Nokken (1971) studies. The classroom teachers in Brumbaugh's (1987) study stated that their preservice experiences had "little, if any influence, on how they conducted their physical education programs during their early teaching years" (p. 231). Principal interest also seemed important to at least one classroom teacher

regarding how she conducted her class. Contrary to the Phillips (1967) study, Brumbaugh (1987) found role confusion about teaching physical education (p.239). The person most likely to exert the most influence on the classroom teacher in the Brumbaugh (1987) study was the physical education specialist (p.240), because of the possibility for increased awareness of physical education with the specialist present. Further, the complexity of the workplace, time limitation, facilities, and equipment were perceived to be factors that influenced what these five teachers actually did in regard to physical education for elementary children.

#### Summary

Numerous studies have focused on the classroom teacher and children's physical education over the last 50 years, characterized by a concern for who should teach elementary physical education. Those who felt that the classroom teacher should teach elementary physical education indicated both their ability to integrate physical education with other academic areas, and their understanding of individual differences of children. Those advocating the specialists believed them to be more qualified, specifically because of their professional preparation.

A large portion of the literature focused on the classroom teacher's competencies and examined and compared the teaching effectiveness of the classroom teacher and the

specialists. All studies reviewed supported the conclusion that elementary children taught by physical education specialists performed significantly better on fitness and motor performance test than those children taught by classroom teachers.

In addition to those studies which sought to determine classroom teachers' competencies, other studies reviewed the professional preparation programs and course offerings for elementary school physical education. It was found that in most states, classroom teachers were required to take only one course in elementary physical education, yet in the studies reviewed the classroom teacher is expected to assume a great deal of the responsibility for teaching elementary physical education.

Four studies reviewed focused specifically on improving competencies of classroom teachers teaching in physical education. In these studies classroom teachers indicated that taking classes in child growth and development, and organization and planning of physical education activities were the experiences that they perceived the most important in improving their competencies. A majority of the studies that dealt with perceptions and attitudes of classroom teachers toward physical education were designed to measure areas of self-concept. These studies varied in their findings but revealed one common point, that the teacher's age, years of teaching experience, and personal experiences

in physical education tended to affect attitudes and perceptions of their role in teaching elementary physical education.

### CHAPTER III

#### RESEARCH PROCEDURE

Qualitative methodology was chosen for this study in order to capture what was actually taking place in physical education lessons taught by classroom teachers. In describing data collection as having four elements, Lofland (1971) suggested that qualitative methodologists should:

- 1) get close to the people,
- 2) be truthful and factual,
- 3) seek a significant amount of pure description of action, people, activities,
- 4) capture the reality of the place through direct quotations from the participants as they speak and/or from what ever they might write down. (pp. 3-4)

The purpose of this inquiry was to describe connections and disconnections of four classroom teachers' actual teaching in physical education with the experiences of their college methods course. In order to describe these connections and disconnections, qualitative data were collected and analyzed from videotapes, audiotapes, interviews, questionnaires. The major sections of this chapter include the setting, a description of the undergraduate physical education course, selection of subjects, approval procedure, and collection and analysis of data.

## The Setting

### The Community

New Castle<sup>1</sup>, a city in the southeastern United States, has a population of 157,000. Originally incorporated in 1896, its geographical location has benefited the economic growth of the city from its inception. The future of the city still rests heavily with its largest employer, shipbuilding, but the city is beginning to diversify its economy with development of its industrial parks, its port areas, and an expanding retail trade (New Castle Daily Press, 1986).

### The School

New Castle is the largest of the four public school systems with an enrollment of about 26,000 pupils. This school system comprises 21 elementary schools for kindergarten through 5th grades, 9 middle schools housing 6th through 8th grades, and 4 high schools which serve 9th through 12th graders. The total school budget for 1985-86 was \$83.45 million with more than 80% of the budget supporting instruction (New Castle Public Schools, 1986).

The three elementary schools used in this study ranged

---

<sup>1</sup> The names of all people, institutions, and locations have been changed in order to assure anonymity for those participating in the study.

in size from 339 to 720 students enrolled. The professional staff, teachers, and administrators numbered approximately 22 to 38, not including other support-staff members. The class sizes of the four teachers in this study ranged from 7 to 17. In all three schools, physical education was taught by a physical education specialist one time per week, unless the specialist combined classes. In these combined cases, the classroom teacher scheduled for the physical education specialist twice a week.

Each elementary school in this study had a large multipurpose room approximately 70 feet by 100 feet. At one end of this multipurpose room, there was a stage which served as a resource space for music or remedial reading. The floor was divided in half and two basketball courts were marked off across the width; the floor surface was tile. Large ceiling-to-floor windows were placed on one entire side of the space.

On the days that physical education specialists were scheduled in the schools, the gymnasiums were for their exclusive use. In this study, physical education specialists were scheduled in the schools two and one half days per week. All of the equipment used for physical education was locked in a closet at one end of the multipurpose room. The physical education specialist and the principal of each school had a key to this equipment room. Classroom teachers were given opportunity to check out



equipment as they needed it from the physical education specialist or the principal. A variety of equipment was checked out on a permanent basis by the teachers for their use on the days that the physical education specialist was not at that school.

All of the schools had some type of outside play area for recess and physical education activities. These outside areas were wide expanses of space which included multiple blacktop areas, swing sets, at least one softball field, jungle gym, sandboxes, and shaded areas with large trees. Several of the blacktop areas had basketball backboards and poles for either tennis or volleyball. A few of the blacktop areas were painted with hopscotch diagrams and state maps.

### The College

New Castle College is a nonresidential, coeducational, comprehensive undergraduate college. The college offers 39 different majors and concentrations under 7 baccalaureate degree programs including a degree in elementary education. The college has a current enrollment of below 5,000 students. The organization of the college focuses on the lifelong learning interests and needs of the community and works cooperatively with other institutions including the city's public school system (New Castle College, 1986).

The college's Department of Education offers state-approved teacher education programs designed for the

preparation of early (NK-4), middle (4-8), and secondary teachers. Early and middle education teachers are prepared through state approved programs leading to the Bachelor of Arts degree in Elementary Education. During 1980-84, 81 teachers graduated with certification NK-4 and 44 graduated with certification grades 4-8.

Physical Education in the Elementary School  
(LSPE 318)

The elementary physical education course for the elementary education majors, on which this study focuses, was a three-credit course taught by the Leisure Studies and Physical Education Department between fall 1980 and fall 1984. This course was a state certification requirement for all elementary education majors and met for 15 weeks, one and one half hours twice a week. This course was designed to specifically meet the state competency (Number 8), which requires teachers to develop competencies in "guiding children in developing physical skill, motor coordination and knowledge of sound health and safety practices" (Board of Education, 1982, p.21).

The course comprised four major components. First, an overview of elementary physical education and the significance of physical education to the growing child was presented. Also included in this early overview was the significant role of physical education to the total school curriculum. Emphasis was placed on the importance of a

planned sequence of activities. Goals of elementary physical education as outlined in the class text, Physical Education for Children: A Focus on the Teaching Process, written by B. J. Logsdon, K. R. Barrett, M. Ammons, M. R. Broer, L. E. Halverson, R. McGee, and M. A. Roberton (1977), were presented, followed by a discussion of the humanistic goals of education. Students experienced different teaching styles in practical work and observational activities. These planned activities were designed to illustrate how one's philosophy could influence content selection and teaching methods. It is recognized that this text is now in its second edition (Logsdon, Barrett, Ammons, Broer, Halverson, McGee, and Roberton, 1984) but the first edition was the one used by the teachers in this study; thus all references will be made to the 1977 edition.

The second component of the class included work related to motor development and the importance of this body of knowledge to the understanding of children. Emphasis was placed on the teacher's ability to observe, analyze, and make choices about content as it related to motor stages of children. This work was presented through a variety of different methods including lecture, film analysis, and field observations of children in a physical education setting. Herkowitz's (1978) task analysis charts were used during the field observations to provide focus for the

experience. A practical experiment with different types, size, color, and texture of equipment was conducted to illustrate how equipment selection by the teacher can directly influence the difficulty of the task. Morris's (1976) work on the selection of games and equipment helped to focus the practical experience.

The third component of the course focused on the study of the content of games as presented by Barrett (1977). Nine movement themes for organizing and developing games content as outlined in the course text were emphasized along with opportunities to write and present movement tasks. Each task was critiqued by the instructor after the presentation. In relation to the entire course, the study of the games content represented about 50% of the course content.

The fourth component of the course was devoted to the observation of teaching behaviors. Students were responsible for teaching two lessons and observing their peers for an additional two. Class time was spent in the practical application of four observational instruments which were later used as part of the field observation sessions in the public schools. Four instruments (found in Appendix A) were used: Amount of Active Participation on the Part of Students (UNCG/PED 655), Location of the Teacher, Focus of Teacher's Verbal Behavior, and Content of the Lesson (Barrett, 1977, pp. 271-274). As a result of this work, a culminating activity in the form of an "insight paper" was

required.

### Selection of Subjects

Subjects for this study were four elementary school classroom teachers who had successfully completed LSPE 318, Physical Education in the Elementary School, taught by the researcher at New Castle College sometime between fall 1980 and fall 1984. Nine class rosters (N=197) were used as the starting point for subject selection. The alumni office was then contacted and a list of graduates for 1980 through 1984 were matched to the class rosters. All students appearing on both the alumni office rolls and the class rosters became the original subject pool (N=86). Five steps were followed to select a pool of eight subjects, four of whom would become the subjects for this study.

1. All students who received grades of "D" or "F" were eliminated from the pool.

2. All students who were not currently teaching, who were not employed in a public school system, or who taught seventh grade and above were eliminated.

3. With the help of the Alumni Association, an attempt was made to locate all names remaining on the list (N=31).

4. Of the 31 eligible teachers, those who were teaching outside of the general geographical area requiring more than 50 miles of travel were eliminated, reducing the pool of teachers to 15.

5. A review of these 15 teachers revealed that 8 were

teaching in the same public school system and had all received a grade of "B" in the undergraduate course. These eight teachers became the pool from which four subjects were chosen for this study.

The decision to limit the final selection from the eight teachers in the same school system was made to control as many variables as possible that might impact on the study. All subjects in this final pool worked in the same public school system, were assisted in their physical education classes by the same supervisor of physical education, and worked under the same guidelines and educational philosophy directed by the superintendent of schools and supervisor of instruction.

From this pool of eight remaining teachers, four teachers were randomly selected to participate in the study. Two of the four declined because of busy schedules. Two additional subjects were then randomly chosen from the remaining four; they agreed to participate.

#### Approval Procedure

The Assistant Director of Data Processing and Program Evaluation Services for the public school system was contacted for approval to conduct the research. Applications for Research Authorization (Appendix B), an abstract of the research proposal, and a copy of the Report to the University of North Carolina at Greensboro Institutional Review Board on Research Projects Involving

Human Subjects (Appendix C) were presented to the Assistant Director of Data Processing and Program Services for review. The New Castle school system required a letter to parents (Appendix D) explaining the research project and requesting permission to have their child participate in the class when it was being videotaped. Permission to videotape the teachers teaching a physical education lesson (Appendix E) and permission to use the lesson segments for research (Appendix F) were also obtained. These three forms were developed and presented along with the proposal abstract.

The project was approved within a week at which time the Assistant Director of Data Processing and Program Evaluation requested the names of the teachers and schools involved. He made the initial contact with the principals. A meeting was arranged with each teacher and principal to explain the research project and to discuss their involvement. At this meeting each teacher and principal received a description of the research project (Appendix G) and acceptance forms to grant approval to proceed. The research project was explained and a question-and-answer period followed. It was emphasized by the researcher that the study would be conducted under the auspices and approval of The University of North Carolina at Greensboro; The School of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance; The University's Human Subjects Review Committee guidelines (Appendix H), and the New Castle public school

system. At any point during the research project the teachers were free to withdraw if they wished to do so.

The teachers signed the release forms during the initial meeting. A schedule for the filming of the lessons was arranged by the principals. The final arrangements with each teacher were completed by phone, requiring only one additional trip to each school to organize the videotaping procedures and to obtain the permission slips for each child. It was agreed that teachers would plan a special activity for those children who had not returned their permission form allowing them to participate. The entire approval process took one month from the initial contact with the public school system to the first day of filming.

#### Data Collection

The primary data in this study were collected by means of microethnographic techniques which included the use of videotape and auditory recordings to document events in the field. Erickson (1986) described the difference between microethnography and participant observation in the following:

Machine recording and analysis differ from participant observation in one crucial respect. Unlike the participant observer, the analyst of audiovisual or audio documentary records does not wait in the setting for instances of a particular event type to occur....The researcher indexes the whole recorded corpus, identifying all major named events recorded and identifying as well the presence in certain events of key informants. (pp. 144-145)

The decision to use microethnographic techniques rather than



participant observation was a conscious effort to avoid the possibility of researcher bias. The qualitative methodology used in this study generated data from three different sources: video- and audiotaped lessons, interviews, and a demographic questionnaire.

### Videotaping

Three 30-minute physical education lessons taught by the four classroom teachers were videotaped on three separate occasions for post-field analysis (See Figure 1 for specific schedule). The videotaped lessons were filmed by an outside technician to avoid bias by the presence of the researcher.

Following the filming of each lesson, the data were prepared for analysis. The verbal responses from each videotape were transcribed by an outside technician. The narrative transcription of each tape was maintained in sequential order allowing student and teacher behaviors to remain in a chronological time context. The accuracy of each transcription was checked against the tape recordings.

Five teacher behavior instruments were used to view each videotaped lesson for the purpose of expanding the narrative description of each lesson. The information obtained from these instruments included Amount of Active Participation on the Part of Students (UNCG/PED 655), Location of the Teacher, Focus of Teacher's Verbal Behavior, Content of the Lesson, and Teacher Behavior Continuum

|                      | May 5-11<br>Week 1        | May 12-18<br>Week 2        | May 19-25<br>Week 3        | May 26-31<br>Week 4                        | June 2-8<br>Week 5                         | June 9-15<br>Week 6     |
|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|-------------------------|
| Teacher 1<br>(Hope)  | VTR Lesson<br>#1<br>May 9 |                            | VTR Lesson<br>#2<br>May 20 | VTR Lesson<br>#3<br>May 30<br>Interview #1 | June 6<br>Interview #2                     |                         |
| Teacher 2<br>(Cory)  | VTR Lesson<br>#1<br>May 9 |                            | VTR Lesson<br>#2<br>May 20 | VTR Lesson<br>#3<br>May 30<br>Interview #1 | June 6<br>Interview #2                     |                         |
| Teacher 3<br>(Letty) |                           | VTR Lesson<br>#1<br>May 17 | VTR Lesson<br>#2<br>May 24 |  | VTR Lesson<br>#3<br>June 3<br>Interview #1 | June 10<br>Interview #2 |
| Teacher 4<br>(Dawn)  |                           | VTR Lesson<br>#1<br>May 16 | VTR Lesson<br>#2<br>May 23 |  | VTR Lesson<br>#3<br>June 3<br>Interview #1 | June 10<br>Interview #2 |

**Figure 1.** Data collection schedule.

(Barrett, 1977, pp. 266-274).

### Interviews

Two interviews were conducted at separate times during the study. Interview #1 was a "standardized open-ended" interview (Patton, 1980), which was conducted by an outside researcher at the time of the lesson filming. Interview #2 was a "general" interview (Patton, 1980) designed specifically for each teacher.

