

PEDAGOGY

“Like, We Don’t Want to Be PE Teachers:” Preservice Classroom Teachers’ Beliefs About Physical Education and Willingness to Incorporate Physical Activity

Jenny Mae Linker and Amelia Mays Woods

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine preservice elementary classroom teachers’ (PCTs) beliefs about physical education and their willingness to incorporate physical activity as they progressed through an undergraduate physical education methods course. This course focused on quality physical education as well as the classroom teacher’s role in school-wide physical activity and required participation in one of three laboratory experiences. Participants (33) completed either focus-group or individual interviews at the beginning and end of the course. Results indicated that PCTs’ beliefs about physical education positively evolved through the course and PCTs gained an appreciation for the subject. Despite this, PCTs strongly indicated that they are not willing to teach physical education lessons as future teachers. They are very willing, however, to incorporate physical activity into their classrooms.

Jenny Mae Linker is an assistant professor, Department of Health, Nutrition, and Exercise Sciences, North Dakota State University. Amelia Mays Woods is a professor, Department of Kinesiology and Community Health, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Please send author correspondence to jenny.linker@ndsu.edu

Physical education (PE) should be taught by a state-licensed or state-certified specialist endorsed to teach the subject (SHAPE America, 2015). Studies comparing PE specialists and nonspecialists have shown that specialists are more likely to use effective teaching strategies and avoid less effective strategies, have greater amounts of student physical activity (PA), select activities that are more appropriate, and spend more time on motor skill acquisition and fitness development (Faucette & Patterson, 1990; Patterson & Faucette, 1990; Placek & Randall, 1986; Siedentop, 2009). Despite this, the percentage of states requiring elementary PE teachers to have licensure or certification decreased from 82.4% in 2010 to 71.4% in 2016 (SHAPE America & Voices for Healthy Kids, 2016). According to the most recent *Shape of the Nation* report (SHAPE America, American Heart Association, & Voices for Healthy Kids, 2016), classroom generalists are also permitted to teach elementary PE in 31 states.

Beyond the possibility of having to teach PE, elementary classroom teachers (CTs) are called upon to be active participants in Comprehensive School Physical Activity Programs (CSPAPs) (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2013). Proponents of the national Let's Move! Active Schools (LMAS, 2015) initiative encourage CTs to engage students in PA within their classrooms as part of the Physical Activity During School component within a CSPAP. Classroom PA may take several forms including, but not limited to, brain boosts (formally known as brain breaks) and academic lessons that incorporate PA.

Given that many preservice elementary classroom teachers (PCTs) are assigned to teach PE during their careers, and given the more recent call to contribute to school-wide PA, it is important to consider their beliefs about these roles, as their beliefs may strongly influence their perceptions and judgments, and ultimately affect their behavior (Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992). Specifically, these beliefs may serve as their foundation when they are planning PE lessons or classroom physical activities.

Beliefs

Teachers often teach specific content based on the values they hold for that content (Pajares, 1992). According to Pajares (1992), values combine affect (feelings toward the content) and evaluation and can determine the amount of energy teachers allocate to specific

content as well as how they will expend that energy. The foundation of a person's belief system holds personal backgrounds and experiences. Beliefs are mostly stable and unlikely to change unless they are proven unsatisfactory through experiences that challenge them (Pajares, 1992; Prawat, 1992). Last, the earlier a belief structure is developed, the more difficult it becomes to alter (Pajares, 1992).

Past school experiences significantly affect teachers' attitudes and dispositions toward preservice education and teaching, and teacher educators often encounter resistance from students who have been "socialized" prior to entering a teacher education program (Doolittle, Dodds, & Placek, 1993; Hutchinson, 1993; Lortie, 1975; Schempp & Graber, 1993). Lortie (1975) surmised that teachers enter teacher education programs with strong beliefs, noting that they already know what is needed to teach, because they observed teachers as they progressed through their pretraining, also termed *apprenticeship of observation*. Most research has shown that these attitudes and beliefs can be so strong that they are often maintained throughout teacher preparation programs (Carney & Chedzoy, 1998; Doolittle et al., 1993; Lortie, 1975; Rovegno, 1993; Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1984), but other research indicates that these ideologies may be malleable. For example, teachers have reported changes in their beliefs as a result of field experiences (Clarke & Hubball, 2001; Curtner-Smith, 2007; Xiang, Lowry, & McBride, 2002).

