

Field : Sport Sciences

Type : Review Article

Received: 11.09.2015 - Accepted: 13.11.2015

Reform in Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE): A Critical Inquiry for the Future¹

Ferman KONUKMAN

Assist. Prof. Dr., College of Arts and Sciences, Sport Science Program, Qatar University, QATAR

Email: fkonukman@qu.edu.qa

Abstract

Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) programs should connect to reality of school life with collaborative and innovative efforts to improve quality of school physical education programs. Undergraduate physical education programs in the United States have changed considerably during the past two decades. One of the main changes was the expansion of non-teaching majors (Zeigler, 1988). The reform of undergraduate physical education programs from single track to multiple was a result of changing employment patterns of students in the programs. Thus, physical education programs in the United States have begun to prepare students in different careers (McBride, 1984). On the other hand, There is an argument over subject matter of physical education being closely aligned to sport, games, and fitness activities that physical education should focus on sub-disciplines (i.e. biomechanics, exercise physiology) (Corbin & Eckert, 1990). Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to analyze these different approaches in reforming PETE programs with a critical inquiry for the future.

Keywords: Physical Education, Teacher Education, Reform

¹ This submission is the paper portion of the keynote speech that Dr. Ferman Konukman delivered at the Fourth International Conference on Science Culture and Sports that is affiliated with the International Science Culture and Sports Association (ISCSA) from 22-26, May 2015 in Ohrid, Macedonia

Introduction

"Those who can, do. Those who can't, teach. Those who can't teach, teach physical education" Woody Allen

The crisis in public education manifested itself at the beginning of 1980s, followed by the publication of "A Nation at Risk" (1983), a report that became a turning point. It was sad that this report questioned the place of physical education courses in the school curriculum and suggested that school boards include more academic subjects in course requirements instead of physical education and other arts and music subjects.

Graham (1990) reviewed school physical education programs in the United States and reported improvements in elementary school physical education programs. A wide variety of activities rather than fitness and skill, on the other hand, were emphasized in middle school physical education. In high schools, on the contrary, he reported unsatisfactory physical education programs. In addition, Rink (1993) suggested that there were five reasons for the problems in middle school physical education programs:

1. Failure of the profession to improve the goals of the physical education programs in schools.
2. Failure of state and school districts due to low expectations for physical education programs as well as less accountability for holding teachers responsible to have quality programs.
3. Failure of teachers to behave professionally.
4. Failure of physical education teacher preparation programs to prepare teachers for the reality of the world and support the teachers in the school system.
5. Reality of the life conditions beyond the control of teacher preparation programs such as lack of funding and equipment, and large class size.

After all these years, in recent research studies there is an evidence of engaging in moderate level physical activity. The research also supports many benefits of physical activity. However, research has shown that physical activities of youngsters begin to decrease at age of 12 and 21. As a result of this, The National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion (1997) strongly recommended that physical education that emphasizes variety of activities and enjoyable participation in physical activity helps students maintain healthy, active life styles. It is quite sad to see Woody Allen, one of the famous and "intellectual" actors of our time, claimed in the above quote from Dr. Graham's book *Teaching Children Physical Education* (2008), that physical education is done by those who "can't teach." Recently, Standard of Learning (SOL) reform efforts in several states are putting an emphasis on academic subject matters such as reading and math by removing physical education and art courses. It is possible to anticipate that the trend "schools without PE" may lead an unhealthy youth population for the sake of academic subjects in the near future. In brief, there is a need for reform in physical education teacher education programs (PETE) due to the facts I mentioned above. PETE programs should connect to reality of school life with collaborative and innovative efforts to improve quality of school physical education programs.

Changing Physical Education Programs

Undergraduate physical education programs in the United States have changed considerably during the past two decades. One of the main changes was the expansion of non-teaching majors (Zeigler, 1988). The reform of undergraduate physical education programs from single track to multiple was a result of changing employment patterns of students in the programs. Thus, physical education programs in the United States have begun to prepare students in different careers (McBride, 1984).

Newell (1990) stated that developing trends in academic discipline of physical activity caused dramatic changes in physical education programs. In addition to this, Sage (1987) pointed that the movement of making physical education an academic discipline was the main reason of having multiple-track in the field instead of a single-track program. However, it is important to realize that these changes were not related with reform of teacher preparation programs. On the other hand, change in physical education teacher education programs can be explained in two ways as conceptual orientations and theoretical perspectives (Bain, 1990; Rink, 1993a).

On the other hand, There is an argument over subject matter of physical education being closely aligned to sport, games, and fitness activities that physical education should focus on sub-disciplines (i.e. biomechanics, exercise physiology) (Corbin & Eckert, 1990). Wiegand, Bulger & Mohr (2004) stated that there are curricular issues in physical education such as foundational courses, time spent in pedagogical content knowledge and the best order of curriculum in the programs. Siedentop (1991) emphasized the importance of pedagogical knowledge and stated that all failures of bad teaching come from a lack of pedagogical knowledge, not from the inadequate subject matter knowledge. Besides, teacher educators contributed to development of pedagogical content knowledge that emphasized both pedagogical formation and knowledge base (Griffey & Housner, 1991).