Interview #1 was designed after Patton (1980) and consisted of a set of questions carefully worded and arranged for the purpose of taking the teachers through the same sequence of questions with essentially the same wording (Figure 1 shows the specific schedule). These interview questions were based on the objectives of the undergraduate methods course and focused on knowledge and comprehension regarding motor development, motor learning, content, skill analysis, goals of elementary physical education, teacher/student roles and responsibilities, the place physical education should assume in the total curriculum, the subjects' understanding of lesson design, and application of the movement content in a physical education setting. These interview questions were tested and revised before they were used in the study. All interviews were administered and audiotaped by a trained interviewer to avoid researcher bias. Interview #1 was conducted after the teachers had completed teaching the three video lessons. The

interview questions can be found in Appendix I.

Interview #2 was conducted after all data from the videotapes, Interview #1, and questionnaire had been collected. This interview took the form of a guide patterned after Patton (1980) and consisted of an outline of a set of issues that were explored with each teacher. Interview #2 was designed to probe, for each subject, the connections and disconnections discovered from studying the videotaped lessons, the narrative transcription of each lesson, and answers given during Interview #1.

#### Questionnaire

A questionnaire administered at the time of the first interview was developed for the purpose of examining various variables that the researcher considered were potential influencing factors on the classroom teacher's practices. These data were demographic in nature and included personal data (age, sex, birth date), work-related data (grade level taught, years in position, type of school, number of students in class), education, and current physical education facilities. The questionnaire in its entirety can be found in Appendix J.

#### Data Analysis

The analysis of data was completed in two phases: initial and final. "Analysis is the process of bringing order to the data, organizing what is there into patterns, categories, and basic descriptive units" (Patton, 1980,

p.268). The data gathered for this study were organized, categorized and coded immediately after collection and were constantly reordered and recategorized throughout the study.

#### Initial Phase

The initial phase of data analysis included coding all transcriptions and questionnaires with the subject's identification number, a lesson number, a data source number which identified the transcription as lesson narrative or interview narrative, and a code which identified the ordering of the interview questions. All of these data were color coded to aid in the analysis process.

Each lesson tape was reviewed by the researcher for the purpose of developing the second set of interview questions. The focus of this review was to determine how the lessons taught related to the undergraduate course objectives.

#### Final Phase

This phase of the analysis process was ongoing and occurred in four parts. First, a content analysis was completed for the purpose of establishing broad topics around which to organize the data. The undergraduate course objectives (Appendix K) helped focus this analysis. Notes were made in the margins of the lessons and interview transcriptions of possible topics under which the data might be organized. At this point in the analysis, the following categories were identified: (a) content, (b) methods, (c)

philosophy, and (d) classroom management. The transcriptions of the videotaped lessons and interviews were cut and sorted according to the aforementioned categories for the purpose of establishing a basic orientation to the large amount of data collected. Through this sorting process, it was found that data from these transcriptions could be categorized under several subtopics within each of the four broad categories; thus, a second set of transcriptions was cut and sorted accordingly.

Part two of the final analysis included recoding, sorting, and reordering of original data into topics set forth in the original four research questions. Specifically, the data were grouped with the intent to answer the following:

1. Which major areas of content of a college course taken by classroom teachers were meaningful to them, and therefore remembered and implemented into their physical education teaching?

2. What was the classroom teachers' philosophy and attitude regarding elementary physical education; what connections and disconnections do they have with the philosophy that was presented to the subjects as a part of the college methods course?

3. What was included in a typical physical education lesson taught by the classroom teachers and what were the connections and disconnections of the lessons with the

practical experiences in the college methods course?

4. What were the strongest influencing factors that directed what classroom teachers planned for their students in a physical education setting?

The third part of the analysis was the establishment of a list of follow-up questions which were used as the basis of the second interview. These follow up questions fell into three major categories: (a) questions for clarification of events observed and answers given to the first interview questions, (b) questions about inconsistencies discovered between the first interview and the lessons taught, and (c) probing questions to gain more insight and information on topic areas which were scantily covered or omitted in interview #1.

Last, the data were searched for patterns of connections and disconnections across the four teachers and throughout the 12 lessons. Vignettes and pure narrative were pinpointed to support the connections and disconnections and to further "paint a holistic picture" (Patton, 1980) of what these four classroom teachers were doing in physical education lessons.

## CHAPTER IV

## RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to describe the connections and disconnections between four classroom teachers' teaching of physical education with the experiences they received in their college methods course. Specifically, the study sought to determine:

1. Which major areas of content of a college course taken by classroom teachers were meaningful to them, and therefore remembered and implemented into their physical education teaching?

2. What was the classroom teachers' philosophy and attitude regarding elementary physical education; what connections and disconnections did they have with the philosophy that was presented to the teachers as a part of the college methods course?

3. What was included in a typical physical education lesson taught by the classroom teachers and what were the connections and disconnections of the lessons with the practical experiences in the college methods course?

4. What were the strongest influencing factors that directed what classroom teachers planned for their students in a physical education setting?

Data collected for the purpose of answering these



questions came from videotaped lessons, audiotapes of interviews, and questionnaires. In the initial phase, lesson narratives and answers to questions were transcribed and coded. The final phase included (a) organizing all data into broad topics, (b) reorganizing the same data to reflect the original four research questions, (c) developing a set of questions from examining the videotape for the second interview, and finally, after administering the second set of questions, (d) searching for patterns of connections and disconnections across the four teachers and throughout the 12 lessons. Based on the analysis of these data, five themes illustrating the major connections and disconnections were identified and will be presented in this chapter. Each theme will be presented in four parts: a) main assertions, b) support from data, c) discussion and d) summary of major connections and disconnections between the classroom teachers' teaching of physical education with the experiences they received in their college undergraduate course (Erickson, 1986). The five themes identified were (a) effect of equipment on the movement responses of children, (b) content of the lessons, (c) development of motor skills, (d) teaching styles, and (e) planning.

Effect of Equipment on the Movement Responses of Children  
Assertions

1. Teachers did not understand that the equipment selected affected the type of movement response elicited

from the children, but did recognize its effect on the children's ability to work safely and individually with their own piece of equipment.

2. Teachers did not consider the size, weight, color, or texture of the equipment when planning for teaching.

3. Teachers used multiple pieces of equipment occasionally, but the rationale for this decision was unclear.

#### Support from Data

Multiple equipment. Selection of equipment--specifically, the effect that amounts and types had on children's movement responses--was a major topic of discussion during the undergraduate methods course. Class experiences were designed to illustrate how the use of multiple equipment increases student participation, and heightens the potential for motor skill improvement. One such experience involved a comparison of motor responses of children as they played in an activity which involved the use of only one 8-inch rubber playground ball for the entire class with an activity which was designed so that every student had one. The intent of the lesson was to emphasize how the number of pieces of equipment increased participation time, ultimately giving students more time to practice motor skills. A point made throughout the course was that children do not improve motor skills by standing around; they improve by practicing them.

Based upon these course experiences and others similar to them, it was assumed that when teaching physical education to their own classrooms, these four teachers would be concerned about the skill development of their children and thus would try to include multiple pieces of equipment in their lesson designs. This did occur, but to only a small degree. Of the 12 lessons taught by the classroom teacher, 7 included one piece of equipment for each child, 1 lesson required one piece per two children, 1 used an 8-inch red rubber playground ball as the sole piece of equipment, and 3 were designed to include no equipment at all. While all four teachers had at least one lesson in which every child had an opportunity to use a piece of equipment at the same time, the amount of time they allowed it to continue was minimal.

The fact that all four teachers planned at least one lesson in which multiple equipment was used, albeit these moments were brief, was accepted as a direct link with their methods course experiences, as this pattern was often demonstrated during the semester in which they took the course. And as pointed out earlier, the potential effect that this pattern had on skill development was continuously stressed. What was not present, however, was convincing evidence that the reason these teachers gave for using this pattern of equipment was the same one given in their methods class.

For example, Cory, in her first lesson with a kindergarten class, gave every child a bean bag and told the children to get into their own space. She then put on the Hap Palmer record, "Bean Bag Rock", letting the record run completely through. Her verbal behavior was primarily repeating what was being said on the record with additional comments focused toward giving feedback to students who were using the wrong hand or to those who were not keeping up with the instructions on the record. The basic pattern of instructions was first asking the child to do an activity with a bean bag using different body parts (i.e. carry a bean bag with right hand; left hand) followed by another activity called the "bean bag rock". The first activity usually took approximately 10 seconds and the last took another 10 seconds. The biggest problem occurred when the children were unable to keep up with the instructions as the pace was too fast. After using the record, Cory continued the lesson with the children throwing and catching their own bean bags in the air. She gave her students some instructions about how to throw and catch such as when she told them to "throw it straight up", "watch it", "use two hands", "let it fall in your hands", or "make a basket". The fact that Cory did give each child a bean bag could be interpreted that she was aware that this organizational pattern allowed for increased practice time for each child. Review of the videotape and interview data,

however, revealed that this may not have been considered.

During Interview #2, Cory was asked where she had learned about the Hap Palmer record that she used in her first lesson. She said, "when I was substituting once at school, the kindergarten there had two records". She went on to say that she had chosen that lesson for "convenience", and because she had done those activities before, she knew her students would be familiar with the activity. Following up on this question, Cory was asked what she had hoped her children would learn from the lesson. Her answer was: "to follow directions - things like on the record; it was more eye-hand coordination with the bean bags. It was gross motor skills, a little bit of eye-hand coordination". She further stated that her reason for giving each child a bean bag was because that was what the instructions on the record said to do. Thus, Cory's choice of multiple equipment, while evident, was not interpreted as a direct link to the idea of increased practice time, but rather, to "convenience", to what she saw other teachers do when she was substituting, and to the instructions given on the Hap Palmer record.

In another instance, with a different teacher, a similar use of multiple equipment occurred. Hope, in her initial lesson with a first grade class, started with some fitness exercises in squad lines and running laps to music. After this was completed, she gave each child, one at a time, an 8-inch, red rubber playground ball, instructing

the children to take the ball back to their squad lines and "hold it still". Her first verbal instructions were: "I want you to get into your own space and do anything you want to; I want you to get to know your ball". She continually reminded the children that they should not leave their space. The students began bouncing the ball in front of their bodies and then several began to move around the space. Several more tried to bounce the ball under a leg or around their bodies and one girl threw the ball over her head and turned around and caught it with two hands. Again, Hope reminded the class that they were not to leave their space. This statement appeared to be a direct response to several students moving way across the gym floor to retrieve their ball. At this point in the lesson, the task was expanded by Hope when she told the class to "try to use all parts of the body, see how many things you can do with it" [referring to the ball in relation to the body]. As the lesson progressed, the activity level of her students increased. By the expression on Hope's face, the increased activity level of her students seemed to concern her, because all of a sudden, she blew her whistle, stopped the record, and had her students line up in four squads in the center of the gym. Up to this point, the lesson had been in progress for about five minutes. From these squad lines, she moved the entire class to one corner of the gym and organized them into partners, and thus reduced the amount

of equipment by 50 percent. Not only did she reduce the amount of equipment, she had moved the class to a small corner area of the gymnasium about one-fourth the size of the space in which she had had the children previously work. In this organizational pattern, Hope started the second phase of the lesson, "different types of passing to partners". For the remainder of the lesson, about 20 minutes, Hope had the children throw and catch to each other in this confined space. During Interview #2, Hope was asked where she had gotten the idea for this lesson and for using the equipment as she did. Her reply was "I don't know... I guess...probably from the course [referring to the LSPE 318 course]. I remember you giving us all a bean bag and walking around the room seeing what parts of our body we could balance them on". Hope had made a connection to the undergraduate course with the use of multiple equipment, but her explanation did not include the concept that all children working individually with their own piece of equipment would increase their practice time and thus have an opportunity to improve their motor skills. She had remembered from the class experience that multiple equipment was used, but in the interview, she did not link this concept with increased practice time.

Types of equipment. Another aspect of selecting equipment that was stressed in the undergraduate course related to its size, weight, color, and texture. Morris's

(1980) and Herkowitz's (1978) work were used to introduce this concept and served as the major resource.

To illustrate key concepts related to the selection of equipment, an undergraduate course activity was designed to have all students experiment with a variety of equipment for the purpose of determining which types of equipment were easier or more difficult for young children to use. Students were given a variety of sizes, weights, shapes, and colors of equipment (e.g., foam balls, fluff balls, multi-colored plastic beach balls, rubber playground balls of different sizes and colors; balloons, tennis balls, footballs, whiffle balls, foam disc, long-handle and short-handle rackets). In small groups, their task was to determine which pieces of equipment were easier or more difficult for young children (K-3) to use when learning the basic skills of catching, throwing, striking, and kicking. After the students had collected their data and each group had discussed the influence of equipment on levels of skill difficulty, they were asked to link their findings to the work of Morris (1980) and Herkowitz (1978). These sources were purposely selected since reference to them is made in the class text (Logsdon et al., 1977) as well as being readily available for purchase.

Apparently, this idea was difficult to retain between the time these teachers completed their methods class in physical education and the time of this research study,



since the idea seemed to be missing from both their planning and in their actual lessons. For example, in Dawn's second lesson (grade 1), she gave each of her children an 8-inch, red rubber playground ball and asked them to stay in their own space while bouncing it. They began bouncing the ball, some with one hand, several with both hands. As many of the children were unable to control the ball by hand dribbling, much of the class time was spent chasing the balls. One little boy slapped at the ball; Dawn noticed and tried to help him by taking the ball away and demonstrating to him how it should be done. She said, "Brad, don't let your hands flap, keep them stiff and straight like this" and she demonstrated again. Most of the children were very small for their age, and they were having trouble with the size and weight of the ball. The videotape clearly showed the children having several patterns of difficulty with hand dribbling, force, and improper use of hand and wrist, in particular. Most of the children were unable to bounce the ball continuously without catching it, mainly due to insufficient force being applied to the ball causing it to rebound low or not at all. In their hand action, most of the children were using a flat palm to apply force to the ball rather than the upper portions of the fingers applying force behind the ball, then pushing it away from them. Dawn tried to work on these problems by telling her students not to "slap" at the ball. A smaller size and lighter weight

ball might have helped elicit a more relaxed dribbling action, had it been available. Dawn seemed to be primarily concerned with her children's control of the ball and their use of space, rather than the quality of the hand dribble, because after a short while she put her children on the red line, took the balls away, and using one ball had them bounce the ball down the line one at a time. She had stopped all the activity except for the one child that was asked to bounce the ball down the line. Each child completed a turn bouncing the ball down the red line while she gave each individual help with their skill. Other children stood and watched quietly. After all had a turn, she said, "OK, I'm going to give you 2 or 3 minutes to get a ball and go back into the area that you were working in and just bounce the ball some more." From the videotape it was evident that her children were still having the same problems with dribbling described earlier. At this point, she stopped the lesson, had her children put the equipment away, and lined them up to go back to the classroom. She had stopped her lesson 10-15 minutes earlier than usual. It appeared Dawn had become frustrated by the lack of success demonstrated by her students and decided to stop the lesson. She did not seem to know what to do.

While this organizational pattern did suggest that Dawn, like Hope and Cory, remembered the importance of each child having a piece of equipment, examination of the

videotape revealed that her children continuously had difficulty with the dribbling action throughout the lesson. Dawn recognized these difficulties and tried to help her children. What she apparently did not remember from the undergraduate course was the effect that this large, heavy ball might have had on her children's movement responses. It was observed from the videotape that the equipment basket she rolled out at the beginning of her class contained a variety of balls of different sizes, colors, and weight. There were enough smaller balls for each child to use if she had wanted them to do so. During Interview #2, Dawn said she tried to reinforce whatever the physical education instructor does; "They [her children] had been doing some ball activities in physical education", so she tried some. It is not known whether the ball used by Dawn was the same type that the physical education specialist had used when this type of activity was presented in previous lessons. A question that could be raised is the extent to which Dawn observed and duplicated what the specialist did, including the type of equipment, rather than deciding on her own which type of equipment to use.