Physical Education Experiences of CTs and PCTs

Both CTs and PCTs have had generally poor PE experiences (Allison, Pissanos, & Sakola, 1990; Clayton, 1999; Howarth, 1987; P. Morgan & Hansen, 2008b; Portman, 1996; Randall & Maeda, 2003). Teachers and curricula have been the most frequently cited influencing forces on these prior PE experiences and have often included inappropriate practices such as public fitness testing (Randall & Maeda, 2003), public selection of team members (Howarth, 1987), overemphasis of competition (Randall & Maeda, 2003), and reinforcement of stereotypes (Allison et al., 1990) in the classroom. Some CTs also recalled their teachers yelling, making the class stressful, and ignoring unskilled students (Randall & Maeda, 2003). Classroom generalists have identified PE curricula as lacking variety and being dominated by sports and games with little

emphasis on motor skill development (P. Morgan & Bourke, 2008; P. Morgan & Hansen, 2008b).

Studies conducted during the late 1980s and through the 1990s described CTs' generally negative attitudes toward PE, as well as toward PE teaching (Faucette, Nugent, Sallis, & McKenzie, 2002; Faucette & Patterson, 1989; Howarth, 1987). However, researchers reported more positive attitudes toward the subject in the 2000s (Barney & Deutsch, 2009; P. Morgan & Hansen, 2008b). Mixed perceptions of the value of PE have also been found among CTs, with some citing it as valuable and others not (DeCorby, Halas, Dixon, Winthrop, & Janzen, 2005; Faucette & Patterson, 1989; P. Morgan & Hansen, 2008a; Xiang et al., 2002).

PCTs' beliefs about PE and their experiences in PE methods courses have been understudied. Existing literature reports that PCTs have had mixed beliefs about PE prior to completing a PE methods course and more positive dispositions have occurred during these courses (Ashy & Humphries, 2000; Curtner-Smith, 2007; Xiang et al., 2002). At the conclusion of a methods course, Xiang et al. (2002) reported that positive beliefs about the value and purpose of elementary PE significantly increased, whereas negative beliefs significantly decreased among PCTs. At the end of the course when participants were asked whether they would like to teach elementary PE (if given the choice postgraduation) however, only 27.8% of the 97 participants were categorized by the researchers as "willing to teach it," whereas 55.7% were categorized as "unwilling." Some (13.4%) were categorized as willing to teach PE under conditional terms such as only for a little while, as part of the regular classroom schedule, or only if they could not find a job as a CT (Xiang et al., 2002). This study found a general unwillingness of preservice classroom generalists to teach PE, but it is important to consider that it is only one role CTs may take regarding PA in schools.

Given the newer perspective to prepare CTs to incorporate PA beyond teaching quality PE, instructors may choose to integrate LMAS and CSPAP content knowledge into undergraduate PE methods courses for PCTs. Therefore, the purpose of this study was two-fold: (a) to describe PCTs' beliefs about PE within a PE methods course that incorporated LMAS and CSPAP content, as well as how these beliefs differ across three laboratory experiences and (b) to

describe their willingness to incorporate PA as future classroom teachers.

Method

Research Setting

The study was conducted at a large Midwestern university where a 3-credit PE methods course is required for elementary education majors as part of the teacher certification program. This course consisted of a 2-hr lecture and one 2-hr laboratory each week for 14 weeks. The lecture was taught by one instructor, and a second instructor taught all three laboratory sections. Both instructors were doctoral candidates and PE teacher education specialists. The lecture instructor had taught laboratory sections of this course in previous semesters; this was her first semester teaching the lecture portion. The laboratory instructor had not previously taught the laboratory sections of the course. The investigators were not formally associated with the course.

The lecture portion of the course addressed the benefits of PA, characteristics of quality PE, appropriate and inappropriate practices, motor skills and concepts, and lesson planning. In addition, the instructor also incorporated LMAS, CSPAPs, and the role of the CT in elementary PE. Brain boosts were incorporated regularly throughout the 2-hr lectures.

During the laboratory experience, all students participated in elementary PE lessons designed by the instructor and were exposed to the same PE content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge. Laboratories were altered in only one aspect to reflect three application conditions. The laboratory conditions were *teaching children*, *peer-teaching*, and *no teaching*. Participants registered for one of the three laboratory sections prior to the start of the study and were not aware of the condition assigned to their laboratory section prior to enrolling. Participants remained in the same laboratory section for all 14 weeks of the course.

In the *teaching children* condition, participants cotaught small groups of children and were responsible for planning and implementing a minimum of eight instant activities (activities used at the beginning of a class as a warm-up or review of skills) and two 30-min lessons. The children were ages 8 and 9 years and enrolled in an

on-campus after-school PA program. In the *peer-teaching* condition, each pair of students taught a small group of their peers a minimum of eight instant activities and two 30-min lessons. In the *no teaching* condition, students did not participate in teaching during the semester. Instead, they spent their laboratory experiences discussing eight instant activities and two 30-min lessons with peers. All students gave and received peer feedback on their planned activities.