Conceptual Orientations

Using Feiman-Nemser (1990) conceptual orientations framework, Rink (1993b) adopted and applied these orientations to physical education teacher education programs. In this analysis five different conceptual orientations to physical education teacher education were identified. These are:

- a) *An academic orientation*: a focus on the subject matter of games, dance, sport, and, fitness.
- b) *A practical orientation*: an emphasis on early field experience and practice.
- c) *A technological orientation*: a focus on teacher effectiveness skills and research based teaching skill development.
- d) *A personal orientation*: emphasis on individualized, nurturing, personal meaning based orientation to growth as a teacher.
- e) *A critical/social orientation*: a focus on moral basis of teaching and equity issues of schooling.

Rink (1993b) suggested that these conceptual orientations "can and do coexist in different aspects of the same program and perhaps should all be a consideration in program design".

Moreover, she stated that the lack of affiliation with a strong orientation might result in program deficiencies.

In my opinion, these orientations provide a strong framework for change/reform in PETE and may have a positive impact on programs. Teaching and learning environment is dynamic, and always changing due to the contextual factors. Therefore, it is better to have some of these orientations in the same teacher education programs to provide broader perspective for teacher preparation.

Theoretical Perspectives

According to Bain (1990) changes in PETE programs can be derived from three theoretical positions. These are:

a) *Behavioral analysis perspective*: This perspective reflects a natural science tradition within physical education programs. Behavior analysis shares the assumptions of causality and determinism that seeks to find generalizations about human behavior. The main goal of this tradition is to determine procedures for developing effective programs for teachers (Siedentop, 1986).

b) *The occupational socialization perspective*: This perspective emerged in the early 1980s. Occupational socialization includes all kinds of socialization consequences that initially affect teacher candidates to enter the field of teaching physical education. It also includes perceptions of teachers and actions as teacher educators (Lawson, 1986, 1988; Templin & Shemp, 1989).

c) *Critical theory perspective*: This perspective views research as political and tied to issues of power and legitimacy. This paradigm seeks to understand contextual constraints such as racism, sexism, social and political implications. (Bain, 1989; Bain & Jewet, 1987).

Similar to conceptual orientations, these theoretical perspectives provided diverse frameworks for PETE programs. These perspectives can be used in different teacher education courses simultaneously to achieve diverse objectives.

The Influence of Standards

Nowadays, The National Council for Accreditation (NCATE) has an important power on content and accreditation of teacher preparation programs. National standards became an essential tool of teacher preparation program assessment in many ways. NCATE has an impact on state-based approval programs in teacher education. As a result of this trend, National Association for Physical Education (NASPE) developed a task force in 1992 to establish National Standards in physical education as a subject matter. In 1995, NASPE published a general description of content standards by grade level and variety of techniques for assessing student achievement. *Moving into the future, National standards for physical education: A guide to content and assessment* (1995) is no longer a mandatory curriculum but a guideline for quality physical education practice in schools. NASPE standards are required by NCATE for accreditation of PETE programs. Therefore, PETE programs started to follow these standards in their subject matter. In brief, there are many advantages of standard driven policies for physical education programs. As a result of this, physical education had a general subject matter to teach in schools, and assessment of students' outcomes is very clear now.

Currently, National Teacher Examination (NTE), PRAXIS series are very influential due to the state use of this examination for a standard to teach in schools. Preservice teachers are required to pass Praxis 1, and 2 exams to start student teaching in schools. As a result, teacher preparation programs have started to train students to pass these exams satisfactorily. It is probable that these standards may promote the quality of teacher candidates in the future. One recent movement is about “Common Core State Standards.” This is an educational initiative in United States about what K-12 students should know about English language arts and Mathematics at the end of the each grade level (www.corestandards.org) This web site states that the standards based on international models, scientific research and inputs of teachers, scholars, assessment developers, parents, students and members of the public.

Early Field Experiences

Early Field Experience (EFE) courses are taken prior to student teaching and provide preservice teachers with opportunities to observe practicing teachers and their students. Preservice teachers work with individual students and discover the function of schools (Dodds, 1989).