### Discussion

To date, classroom teacher research in which the topic of equipment was included focused primarily on the type of equipment used and its availability rather than the effect it had on children's development of skill. For example, in

an earlier study examining the amount of equipment available for elementary physical education, Schneider (1959) reported that of 393 respondents, 75 percent reported that they used equipment "in a ratio of one piece of equipment to every six to eight children" (p. 46). She found an "average of one piece of equipment for 8-15 children in 64 school systems, 16-30 in 30 school systems" (p.47). No mention of the role that equipment played in skill development was made. While not research based, recommendations over the years have been made by authors of elementary textbooks about the importance of having ample physical education equipment and supplies for each student (Graham et al., 1980; Logsdon et al., 1984; Schurr, 1980). In Essentials of a Quality Elementary Physical Education Program (The American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 1981), it was stated that:

If children are to be physically active and fully involved in the learning situation, ample equipment and supplies that vary in size, texture, etc. for each child are as essential as pencils and books. One ball, one rope, etc. per child is necessary for maximum learning to take place. (p.14)

Other authors such as Kirchner, Cunningham, and Warrell (1970) recommended balls of different colors and sizes as well as small apparatus for student movement tasks. Several studies pointed to problems that the classroom teacher encountered when teaching elementary physical education. Among these was the problem of insufficient help with equipment (Brumbaugh, 1987) and lack of adequate equipment

(Amiot, 1966; Haynes, 1973). One of the five classroom teachers in Brumbaugh's (1987) recent study also expressed an interest in using extra equipment, especially indoors. In this case, extra referred to playing kickball with two balls instead of one. From studying Brumbaugh's (1987) research, it appeared that her classroom teachers had a variety of equipment for their use; the problem seemed to be gaining access, storage, and repair of equipment. How the equipment was actually used or for what purpose, did not emerge as a topic of discussion within her study. The four teachers in the current study did not seem to have any of the problems reported in other studies regarding equipment. They had sufficient equipment, access to it and were observed using multiple equipment in their physical education lessons.

#### Connections and Disconnections

All four teachers had planned at least one lesson which allowed every child to use a piece of equipment at the same time. This use of multiple pieces of equipment was accepted as a connection to the undergraduate methods course since during the course experiences with multiple equipment and types of equipment were conducted. There was little evidence to support, however, that they understood how this decision could influence the movement responses of their children other than, if reduced in number, it would help slow down the activity levels of their class, and thus help them control the children's behavior. As a "true"

connection to the undergraduate methods course it was questionable as there was no evidence in the data collected that teachers understood that giving each child a piece of equipment with which to practice might affect their level of motor skill development. Likewise, no "true" connection seemed apparent between the idea of having children use different sizes, weights, shapes, and colors of equipment accommodating their different levels of motor development.

### Content of Lessons

#### Assertions

1. It was assumed that teachers would leave the undergraduate methods course with a "new" orientation to elementary physical education which would influence their content selection.

2. Origin of the content of lessons varied from teacher to teacher and had little or no connection with the content of games as presented in the undergraduate methods course.

3. Content progression within lessons as well as between lessons was limited.

4. Content within written objectives only slightly resembled content from the nine game themes.

#### Support from Data

In the undergraduate methods course, the content of children's physical education was presented as human movement with the basic framework used to conceptualize it,

the one identified by Logsdon and Barrett (1977) in the class text. This framework which categorizes all of human movement into four aspects: body, space, effort, and relationship, along with the nine game themes which organize and describe games content in progression, was examined to illustrate how it applied to the teaching of educational games (Barrett, 1977, p.98). In the course students were helped to understand this particular organization of games content through practical work with lessons involving content derived from each of the "nine movement themes" (Barrett, 1977, pp. 171-203). The amount of time spent on the content inherent in the nine movement themes for educational games was clearly a major focus of the semester's work. It included class discussions, demonstrations of how the content within the nine game themes was applied in lessons, experience with planning lessons, and implementation of lessons with elementary children in a public school.

Origin of content. Of the 12 lessons taught for this study 1 lesson was in "creative movement", 2 lessons were in "games", 4 lessons were in "rhythmic activities", and 5 lessons were activities which focused on "basic movement skills". As the content of most of these activities bears little resemblance to the content taught in the undergraduate methods course, the teachers were asked, as part of the second interview, from what resource they had

selected their content. Four basic resources emerged: school libraries, past experiences, specialists, and "things" their children like to do. All four teachers indicated that they still owned the textbook (Logsdon et al., 1977) used in their undergraduate methods course, but had not referred to it as a resource since leaving the class.

Considering the school library as a resource for content selection, Letty was the only teacher who indicated that she used the professional library in her school. As she stated: "I look in the professional section of the library and look for physical education objectives; then I just try to take something the physical education teacher isn't working on". A review of the materials in Letty's professional library revealed that they contained the State Guide for Elementary Physical Education, a New Castle City Guide, and a large collection of commercial records. The state and city guides are organized into major categories of predetermined physical activities with little or no progression given.

Relating to past experiences as a source for content, Dawn said in Interview #2 that her lesson ideas came from past experiences and on the "things" she had seen others do. Examples given included ideas from aerobic exercise, watching the Disney Channel on television, participation in parks and recreation activities, and



watching peers teach in their own schools.

For three teachers the physical education specialists were considered an important resource for at least some of their content. As they felt the specialists had more knowledge of appropriate content for children's physical education they saw their role in content development to "follow up" the lessons taught by the specialists. While each of the three teachers understood this role, the degree to which they actually followed up the specialist varied. For example, Dawn indicated that since her principal required her to sit in on the physical education specialist's lessons she tried to "model" the specialist's lessons. "I plan my lesson each day according to what she [the specialist] has done. I may not play the same game, but I would take those skills and use them in different ways." Letty's techniques for follow-up and selecting of content were different from those of the other teachers. Rather than sitting in on the lessons taught by the specialist, she would ask her children what they had done upon their return to the classroom and have them show her. "If it was something I knew, we would try it at recess". Hope, on the other hand, felt free to use or not to use the content ideas given her from the specialist. For example, at the start of the school year, her specialist gave her a list of objectives and what he planned to teach during the semester. In Interview # 2, she indicated that the list was

helpful, but she did not use it consistently. As she stated: "I try to find out what they are doing, but I don't always follow it". Cory was the only teacher who did not use content ideas from the specialist, stating, "I really don't know what he does."

Of the four teachers, Hope was the only one to state that her selection of content came from what she perceived her children liked to do; for example she chose the "ball and hoop" activities because these were her children's favorite games. Likewise, she had about seven or eight games that she rotated on a regular basis, as these were "favorite" games of her children. Of the games she played, "dodge ball" was one of the children's most favorite. What makes this game of particular interest when discussing content, is that within the game of dodge ball, Hope described the content of a dodge ball game as "putting fundamental skills into a game"; then, specifically naming them as passing, throwing, catching, and dodging. It is not clear whether Hope made a direct connection to the content in theme nine, as she did not mention it specifically. What was apparent, however, was that she identified several fundamental motor skills related to the game of dodge ball, and this specific idea had been experienced in the undergraduate methods class through a practical demonstration using the specific game of field dodge. Of all the lessons taught, across all teachers, only in this one

incident did the content come from the nine game themes. Other than this one time, there was no link with the content ideas used by the teachers with those presented in the undergraduate methods course.

In a review of the interview data of the descriptions given by these teachers of the content of their lessons, it was clear that except for the dodge ball game described by Hope these lessons were not linked to the content as presented in the undergraduate methods course. The content orientation taken in the undergraduate methods course textbook, Logsdon et al. (1977), can be described as coming from a "human movement perspective" rather than an "activities perspective", a distinction made evident in two recent articles by Barrett (1986; in press). In her latest article, Barrett explained:

When the subject matter [content] is viewed as 'human movement,' the structure is revealed by the total pattern of components (e.g. space; relationships) and sub-components (e.g. pathways, extensions; meeting/parting, in front/behind); in other words, how the author(s) analyze movement. There are no categories of activities such as those found in the texts supportive of a 'physical activities' perspective. Labels, such as games/sports, dance, gymnastics, and aquatics, are used to identify a 'form of movement,' not a category of predetermined activities. Progression is achieved by arranging the material (inherent in the sub-components) in an order of simple to complex--to be used in relation to children's developmental levels. (p.4)

Further, Barrett (1986; in press) described the "activities perspective" as:

When the subject matter [content] is viewed as 'physical activities', its structure is revealed by the

total pattern of all major categories and their specific activities (i.e. apparatus, stunts, tumbling; sport skills and activities; simple games and relays; fitness routines and activities; rhythmic activities). In making program decisions the stress is on a balanced and wide range of activities placed in a progression from simple to complex across grade levels. (p.3)

It is this latter perspective that seemed to best describe these teachers' approach to content identification.

It is important to mention that all four teachers in this study had described their own elementary physical education experience in such a way that, in the researcher's judgment, an "activities perspective" rather than a "human movement perspective" was reflected. This meant then, that the orientation to content presented in this elementary school physical education methods course was new to these teachers and possibly too difficult for them to grasp within the time allotted. It had been an assumption of this researcher that the teachers in this study would leave the undergraduate methods class with an understanding of games content from this "new" orientation and thus possess the ability to use the nine themes as their basic resource for content selection. This, as the data illustrated, did not happen.

Progression of content. Content progression in educational games was presented to the undergraduate methods class through demonstrations and practical experiences with each of the nine game themes. The games content was organized into lesson experiences and presented from simple

to complex, with the intended purpose of demonstrating content sequence and relationship among the nine game themes. Two examples of learning tasks were experienced during the undergraduate methods course: "Strike a ball above your head with different body parts", Theme 1 - Basic body and Manipulation; "Travel through space catching and throwing a ball near and far from the body - now try to change directions as you throw and catch", Theme 4 - Emphasis on the integration of Themes 1, 2, 3.

A review of the videotapes of the lessons taught by the four teachers revealed that Hope was the only teacher who seemed to demonstrate progression of content between or within lessons. Her first lesson involved work with fundamental skills of dribbling and passing, skills which she had determined were later required to play a dodge ball game she had planned for her second lesson. She acknowledged in Interview #2 that she had planned the content of her first lesson as a review of skills needed by her children to play the game. All lessons taught by the remaining teachers were distinctly different from each other and not connected to any of the previous lessons.

The lessons taught for this study were purposefully scheduled 7 to 10 days apart to allow time for the analysis characteristic of this type of study. This scheduling, thought necessary at the time, might have precluded the possibility of progression being evident between lessons.

As there was little, if any progression within the majority of lessons, it seems doubtful that the schedule had significant influence on the progression across lessons. As the content of these 12 lessons did not reflect the content taught in the undergraduate course, except possibly Hope's, it seemed reasonable to expect that the concept of progression as presented in the undergraduate methods course would not be present. Support for this assumption came from Interview #1, at which time these teachers were asked to talk about their typical physical education lesson and yearly program of instruction; no mention was made of progression of lessons either within or between them. In fact, Cory admitted a lack of knowledge about content progression when asked if she sequenced physical education lessons the same way she did reading lessons. Her answer was, "I would try to if I knew what to do". Likewise, other reasons were expressed for choices of content that did not appear to be influenced by a specific knowledge of progression. Selection and progression of content for the purpose of developing motor skills does not seem to be a concept these teachers understood; at least they did not talk about it during any of the interviews nor did they develop it in their lessons. Hope might be an exception, since she demonstrated some degree of understanding through two of the lessons she taught for this study. For the most part, however, findings in this study validate Barrett's

(1984) observation that teachers have problems "using this [games] framework as the major resource for designing experiences in games [and] knowing where to begin and how to continue" (p. 195).

Objectives. Each teacher was requested to write and submit to the researcher objectives for each of her three lessons prior to her actual teaching. The purpose for this requirement was not only to provide information to the video technician regarding the direction of the lesson, but also for analysis at a later date. All the lesson objectives written by the classroom teachers for this study follow:

(Cory) The Student will be able to:

1. throw to one's self and catch the bean bag using two hands and using one hand.
2. to roll a tire forward; push a tire from one destination to another; throw an object (bean bag) through a tire.
3. keep time with music while marching, moving, and standing; clapping and tapping rhythm sticks as directed.

(Hope) Students will be able to:

4. pass the ball to a partner 10 feet away, using a two-handed pass.
5. catch a ball that is bounced chest high from a partner.
6. throw a ball aimed toward striking an opposing team player below the waist.
7. catch a ball that is bounced toward him/her at varying levels.
8. utilize a hoop in following oral directions pertaining to directional movements.
9. roll a hoop to a partner.
10. catch a hoop rolled to him/her from a partner.

(Letty) Students will:

11. learn the basic steps to a dance and will be able to use these steps when a song is played.

12. learn basic skills they can apply to learning to jump rope.
13. practice running, walking and skipping (forward and backward) in relays and will use these skills in playing "Duck, Duck, Goose".

(Dawn) Students will:

14. use body parts to imitate animal movements.
15. bounce a ball while moving about.
16. keep time to music while marching, skipping, and tapping lummi sticks.

Of the 16 written objectives, 4 objectives appeared to relate in some way to the games content as discussed in the undergraduate methods course. For example, Objective #1, "The student will be able to throw to one's self and catch the bean bag using two hands and using one hand", is associated with catching and throwing, specifically, helping children gain an awareness of manipulation (catching and throwing) and use of body parts (one/two hands), content inherent in Theme 1. Two objectives were written for a lesson in which children would play a specific game. The first, "The student will be able to catch a ball that is bounced toward him/her at varying levels", Objective #7, is associated with awareness of space with an emphasis on levels and is specifically linked to content inherent in Theme 7, awareness of space with emphasis on pathways and levels. The second objective, #6, "The student will be able to throw a ball aimed toward striking an opposing team player", is associated with the content in Theme 9, awareness of complex relationships in a competitive game, in this instance, dodge ball. The last of the four



objectives, #4, "Students will bounce a ball while moving about", is associated with awareness of body with an emphasis on locomotion and use of body parts, content which is inherent in Theme 1.

These four objectives were interpreted as the only ones that appeared to contain games content as described in the nine game themes, though they were written in more precise terms than were used in the undergraduate methods course (e.g., "throw and catch" rather than "send and receive"). All of the other objectives were considered to fall outside of the games content and therefore were not linked to the undergraduate methods course. This decision was based upon (a) the context in which the content was placed (e.g., running, walking, skipping; forward and backward in a relay game) and (b) the terminology used (e.g., roll a tire forward). Reviewing the sources and origin of content given by the teachers it is not surprising that this would occur, since the sources they mentioned during Interview #2 seem to have had a more significant influence on them than the content of games as presented in the undergraduate methods course.

### Discussion

Classroom teacher research which includes an investigation of the lesson content has focused primarily on the ability of teachers to write lesson objectives rather than the origin of content ideas. The question of

classroom teachers' abilities to write appropriate learning experiences from "prepared" objectives was addressed by the Evans study (1978), but was not a specific focus of the current study. Her study is linked to the current study in two important ways: first, the content use in the objectives came from the same source as the content in the undergraduate methods course (nine movement themes, Barrett, 1977) and second, the subjects were all classroom teachers. As teachers in this current study were not directed to write objectives in any specific content area, this could account for why only 4 of the 16 objectives related to games. The purpose of the Evans study (1978) was to determine whether "classroom teachers with minimal knowledge of the movement approach to elementary school physical education could comprehend and demonstrate application of the objectives by writing appropriate learning experiences for children" (Evans, 1978, p.14). The classroom teachers (N = 36) in the Evans study were asked to write learning experiences for six objectives, dealing with Theme 2, the aspects of space awareness in the games area. The objectives from which the learning experiences were to be written were designed by Evans herself, an elementary school physical education specialist. Each learning experience designed by the classroom teachers was submitted to a committee of three experts for evaluations. Seventy-eight percent of the teachers participating in her

study demonstrated "the ability to design appropriate learning experiences" (p.130). While Evans' teachers could design learning experiences from prepared objectives, the study does not indicate how, if left on their own, as were the teachers in this study, they might use the material in designing objectives and in actually teaching the children.