Recruitment and Participants

After institutional review board approval was granted, all elementary education undergraduates enrolled in an undergraduate PE methods course for CTs were invited to partake in the study on the first day of lecture. Sixty-six PCTs were recruited, and from this pool, six were randomly selected from each laboratory to partake in the focus group interviews (18 total) and five were randomly selected from each laboratory to partake in individual interviews (15 total). Of the 33 participants, three were male and 30 were female.

Data Collection

Focus group interviews and individual interviews were conducted during the first and last weeks of the course during laboratory time. Interviews were audio recorded and transcribed. Participants were assigned pseudonyms to maintain anonymity.

Focus group interviews. Focus groups are useful in preliminary and follow-up evaluations and for hearing participants' experiences with a program (D. Morgan, 2008). They create an opportunity for participants to engage in thoughtful conversations about the topics of interest to themselves and the researchers. The same interview guide was used for the initial and final focus group interviews with slight modifications in grammar to reflect the time at which the interview was conducted. According to Patton (2002), the "same questions need to be asked in the same way" (p. 346), for a researcher to compare answers across different times. Special attention was directed toward the topics that consistently generated high levels of interest from most participants (D. Morgan, 2008).

Group interviews consisted of six participants from the same laboratory and occurred during the regularly scheduled laboratory time. Interviews occurred in a classroom within the same building as the laboratory and circular seating was employed. At the start of

each focus group interview, one of the researchers welcomed the participants, provided them with an overview of the discussion topics, explained the ground rules, and addressed participant questions before asking the first interview question. Initial focus group interviews ranged from 20 to 23 min, and those at the end of the course were 20 to 35 min in length. Participants were not required to answer all questions during the interviews.

Individual semistructured interviews. Semistructured interviews allow researchers flexibility to explore previously unanticipated topics of interest while keeping the core interview questions standardized (Patton, 2002). The semistructured interview guide began with general questions and progressively focused on specific research topics. The last question for each interview was, as recommended by Roulston (2008), “are there any additional comments you would like to make in regards to your experiences in the course this semester” (p. 582). Pre- and postinterviews consisted of the same open-ended questions (Patton, 2002). Additionally, the researcher expanded one question to accommodate emerging themes. During the initial interviews, all participants expressed an interest in implementing movement. To follow up on this theme, the researcher not only asked participants the extent to which they planned to use movement in their future careers, but also specifically how (movement breaks, interdisciplinary lessons, or complete PE lessons) and why, during the postinterviews.

Individual interviews were conducted during the regularly scheduled laboratory time in a classroom within the same building as the laboratory. Prior to commencing each interview, the researcher provided an overview of the interview topics and protocol and addressed participants’ questions. Individual preinterviews were 10 to 13 min in length and postinterviews were 12 to 22 min long. Participants were not required to answer all questions during the interviews.

Data Analysis

The researcher read all focus group and individual interview transcripts three times prior to organizing responses by question and data collection point. Both data sources were then analyzed inductively. Within each type of data, the first stage was open coding of responses, for the researcher to identify as many ideas and con-

cepts as possible without concern for how they relate (Benaquisto, 2008). Through open coding of the data, constructs such as categories, statements of relationship, and generalizations were developed. Triangulation of themes and codes occurred through cross-data validity checks among the focus group and individual interview data. The researcher generated final codes and created a coding frame to define key concepts, their definitions, and criteria for recognition in the coding for each data source. The researcher adjusted these coding frames as needed to accommodate data that presented during the use of the constant comparison method (Patton, 2002).

To enhance the integrity of the qualitative analyses, the researcher employed several strategies. First, using the constant comparison method, the researcher purposely sought out negative cases that differed from working theories, to help protect against researcher bias in how data were seen and reported (Brodsky, 2008). Second, written memos were used to describe thinking processes during analysis. Memoing contributes to the credibility and trustworthiness of qualitative research, and there are no rules regarding writing, grammar, or style; however, each entry should be dated and referenced. Last, at the conclusion of the inductive analyses, a kinesiology, pedagogy doctoral candidate conducted an external audit. The auditor read all focus group and interview transcripts, formulated her own themes, and compared them to those of the investigators. Discrepancies in findings were not indicated.