The extensive use of EFEs during teacher education is well documented (Dodds, 1989; Gushart & Rink, 1983; O'Sullivan & Tsangaridou, 1992) and both teacher educators and preservice teachers believe in the positive role of EFEs in school experiences (Bell, Barrett, & Allison, 1985; Dodds, 1989; Goodman, 1985). However, other studies point out that some EFEs have harmful effects on preservice teachers (Placek & Silverman, 1983; Smith, 1993) and that preservice teachers become more custodial (Schempp, 1989). On the contrary, O'Sullivan and Tsangaridou (1992) stated that well-constructed early field experiences can provide opportunities to preservice teachers to understand the role of schooling. In a follow up study, Tsangaridou and O'Sullivan (1994) showed that carefully designed reflective assignments in EFEs promoted the preservice teachers to focus on the ethical and social aspects of teaching and learning. In my opinion, the studies mentioned above showed that EFEs had positive effects on preservice teachers' socialization and development. However, these experiences may have detrimental effect unless carefully organized.

Professional Development Schools & Collaboration

Major educational reforms advised strong relationship between teacher preparation programs and the public schools (Carnegie Forum, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986; National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). Collaboration between teacher education faculty and school teachers provides exchanging information and creates an opportunity to improve the continuing experiences of public teachers and faculty. (Sharpe, Bahls, Lounsbery, Wolf, Bro, Golden & Deibler, 1995). Graham (1991) stated that current reform in United States centers around Holmes and Carnegie reports and Holmes group report, adapted by many states, that recommends establishment of professional development schools (PDS). This will definitely continue to affect physical education teacher preparation programs in the future.

Since early 1900s teacher educators at universities have tried to work together and established a kind of collaboration (Fiorentino, Kowalski & Barrette, 1993). The concept of collaboration is currently coming from reform-based teacher education (Bickel & Hatrup, 1995).

Collaborative reform discussions are as a result of the belief that teacher education and school practice may benefit for each other because of overlapping goals (Ishler, 1994).

A clear and successful collaboration should be defined as:

- a) Mutual contributions to teacher preparation course work,
- b) Co-instruction of future teachers,
- c) Co-development laboratory schools in which new teaching instruments may be tested,
- d) Co-production of in-service workshops, (Sharpe, Lounsbury & Templin, 1997).

In the history of physical education teacher education programs, there were promising signs of collaboration efforts. Sharpe (1992) initiated a collaborative professional development school approach at the University of Nebraska Lincoln and found positive perceptions in terms of faculty, practitioner, graduate teaching assistants and preservice teachers. In another example, The Ohio State University physical education teacher education program developed school-university collaboration in an urban physical education program (O'Sullivan, Tannehill, Knop, Pope & Henninger, 1999). Researchers stated that collaborative efforts produced a positive impact on improved teaching for underserved urban youth, curriculum content as well as increased professional development and teaching responsibility.

Consequently, Collaboration and PDS efforts had promising effects on physical education teacher education programs. These efforts were essential to connect the realities of public schooling to PETE programs. However, lack of funding, and different perspectives among school districts, teacher educators and teachers may cause frustration and problems. Therefore, collaborative efforts should be designed very carefully through multi-agreement approaches.

Academic Service Learning (ASL)

Academic Service Learning (ASL) is a non-traditional experiential learning that offers students an opportunity via active community involvement and reflection (Stacey, Dale, & Langer, 1997). This experimental learning model is a way of learning through experience that students obtain and apply academic skills based on community needs and social problems. Service-learning may also be defined as an instructional methodology that is integrated into the academic curriculum and provides planned time for students to think about real life situations in their communities (Sigmon, 1994). During this process students learn academic course content and concepts and develop professional skills using active participation via thoughtfully organized service (Bowers & Alawiye, 2005). Service learning is conducted according to the needs of the community. There are four important characteristics of any academic service learning activity:

- It is coordinated with the community.
- It helps to create civic responsibility.
- It is integrated into the academic curriculum of students.
- It has organized and structured time for students to reflect on the experience.
- In the United States, beginning in the 1993, various universities included service learning programs in academic departments as a part of their curriculum. The value and

experience of these programs is well documented in several physical education programs such as : The University of Illinois at Chicago, The Apprentice Teacher Education Program (Hellison, 1993), University of Denver, Project Lead (Cutforth, 2000); University of Utah, Department of Exercise and Sport Science, Physical Education Program (Watson, Hueglin, Crandall & Eiseman, 2002); Central Washington University, Physical Education Program (Konukman, 2007); Louisiana State University, the Life Time Exercise and Physical Activity Service Learning (LE PAS) program (Carson, 2008); Troy State University, Department of Kinesiology and Health Promotion Physical Education Program (Lee, Bush & Smith, 2005).

- Academic service learning is applied in limited, yet growing number of programs to date. One of the first documented programs was conducted at the University of Illinois at Chicago by Don Hellison. This program was called The Apprentice Teacher Program which evolved from the Coaching Club (Hellison, 1993). The coaching club was a weekly before school program that uses basketball to teach elementary school children. Sixth, seventh and eighth graders taught basketball to elementary school children. One year later, in 1994, the University of Denver launched a service-learning program known as Project Lead that involved (Cutforth, 2000). Project lead in Denver organized an after school physical activity program in the gym of an elementary school. Two years later, in 1996, the University of Utah Exercise and Sport Science Department applied service learning in to their physical education teacher education (PETE) curriculum. Three courses within PETE program which were Exploration of Movement Sciences, Methods of Special Physical Education, and Methods of Middle School Physical Education integrated to service learning (Watson, Crandall, Hueglin & Eisenman, 2002).