As for classroom teacher orientation toward the content of children's physical education, both the teachers in the Brumbaugh (1987) study and the four classroom teachers in this research study appeared to view content from an "activities perspective" rather than that of "human movement" (Barrett, 1986; in press). This view of elementary physical education subject matter seemed to influence content selection by teachers in both studies. Furthermore, both sets of teachers used similar techniques for selection of content, in particular, that of choosing or repeating their children's favorite activities and favorite games. In addition, Brumbaugh (1987) found that her classroom teachers lacked knowledge of how to teach specific games skills and believed that the "physical education specialist was responsible for planning organized activities" (p.141).

#### Connections and Disconnections

The origin of the content of lessons varied from teacher to teacher and, for all except possibly Hope, had little connection with the content of games as presented in the undergraduate methods course. The content ideas of the four

teachers in this study appeared to be from a "physical activities perspective" rather than the "human movement perspective", the perspective toward content taken by the undergraduate methods course. The activities actually selected were reported as coming from materials housed in their school professional library, past experiences outside of the undergraduate course, and from the activities the specialist taught. The teachers acknowledged that they had not referred to the textbook used in the undergraduate methods course since the completion of the class.

The organization of content for this study showed only a slight connection to the movement framework as applied to games and, with one exception, had little or no progression between or within lessons. Only four of the written objectives contained subject matter resembling the content within the nine game themes as experienced in the undergraduate methods course; all other objectives came from sources outside the undergraduate methods course.

### Development of Motor Skills

#### Assertions

1. Psychomotor goals of elementary physical education were not emphasized.

2. Knowledge of intratask stages and the role of practice time in motor development did not influence how teachers planned and implemented lessons; interest in the knowledge, however, was high.

3. The amount of time students were given to practice motor skills varied from teacher to teacher and lesson to lesson.

#### Support from Data

During the undergraduate methods course three goals of elementary physical education were presented as directions to guide the development of elementary school physical education programs. Specifically stated (Logsdon et al., 1977), these goals were to improve the ability of the learner to:

1. Move skillfully, demonstrating versatile, effective, and efficient movement in situations requiring either planned or unplanned responses.
2. Become aware of the meaning, significance, feeling, and joy of movement both as a performer and as an observer.
3. Gain and apply the knowledge that governs human movement. (p. 17)

While all three were considered important the undergraduate methods course focused most of the class activities on examining how lessons could be planned that would enhance versatile, efficient, and effective movement, and within the games area of the curriculum in particular.

To help meet these goals, intratask stages (Robertson & Halverson, 1977, pp. 43-44) of selected fundamental motor skills were studied through classroom discussion, films, and observations of children in physical education settings. This specific knowledge of development in the motor domain was presented as the foundation for planning lessons and

individualizing instruction. To help classroom teachers focus their observations on the qualitative differences within the development of fundamental motor skills one specific task, hopping, was examined in some detail (Robertson & Halverson, 1977, p.44). Based upon this knowledge, learning experiences were presented which were used to demonstrate how tasks could be individualized to meet different developmental levels of students. Also, within these demonstrations the concept of practice time was presented with emphasis on allowing enough time for students to work toward increased quality in their movement responses. Increasing the amount of time children practiced motor responses was emphasized as an important part of implementing lessons whose purpose was to improve the students' motor skills (e.g., every child having a piece of equipment with which to work and time to work). It was assumed that with an understanding of intratask stages and the role of practice time in motor development, the teachers would be able to develop learning experiences that would ultimately lead to more individualized lessons coupled with more opportunities to practice motor skills. All four teachers had passed the undergraduate methods course with a "B" grade, having been tested on their knowledge of goals of elementary physical education as presented in the course text, their knowledge of motor development of children, and their ability to plan learning experiences which used the

games content and knowledge of motor skill development.

Psychomotor goals. While three goals were discussed in the undergraduate methods course spanning the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains of learning, psychomotor goals were underscored. When asked in Interview #1, however, what they thought the goals of elementary physical education were, there was little attention given to psychomotor goals; rather, they spoke of affective goals or broad educational goals. For example, Dawn said, "It is important for the child to realize and learn that physical education is a part of the total act of education;" Hope referred to "good sportsmanship;" and Letty talked about her students learning "to feel good about themselves and learning to develop self-confidence." Cory's comment was the exception to the others' emphasis on affective goals. She said she thought the goal of elementary physical education was to help students learn "how to use their bodies" and learn "what their bodies could do." This response by Cory came the closest to referring to the psychomotor goals of elementary physical education; yet, throughout her three lessons, she demonstrated few planned activities for the purpose of refining motor skills. Two of her lessons were directed by a commercial record (Bean Bag Rock and Lummi Sticks) and the third lesson resulted in a group of activities using tires and bean bags linked together at such a fast pace that her children were unable

to practice motor skills in any appreciable way.

Motor development knowledge. Evidenced through Interviews #1 and #2 and the videotaped lessons, these classroom teachers did not have a clear understanding of children's motor development. For example, during Interview #1 classroom teachers were asked how they thought children developed motor skills. All four teachers agreed that children learned by "doing" and "practicing" motor skills. Letty emphasized that children "can't develop skills if they don't use them through practice and manipulation". Hope emphasized the importance of doing tasks "over and over". Dawn suggested that she would start out "simple"; Cory said very frankly she relied a lot on the specialist. When asked about the role of development in learning in the same interview, the teachers' answers were somewhat vague. All four teachers felt that the role of motor development was important, but their answers lacked specific illustrations that would demonstrate they remembered motor development material from the undergraduate methods course. There was little discussion of differences in motor stages between or among children, although Hope and Letty both talked about meeting individual needs by planning something different for those students who were at a lower ability level. Hope said "I plan something different for them", but she did not elaborate. Letty varied the activity to give "the ones who were a little more capable more of a challenge".



Cory described in Interview #2 how important she thought the information about motor development was, but how difficult it was for her to understand that material when it was presented during the undergraduate methods course. She said "it just didn't sink in" referring to the work on intratask stages. She offered a suggestion for what she perceived would have helped her gain a better understanding of the material by saying, "seeing children at each stage of development as the stages were being described would have helped". She used throwing as an example and referred to a television program that she had seen which showed in slow motion developmental stages of throwing. She elaborated on how this material might have been presented to her in a way that would have helped her understand it better, explaining, "when you see it and hear it at the same time it sinks in a lot better". Cory admitted that she had not been able to take the motor development information and make any application of it to her physical education classes. Hope also said that she needed more information about motor development. She confided that when she did not "understand what was happening" [referring broadly to development] with one of her students, she asked a good friend who taught a transitional first grade and who had a good "grasp" on growth and development of young children; this reference did not specifically include motor development stages.

Dawn saw development in a broader context, sensing a

relationship of motor development with cognitive development. As she saw it, with the physical education class as her last class, it helped her put "it all together". "It was a wonderful dawning," she said, "to see how the body and the mind develop together." In contrast, throughout both her interviews Letty never talked about motor development; her answers skirted the topic completely. Rather, she always talked about "students having fun and feeling good about themselves. She seemed content with her lessons if her students were involved and active throughout.

Practice time. While teachers expressed the importance of practice time on the development of efficient movement this knowledge was not integrated in any significant way into their lessons. Teachers observed in this study allowed their students various amounts of practice time with no apparent rationale for the length of time selected. In 8 of the 12 lessons, there was no emphasis on length of practice time as a way for children to develop efficient motor skills. For example, within a three-minute period, Hope, in her third lesson, worked on "hoop activities" moving quickly from task to task: thus eliminating time for her children to practice the task. Her instructions to her students were, "do anything you want to, inside of your hoop"; "sit in your hoop"; "put body parts in your hoop"; "twirl it around your neck", thus, allowing little time for

her students to explore the possibility of different body parts or to practice specific tasks to which she had referred.

The lack of knowledge about the length of time to spend on any given task for the purpose of improving motor skills was a problem area for the teachers in this study. Though "time on task" for the purpose of improving the quality of movement was discussed and demonstrated during the undergraduate methods course, this concept was not effectively utilized in any of the videotaped lessons.

Of the 12 lessons taught, Letty's was the one exception. Her lesson, "Step in Time" , showed some indication that she was concerned about giving students time to learn the dance. The lesson content was directed by the Hap Palmer record, "Step in Time", and focused on movement imitations. Students were to "jump like frogs", "bounce like bunnies", "trot like horses", and "soar like rockets". The movements performed by the students were clearly not appropriate as well as being inefficient or ineffective; therefore, Letty stopped the record on several occasions to give her students time to think of a movement to do for each of the record sections.

For example, she said,

I'm going to read the words to the song to you and we're going to practice first; while I'm reading the words to you I want you to listen. Then we will walk through each.

Her focus on reading it, listening, and then taking each

part to practice showed insight on her part regarding learning in general, but it is still not clear that she related this to motor learning in particular. The emphasis of Letty's lessons appeared to be more on listening and following directions than on the development of movement quality.

The two lessons taught by Cory and Dawn using lummi sticks also demonstrated how students' practice time was directed by the record used. It was observed through the videotape that both teachers let the record play on and on without stopping to allow students to catch up, unlike Letty's effort to teach the movements first. While probing in Interview #2 for the reasons of the observed lack of practice time for children to learn motor tasks, none of the teachers could explain why she had taught the lesson the way she did. Cory did say, however, that she picked something she thought her children knew so did not think she had to teach it again.

### Discussion

Even with the emphasis on the concept of motor skill development in the undergraduate methods course, it was not stated as the predominant goal used by the teachers in this study. Rather, these teachers seemed to shift away from the methods course focus and become more concerned with the goal of establishing a sense of well-being or affective goals of having fun, being successful, and participating. A possible

explanation for this occurrence might be the teachers' inability to internalize and apply the motor development information presented during the course. The apparent narrow focus on the affective goals of elementary physical education by the teachers in this study is not consistent with goals reflected in elementary physical education textbooks. Authors of earlier textbooks to the present in their goals include the development of physical, social, and mental abilities of children as important, underscoring the development of motor skills as a unique contribution of physical education to the total education of the child (Gallahue, 1987; Schurr, 1980; Vannier & Gallahue, 1978). Perhaps if these teachers had been able to use their course text in combination with other more recent ones, they would have placed more emphasis on the psychomotor goal.

The findings in the current study conform with those found in Placek's (1982), in which the concept of teacher success was viewed in terms of students being "busy, happy and good" (p. 46). Her study focused on four physical education teachers and examined how they planned lessons and the factors that influenced their planning. What Placek (1982) found was the possibility that teachers were more concerned with student enjoyment than with student learning. She admits that her research does not answer the question of why teachers equate success in teaching with busy, happy and good (p. 55); she postulates that "perhaps they really do

view learning as an ultimate goal, but believe that busy, happy, and good are necessary prerequisites for learning to take place" (Placek, 1982, p. 55), pointing to a positive relationship between time on task (busy) and student learning (p. 55).

Placek and Randall (1986) in a study comparing specialists with nonspecialists (elementary classroom teachers), found that students of nonspecialists spent 47% of their class time "waiting". Comparing the current study with the findings of the Placek and Randall (1986) study, "waiting time" was minimal; the students were kept "active" throughout the class time. While they were kept "active", however, the length of practice time for each task was extremely short, not allowing enough time for skill improvement to occur.

#### Connections and Disconnections

Three goals of elementary physical education were presented during the undergraduate methods course: psychomotor, affective, and cognitive. While all three goals were considered important, the psychomotor goal was the one emphasized throughout the course. In spite of this focus, however, the classroom teachers placed greatest importance on "having fun, being successful, and participating", rather than the psychomotor goal of developing motor abilities of young children. A possible reason for this shift in emphasis may be due to the teachers' lack of

understanding of the motor development information presented during the course.

There seemed to be little evidence that there was an understanding of motor skill development by these teachers which actually influenced their lessons. A very weak connection is apparent in regard to a general awareness by these teachers of a body of knowledge called motor development of young children. Interestingly enough, these teachers demonstrated little knowledge about motor development of young children though they all felt strongly about its importance and appeared to want to know more.

There was little or no evidence that lessons were planned for the expressed purpose of improving motor skill. While the amount of time given students to practice skills varied from teacher to teacher, it was so brief as to suggest that these teachers had little understanding of the relationship of practice time with learning of motor skills.

### Teaching Styles

#### Assertions

1. Teachers structured the learning experience to allow either maximum or minimum opportunities for students to make decisions.

2. Teachers thought that students had a right to make decisions about their learning, but only to a degree and with a great deal of teacher guidance.

3. Teachers demonstrated the ability to move about

the gymnasium space and to interact with each student.

4. Teachers had different views of their role in helping students learn to move effectively.

#### Support from Data

The teaching approach taken by the course textbook viewed teachers and children "as active contributors in the development of the learning environment, both having mutual responsibility for significant decisions" (Barrett, 1977, p.252) regarding their learning. Thus, the undergraduate methods class focused specifically on the role of the teacher as one who guides and facilitates learning through designing tasks that accept students as capable decision makers in the physical education setting. Teaching was viewed as an interactive process within the learning environment, whereby students assume increasingly greater responsibility for their own learning under the guidance and leadership of the teacher. Emphasis was placed on the importance of developing a teaching style for elementary school physical education that would be consistent with the role of the teacher as guide and facilitator.

During the undergraduate methods course the study of teaching focused on learning to observe specific student/teacher behaviors for the purpose of understanding how learning tasks specific to physical education might be designed. The course provided the classroom teachers, in groups of three, an opportunity to plan and teach one 15-



minute lesson; this lesson was videotaped to allow for follow-up class observation and discussion. Three tools for observing and analyzing the teacher behaviors recorded on the tapes were used: (a) Location of the Teacher (Barrett, 1977, p. 271), (b) Focus of Teacher's Verbal Behavior (Barrett, 1977, p.272), and the (c) Structure of the Learning Experience (Barrett, 1977, p. 278). The purpose of the tool, Location of the Teacher, was to "chart whether and where a teacher moves while teaching" (p. 271). Using this observational tool, students were able to understand aspects of effective teaching, influenced by their presence and location. In addition, one variation of the tool "focused on where the teacher was facing in relation to the group he/she was teaching" (p. 271). The purpose of the second tool, Focus of Teacher Verbal Behaviors, was to record the direction of teacher's communication: total class, group, or individual. The purpose of the Structure of the Learning Experience tool was to chart the types and numbers of decisions teachers give to the learners. Inherent in this tool is the belief that:

teaching behavior is a continuum reflecting the opportunity available for children to make decisions relative to content and the learning process. One end to the continuum is represented by minimum opportunity for the child (the teacher's role in decision-making is predominant); the other end represents maximum opportunity for the child (the child's role in decision-making is predominant). (p. 266)

The major importance in learning to observe the

teacher's behavior was how to assess personal progress in using specifically identified teaching behaviors, thus having a rationale upon which to base change. Following class work specifically designed to help students observe teaching behavior, each student in the undergraduate methods class was given a set of the three observational tools to use to record data from their videotapes. These data were then used as focal points for discussion of different teaching styles. In relation to the tool focusing on the Structure of the Learning Experience, two terms were added to distinguish those tasks falling on each end of the continuum. Those tasks designed with minimum opportunity for children to make decisions within the tasks were called "closed tasks", and those tasks designed for maximum opportunity for children to make decisions within the tasks were called "open tasks". As an example of an open task, "striking a ball using different body parts" was given and "kicking a stationary ball against the wall with the right foot" was given as a closed task. Discussion of tasks focused on the importance of task structure and its relationship to providing opportunities for children to make decisions. Some emphasis was given to developing a range of teacher behaviors along the Teacher Behavior Continuum (Barrett, 1977, p. 266), giving increasingly more or less decision-making opportunities to students as situations changed. Lessons taught by the students in the

undergraduate methods class to elementary children in the public schools were designed to include tasks with varying degrees of decision making and to give practice in moving along the teacher behavior continuum.