Results

Results are represented through two major themes. The first theme describes participants' evolution of beliefs about PE through the methods course. The second theme describes the venues in which they are willing to incorporate PA as future CTs and their reasoning for incorporating it. Participants' quotes include the laboratory section enrolled (*no teaching, peer-teaching, or teaching children*) and indicate if they occurred in a focus group interview (FG) or individual interview (II). Last, pseudonyms have been used and all participant quotes have been reported verbatim with grammar errors intact.

Appreciation of Physical Education and Changed Beliefs

Participants expressed a change in their perceptions of PE across all of the laboratory experiences. This change in perception was based on an increased awareness of PE and its national standards and outcomes, as well as an understanding of the requirements necessary to teach quality PE. Participants acknowledged that contemporary PE is different from what they experienced when they were children, is not easy to teach, and is an important subject. Last, the PCTs credited their learning experiences in the lecture portion of the methods course for their changed perspectives.

Today's physical education is different. Participants made frequent comparisons between the knowledge gained through the course and their own PE experiences. Kara stated,

I just see how bad my physical education was when I was younger. We would just play games all day and it was a free for all. I don't know, it's just more structured, and we didn't know what instant activities were until this. (*no teaching*, II)

Similar to Kara, others also mentioned a lack of structure in their learning. Amy stated,

I think in general it [the course] gave me an idea of what P.E. is. We taught things that I was never taught when I was younger. We just played games. I mean, I remember learning how to bowl, or jump-rope, but never cue by cue. (*peer-teaching*, FG)

Additionally, participants cited specific inappropriate activities or games that were played in their past PE classes: "When I was little, we still played dodgeball and kickball and these days you're not supposed to be doing that" (Claire, *teaching children*, II). These comparisons revealed inadequacies and inappropriate practices in the participants' PE programs and allowed participants to recognize that past experiences may not have been appropriate models of PE.

It is not easy to be a PE teacher. At the end of the course, the PCTs conveyed an appreciation for PE and those who teach the subject. Their statements communicated recognition of the legitimacy of PE:

If a person really wants to be an effective P.E. teacher there is a lot to learn and a lot of resources out there. You can't just sit

around and be like, “oh, we’re gonna play tag for the whole period.” You have to plan things out. You have to have the national standards and you have to have a goal to teach the students. (Lauren, *teaching children*, II)

Participants also acknowledged the challenges in teaching the subject:

I definitely look at it in a different way. It isn’t just a joke job, it’s definitely just as hard as being a classroom teacher, if not harder, because of all the stuff I never thought of. Like they don’t have a classroom, they have a little office in the gym, they teach way more students, they sometimes don’t have the right equipment. So yeah, it’s definitely opened my eyes. (Melissa, *no teaching*, II)

It appears the PCTs’ impression of PE evolved from a “roll out the ball” perspective to a perspective that the subject requires preparation and planning with aims to achieve its own set of student learning outcomes. In addition, the PCTs understood that to achieve this perspective of PE successfully, physical educators must be dedicated to this goal and capable of overcoming challenges not faced in the regular classroom.

Physical education is essential to a child’s education. By the end of the semester, the PCTs expressed changes in their beliefs regarding the importance of PE and concluded that it was “essential to a child’s education.” Ashley verbalized,

I’ll admit I used to think academics was more important than P.E., but I realize that P.E. is essential to a child’s education. It influences everything else. Our kids have to be healthy. I do respect P.E. teachers more now. (*peer-teaching*, FG)

Michael affirmed this and emphasized the long-lasting impact elementary PE may have on a child’s health:

There’s a lot of interesting facts about obesity, and just statistics. I never really thought that elementary P.E. would be so necessary for students and for people in general. ‘Cuz that’s when they’re kids, that’s where everything starts

forming and happening. So if we get them there, then they'll start young. (*teaching children*, II)

For others, the reason for mandating a PE methods course in the curriculum for the elementary education major became more apparent:

It never occurred to me before that you could have movement in a classroom; you don't just have to sit in a desk all day. Before I was wondering why they were making us take this class, like "we don't want to be P.E. teachers," but now I see how beneficial it is. (Anne, *peer-teaching*, FG)

Overall, participants recognized the importance of PE and its ability to influence children's well-being positively.