- As the pathway of service-learning was laid in American teacher education programs, including physical education and other related professions, other programs instituted service-learning as an instructional methodology (Konukman & Schneider, 2012) These include Troy State University, Department of Kinesiology and Health Promotion Physical Education Program in 2002. Professional preparation course students conducted the Presidential Fitness Testing Program at a local elementary school. In addition, the senior level Administration of Sport, Recreation and Athletic Training course students organized and implemented an annual 5K/10K run (Lee, Bush & Smith, 2005). Central Washington University, Physical Education Program incorporated service learning in the courses of Movement Analysis & Applications 1 (locomotor and non-locomotor skills), Movement Analysis & Applications 2 (Striking with short and long handled implements), and Movement Analysis 4 (Manipulative sport skills) courses in 2006 (Konukman, 2007). Students enrolled in each course taught supervised sessions, in area schools not having a physical education program. Finally, Louisiana State University, the Life Time Exercise and Physical Activity Service Learning (LE PAS) program in kinesiology department incorporated a formal service learning component in physical education pedagogy courses in the fall of 2006 (Carson, 2008)

- Consequently, Academic service learning was such a vital application of connecting college physical education programs to the community and reality of societies. Physical education majors learn many important academic, social and professional skills during this authentic learning environment. However, service learning requires very careful planning and organization. Infusion of service learning ideals to college physical education has many challenges.

Service learning courses can be integrated to college physical education programs in three different ways: as a separate course, as an assignment within a course, or as an extracurricular

activity (Cutforth, 2000). It is very obvious that service learning activities are highly connected to NASPE's National Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards 3-4, and 5. For example, Standard 3 emphasizes planning and implementation and all service learning projects requires intensive planning before teaching with supervised structured implementation. Standard 4 focuses on instructional delivery and management. Students practice instructional teaching skills based on their course and apply managerial task to their teaching repertoires during service learning. Finally, standard 5 emphasizes impact on student learning and physical education preservice teachers utilize assessment and reflection to foster student learning during their service.

Service learning could be seen as an important opportunity for physical education programs to integrate preservice teachers' knowledge to real life of schools and society. Preparing physical education teacher candidates for the 21st century is a challenging task and teacher candidates could learn and practice hands on experience in physical education "doing by learning" via service learning and serving the community. Service learning is such nice opportunity for other related professions as well. It is proven that service learning is a valuable learning tool for both students and participants although there is limited information and application about the effects of service learning in physical education and related professions.

Teacher-Coach Role Conflict

Teaching is a highly demanding occupation that requires effort and commitment. In a typical day, teachers instruct many classes, execute various activities around the school campus, and contribute to committees; a majority of teachers have extracurricular assignments as well. These multi-faceted responsibilities often result in full time exhaustive job conditions (Sage, 1987; Sutton, 1984). For many physical education (PE) teachers, coaching a sport is perceived as an expected extracurricular professional commitment. However, coaching is unlike many extracurricular activities in that it demands very intense job performance and daily planning throughout the year. School athletic teams are expected to participate in league tournaments with advancement to state championships and coaches are publicly held accountable for the performance of their teams.

Teaching and coaching are two different occupational roles and teachers who also coach have stressful work environments common to all educational settings, but each occupational role has a specific stress and burnout problems (Sisley, Capel & Desertrain, 1987). The responsibilities of teachers and coaches are distinguishable from each other (Sage, 1987). These different roles and role conflicts may create stress among teachers who also coach. Thus, incompatible role demands may cause conflict, ambiguity, and psychological burnout (Lumpkin, 2002, p.333; Siedentop, 2009, p.284.)

In brief, a majority of physical education teachers may be required to coach, and some of the literature indicates that teaching and coaching roles require different characteristics and abilities. Research indicates that employment as a teacher who also coaches causes role conflict, stress and burnout (Bain, 1983; Capel et. al., 1987; Donovan, 1997; Kosa, 1990; Locke & Massengele, 1978). The heavy time commitment required to fulfill two roles that are quite different from one another is a major source of stress. As a result, one role is adopted as the dominant one. Consequently, due to the greater popularity and prestige of the coaching role, many physical education teachers will likely have a greater commitment to coaching than to teaching.