Decision making. To begin to discover what the teachers believed about students making decisions within the physical education lesson, all four teachers were asked in the first interview if they thought children could make decisions about their own learning, and if so, did they think they had the potential ability to make these types of decisions. All four teachers thought children could make decisions about their own learning, but they were hesitant about the type and amount. Hope said, "I think they do at my age level" [referring to second graders]; Dawn answered, "Yes, to a degree. I leave my children to sort of do their own thing. I will show them things and then I will leave them to use their imagination;" Letty responded, "In some cases they do. I thought more so before I started teaching, but then I got in here [referring to her kindergarten class] and some kids just can't make decisions;" Cory said, "They can help, at times, if they are old enough, if it is with guidance, but sometimes they do not have the information to make a wise decision."

While all four teachers said "yes, to a degree" that children were able to make decisions about their learning the predominant decision-making pattern was closed. Even

though the structure of the tasks was primarily closed, three of the teachers afforded children some opportunities to make decisions about tasks, but these lessons were characterized by quick shifts from one end of the Teacher Behavior Continuum to the other with few tasks falling within the middle range (Barrett, 1977, p. 266).

The examples that follow illustrate these two patterns of decision making. Typical of closed patterns of decision making, a task designed by Dawn which allowed for her children to make minimum decisions about their learning included imitation of different animal movements. A portion of the narration follows:

OK, we're going to do some animal movements this morning. We've been talking about the farm animals we saw the other day, and we're going to do some animal movements. I want you to use your body parts. I want you to show me how an animal uses their body parts. I want you to use your body parts to show me what an animal looks like.

At this point she played a record with some very slow, heavy music and said to her children, "Show me how a big elephant moves." All of her children began to move around imitating elephants. Their movements were varied, but elephant-like as might be expected. Dawn's task was structured to allow her students to make few decisions, but throughout the lesson the tasks were redefined encouraging children to think of different ways to move. For example, Dawn asked her students to use all of their body parts; however, she always put these tasks within a very structured situation, a specific

animal imitation, which gave her students very little opportunity to make decisions.

Another example of closed tasks was Letty's lesson in which she used the "Step in Time", Hap Palmer record. Her students were required to perform tasks, like marching in a circle and trotting like a horse, all of which allowed for very little student decision-making. All of Letty's tasks were considered to be closed; for example, when the record asked children to trot like horses, she explained to her students that horses trot on four legs. Consequently, all of her children got down on their knees and moved around the circle. The structure of the tasks in this lesson was consistent with her earlier comment that she didn't think her children could make decisions at that age. Cory's lummi stick lesson was similar to Letty's lesson in that all of her tasks were closed, (i.e., tap low, tap high, shake your stick high, tap your sticks on your knees), allowing for few decisions as to what to do and where to do it. Cory agreed with Letty that her children were too young to make many decisions; "they needed structure", she said. Letty and Cory, the two kindergarten teachers, were interviewed for this study in late spring so most of their children were approaching promotion to first grade; yet, both teachers had doubts about their children's ability to make decisions. It seems apparent this was not a concept these teachers had worked on during the school year.

In the second pattern of decision making, teachers began with "open" tasks but shifted quickly to "closed" tasks. Two such lessons taught by Hope were characterized by quick shifts from open to closed tasks. For example, in her second lesson, Hope had all of her children working with a hoop. Her first instruction to the class was "I'm going to play a little music and while the song is playing you may do anything you want to inside of your hoop." She allowed her children to work on this task for about two minutes and then shifted to closed tasks: "twirl the hoop on your arm," followed by another closed task: "when the music stops, I want you to put the hoop on the floor and put two fingers in it". Hope used this same shifting pattern of decision making in her "ball" activity lesson. She started out with every child working with a ball giving her children maximum opportunities to make decisions by saying to them, "I want everyone to get into your space. I'm going to turn on the music again and I want you to do anything you want to. Get to know your ball...use all of your body parts". After observing her students, Hope gave a follow-up suggestion which appeared to be used for the purpose of keeping her students from traveling all over the gymnasium. Her statement was, "Remember, you can't leave your space, so if you want to throw your ball or roll it or something, make sure you can get to it without going out of your space. Please everyone, stay in your space." Analyzing this

example, Hope had not changed the structure of the movement task; she changed the space in which her students could perform the task. The movement task was still very "open", allowing for maximum student decisions, but the space within which to move was limited. The shift from open tasks to closed tasks came several minutes later when she had her children line up in two lines to practice a "chest pass".

Another example of the open to closed tasks shift was observed during Dawn's second lesson. She started this lesson with each of her children having a ball and her instructions to them were, "I want you to bounce your ball in your own space." This activity progressed for about five minutes, during which time Dawn offered suggestions which began to show some shifting from open to closed tasks. Her suggestions were "use both hands, two hands, left hand." All of a sudden she stopped her class, lined them up on a red line to the side of the gym and had each child, one at a time, bounce the ball down the line, using the right hand; she had moved from open to closed tasks for the purpose of observing each child individually.

The remaining lesson in which this shift in decision-making opportunities for students was demonstrated was in the last half of Cory's first lesson in which her children were throwing and catching a bean bag. Cory's lesson started in a fashion similar to Hope's with the use of music; she said, "I'm going to put some music on and I want

you to practice throwing and catching your bean bag." This open task was immediately followed by three closed tasks: throw and catch with one hand, two hands, change hands. This pattern of open task to closed task was characterized by quick shifts in decision making in the direction of open to closed with no middle range of decision making.

Interactions with students. In relationship to positioning of the teacher two interesting patterns emerged. First, teachers seemed bound to a particular position in relation to their class either because of the record player used or the type of activity chosen. In all but one lesson that involved the use of music (5), the teachers did not move more than a few steps away from the record player; they remained in front of the class at all times. It was observed in two additional lessons, one designed around relay races and another around a dodge ball game, that the teachers also did not move about the gymnasium space. In all cases the teacher stood either to the side or the center of the activity as she directed the lesson. Second, in five different lessons, all of which did not use a commercial record, but did have each student working with a piece of equipment for part of the lesson, the teachers moved about the room, and in most cases, covered the entire space where students were working. This latter pattern of "teacher positioning" was interpreted as a direct link to the demonstrations given during the undergraduate methods course



as it was a pattern consistently encouraged throughout the course. The lack of movement through space by the teachers in the seven other lessons may have been caused by the task structure (e.g., relay race) and the fact a record player was being used. Dawn was an exception to this pattern, however, as she moved all over the gymnasium floor throughout the lesson. Her activity level was extremely high; she stopped only to change the record as she presented another task. What was different, however, with Dawn's lesson and the other lessons using a record, was that Dawn's record did not have verbal instruction on it. This fact alone gave her more flexibility in the amount of time she could allow for her children to work on a single task.

In relation to the observational tool used to record the focus of the teachers' verbal behaviors, while the tool did not look at general communication of teachers, the following point is made that is of interest. Checking the names of the students identified from the transcription of the lesson videotapes revealed that all four teachers across the 12 lessons used every child's name a least once per lesson and in many cases several times. There appeared from observation of the videotapes that there was an effort on the part of these teachers to interact with each child in each lesson, a teaching skill which was discussed during the undergraduate methods course and one which is also emphasized in an education course taken by the classroom

teacher.

Role of teacher. During Interview #2 the teachers were asked to describe how they viewed their teaching role in relation to helping their students learn to move more effectively. Hope felt she could help children learn to move more effectively through demonstration and active participation. She said, "I show them. I try to demonstrate everything we do." She viewed her role in a typical physical education lesson as "active". She went on to say, "I do a lot of demonstrating and a lot of verbal encouragement. I try to get right in the middle of it and be a part of it." Letty described her role as authoritarian, but went on to say she was as open and active as the subject matter would allow. In describing her role within a lesson, Letty said, "I try to guide usually with the first lesson and be more closed and authoritarian and then as we get into the lesson, I just kind of loosen up." Cory said she had to be more authoritarian because her students needed more guidance. Dawn believed she was "open" and "humanistic". She felt her students needed structure but she wanted to "back away and let them explore for themselves".

### Discussion

Research on teaching as it relates to actual observations of physical education lessons taught by elementary school classroom teachers is limited, but one

such study has been found that relates directly to this research. Smith (1964) conducted a follow-up study of 25 elementary and early childhood majors who graduated from Newark State College in New Jersey into their first year of teaching. All had completed a course in the practice of teaching elementary physical education. Through observations, teacher diaries, and interviews, the study's purpose was to determine the implications for improvement of the curriculum in physical education at Newark State College. Similar to the teachers in this study who started out lessons with some open tasks and then changed abruptly to closed tasks, Smith (1964) found that "one first grade teacher made an attempt to use exploration, but gave up before the lesson was finished" (p. 114). Barrett (1977) stated that "the inability to leave decisions with children seems characteristic of early attempts at learning how to work with children as decision-makers" (p.267), a case in point with all four of the classroom teachers in this study.

Findings regarding the concern for the location of teachers in relation to their class were also the same for each study. Smith (1964) indicated that her teachers were "aware of the importance of being in a position to be seen and heard at all times" (p. 122), but she did not elaborate on where her teachers positioned themselves. In relation to the teachers' interactions with students, Smith (1964) found that her teachers were more concerned with the group as a

whole than with the individuals within the group (p. 120). This is in contrast to the finding of this research study in which teachers moved about the class as their students were working making an effort to call each child by name and interact with them individually during the lesson.

#### Connections and Disconnections

While the teachers in the current study favored tasks which provided decision-making opportunities for their children, their predominant teaching behavior pattern was one of closed tasks. The other teacher behavior pattern observed in limited instances was open tasks shifting quickly to closed tasks. The undergraduate methods course work regarding the structure of tasks and the role of the teacher as a facilitator had only minimal influence on the teachers. It appeared that these teachers, for the most part, did not structure tasks for the purpose of providing opportunities for students to make decisions about their movement responses. Evidence from the videotaped lessons revealed that attempts to structure open tasks were fleeting with abrupt shifts to closed tasks which allowed little time for student decision making.

A strong connection to the undergraduate methods course was the teachers' direction of communication. Three of the four teachers were seen moving through space and positioning themselves in such a way that they were able to interact with each student by calling them by name.

## Planning

### Assertions

1. Teachers did not plan for progression over the four lessons, but lessons were structured to include three phases: introduction to the activity, the activity, and a review of the activity.

2. Teachers correlated physical education activities with other academic subjects.

3. The attitudes of teachers, their perceptions of the value and importance placed on physical education by their principal, their past experience and time constraints served to influence their planning.

### Support from Data

Planning, considered to be a very important part of the teaching process, was discussed during the undergraduate methods course around three big questions: (a) Whom are we teaching, (b) What should we teach, and (c) How will we teach. These three questions were considered to represent the key ideas expressed in the undergraduate methods course textbook (Logsdon & Barrett, 1977). As discussed previously, the early portions of the course were spent on developing an understanding of growth and development of young children and the importance of understanding intratask stages of fundamental motor skills underscored as key to the design of lesson plans.

Lesson planning was approached from a practical

perspective in that lessons planned were based upon observations of children participating in actual physical education lessons. The emphasis of these lessons was to be on individualized learning and shared decision making. Lesson plans were to be designed for a 30-minute time frame, using multiple equipment.

The actual "lesson plan" experience was conducted as a group activity (maximum 3 per group) for the purpose of sharing ideas. Following the completion of the written plan all members of the group taught a 10-minute segment of their lesson to their peers. Near the end of the course selected lesson segments were taught to a group of elementary children. It was assumed that experiences such as those just described would help preservice teachers gain a better understanding of how to manage theoretically based lessons. Further, it was hoped by this researcher that teachers from the undergraduate methods class would leave the course with a new vision of elementary school physical education and as a result would attempt to implement these new ideas into their elementary physical education planning and teaching.

Planning. To gain insight into the teacher's approach to planning, all four were asked during Interview #1 to give an overview of their physical education program, to describe a typical physical education lesson, and to describe how they structured the physical education lesson. The description of a semester's work in physical education can

be characterized as conspicuously insufficient in scope and sequence. Review of the comments made by all four teachers revealed that little evidence of long-range planning was evident. Of the four teachers, Dawn was the only one who tried to explain what she did over a full semester. Her explanation follows: "I take them where they are, assuming they come to me with little motor coordination, and over a semester I work on directionality, balance, coordination, and body control". The other three teachers admitted that they did not carry out semester planning; however, they answered the question by naming some activities that they might do. As Letty explained, "We haven't really done that much of a unit; we probably would start with large motor skills and then work into small motor skills". And Hope stated that she really did not try to teach her students anything new, with the exception of a few games. She explained that she tried to reinforce the physical education specialist's work. She pointed out that her physical education teacher always gave her a list of objectives that he plans to work on over the semester. She uses this list two days a week to reinforce the physical education teacher's lessons and then for the other three days she has free play or plays a game. Cory was very frank in her answer to the question of semester planning; she said, "Well, the children go to the physical education instructor once a week and they get their basics there". In regard to

planning, all four teachers were asked to describe their typical physical education lesson. Three of the four teachers tried to answer the question, but it was clear from their answers that they really had not given much thought to planning of a lesson in physical education. Hope's typical lesson, as she explained it, was "warm up", "laps", "group game" or "free play". She described her lesson structure as "doing the same thing each time". Dawn's answer was vague; she stated, "we have lots of typical lessons, I'm not very structured at all, we do all kinds of things; I can't say that there is a typical lesson". During Interview #2 it was revealed by Dawn that she always reinforced what the physical education instructor was doing. Cory kept going back to her dependence on commercial records, saying, "A typical movement activity would be two or three bands on a Hap Palmer record". She named walking around a circle, skipping, hopping, jumping, and working on colors; referring to a color recognition activity produced by Hap Palmer. In describing the structure of her lesson, she said, "We talk about what we are going to do, then we do it and the end [of the lesson] I ask them [her students] about what we did".

In contrast, Letty's answer was interesting because right from the beginning she indicated that physical education was low on her list of priorities. "Usually, she said, "if we have the time for physical education, we start out with an explanation of where we are headed, basic



objectives; then we review a basic dance step or skill we have already done; then we put it all together in a final dance or game". Letty's explanation of her typical lesson included the basic structure of a lesson--introduction, activity, and review, a basic pattern given during the undergraduate methods course.

Observing each teacher's videotaped lessons, it was found that their description of a typical lesson was accurate. In all three lessons, Hope always started her lesson with fitness exercises and laps followed by a game or other activity. Dawn's lessons were very much like her earlier description: varied, characterized by work with body parts, ball skills, and rhythm. Cory used commercial records for two of the three lessons she taught and in the third lesson she planned activities which included the use of bean bags. All three of Letty's lessons had a definite organizational pattern, which included an introduction, activity, and a review.

#### Correlation of physical education with other subjects.

The idea of integration of physical education with other subject areas was not a new idea, but one which emerged during Interview #2 with Hope. She placed a great deal of emphasis on correlation of physical education activities with other subjects; so much so, that this researcher felt the question should be asked of the other three teachers. The four teachers in this study expressed different views

and strategies for correlating physical education activities with other subject areas. Three of the teachers gave examples of how they did this, while Letty was the lone teacher who had not used correlation. Her statement in Interview #1 was, "I really haven't given it much thought. I probably would not consciously sit down and think about a physical education lesson and how I could use it in social studies or math". Hope seemed to rely on her imagination for many of her ideas. She explained how she made up games for her children to play that would help them learn math and English. Hope explained,

Yes! Sometimes we get in groups and they take a certain number of bean bags and they practice adding by tossing them into a ring on the floor. I ask them if they missed three and they had six to start with, how many go in. In the listening type of activities one team will get to advance if they hear me say a noun and one team will get to go if I say a verb. When they move they use different locomotive movements.