Lecture primarily facilitated participants' changed beliefs. When participants were asked to indicate which portion of the course had the greatest overall impact on their learning, most indicated the lecture. Additionally, strong affirmation responses were noted from participants across all laboratory sections when asked about the extent to which the lecture portion of the course influenced their thoughts and feelings regarding PE. Aspects of lecture most cited for influencing their overall perceptions were obesity statistics, "Hall of Shame" articles (Williams, 1992, 1994, 1996) and discussions, and research associated with the importance of PA:

Some of the stats that we looked at were really shocking about obesity and children who are overweight. I never thought about PE even though I'm in the education program but it never hit me - maybe I have some responsibility for teaching children about physical activity and stuff. (Jenna, *peer-teaching*, FG)

Adrienne discussed content from the "Hall of Shame" articles:

I never realized games like dodgeball or elimination games were that bad. I just kind of played them. I never really thought about the whole aspect of someone getting eliminated, which is a bad thing or having humans as targets. I just thought of them as part of the game. (*teaching children*, FG)

Last, Andrea cited research on PA, “Probably lecture again, because we talked about why it was important and what would happen if we didn’t have P.E., and the importance of 60 minutes a day” (*peer-teaching*, II). Lecture components regarding the obesity pandemic, inappropriate curriculum, and PA research were presented during the first two weeks of the course. It is apparent that these components resonated with the PCTs and affected their beliefs about PE.

I’m Willing to Implement Movement in My Classroom

The second major theme describes PCTs’ willingness to teach PE lessons and incorporate PA into the classroom. At the conclusion of the course, the PCTs overwhelmingly expressed their unwillingness to teach full PE lessons in their future careers and often explained that they “did not want to be a physical education teacher.” For example, Quinn stated, “I would never want to teach P.E.” (*peer-teaching*, II). Shannon exemplified this theme, but conveyed her interest in understanding schools’ PE programs: “So it’s something. I want to be a classroom teacher, not a physical education teacher. But at the same time, I’m gonna want to know what they are doing in there and incorporate activities into my classroom” (*peer-teaching*, II). It is important to note that the course lecturer had informed the PCTs that they might be required to teach complete PE lessons to their future students. To support this notion, she cited one of the university’s hometown school districts where there are no elementary PE specialists. The potential future responsibility of having to teach PE did not seem to influence their willingness to do so.

Although the preservice teachers did not indicate a willingness to teach PE lessons, they unanimously reported that they were willing to implement movement activities within their future classrooms, during pre- and postinterviews (23 responded affirmatively to this question in preinterviews and 29 during postinterviews). During postinterviews, participants were asked to predict how this implementation would occur, either in the form of movement breaks, interdisciplinary lessons, or complete PE lessons. Of these 29 respondents, only three indicated that they would integrate all three forms of movement implementations. Overall, participants were more willing to implement movement within the classroom learning environment; 11 indicated movement breaks and interdisciplin-

ary lessons, nine indicated movement breaks only, and six indicated interdisciplinary lessons only. Examples of PCTs' responses are as follows: "I'm planning on doing movement breaks. Even during lecture, you need that three minutes to jump around and laugh" (Anne, *peer-teaching*, FG). Andrea and Lauren reported,

I'd probably use movement breaks the most, it's the easiest and most practical thing to do. But if there was a lesson plan that I thought would help a certain subject, like getting them outside, it would help because they get more excited and focus more. The issue is getting something practical to do. (Andrea, *peer-teaching*, II)

If I was able to, I would like to take the kids and go outside and do things too. If I could, if the school allowed me to do like 30 minutes outside. If they didn't have P.E. and the school allowed me to do 30 minutes outside, I would do that and take advantage of that. So yeah, I would. (Lauren, *teaching children*, II)

The law of conservation of energy applies to the classroom. The law of conservation of energy states that the amount of energy in a system remains constant over time. This energy may change forms but cannot be created nor destroyed. The PCTs in this study saw movement as a way to regulate the balance of energy within the classroom. This subtheme did not change over the semester as evidenced by pre- and postinterview data. At the beginning of the semester, 20 participants cited the benefit of balancing student energy levels as their primary motivation to implement PA in their future classrooms, and 26 did so at the end of the semester.

Using PA to balance student energy was split fairly evenly between the purposes of "energizing" and "de-energizing" students. PCTs were drawn to movement's ability to energize their students when they seemed mentally tired. Kevin stated,

Yeah, I plan on doing the movement breaks like we do in lecture. They are a great idea I think. That's the kind of I thing I would do just in the middle of the day, when I see kids are dragging; just get up and have kids do something fun like she has us do. (*peer-teaching*, II)

Other participants cited movement as a way to “de-energize” students who were being “antsy” or “squirrely”:

I know the kids I’ve worked with, first graders, they are just so “antsy.” All the little boys, and even the girls, just want to get out and they’re always asking to go to the bathroom so they can walk around and they’re asking to go sharpen their pencil because they just need to get out of their seat. (Hilarie, *teaching children*, II)