Moreover, the recent role of physical education is changing rapidly in schools. It is known that regular physical activity provides health benefits for participants. Despite the recent emphasis on physical activity in children, according to the Surgeon General's Report (2002) the increase in child obesity is recognized as the number one threat to the lives of children in the USA. These recent trends emphasized the concept of a "New Physical Education." The role and function of the physical education curriculum has started to change in many schools. "New PE" emphasizes integration of health and fitness concepts into school curriculum with individual and lifetime activities as well as cognitive and affective development. These new roles and concepts increased the responsibilities of PE teachers who were already giving full time commitment and dedication to their work. Therefore, it is better to separate the responsibilities of both teaching and coaching in our schools to get maximum efficiency. Therefore, physical education teacher training programs should consider teacher-coach role conflict during preparation of preservice teacher candidates. (Konukman, Agbuga, Erdogan, Zorba, & Yilmaz, 2010).

Marginalization of Physical Education Programs in Schools

Marginalization is one of the critical issues in school physical education programs today. Teacher candidates should be trained how to deal with this issue and they should be very proactive. Physical education is being marginalized in USA and throughout the world for different reasons. Some of these reasons can be related to the financial problems many districts are facing in the pressure of Common Core Standards. Yet there are also just as many contributing factors that PE teachers are not taking responsibility for and are not taking steps to change. Precautions need to be taken by physical education teachers if their programs are going to be valued as an important subject for students to be participating in during school. Parents, teachers, administrators, and students alike need to view the field as important for their physical health which will lead students to better test scores. (Laureano, Konukman, Gümüşdağ, Erdogan, Yu & Çekin, 2014).

Schools are being forced to make budget cuts and physical education teachers are feeling a great deal of the repercussions that come with those choices. In the research, teachers stated a lack of facility space and also a lack of adequate equipment. Lacking facilities and also equipment affects where and how physical education teachers are able to accurately assess their students (Collier, 2011). The physical education teachers are being asked to cover other positions such as study halls and lunch duty, and thus giving up their planning time (Curtner-Smith, 2010). When teachers lack planning time it becomes hard to always plan lessons that are geared towards state and national standards and that also take prior assessments into account.

It is important for physical education teachers to break down the barriers they feel are present with other staff and reduce the sense of isolation. Even though physical education teachers cannot always control their physical location to decrease feelings of isolation it is important to change the aspects that are controllable. To do this physical education teachers need to be involved with what is happening at their school, belong to committees, offer assistance to reinforce content subjects in physical education, and also show they care about the wellbeing of their students (Lux & McCullick, 2011).

Future of Physical Education Teacher Education Programs

Technology and knowledge base will be two very important concepts in the future of physical education teacher education programs. Unfortunately, in many ways, the physical education teacher education programs has been slow to join the technological revolution while the foundation disciplines such as motor learning and exercise physiology have taken the recent advantage of developments in technology (Sharpe & Hawkins, 1998).

However, there are several good examples of implication of technology in physical education programs. Computers can be used by physical education teachers in three ways: a) utilities, b) assessment, c) computer assisted instruction (CAI) (Silverman, 1997). The use of e-mail, list servers, and World Wide Web led to important developments in physical education programs. (Elliott & Manross, 1996a, 1996b). The most innovative one is "PE Central" Web page (<http://pecentral.org>). This web page provides numerous information and support to physical education teachers world wide. Technology will be an important part of physical education teacher preparation. Many teacher training programs integrated technology courses into their core curriculum about how to use heart rate monitors, pedometers, accelerometers for physical education in schools.

Knowledge base will also be an important concept in the future. Shulman (1987) defined knowledge base of teaching as a different way of knowing that is essential for teachers. This includes: a) content knowledge, b) pedagogical content knowledge, and c) pedagogical knowledge.

There is an argument over subject matter of physical education being closely aligned to sport, games, and fitness activities, that physical education should focus on sub-disciplines (i.e. biomechanics, exercise physiology) (Corbin & Eckert, 1990). Siedentop (1991) emphasized the importance of pedagogical knowledge and stated that all failures of bad teaching come from a lack of pedagogical knowledge, not from the inadequate subject matter knowledge. Besides, teacher educators contributed to development of pedagogical content knowledge that emphasized both pedagogical formation and knowledge base (Griffey & Housner, 1991).

Recently, obesity epidemic is number one factor that affecting children's health and overall well-being in the world. Children are spending more screen time including computer and videogames and participation to physical activity is very low. Therefore, school physical education programs have very critical role to solve physical activity and health issues and they should be reorganizing their programs in an innovative way. The current environmental factors provide only few opportunities for physical activity and children consume excessive amount of high calorie fast foods (Sothorn, 2004). At this point, Erwin, Beets, Centeio, & Morrow (2014) suggested a "National Physical Activity Plan" for children including seven strategies:

Strategy 1: Provide access to and opportunities for high-quality comprehensive physical activity programs via physical education, in pre-kindergarten through grade 12.

Strategy 2: Develop and implement state and school district policies requiring school accountability for the quality and quantity of physical education and physical activity programs.

Strategy 3: Develop partnerships with other sectors for the purpose of linking youth with physical activity opportunities in schools and society.

Strategy 4: Ensure that early childhood education settings for children ages 0 to 5 years old promote and facilitate physical activity.