Cory, again using records, said, "Well that's really what Hap Palmer does because he uses a lot of language concepts with movement and singing". Dawn referred to using skipping, bouncing, hopping, and jumping when she worked with letters. When asked to explain, she said, "Because with the body movement modality we reinforce what they learned about letters". Asked where she learned that, she said, in her "L.D. class probably".

The idea of using physical education to teach other subject areas is not a new concept, but one which was not discussed during the undergraduate methods course. With the

exception of Dawn and Cory, there is no indication of the source of these concepts. This researcher speculates that the ideas might have come from peer teachers, a point not verified in this study.

Factors that influence planning. From this study four major influencing factors have emerged that might have had some influence on what and how these four classroom teachers plan. These factors are (a) the classroom teachers' past experiences in physical education, (b) their perceptions of the value of elementary physical education, (c) time constraints experienced by these teachers, and (d) the importance placed on physical education by their principal. Regarding the teachers' attitude toward physical education, there was not a clear link demonstrated between the teachers' experiences in physical education as children and their selection and organization of physical education activities for the 12 lessons taught. In Interview #2, however, each teacher expressed likes and dislikes regarding their elementary physical education experience which could be regarded as a factor which influenced their choices. The extent to which this happened is not clear.

Only one of the four teachers liked physical education as a child. Cory, Dawn, and Letty expressed concern about playing competitive games because they were not very skilled. Letty liked physical education as a child only because she "enjoyed getting out of class". Her dislike was

because she was "sort of overweight" and for that reason was not very successful at physical education. Cory's dislike also came from not being very successful; she said she "wasn't extremely coordinated". Dawn did not like physical education as a child and was sure that these past experiences influenced what she did with her own class. Her reason for not liking physical education was that she couldn't do what other classmates were doing, stating, "Because we didn't do the type things then that we do now. It was more an athletic type thing. We didn't have movement activities, I could have done that". When asked if she included competitive games in her activities for her children, she replied, "Rarely, they like it, so I let them race, but we do not do a lot".

During Interview #1, each teacher described the value she placed on elementary physical education and concern for its importance. Of the four teachers, Dawn was the only one of the teachers who felt that elementary school physical education was important. She said, "I think that physical education is very important for the children that I work with". Her reference was to her transitional first grade, students who had completed first grade but were not developmentally ready to move on to second grade. On the other hand, Hope, Cory, and Letty all said that it might be important, but the academic areas of the curriculum were more important. Hope did not place as much value on

physical education as she did on reading and math. She said, "If it comes down to leaving something out one day, physical education will usually get put on the self". Cory pointed out she uses physical education only to "break up the day". Letty explained that she had a resource person to teach physical education so she didn't feel it was necessary for her to do a lot.

In spite of their attitudes, two of the four teachers, Cory and Letty, were concerned with not having enough time to include physical education in their school day. Both were kindergarten teachers who taught two half-day classes. Cory referred to having to set priorities, saying "Time has been my enemy this year, that there have been so many things that I have had to do that I have not had the time to do the things that I would like to do." Letty, also, said she had a hard time getting everything done in half a day.

During Interview #2 all of the teachers were asked if they were influenced by their principal to include or not to include physical education as a part of their daily program. Hope said she felt, "No pressure. I've never heard her [referring to the principal] speak for it or against it. There is a policy requiring us to stay if we have an especially difficult group of children". Cory, who had the same principal as did Hope, and had previously mentioned not having enough time for physical education, expressed a great deal of pressure from her principal to work on

"academics", specifically reading. She confided, "The emphasis in this school is on reading and we were told that. I know where I've got to have them [students] by the end of the year. I was marked down on my evaluation on my pacing because I did not have my students reading where they [principal and reading specialists] wanted them to be". She went on to say, "I would like to do more in physical education and art, but I know where my bread is buttered". Three of the teachers in their own way said that physical education was not their first priority. The following statements sum up the concerns that each teacher had with time constraints: Hope, sometimes "puts physical education on the shelf"; Letty has some doubt about how much time she has by questioning, "If we have time for physical education"; Cory referred to time "as my enemy all year".

### Discussion

This research study found that the four classroom teachers involved did not conduct comprehensive long-term planning for physical education. Planning that did take place was at the last minute and was interpreted as being influenced by outside factors rather than linked with experiences designed in the undergraduate methods course. These classroom teachers tended to be reactors to their environment and responded more often and more directly to their own interests, peers, and their principal.

Of the studies in teacher planning in physical

education ( Brumbaugh, 1987; Placek, 1982; Sherman, 1979), only one has looked at the classroom (Brumbaugh, 1987); rather, most have focused on the physical education specialist. Likewise, in educational research, much of the research completed in teacher planning is with the classroom teacher, but has focused on academic subjects outside of physical education. Regardless of who the subjects were or how the data were collected, Placek (1982) pointed out that they all produced essentially the same results. Teachers apparently do not design lessons starting with objectives (Clark & Yinger, 1979; Taylor, 1970; Zohorik, 1975). There is a great deal of agreement in the research on planning which suggests that teachers begin their planning by determining students' needs (Merriman, 1975). Decisions are made about planning which may include decisions about content (Taylor, 1970; Zohorik, 1975). Planning was found to be characterized by a list of activities (Clark & Yinger, 1979; McCutcheon, 1980; Placek, 1982), a similar finding in the current research with classroom teachers.

Three studies which have research design relevance to this study were conducted by Brumbaugh (1987), Placek (1982), and Yinger (1977); each used naturalistic techniques and focused, in part or whole, on teachers' planning in physical education. Yinger's (1977) study was an extensive case study of an elementary teacher conducted over a five-month period. He used a "think aloud" technique where the

observed teacher was asked to say aloud what she was thinking. Yinger (1977) found, through this "think aloud" process, that activities were the focus of his teacher's planning. Placek (1982), conducting a naturalistic study of four physical education teachers, found that they conducted most of their long-range planning before classes began in the fall during the traditional in-service day. This planning was characterized by listing of activities; daily lesson planning occurred on the same day that the lesson was taught. Most teachers kept a mental image of the activities they wanted to teach, with very little being written (pp. 107-109). The classroom teachers in this current research study planned in similar ways as Placek's (1982) teachers. They wrote little down in a formal plan, they did not do long-term planning, and they used a group of activities as the basis of all their planning.

Brumbaugh's (1987) study of five classroom teachers closely resembles this researcher's study both in the subjects used and the research findings on planning. Four of the five subjects in her study wrote what they considered were plans for physical education lessons. These plans included a simple list of games and activities, a collection of rules of games, a weekly outline of physical education activities, and brief notations (e.g., Monday-Relays) of activities taken from handouts furnished by the physical education specialists. Only one of Brumbaugh's (1987)



subjects said that she did not write down her plans, but she talked about planning different and varied activities for her students which is not unlike the "mental image of activities" that Placek (1982) found her subjects conducting. Three of Brumbaugh's (1982) subjects specifically stated that they tried to follow up a list of activities given them by their specialists; if this was the case, then it seems reasonable to believe that the type of planning [list of activities] by the specialist was influencing the type of planning by the classroom teacher.

A number of factors were identified by Brumbaugh (1987) which influenced planning of her teachers and were similar to this researcher's findings: student needs, students favorite games, students having difficulty with a skill, and student behavior. One of Brumbaugh's (1987) subjects said she was limited in the amount of time she had for planning physical education lessons so she selected something quick and easy to organize. Two of the four subjects in this research study also indicated that having time to plan was a problem. There was no mention of selecting a game or activity because it was easy to organize, but following these two teachers into the implementation of their lesson showed a heavy use of commercial records which was interpreted to be considered "quick and easy".

Correlation of physical education activities with other

academic subjects seems to be appealing to classroom teachers. It is not known with any certainty where these ideas are coming from, but apparently teachers are picking up on the concept, perhaps from other college course work, and using it in their teaching. Through diaries, interviews, and observations of 25 classroom teachers who had completed an undergraduate methods course in elementary school physical education at Newark State College, Smith (1964) found four teachers who showed evidence of integrating physical education with other subject areas (p. 106). One of Brumbaugh's (1987) subjects, also, indicated that she correlated physical education with other subject areas.

#### Connections and Disconnections

It is difficult to determine a connection between what the teachers in this study described as their planning process and what was taught during the undergraduate methods course as so much of it seemed unrelated to the course experiences. In spite of this, teachers did indicate that they based their planning decisions on the needs of their students. This was a point stressed during the undergraduate methods course, but the emphasis was on understanding the motor development needs of children as the basis of planning--a point these teachers missed. Rather, there was no long-term planning conducted, a definite disconnection with the undergraduate methods course as this

was presented as part of the progression of the "nine game themes". The strongest connection found with the undergraduate methods course was the structure of the actual lesson. Teachers seemed to follow a pattern of introducing the lesson, having their children participate in an activity or games, and then closing the lesson with a review. This was the format used in the undergraduate methods course and one with which the teachers seemed familiar. The correlation of physical education activities with academic subjects was not addressed during the undergraduate methods course, yet it appeared to be a practice that was widely accepted by the four teachers in this study; however, its origin cannot be explained by this study.

CHAPTER V  
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to describe the connections and disconnections between four classroom teachers' teaching of physical education with the experiences they received in their college methods course. Specifically, the study sought to determine the following:

1. Which major areas of content of a college course taken by classroom teachers were meaningful to them, and therefore remembered and implemented into their physical education teaching?

2. What was the classroom teachers' philosophy and attitude regarding elementary physical education; what connections and disconnections did they have with the philosophy that was presented to the teachers as a part of the college methods course?

3. What was included in a typical physical education lesson taught by the classroom teachers and what were the connections and disconnections of the lessons with the practical experiences in the college methods course?

4. What were the strongest influencing factors that directed what classroom teachers planned for their students in a physical education setting?

## Summary

### Content

The undergraduate methods course presented the content of children's physical education as human movement using as its basic framework the one designed by Logsdon and Barrett (1977) and included in the class text (p.98). Basic aspects of the framework--body, space, effort, and relationship--were examined separately to illustrate how they applied to the identification and selection of content for educational games (Barrett, 1977, pp. 166-167; 169). The movement framework elaborated for games, along with the nine game themes which describe games content in progression, were used to identify games content and design learning experiences. The use of content by the classroom teachers was examined in three ways: (a) its origin, (b) its progression, and (c) its placement in written objectives. The content used by the classroom teachers primarily originated from their school libraries, past experiences outside the undergraduate methods course, and from the physical education specialist. None appeared to have originated from the content of the nine game themes as taught in the undergraduate methods course. Since the origin of content was not linked to the nine game themes, the progression associated with them was understandably not evident. In only one case was progression planned between and within lessons (e.g., fundamental skills taught in one

lesson were followed by a game in a follow-up lesson requiring these same skills). In relation to objectives, 4 of the 16 objectives written by the teachers in this study contained content that could be "suggestive" (i.e., similar vocabulary) of physical education content within the nine game themes; all other content identified within the objectives appeared to come from sources other than the themes. Findings from this study demonstrated that content for educational games, as presented in the undergraduate methods course, was not remembered and thus not used in the implementation of the physical education lessons taught by the classroom teachers.

#### Philosophy and Attitude

Physical education in elementary schools as presented in the undergraduate methods course focused on individualizing learning for the purpose of helping children reach their unique motor skill potential. The learner was viewed as an individual, capable of making decisions; the teacher's role was to facilitate the learning process and guide children toward becoming independent learners. How these beliefs influenced both the methodologic approach used and the design and selection of tasks to be taught was central to the undergraduate methods course experiences. Practical experiences with lesson planning, an important part of the undergraduate methods course, focused on developing an understanding of growth and development of

young children, specifically focusing on the importance of understanding motor skill development for the purpose of designing tasks.

There was evidence that this philosophy had influenced in some limited way the teaching behavior of the four classroom teachers in this study. First, after reviewing the 12 lessons it was found that teachers demonstrated little concern for designing tasks which provided opportunities for children to make decisions about their own learning. While these teachers did design a few "open tasks", they either shifted quickly to "closed tasks" or simply used them alone rather than redesigning subsequent tasks with a range of decisions as situations within the lesson required. There was no evidence that as students demonstrated abilities to handle varying types and amounts of decision making that the teachers changed the structure of the learning task accordingly. Thus, these lessons were not regarded as a strong link to a philosophical position which viewed children as independent learners capable of making decisions about their own learning.

Second, the limited use of progression within or across the 12 lessons of these classroom teachers demonstrated the lack of specific knowledge they had about appropriate content and content development for the purpose of developing motor skills in young children. The fact that these teachers did not plan lessons with progression, may

however, reflect a philosophical position on their part that teaching elementary physical education is not as important as teaching other academic subjects; thus, they did not feel it necessary to know much about the content. Likewise, there is an underlying attitude that the specialists should teach physical education since they are the ones who have the knowledge and understanding of elementary school physical education.

#### Typical Lesson

Within a typical physical education lesson, as presented in the undergraduate methods course, the following areas were examined: (a) content representing the nine game themes, (b) tasks planned with a range of opportunities for students to make decisions, (c) the use of different types and amounts of equipment, and (d) lessons structured in three phases: introduction, activity, and review. First, the typical physical education lesson taught by the classroom teachers did not predominantly reflect a human movement approach to teaching educational games. Only 4 of the 16 objectives appeared to relate in some way to the games content as discussed in the undergraduate methods course. All of the other objectives were considered to fall outside of the games content. The origin of content may give some insight to why this occurred since most of the content ideas came from school libraries, past experiences, specialists, and "things" their children liked to do, rather



than the course text or materials related philosophically.

Second, 5 of the 12 lessons taught by the classroom teachers included a pattern of teacher behavior that moved quickly from maximum to minimum decision making, reflecting opposite ends of the teacher behavior continuum with few tasks falling within the middle range. Thus, ability to consciously structure movement tasks for the purpose of providing opportunities for students to make different types and amounts of decisions about their movement in relation to individual responses was not part of a typical physical education lesson.

Third, each teacher planned at least one lesson using multiple pieces of equipment. While this pattern definitely was present, though limited at best, there was no convincing evidence that the reason these teachers had for giving all children a piece of equipment, was the same reason given in their methods class: specifically, the potential effect these teachers' decisions have on skill development of children. The use of a variety of sizes, weights, shapes, and colors of equipment was not used as part of the typical lesson to meet different developmental motor stages of children. It appears that these classroom teachers had not retained the idea that the size, weight, shape and color of equipment, as well as amount, can affect levels of difficulty of a given task, a point that was emphasized during the undergraduate methods course.

### Influencing Factors That Direct Planning

Four major factors were considered to influence the classroom teacher's planning: past experiences in physical education, perceptions of the value of elementary physical education, time constraints, and the importance placed on physical education by their principal. While a clear link between the classroom teachers' past experiences and their planning cannot be definitely claimed, each teacher was clear in what she liked and disliked as a child when experiencing physical education. Three of the four teachers stated that they "disliked physical education" or "viewed themselves as an unsuccessful participant". One teacher liked physical education as a child and did indicate that she felt her past experiences influenced what she planned for her children.

Only one teacher indicated that elementary physical education was very important for her children. The other three teachers felt physical education was of value but it was not the most important subject area; reading and math were considered more important.

The two kindergarten teachers indicated that they had the greatest concern for time. Each taught two half-day classes and felt pressured within that time frame to fit everything in. They talked about having to set priorities and physical education was either left out or left up to the specialists.

Although there was no clear indication that the principal of each school influenced the teachers, there was some discussion regarding this topic. Two teachers seemed more influenced by what they perceived the principal expected than the other two. As one teacher was required to stay in the gymnasium with the specialists to observe what he was doing, she perceived the principal to place importance on physical education. In contrast, another teacher perceived the principal to value academic subjects more than physical education since she emphasized reading and made no mention of physical education. In both cases these perceptions appeared to influence the planning of physical education lessons.