It’s important for them to have a movement break so then they can calm down and pay attention and learn. Whereas, if I wouldn’t give them time to play, they’d be all “squirrely” and not listening. Yeah, kids need space. Kids need to move. (Kayla, *no teaching*, II)

The majority of the PCTs indicated balancing student energy as the primary benefit of movement implementation, but other reasons were also reported. Ten participants acknowledged the ability of movement to facilitate motivation for other subject content, during the postinterviews (compared to three during the preinterviews). Meg explained,

For the research article, I did a research article on interdisciplinary lessons. They are really helpful for the kids, they are motivated so much more and they are able to connect abstract ideas so much more if they combine two things, especially with movement. (Meg, *teaching children*, II)

Some participants (four preinterview and eight postinterview) also reported their enjoyment of participating in movement breaks when they were children and/or during the lecture portion of the current course as a reason to implement movement into their future classrooms: “I think it’s kind of cool. Even when we were in lecture we would do those little instant activities or movement breaks. I just thought that was fun and it kind of made class seem more exciting” (Stephanie, *peer-teaching*, II).

At the end of the course, PCTs rarely mentioned children’s physical health as a reason why they would incorporate PA in their future classrooms. This was unexpected given that the topic of childhood

obesity was thoroughly discussed in the course, and participants clearly expressed a concern for the obesity pandemic. Ashley was one of these anomalies: “You’re moving but you’re also having fun at the same time, so you don’t even know that you’re moving. You’re doing something good for your body, but you’re also enjoying yourself” (*teaching children*, FG).

Summary

PCTs’ beliefs about PE evolved as they progressed through the methods course. Participants identified differences between how quality elementary PE was described in lecture and how they experienced PE when they were children. By the end of the course, participants had developed an appreciation for quality PE and concluded that it played an important role in the development of children. Last, although some participants cited the laboratory portion as having a greater impact on their learning experiences and beliefs about PE, the majority cited the lecture portion of the course as the primary influencer.

Participants in this study overwhelmingly indicated that they did not want to teach PE lessons, but were interested and willing to incorporate PA into their future classrooms. Most stated that they would do so through the use of brain boosts and interdisciplinary lessons. Furthermore, when asked to explain why they would incorporate movement in their future classrooms, PCTs most often discussed using PA to energize and de-energize students.

Discussion

The results of this study corroborate earlier findings that a PE methods course can positively affect PCTs’ dispositions toward PE (Ashy & Humphries, 2000; Curtner-Smith, 2007; Xiang et al., 2002). Similar to elementary education majors in Ashy and Humphries’ work (2000), PCTs in this study displayed an appreciation for PE and recognized the difficulties and challenges in teaching it. PCTs in this study credited the lecture portion of the course as being the most influential regarding their learning and beliefs about PE, as opposed to hands-on experiences during the laboratory. This differs from the study by Xiang et al. (2002), in which participants ranked teaching PE in an elementary school and observing PE classes as the two most influential components of a course of this type. This difference may

be due to the scope of content and varying instructional strategies included in each respective course.

This study extends work by Xiang et al. (2002), by reporting on PCTs' willingness to incorporate PA beyond traditional PE lessons. Similar to the preservice teachers in Xiang et al.'s study, PCTs in this study did not express a willingness to teach PE lessons. Participants indicated, however, that they were willing to incorporate PA in their future classrooms in the form of brain boosts and interdisciplinary lessons. This is encouraging for the LMAS movement, which calls upon CTs to contribute to school-wide PA efforts.

PCTs primarily viewed student movement as a way of energizing students who were tired or bored, yet as a strategy to calm and settle students who were "antsy" or "squirrely." The valuable health benefits of PA were seldom provided as a reason to integrate movement into children's classroom experiences. This was surprising given that participants cited obesity statistics and PA research as influential agents of change regarding their beliefs about PE. Research on teacher concerns may help explain why these preservice teachers rarely mentioned positive health benefits as a reason to incorporate PA in the classroom. Teachers experience varying concerns as they progress through their careers, migrating from initial self related, to task related, and then to student related (Fuller, 1969; Fuller & Brown, 1975). Ashy and Humphries (2000) found that management (with a focus on student behavior) was the single most important issue of concern in a PE methods course for PCTs. Thus, because preservice teachers are likely preoccupied with self- and task-related concerns, rather than student-related concerns, it seems logical that they more frequently cited the use of PA to manage student behavior than the use of PA to improve student health.