Strategy 5: Provide access to and opportunities for physical activity before and after school.

Strategy 6: Encourage post-secondary institutions to provide access to physical activity opportunities, including physical activity courses, robust club and intramural programs, and adequate physical activity and recreation facilities.

Strategy 7: Encourage post-secondary institutions to incorporate population-focused physical activity promotion training in a range of disciplinary degree and certification programs. This means that, physical education teacher training programs need to adopt new courses or change course contents to combat obesity issues for children in the society.

Mohnsen (2000) stated seven important changes in education affecting physical education: New theories in learning, increase in information, advances in technology, increase in home schooling, life-long learning, and increase in violence. Individualized online modules will be used in some states to completion of physical education courses and physical education teachers should be ready for this competency (Price, 2015). This means that teacher preparation programs needs to adjust technology requirements in the courses. Therefore, we should analyze these factors very carefully for the future of physical education teacher education programs in the 21st Century. Otherwise, physical education teacher training programs will disappear at the Universities or transform into new programs under different department names.

Conclusion

In the final analysis, Ward and Douthett (1999) stated that there are two reasons why physical education is not a part of contemporary school reforms. First, physical education is not considered as a core academic subject and perceived as unrelated to the central mission of the school reform. Second, physical education as a profession did not make a case about why it should be an important part of school reforms. In addition, school physical education programs throughout the country are feeling the detrimental negative effects of what is proving to be the longest and most severe financial crisis in this country since the Great Depression. Potentially negative problems in physical education programs resulting from the current recession include (Schneider, Konukman and Stier, 2010): (a) low workplace morale, (b) the elimination of teaching as well as coaching positions, (c) an increase in physical education class size, and (d) a decline in resources (i.e., equipment and supplies). Therefore, Physical education teachers must adjust accordingly if they are to maintain job security and continue to develop professionally. It is suggested that physical education teachers: (a) remain positive, (b) be versatile in what they can teach (and coach), (c) be able to teach and coach at different levels in schools, (d) demonstrate large class teaching skills, (e) be innovative, flexible, and persuasive in all areas pertaining to their job, and (f) be recognized as competent, professional and innovative teachers by school authorities, parents, students and members of the community.

REFERENCES

- Bain, L. L. (1983). Teacher/coach role conflict: Factors influencing role performance. In T. J. Templin & K. Olson. (Eds.), *Teaching in physical education*. (pp. 94-101). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Bain, L. L., & Jewett, A. E. (1987). Future research and theory-building. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 6 (3), 346-364.
- Bain, L. L. (1989). Interpretive and critical research in sport and physical education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 60 (1), 21-24.
- Bain, L. L. (1990). Physical education teacher education. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research in teacher education*. (pp. 758-781) New York: Macmillan.
- Bell, R., Barrett, K., & Allison, P. C. (1985). What preservice physical education teachers see in an unguided, early field experience. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 4, 81-90.
- Bickel, W.E., & Hatrup, R. A. (1995). Teachers and researchers in collaboration: Reflection on the process. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32, 35-62.
- Bowers, J., & Alawiya, O. (2005). *Developing a sustainable service learning program*. Faculty Fellow Training Manual. Central Washington University. Ellensburg, WA.
- Capel, S. A., Sisley, B. L., & Desertrain, G. S. (1987). The relationship of role conflict and role ambiguity to burnout in high school basketball coaches. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 9 (2), 106-117.
- Carson, R. L. (2008). Introducing the life time exercise and physical activity service-learning (LE PAS) program. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 79, 18-35.
- Cherniss, C. (1980). *Staff burnout: Job stressing the human services*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Chu, D. (1984). Teacher /coach orientation and role socialization: A description and explanation. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 3 (2), 3-8
- Corbin, C., & Eckert, H.M. (1990). *The evolving undergraduate major*. 61st Annual Meeting of American Academy of Physical Education Papers. April, 18-19, 1989, Boston, MA.
- Collier, D. (2011). Increasing the value of physical education: The role of assessment. *The Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 82(7), 38.
- Curtner-Smith, M. D. (2001). The occupational socialization of a first-year physical education teacher with a teaching orientation. *Sport, Education and Society*, 6(1), 81-105.
- Cutforth, N. J. (2000). Connecting school physical education to the community through service-learning. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 71, 39-45.
- Dodds, P. (1989). Trainees, field experiences, and socialization into teaching. In T. J. Templin & P. G. Schempp (Eds.), *Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach* (pp. 81-104). Indianapolis: Benchmark Press.
- Donovan, M. (1997). Role overload and role conflict-Teacher or coach? *The British Journal of Physical Education*, 28 (2), 17-20