#### Conclusion

Within the limitations of this study it is concluded that no strong connections exist between the undergraduate methods course and the four classroom teachers' teaching of physical education across the majority of the 12 lessons; the connections that existed were limited, inconsistent, and often without clear rationale.

#### Implications

Based on this research study two areas of implication will be discussed: considerations for improvement of the undergraduate methods course and suggestions for future research.

### Improvement of the Methods Course

First, consideration should be given to shifting the content orientation from "human movement" to "physical activities" including the curriculum areas of games, rhythms, and dance. Throughout this research study, teachers selected content from a broader scope than games. It seems reasonable to redesign the undergraduate methods course to a "physical activities" perspective to address the following realities: a) classroom teachers' difficulty with perceiving content coming from a "human movement" orientation, b) classroom teachers' natural tendency to choose activities as content, c) influence from the physical education specialists, and d) influence from written material, textbooks, and city guides in part.

Second, there should be a continued emphasis on understanding motor development of young children, but there should be a reorganization of how and when this information is introduced. It is suggested that an introduction to basic fundamental motor skills, including how these skills develop over time be presented first, followed by application of this information to include ways to change or adapt the requirements of games, rhythms, and dance to meet developmental needs of children.

Third, the undergraduate methods course required only one teaching experience and three observational experiences in the field with public school children. Consideration

should be given to the expansion of the field experience to include more direct observation and teaching with children and less work with peer teaching and film analysis.

#### Future Research

There were enough similarities between this study and others of similar focus (Brumbaugh, 1987; Placek, 1982; Smith, 1964) to support the research techniques used. If the basic structure of the research were redesigned, however, these recommendations are suggested:

1. Data should be gathered from September to May to allow for follow-up interviews when needed. Conducting data collection late in the school term prevents continuous access to teachers while they are still at school.

2. In this study, there were times when additional probing would have been helpful. Consideration should be given to increasing the number of follow-up interviews throughout the last phase of the study.

3. Consideration should be given to reducing the number of subjects from four to two, but increasing the number of lessons taught to 10. These lessons should be taught consecutively to provide opportunities for progression to emerge.

4. In future research, consideration should be given to viewing the reasons why disconnections occur. Two possible areas of investigation are the effect of socialization and the difficulty of the material presented.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. (1968). Elementary schools physical education teachers' status survey. Washington, DC: Elementary School Physical Education Commission.
- American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. (1969). Promising practices in elementary school physical education. (Report of the Conference for Teachers and Supervisors of Elementary School Physical Education). Washington, DC: Author.
- Amiot, D. J. (1966). A status study of the qualifications of the classroom teacher and programs in physical education of selected elementary schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, South Dakota State University at Brookings.
- Anderson, M. J. (1973). A study of some philosophical beliefs in the area of physical education held by the elementary school teachers of the Moberly Public School System of Moberly, Missouri. Unpublished master's thesis, Northeast Missouri State University at Kirksville.
- Baker, G. M., Annis, E., & Bontz, J. (1954). Supervision of physical education in the elementary school. Research Quarterly, 25(4), 379-386.
- Barrett, K. R. (1977a). Educational dance. In B. J. Logsdon, K. R. Barrett, M. Ammons, M. R. Broer, L. E. Halverson, R. McGee, & M. A. Robertson (Eds.), Physical education for children: A focus on the teaching process (pp. 164-207). Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger.
- Barrett, K. R. (1977b). Studying teaching: A means for becoming a more effective teacher. In B. J. Logsdon, K. R. Barrett, M. Ammons, M. R. Broer, L. E. Halverson, R. McGee, & M. A. Robertson (Eds.), Physical education for children: A focus on the teaching process (pp. 249-287). Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger.
- Barrett, K. R. (in press). The subject matter of children's physical education: Two views. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance.

- Barrett, K. R. (1986). Thinking about the subject matter of children's physical education. The North Carolina Journal, 22(2), 1-4.
- Beck, V. (1963). The classroom teacher is the key. Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 39(9), 23, 46.
- Bressan, E. S. (1974). The assessment of classroom teachers' ability to provide quality instruction in movement education for primary grade children. Unpublished master's thesis, University of North Carolina at Greensboro.
- Brumbaugh, J. I. (1987). A view of physical education: Perceptions of five classroom teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro.
- Buehler, A. (1961). Basic issues: Who should teach physical education in the elementary grades (1-6)--the classroom teacher or a specialist? Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 32(8), 10.
- Buffington, T. C. (1979). The status of physical education in the public elementary schools of North Carolina. Unpublished master's thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Caskey, S. R. (1980, May). Status of elementary school physical education, 1968-79. AAHPERD UPDATE, p. 5.
- Clark, C. M. & Yinger, R. J. (1979). Three studies of teacher planning. Research Series No.55. East Lansing: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University.
- Clarke, M. S. (1971). Muscular strength and cardiovascular fitness of elementary school children taught by specialists and by classroom teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University.
- Cochran, W. W. (1982). Physical education background of elementary classroom teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University.
- Council on Physical Education for Children/National Association for Sport and Physical Education/The American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance. (1981). Essentials of a quality elementary physical education program: A position paper (rev.). Reston, VA: American Alliance for Health,

## Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance.

- Curtiss, M. L., & Curtiss, A. B. (1946). The classroom teacher's dilemma. Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 17(6), 335, 381-382.
- Darlington, H. (1977). The effects of a physical education clinical experience on the self concept of preservice elementary education majors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Davis, J. A. (1978). Two methods of instructing elementary education majors to teach elementary school children physical education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University at Bloomington.
- Davis, K. S. (1931). The classroom teacher. The Journal of Health and Physical Education, 2(4), 29, 53-54.
- Donnelly, A. (1958). Let's ask the classroom teacher. Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 29(8), 43, 80.
- Drew, G. (1961). Basic issues: Who should teach physical education in the elementary grades (1-6)--the classroom teacher or a specialist? Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 32(8), 8.
- Duncan, R. O. & Carruth, W. A. (Eds.). (1961). Basic issues. Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 32(8), 8.
- Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.) (pp. 119-161). New York: Macmillan.
- Evans, C. S. (1978). The guidance quality of selected movement objectives for classroom teachers. Unpublished master's thesis, University of North Carolina at Greensboro.
- Fehrenbacher, H. L., Owens, T.R., & Haenn, J. (1979). Student case studies as part of a comprehensive program evaluation. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 12(3), 63-70.
- Gabbard, C., & Miller, G. (1986). Course offerings and diversity related to physical education for children. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 5, 247-251.



- Gallahue, D. L. (1987). Developmental physical education for today's elementary school children. New York: Macmillan.
- Graham, G., Holt/Hale, S. A., McEwen, T., & Parker, M. (1980). Children moving: A reflective approach to teaching physical education. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.
- Hallstrom, T. L. (1965). An exploratory study of the effects of special teacher, combination special-classroom teacher, and classroom teacher instruction upon certain aspects of physical fitness and motor skill development. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College.
- Hamilton, L. K. P. (1981). A survey of professional preparation in the area of physical education for public school elementary teachers and physical education specialists in geographic areas served by the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers.
- Haynes, J. B. (1973). The impact of consultant assistance on North Carolina elementary teacher's attitudes relating to physical education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Hennessey, B. (1984). The effect of a specialized program of physical activity on first-grade student achievement of selected physical education objectives. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California at Los Angeles.
- Herkowitz, J. (1978). Developmental task analysis: The design of movement experiences and evaluation of motor development status. In M. Ridenour (Ed.), Motor Development: Issues and Applications (pp. 141-151). Princeton, NJ: Princeton Book Co.
- Hill, L. (1961). Basic issues: Who should teach physical education in the elementary grades (1-6)--the Classroom teacher or a specialist? Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 32(8), 8, 10.
- Hoffman, H. A., & Rink, J. E. (Eds.). (1985). Physical education professional preparation: Insights and foresights. Proceedings of the Second National Conference on Preparing the Physical Education Specialist for Children. Reston, VA: American Alliance

for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance.

- Jameson, E.D. (1930). Physical education for the preparation of general elementary school teachers: A study of content and requirements of courses of physical education offered in twenty-two state teachers colleges and normal schools in 1926-27. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University.
- Jones, E. (1961). Basic issues: Who should teach physical Education in the elementary grades (1-6)--the classroom teacher or a specialist? Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 32(8), 10.
- Kirchner, G., Cunningham, J., & Warrell, E. (1970). Introduction to movement education. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown.
- Lahann, B. (1968). A survey of the elementary school physical education programs in the state of Iowa. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Iowa.
- Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1984). Teachers, their world, and their work. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Lofland, J. (1971). Analyzing social settings. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Logsdon, B. J. & Barrett, K. R. (1977). Movement - The content of physical education. In B. J. Logsdon, K. R. Barrett, M. Ammons, M. R. Broer, L. E. Halverson, R. McGee, & M. A. Robertson, Physical education for children: A focus on the teaching process (pp. 97-120). Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger.
- Logsdon, B. J., Barrett, K. R., Ammons, M., Broer, M. R., Halverson, L. E., McGee, R., & Robertson, M. A. (1977). Physical education for children: A focus on the teaching process. Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger.
- Logsdon, B. J., Barrett, K. R., Ammons, M., Broer, M. R., Halverson, L. E., McGee, R., & Robertson, M. A. (1984). Physical education for children: A focus on the teaching process (2nd ed.). Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger.
- Manley, H. (1948). Editorials: The plight of elementary school physical education. Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 19, 335, 376.

- McCutchen, M. C. (1978). Expert determination of knowledge and skills essential to the elementary classroom teacher for the instruction of creative dance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro.
- McCutcheon, G. (1980). How do elementary school teachers plan? The nature of planning and influences on it. The Elementary School Journal, 81(1), 4-23.
- Merriman, E. L. (1975). Considerations identified by elementary teachers as elements of their planning for instructional activities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon at Eugene.
- Merton, R. K., Fiske, M., Kendall, P.L. (1956). The focused interview: A manual of problems and procedures. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Morris, G.S.D. (1976). How to change the games children play. Minneapolis, MN: Burgess.
- Namazi, M. Z. (1969). Critical teaching behaviors influencing attitude development of elementary school children toward physical education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland at College Park.
- National Committee on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for education reform. Washington, DC: National Committee on Excellence in Education.
- Nestroy, J. A. (1978). Fitness levels of children taught by the physical education specialist and classroom teachers. Unpublished master's thesis, Texas Woman's University.
- Nichols, B. (1986). Moving and learning: The elementary school physical education experience. St. Louis: Times Mirror/ Mosby College Publishing.
- Nixon, J. E., & Jewett, A. E. (1969). An introduction to physical education. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders.
- Nokken, O. P. (1971). Elementary classroom teachers' attitudes and practices relating to physical education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado.
- Patterson, E. J. (1955). Physical education experiences for classroom teachers: An identification and description

- of preservice experiences that may help elementary school teachers teach children in the area of physical education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University.
- Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Phillips, M. B. (1967). An investigation of elementary classroom teachers' perceptions of their role in teaching physical education. Unpublished master's thesis, Kent State University.
- Pilson, J. E. (1970). A survey of physical education in the public elementary schools of Rhode Island. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Rhode Island at Kingston.
- Placek, J. H. (1982). An observational study of teacher planning in physical education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Placek, J. H., & Randall, L. (1986). Comparison of academic learning time in physical education: Students of specialists and nonspecialists. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 5(3), 157-165.
- Randall, L. (1986). Employment statistics: A national survey in public school physical education. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 57(1), 23-28.
- Rice, J. H. (1948). Physical education needs on the elementary level. Journal of Health and Physical Education, 19(4), 260, 305-306.
- Robertson, M. A., & Halverson, L. E. (1977). The developing child: His changing movement. In B. J. Logsdon, K. R. Barrett, M. Ammons, M. R. Broer, L. E. Halverson, R. McGee, M. A. Robertson, Physical education for children: A focus on the teaching process (pp. 24-67). Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger.
- Ross, B. M. (1960). A study of the performance of boys and girls taught by the specialist and the nonspecialist, Research Quarterly, 31(2), 199-207.
- Saurborn, J. (1950). Editorials: Who shall teach elementary school physical education? Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 21(2), 76, 114.
- Schneider, E. (1959). Physical education in urban elementary schools. U.S. Office of Education Bulletin

No. 15. Washington, DC: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

- Schneider, E. (1960). Physical education in urban schools. Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 31(2), 21.
- Schurr, E. L. (1980). Movement experiences for children: A humanistic approach to elementary school physical education (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Schwarz, J. O. (1983). Increasing the incidence of physical education lessons taught by second-grade classroom teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University.
- Sefzik, W. P. (1983). A study of the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs in six areas of competency as perceived by elementary school teachers in Texas during their first three years of teaching. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University.
- Sherman, M. (1979, December). Teacher planning: A study of expert and novice gymnastics teachers. Paper presented at the Pennsylvania State Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation Annual Convention, Philadelphia.
- Siedentop, D., Tousignant, M., & Parker, M. (1982). Academic learning time-physical education. Columbus, OH: School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Ohio State University.
- Siff, S. J. (1979). The effects of the use of physical education paraprofessionals upon selected physical education objectives pertaining to fourth, fifth, and sixth grade boys and girls. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University.
- Slater, M. B. (1966). An identification and comparison of some philosophical belief's in the area of physical education held by elementary school teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon at Eugene.
- Smith, C. (1956). Improving the pre-service program in physical education for the undergraduate student majoring in elementary education at Lock Haven State Teachers College. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University.

- Smith, E. (1981). A comparison of fifth grade students with a professional physical education teacher and a regular teacher. Unpublished master's thesis, Brigham Young University.
- Smith, N. D. (1964). A study of first year classroom teacher's competence in teaching elementary physical education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University.
- Stake, R. (1978). The case study method in social inquiry. Educational Researcher, 7(2), 5-8.
- State Department of Education, Division of Elementary and Special Education. (1970). Physical education, kindergarten through grade seven. Richmond, VA: Author.
- Taylor, P. H. (1970). How teachers plan their courses. London: National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales.
- Terkell, M., Deutsch, H., & Noak, J. R. (1970). Physical education in Illinois: A research monograph - 1970. The status of certain aspects of public school physical education programs and personnel in Illinois, 1968-1969. Springfield: Illinois Department of Education.
- Toro Seda, S. (1974). Professional preparation guidelines in physical education for classroom teachers in elementary schools in Puerto Rico. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University.
- Twa, C. A. (1982). A comparison of elementary physical education specialists' and generalists' verbal and nonverbal interaction at the elementary level. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon at Eugene.
- Vannier, M. & Gallahue, D. L. (1978). Teaching physical education in elementary schools (6th ed.). Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders.
- Van Wieren, G. L. (1973). A comparison of elementary teachers and programs instructed by classroom teachers consulting with physical education specialists. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University.
- Wang, B. M. (1977). An ethnography of a physical education class: An experiment in integrated living. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at

Greensboro.

- Wilcox, L. (1966). A suggested method of reporting student progress in physical education for grades 4, 5, and 6. Unpublished master's thesis, Kent State University.
- Wilson, S. (1979). Exploration of the usefulness of case study evaluation. Evaluation Quarterly, 3(3), 446-459.
- Workman, D. J. (1965). A comparison of the performance of children taught by selected physical education specialist and those taught by the classroom teacher. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa.
- Yinger, R. J. (1977). A study of teacher planning: Description and theory development using ethnographic and information processing methods. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University.
- Zahorik, J. A. (1975). Teachers' planning models. Educational Leadership, 33, 134-139.
- Zimmerman, H. (1959). Physical performance of children taught by special teachers and by classroom teachers. Research Quarterly, 30(3), 356-362.