Faculty offering a PE methods course for PCTs already face difficult curricular choices given their limited time with this group. Findings by Xiang et al. (2002) and this study raise the question of whether limited instructional time is best used to teach future generalists how to plan and conduct full PE lessons, when they have little to no desire to do so in the future. Alternatively, their interest and willingness to incorporate PA in the classroom may be left uncapped-

ized if not specifically addressed and developed. The results of this study support Hall, Little, and Heidron's (2013) proposed foci shift in these methods courses to one that seeks out the classroom professional as a partner in school-wide PA. Webster, Erwin, and Parks (2013) studied PCTs in a methods course with this particular foci and found, similar to this study, that PCTS are generally willing to integrate PA at the onset of these types of courses and that the number willing to do so increased at course completion.

To accommodate both perspectives, initial undergraduate courses for PCTs could address the role of CTs in a CSPAP and provide these students with elementary classroom field experiences in which they would implement physical activities such brain boosts and interdisciplinary lessons. These courses should still address the importance of quality PE and its characteristics, the distinction between PA and PE, motor skills and developmentally appropriate activities, and inappropriate and appropriate practices. Guiding CTs in how to plan and facilitate PE lessons may be best reserved for graduate-level courses or continuing education classes. Those charged with the responsibility of teaching the subject may be more invested to further develop their PE content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge at this level. As established CTs, they may feel more comfortable than preservice teachers to expand the range of subjects they teach.

Additional research should continue to examine PCTs beliefs about PE and intentions to teach PE and incorporate PA in their future classrooms, as well as describe their experiences in these types of undergraduate courses. Research of this kind would help the profession establish guidelines regarding the foci of these types of methods courses. Future research should also employ methodology that allows for empirical comparisons of instructional strategies used in these courses. Additionally, a longitudinal approach to study the effects of methods courses on PCTs as they transition to and through their first several years of teaching is recommended. Studies of this type would inform faculty as to which instructional strategies produce long-lasting effects and help them optimize their limited time with this group.

References

- Allison, P. C., Pissanos, B. W., & Sakola, S. P. (1990). Physical education revisited – The institutional biographies of preservice classroom teachers. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 61(5), 76–79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.1990.10604524>
- Ashy, M., & Humphries, C. A. (2000). “Don’t use balloons on windy days”: Elementary education majors’ perceptions of teaching physical education. *Action in Teacher Education*, 22(1), 59–71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2000.10462993>
- Barney, D., & Deutsch, J. (2009). Elementary classroom teachers’ attitudes and perspectives of elementary physical education. *The Physical Educator*, 66, 114–123.
- Benaquisto, L. (2008). Axial coding. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (Vol. 1, pp. 51–52). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412963909.n30>
- Brodsky, A. E. (2008). Negative case analysis. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (Vol. 2, p. 552). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412963909.n30>
- Carney, C., & Chedzoy, S. (1998). Primary student teacher prior experiences and their relationship to estimated competence to teach the national curriculum for physical education. *Sport, Education, and Society*, 3(1), 19–36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1357332980030102>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2013). *Comprehensive School Physical Activity Programs: A guide for schools*. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Clarke, A., & Hubball, H. (2001). Physical education methods course as an immersion experience in an elementary school setting. *Avante*, 7(2), 11–27.
- Clayton, L. B. (1999). Preservice elementary classroom teachers’ perceptions of past movement experiences: Physical education experiences compared to recreation or athletics experiences [Abstract]. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 70(Suppl. 1), A-82.

- Curtner-Smith, M. D. (2007). The impact of a critically oriented physical education teacher education course on preservice classroom teachers. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 26, 35–56. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.26.1.35>
- DeCorby, K., Halas, J., Dixon, S., Winthrop, L., & Janzen, H. (2005). Classroom teachers and the challenges of delivering quality physical education. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 98, 208–220. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JOER.98.4.208-221>
- Doolittle, S. A., Dodds, P., & Placek, J. H. (1993). Persistence of beliefs about teaching during formal training of preservice teachers. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 12, 355–365. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.12.4.355>
- Faucette, N., Nugent, P., Sallis, J. F., & McKenzie, T. L. (2002). “I’d rather chew aluminum foil”: Overcoming classroom teachers’ resistance to teaching physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 21, 287–308. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.21.3.287>
- Faucette, N., & Patterson, P. (1989). Classroom teachers and physical education: What they are doing and how they feel about it. *Education*, 110, 108–115.
- Faucette, N., & Patterson, P. (1990). Comparing teaching behaviors and student activity levels in classes taught by P.E. specialists versus nonspecialists. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 9, 106–114. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.9.2.106>
- Fuller, F. F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. *American Educational Research Journal*, 6, 207–226. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312006002207>
- Fuller, F., & Brown, O. H. (1975). Becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (Ed.), *Teacher education: The seventy-fourth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, part II* (pp. 25–52). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Hall, T. J., Little, S., & Heidron, B. D. (2013). Preparing classroom teachers to meet students’ physical activity needs. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance*, 82(3), 40–52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2011.10598596>
- Howarth, K. (1987). Initial training in primary physical education – No substitute for team-work. *British Journal of Physical Education*, 18(4), 152–155.