- Elliott, E. Manross, M. (1996a). Physical educators and the Internet. Part I: Using E-mail. *Teaching Elementary Physical Education*, 7 (4), 6-9.
- Elliott, E. Manross, M. (1996b). Physical educators and the Internet. Part II: The World Wide Web. *Teaching Elementary Physical Education*, 7 (5), 12-15.
- Erwin, H. E., Beets, M. W., Centeio, E., & Morrow, J. R. (2014). Best practices and recommendations for increasing physical activity for youth. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 85(7), 27-34.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (1990). Teacher preparation: Structural and conceptual alternatives. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Figone, A. J. (1994). Teacher-coach role conflict: Its impact on students and student-athletes. *Physical Educator*, 51 (1), 29-34.
- Florentino, L. H., Kowalski, E. M., & Barrette, G. (1993). SUPPORT-PE: Moving towards collaborative teacher preparation. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, May-June, 76-83.
- Goodman, J. (1985). What students learn from early field experiences: A case study and critical analysis. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36, 42-48.
- Graham, K. (1991). The influence of teacher education on preservice development: Beyond a custodial orientation. *Quest*, 43 (1), 1-19.
- Graham, G. (1990). Physical education in U.S. schools, K-12. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 61 (2), 35-39.
- Graham, G. (2008). *Teaching children physical education: Becoming a master teacher*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Griffey, D., & Housner, L. (1991). Differences between experienced and inexperienced teachers' planning decision, interactions, student engagement, and instructional climate. *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport*, 62, 196-204.
- Gusthart, J. L., & Rink, J. (1983). Teaching behavior through various levels of field experiences. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 3. (1), 32-46.
- Hellison, D. R. (1993). The coaching club: teaching responsibility to inner city students. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 64, 66-71.
- Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow teachers: A report of the Holmes group*. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- Imig, D. G., & Switzer, T. J. (1996). Changing teacher education programs: Restructuring collegiate-based teacher education. In J. Sikula. (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education*. New York : Macmillan.
- Ishler, R. E. (1994). Together we can make a difference : Collaboration between schools and universities. *National Forum: The Phi Kappa Phi Journal*, 74 (2), 3.
- Konukman, F. (2007). Academic Service Learning (ASL): A Reflective Practice for Health & Physical Education Majors at CWU Physical Education Program. *WAPERD Journal*, Fall, 42-44.