APPENDIX A  
OBSERVATIONAL INSTRUMENTS





**LOCATION OF THE TEACHER**

The purpose of this observational tool is to chart whether and where a teacher moves while teaching.

**DIRECTIONS:** In the boxes provided, chart the pattern of movement taken by the teacher as he/she moves throughout the space. Use one continuous line in charting the teacher's path. At the end of approximately three minutes change to a new box. Place an X where the teacher is at the moment you begin to record his/her path of movement.

|    |    |    |
|----|----|----|
| 1  | 2  | 3  |
| 4  | 5  | 6  |
| 7  | 8  | 9  |
| 10 | 11 | 12 |
| 13 | 14 | 15 |

**FOCUS OF TEACHER'S VERBAL BEHAVIOR**

**DIRECTIONS:** As you observe, make a recording each time the teacher communicates (verbally) to the class, a group of students, or an individual. Use the following symbols for recording: C = total class; G = group; and I = individual. Record vertically and draw a line below the last recording approximately every three minutes.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|   |   |   |   |   |   |

**CONTENT OF THE LESSON**

**DIRECTIONS:** Record in the left-hand column what the teacher says in presenting and developing the lesson's content. Include only those verbal behaviors that specifically mention the content. After the observation session is over, study your recordings and identify the actual content that was used. Do this in terms of Body, Space, Effort, and Relationship.

| TEACHER'S VERBAL BEHAVIOR | CONTENT ANALYSIS |
|---------------------------|------------------|
|                           |                  |

## CONTENT ANALYSIS

I. Body Aspect

1. Body Action
2. Actions of Body Parts
3. Activities of Body
4. Shapes of Body

II. Space Aspect

1. Areas
2. Directions
3. Levels
4. Pathways
5. Planes
6. Extension

III. Effort Aspect

1. Time
2. Weight
3. Space
4. Flow

IV. Relationships

1. Body Parts
2. Individuals or Groups
3. Objects/Equipment
4. Rules/Boundaries/Goals

APPENDIX B  
APPLICATION FOR RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
DATA PROCESSING & PROGRAM EVALUATION SERVICES

APPLICATION FOR RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

- 1. Date Application Rec'd: \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. Permission Granted: YES NO
- 3. Date Final Results Rec'd: \_\_\_\_\_

- 1. Name of Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. School/Employment Affiliation:
- 3. Sponsor and/or Motivation for Project:
- 4. Title of Proposed Project:
- 5. Statement of Problem to Be Researched:
- 6. Listing of Resources and Support Being Requested:
- 7. Estimate of Inclusive Calendar Dates Required to Complete the Project:
- 8. Specify Benefits Projected for Public Schools:
- 9. Please Attach a one page Abstract of the Research Proposal.
- 10. I acknowledge that any approval that may be granted for this request will be contingent upon acceptance of the following limitations:
  - A. Teacher/student/parent participation will be on a volunteer basis. Solicitation for volunteers will be made in accordance with guidelines established by the Assistant Director of Data Processing & Program Evaluation Services, Public Schools.
  - B. All information and findings related to this project will be held in the strictest confidence by the investigator, until that information and findings have been reviewed by the Assistant Director of Data Processing & Program Evaluation Services, Public Schools.
  - C. Final approval for initiation of this research project will not be in effect until one complete copy of the research proposal and a copy of each evaluative instrument to be used in the course of the project have been receipted for by the Assistant Director of Data Processing & Program Evaluation Services, Public Schools.
- 11. I do hereby affirm that responses to items 1-9 above are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge. Additionally, in the event that this application is approved, I agree to and accept, without reservations, the limitations listed in item 10 above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Applicant's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Please complete two copies. Return one copy to Data Processing & Program Evaluation (Attn.: Assistant Director), and keep one copy for your record.

APPENDIX C  
REPORT INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS



Item 2

## University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Report to UNC-G Institutional Review Board on Research Project  
Involving Human Subjects

This form is to be filed with the UNC-G Institutional Review Board for all research projects conducted at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro that involve human subjects. If the project is to be submitted for outside grant funding, further review by the UNC-G Institutional Review Board may be carried out to determine the degree of risk involved. Principal investigators seeking outside funding should also submit copies of Form 2 and copies of their proposals to the UNC-G IRB at least three weeks prior to the final date for submission of their request for funds.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Project title: \_\_\_\_\_

Principal Investigator(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Relationship(s) to the University:  Faculty  Student  Other \_\_\_\_\_  
(specify)

Are participants in this project, in the judgment of the School or Department, at risk?  Yes  No

If the participants are at risk, attach a brief abstract of the project and a copy of all forms and/or procedures used to assure the protection of participants. School and/or Department Human Subject Review Committees should keep on file copies of proposals or other information on the basis of which the determination of the degree of risk was made.

I certify that an approved Human Subjects Review Committee has reviewed the project named above and that the statements made concerning the degree of risk involved in the project and the safeguards taken to protect participants are as indicated.

Dean or Department Head \_\_\_\_\_  
name

\_\_\_\_\_ academic unit

Human Subjects Review Committee \_\_\_\_\_  
(person authorized to certify)

Send with accompanying material when applicable to:  
UNC-G Institutional Review Board  
Office for Sponsored Programs  
214 Mossman Building  
The Campus

Form 1-IRB

2

- B. Briefly describe all other procedures to be followed in carrying out the project.
- C. Attach a copy of the proposal you are filing (Graduate School, Agency, etc.) and a copy of orientation information to subjects. Include questionnaires, interview questions, tests, and other similar materials.

VI. Agreements: By signing this form, the principal investigator agrees to the following:

- A. To conform to the policies, principles, procedures and guidelines established by the HPER School Review Committee (SRC).
- B. To supply the SRC with documentation of selection procedures and informed consent procedures.
- C. To inform the SRC of any changes in procedures which involve human subjects, giving sufficient time to review such changes before they are implemented.
- D. To provide the SRC with any progress reports it may request.

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX D  
LETTER TO PARENTS

Dear Parents,

I am studying how classroom teachers teach physical education and your child's teacher has been chosen to participate in this project. Part of the study will be the videotaping of three physical education lessons taught by your child's teacher. Although the taping will center on the teacher, her students will be seen participating as they normally would in a lesson. May I have your permission to include your child in the class during the taping sessions?

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Prof. \_\_\_\_\_  
New Castle College

---

I give my permission to have my child participate in the class when it is being videotaped.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Parent or Guardian

APPENDIX E  
PERMISSION TO VIDEOTAPE TEACHER'S LESSON

**PERMISSION TO VIDEOTAPE  
A TEACHER'S PHYSICAL EDUCATION LESSON**

I grant permission to (Name) \_\_\_\_\_  
to record on videotape my lesson on \_\_\_\_\_, 198\_.  
The objective of the lesson will be \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_.

I understand that the videotaped lesson will not be  
used by anyone except the researcher, the person named  
above, and me and that it will be destroyed at the end of  
the study.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

APPENDIX F  
PERMISSION TO USE VIDEOTAPE FOR RESEARCH

**PERMISSION TO USE THE VIDEOTAPE  
OF A TEACHER'S PHYSICAL EDUCATION LESSON  
FOR THE PURPOSE OF STUDYING PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHING**

I grant permission to \_\_\_\_\_ to use the video-  
tape of a lesson that I taught on \_\_\_\_\_,  
198\_\_\_\_, for the purpose of studying physical education  
teaching. The objective of the lesson was \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_.

I understand that the recorded lesson will be destroyed  
at the completion of the research project and it will not be  
lent, given, or sold to anyone outside of the New Castle  
School system.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



APPENDIX G  
DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH PROJECT

### ORIENTATION INFORMATION TO SUBJECTS

This study is concerned with describing what classroom teachers know, practice, and believe about elementary physical education. You have completed a three-credit course in elementary physical education at \_\_\_\_\_ as part of your State Certification. There is a great deal of valuable information that can be obtained through follow-up studies of your progress during your first years of teaching. Therefore, this research purposes to describe the connections and disconnections of your physical education teaching with the \_\_\_\_\_ elementary physical education course.

This study will request your participation in the following: a) a series of three observations of you teaching a thirty-minute physical education lesson; these observations will be videotaped for analysis by an outside technician and will be scheduled at your convenience, b) Interview #1 conducted by an outside researcher which will take approximately one hour and will be audiotape recorded, c) completion of a brief questionnaire which will take approximately fifteen minutes and which will be completed on the same day as Interview #1, d) a second interview conducted by the researcher which will consist of open-ended questions based on the videotaped observations and Interview #1.

Individual anonymity is guaranteed to you for all

information gathered in this study. This guarantee will be stated in writing on an "Informed Consent Form" to be completed before any data are gathered. Interview and observational tapes will not include your name and the tapes will be destroyed after the study is completed. Information will be presented in the research without revealing the identity of the individual or schools involved.

APPENDIX H  
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO  
SCHOOL OF HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION & RECREATION

SCHOOL REVIEW COMMITTEE

INFORMED CONSENT FORM \*

I understand that the purpose of this study/project is

---

---

---

I confirm that my participation is entirely voluntary. No coercion of any kind has been used to obtain my cooperation.

I understand that I may withdraw my consent and terminate my participation at any time during the project.

I have been informed of the procedures that will be used in the project and understand what will be required of me as a subject.

I understand that all of my responses, written/oral/task, will remain completely anonymous.

I understand that a summary of the results of the project will be made available to me at the completion of the study if I so request.

I wish to give my voluntary cooperation as a participant.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Address

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\* Adopted from L. F. Locke and W. W. Spirduso. Proposals that Work. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1976, p. 237.

APPENDIX I  
INTERVIEW #1 QUESTIONS

**INTERVIEW #1 QUESTIONS**

1. Do you remember what you believed about elementary physical education before you took the LSPE 318 course?
2. Have these beliefs changed? If so, how?
3. Do you think children should have the right to make decisions about their learning? Do they have the ability?
4. Is physical education a means or an end?
5. What value do you place on physical education in comparison to other subject areas in the curriculum? Do you feel that there are other things that are more important? If so, what?
6. What does physical education for children mean?
7. What is the role of competition in elementary physical education?
8. As you get older, do you think the types of experiences that you plan in physical education will change?
9. How do you help children learn to move more effectively and efficiently?
10. Describe your typical physical education lesson.
11. Give me an overview of what you would do in physical education over a semester.
12. What do you do to help children learn?
13. How do you structure a physical education lesson?
14. On the days that the specialist does not meet with your class, what do you do for physical education?
15. Describe your role in a typical physical education lesson.
16. What is the role of development in motor learning?
17. How do you think children develop motor skills?
18. How do children learn in physical education?

19. Can children learn a motor skill even if it has no meaning to them?
20. Does experiencing error help or hinder children's capacity for learning?
21. What is essential for all children to learn in physical education?
22. What is a basic motor skill?
23. What is the strongest influencing factor that directs what you plan for your students in physical education?



APPENDIX J  
QUESTIONNAIRE

## QUESTIONNAIRE

Please choose the appropriate response or responses to the questions below. In the space provided, you may elaborate or clarify your answer.

### Part I. Personal Data

1. Age:

- |               |          |          |
|---------------|----------|----------|
| 1. 20-25      | 2. 26-30 | 3. 31-35 |
| 4. 36-40      | 5. 41-45 | 6. 46-50 |
| 7. 51 or over |          |          |

2. Sex:

- |         |           |
|---------|-----------|
| 1. Male | 2. Female |
|---------|-----------|

### Part II. Education

1. Undergraduate Degree:

- |         |         |          |          |
|---------|---------|----------|----------|
| 1. B.S. | 2. B.A. | 3. B.Ed. | 4. Other |
|---------|---------|----------|----------|

2. Undergraduate Major Area(s):

- |         |        |
|---------|--------|
| 1. NK-4 | 2. 4-8 |
|---------|--------|

3. Honors:

- |          |          |
|----------|----------|
| 1. _____ | 2. _____ |
| 3. _____ | 4. _____ |

4. Grade Point Average:

- |                |                |
|----------------|----------------|
| 1. 2.00 - 2.50 | 2. 2.60 - 3.00 |
| 3. 3.10 - 3.50 | 4. 3.60 - 4.00 |

5. How many years ago did you obtain your present certification?

- |      |      |      |      |
|------|------|------|------|
| 1. 1 | 2. 2 | 3. 3 | 4. 4 |
|------|------|------|------|

6. Was your student teaching experience in the elementary grades?

- |        |       |
|--------|-------|
| 1. Yes | 2. No |
|--------|-------|

7. Was teaching physical education a part of your student teaching experience?

1. Yes      2. No

Part III. Work-Related Data

1. Grade level currently teaching:

1. Kindergarten      2. 1st Grade      3. 2nd Grade  
4. 3rd Grade      5. 4th Grade      6. 5th Grade  
7. 6th Grade

2. Years of teaching experience:

1. 0 - 1      2. 2 - 3      3. 4 - 5  
4. 6 - 8      5. 9 - 12      6. 13 - 15

3. Which of the following best describes your school location?

1. Rural      2. Suburban      3. Urban      4. Other

4. Which of the following best describes your school environment?

1. Open      2. Traditional      3. Self-contained

5. Number of students in your class:

Boys: \_\_\_\_\_  
Girls: \_\_\_\_\_  
Total: \_\_\_\_\_

6. Is a teacher's guide for physical education provided at your school?

1. Yes      2. No

7. Are you alone responsible for teaching physical education?

1. Yes      2. No

8. If your answer to #7 was "No", who is responsible for teaching instructional physical education?

1. Physical education specialist      2. No one  
3. Other \_\_\_\_\_

9. What time is spent in instruction of physical education each week by your class?
1. Every day
  2. Four times
  3. Three times
  4. Two times
  5. Once a week
  6. None
10. How many minutes are spent in instruction of physical education each day?
1. 0 - 19
  2. 20 - 24
  3. 25 - 29
  4. 30 - 34
  5. 35 - 39
  6. 40 - 44
  7. 45 or more
11. How often do you have the help of a specialist in physical education who teaches at your school?
1. Every day
  2. Three times a week
  3. Twice a week
  4. Once a week
  5. Once every two weeks
  6. Once a month
12. How often do you have the help of a specialist or consultant in physical education from the central office staff?
1. Once a week
  2. Once every two weeks
  3. Once a month
  4. Once a semester
  5. Once a year
  6. Never
  7. Other \_\_\_\_\_
13. When are in-service programs in physical education presented?
1. Monthly
  2. Annually
  3. Bi-annually
  4. Other \_\_\_\_\_
  5. Never
14. How many times since you began teaching has an in-service program in physical education been presented?

15. Are in-service programs in physical education presented by:
1. Your school
  2. School system
  3. Area colleges' personnel
  4. State department of education
  5. Others \_\_\_\_\_
  6. None of the above
  7. Several of the above
16. Name the types of activities included in the in-service programs.
17. Name topics which have been included in the in-service programs.
18. What type of physical education space do you have available for instruction?
19. Do you think you have sufficient equipment to teach physical education?
1. Yes
  2. No
20. What type of equipment do you have?
1. Hoops
  2. Ropes
  3. Bats
  4. Sticks
  5. Different size balls
  6. Racquets
  7. Other \_\_\_\_\_
21. Do you have enough equipment so that you might give each child a piece of equipment?
1. Yes
  2. No

APPENDIX K  
COURSE OBJECTIVES

**OBJECTIVES****UNDERGRADUATE METHODS COURSE**

Each student should be able to:

1. comprehend the movement approach to elementary school physical education.
2. demonstrate insights into how children learn and develop motor skills.
3. formulate a philosophy about physical education for elementary school children relative to the contribution it could make to their educational experience and the long range goals it seeks to attain.
4. design the types of physical education experiences in games which are appropriate for elementary school children and consistent with your emerging philosophy.