- Hutchingson, G. E. (1993). Prospective teachers' perspectives on teaching physical education: An interview study on the recruitment phase of teacher socialization. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 12*, 344–354. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.12.4.344>
- Let's Move! Active Schools. (2015). *Roadmap for creating an active school*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Morgan, D. L. (2008). Focus groups. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (Vol. 1, pp. 352–354). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412963909.n30>
- Morgan, P., & Bourke, S. (2008). Non-specialist teachers' confidence to teach PE: The nature and influence of personal school experiences in PE. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 13*, 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17408980701345550>
- Morgan, P. J., & Hansen, V. (2008a). Classroom teachers' perceptions of the impact of barriers to teaching physical education on the quality of physical education programs. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 79*, 506–516. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2008.10599517>
- Morgan, P. J., & Hansen, V. (2008b). The relationship between PE biographies and PE teaching practices of classroom teachers. *Sport, Education, and Society, 13*, 373–391. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573320802444994>
- Nespor, J. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 19*, 317–328. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0022027870190403>
- Pajares, F. M. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research, 62*, 307–332. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543062003307>
- Patterson, P., & Faucette, N. (1990). Children's attitudes towards physical activity in classes taught by specialist versus nonspecialist P.E. teachers. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 9*, 324–331. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.9.4.324>
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Placek, J., & Randall, L. (1986). Comparison of academic learning time in physical education: Students of specialists and nonspecialists. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 5, 157–165. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.5.3.157>
- Portman, P. A. (1996). Preservice elementary education majors beliefs about their elementary physical education classes (Pt. 1). *Indiana Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance Journal*, 25(2), 25–28.
- Prawat, R. S. (1992). Teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning: A constructivist perspective. *American Journal of Education*, 100, 354–395. <https://doi.org/10.1086/444021>
- Randall, L. M., & Maeda, J. K. (2003). Eastern Canadian and Hawaiian pre-service elementary generalist teachers' past experiences in elementary physical education and considerations for teacher education. *Avante*, 9(2), 1–7.
- Rovegno, I. (1993). Content-knowledge acquisition during undergraduate teacher education: Overcoming cultural templates and learning through practice. *American Educational Research Journal*, 30, 611–642. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312030003611>
- Roulston, K. J. (2008). Open-ended question. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (Vol. 2, p. 582). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412963909.n30>
- Schempp, P. G., & Graber, K. C. (1992). Teacher socialization from a dialectical perspective: Pretraining through induction. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 11, 329–348. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.11.4.329>
- SHAPE America. (2015). *The essential components of physical education*. Reston, VA: Author.
- SHAPE America, American Heart Association, & Voices for Healthy Kids. (2016). *Shape of the nation: Status of physical education in the USA*. Retrieved from https://www.shapeamerica.org/advocacy/son/2016/upload/Shape-of-the-Nation-2016_web.pdf
- SHAPE America & Voices for Healthy Kids. (2016). *2016 shape of the nation report: Status of physical education in the USA*. Reston, VA: SHAPE America.

- Siedentop, D. (2009). National plan for physical activity: Education sector. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 6(Suppl. 2), S168–S180. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jpah.6.s2.s168>
- Tabachnick, B. R., & Zeichner, K. M. (1984). The impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teacher perspectives. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(6), 28–36. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002248718403500608>
- Webster, C. A., Erwin, H., & Parks, M. (2013). Relationships between and changes in pre-service classroom teachers' efficacy beliefs, willingness to integrate movement, and perceived barriers to movement integration. *The Physical Educator*, 70, 314–335.
- Williams, N. F. (1992). The physical education Hall of Shame. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance*, 63(6), 57–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.1992.10606620>
- Williams, N. F. (1994). The physical education Hall of Shame, part II. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance*, 65(2), 17–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.1994.10606848>
- Williams, N. F. (1996). The physical education Hall of Shame: Part III: Inappropriate teaching practices. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance*, 67(8), 45–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.1996.10604838>
- Xiang, P., Lowry, S., & McBride, R. (2002). The impact of a field-based elementary physical education methods course on preservice classroom teachers' beliefs. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 21, 145–161. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.21.2.145>