- Konukman, F., Agbuga, B., Erdogan, S., Zorba, E., Demirhan, G., & Yilmaz, I. (2010). Teacher-coach role conflict in school based physical education in USA: A literature review and suggestions for the future. *Biomedical Human Kinetics*, 2, 19-24.
- Konukman, F., & Schneider, R. (2012). The Role of Academic Service Learning in Physical Education Teacher Education: Serving for The Community in 21st Century. *STRATEGIES*, 25(7), 15-18.
- Kosa, B. (1990). Teacher-coach burnout and coping strategies. *The Physical Educator*, 47 (3), 153-158.
- Laureano, J., Konukman, F., Gümüřdađ, H., Erdogan, S., Yu, J. H., & Çekin, R. (2014). Marginalization on School Physical Education Programs: A Literature Review. *Physical Culture, Sport Studies and Research*, 64, 29-40.
- Lawson, H. A. (1986). Occupational socialization and design of teacher education programs. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 5 (2), 107-116.
- Lawson, H. A. (1988). Occupational socialization, cultural studies, and the physical education curriculum. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 7 (4), 265-288.
- Lee, J.W., Bush, G., & Smith, E.W. (2005). Service-learning: Practical learning experiences in sport and physical education. *STRATEGIES*, January/February, 11-13.
- Lumpkin, A. (2002). *Introduction to teaching physical education, exercise science, and sport studies*. (5th ed.) (pp.333). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lux, K., & McCullick, B. A. (2011). How one exceptional teacher navigated her working environments as the teacher of a marginal subject. *Journal of Teaching Physical Education*, 3, 358-374.
- Locke, L., & Massengale, J. D. (1978). Role conflict in teacher coaches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 49 (2), 162-174.
- Massengale, J. D. (1981). Role conflict and the teacher-coach: Some occupational causes and considerations for the sport sociologist. In S. L. Greendorfer (Ed.), *Sociology of sport: Diverse perspectives*. (pp. 149-157). New York: Leisure Press.
- McBride, R. E. (1984). Some future considerations in the professional preparation of physical education. *Physical Educator*, 41 (3), 95-99.
- Mohnsen, B. (2000). The impact of future trends on physical education and the role of leadership. In B. Mohnsen (Ed.), *The new leadership paradigm for physical education: What we really need to lead*. (pp. 129-134) Reston, VA: National Association for Sport and Physical Education.
- Moving into the future, National standards for physical education: A guide to content and assessment. (1995). National Association for Sport & Physical Education. St. Louis, MO: Mosby.
- National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (1997). Guidelines for school and community programs to promote lifelong physical activity among young people. *Journal of School Health*, 67 (6), 202-219.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- Newell, K. M. (1990). Physical education in higher education: Chaos out of order. *Quest*, 42, 227-242.
- O'Sullivan, M., & Tsangaridou, N. (1992). What undergraduate physical education majors learn during a field experience. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 63, 381-392.
- O'Sullivan, M., Tannehill, D., Knop, N., Pope, C., & Henninger, M. (1999). A school-university collaborative journey toward relevance and meaning in an urban high school physical education program. *Quest*, 51, 225-243.
- Placek, J. H., & Silverman, S. (1983). Early field teaching requirements in undergraduate physical education programs. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 2 (3), 48-54.
- Price, S. L. (2015). Hiring considerations and training physical education pedagogy: Current trends in physical activity grades K-12. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 86 (3), 5-6.
- Rink, J. (1993a). Teacher education: A focus on action. *Quest*, 45, 308-320.
- Rink, J. (1993b). What's so critical? In J. E. Rink (Ed.), *Critical cross roads: Middle and secondary physical education* (pp. 1-6). Reston, VA. National
- Sage, G. H. (1987). The social world of high school athletic coaches: Multiple role demands and their consequences. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 4 (4), 213-228.
- Schempp, P. G. (1989). Apprenticeship-of-observation and the development of physical education teachers. T. J. Templin & P. G. Schempp (Eds.), *Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach* (pp. 13-38). Indianapolis: Benchmark Press.
- Schneider, R. C., Konukman, F., & Stier, F. W. (2010). Survival Strategies for Physical Educators During Recessionary Times. *The Physical Educator*. 67(4), 170-177.
- Sharpe, T. (1992). Teacher preparation-A professional development school approach. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, May-June, 82-87.
- Sharpe, T., Bahls, V., Lounsbery, M., Wolf, P., Bro, M., Golden, C., & Deibler, C. (1995). Tips for beginning a collaborative activity-Three case studies. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, April, 22-57.
- Sharpe, T., Lounsbery, M., & Templin, T. (1997). Cooperation, Collegiality, and Collaboration: Reinforcing the scholar-practitioner model. *Quest*, 49, 214-228.
- Sharpe, T, & Hawkins, A. (1998). Technology and the information age: A cautionary tale for higher education. *Quest*, 50, 19-32.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge of teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57 (1), 1-22.
- Siedentop, D. (1986). The modification of teacher behavior. In M. Pieron & Graham, G. (Eds.), *Sport Pedagogy*. (pp. 3-18). Champaign: IL.
- Siedentop, D. (1991). *Developing teaching skills in physical education*. Mountain view, CA: Mayfield.
- Siedentop, D. (2009). *Introduction to physical education, fitness, and sport*. (6th ed.) (pp. 284). New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Sigmon, R.L. (1994). Serving to learn; learning to serve. *Linking service with learning*. Council for Independent Colleges Report. National Youth Leadership Council.
- Silverman, S. (1997). Technology and physical education: Present, possibilities, and potential problems. *Quest*, 49, 306-314.
- Sisley, B. L., Capel, S. A., & Desertrain, G. S. (1987). Preventing burnout in teacher/coaches. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 58 (8), 71-75.
- Smith, M. D. (1993). An examination of a generic field experience from a physical education perspective. *The Physical Educator*, 50, 151-168.
- Stacey, K., Rice, D. L., & Langer, G. (1997). *Academic Service Learning Faculty Development Manual*. Eastern Michigan University, Office of Academic Service Learning. Ypsilanti, MI.
- Sothorn, S. M. (2004) Obesity prevention in children, physical activity and nutrition. *Nutrition*, 20, 704-708.
- Sutton, R. J. (1984). Job stress among primary and secondary school teachers. *Work and Occupations*, 11, 7-28.
- Templin, T. J., & Anthrop, J. L. (1981). A dialogue of teacher/coach role conflict. *Physical Educator*, December, 183-186.
- Templin, T. J., & Schempp, P. G. (Eds.), *Socialization into physical education: Learning to teach*. Indianapolis, IN: Benchmark Press
- Tsangaridou, N., & O'Sullivan, M. (1994). Using pedagogical reflective strategies to enhance reflection among preservice teachers. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 14 (1), 13-33.
- Ward, P., & Douitis, P. (1999). Toward a consolidation of the knowledge base for reform in physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 2 (18), 382-402.
- Watson, D. L., Crandall, J., Hueglin, S., & Eisenman, P. (2002). Incorporating service-learning into physical education programs. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 73, 50-54.
- Wiegand, R., Bulger, S., & Mohr, D. (2004) Curricular issues in PETE. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 75, 47, 55.
- Zeigler, E. F. (1988). A comparative analysis of undergraduate professional preparation in physical education in the United States and Canada (1960-1985). In K. Broom, R. Clumpner, B. Pendleton, & C. Pooley. (Eds.), *Comparative physical education and sports: Vol. 5* (pp. 177-196). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.