DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 104 824 SP 009 057

AUTHOR	Locke, Lawrence F.
TITLE	Teacher Education for Physical Educators: Inventing the Wheel and Other New Practices.
PUB DATE	31 Oct 74
NOTE	33p.; Not available in hard copy due to poor reproducibility of original document
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC Not Available from EDRS..PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Admission Criteria; Higher Education; *Performance Based Teacher Education; *Physical Education; Resource Materials; *Teacher Education; Teacher Education Curriculum

ABSTRACT

This document presents various teaching strategies for educators using a physical education curriculum. The study discusses availability of written materials, including journals, computer searches, and conference reports. The future of competency-based teacher education (CBTE) for physical education majors is analyzed, and five inaccurate key assumptions generally made by physical education teachers regarding CBTE are discussed. The assumptions are that: (a) basic competencies for physical education teachers have been specified; (b) competency-evaluation techniques are available; (c) research literature will show which teacher competencies are causally related to student learning in the psychomotor domain; (d) the question of how to teach physical education teachers can be resolved; and (e) developing a CBTE program will not cost any more than traditional teacher education programs. The study examines the assumption that the teacher education system must produce teachers unsuited to the present system before the training of physical education can be changed. The selective admissions procedure to professional programs and its difficulties are also discussed. The study concludes that problems in the education of physical educators are not supply and demand but quality. (A list of references is included.) (JS)

TEACHER EDUCATION FOR PHYSICAL EDUCATORS:

INVENTING THE WHEEL AND OTHER NEW PRACTICES

by

Lawrence F. Locke

Manuscript prepared for delivery at the SAPECW Fall Workshop
in Gatlinburg, Tennessee, October 31 - November 2, 1974

Teacher Education for Physical Educators: Inventing the Wheel and Other New Practices[1]

It is impossible to capture a completely valid picture of what is going on in physical education teacher education at any point in time. There now are some 700 institutions of higher education in 50 states and the District of Columbia operating one or more degree programs related to physical education (5). Moreover, the rate of significant change in content and structure of these programs is at an all-time high and likely to further accelerate. The sheer size of th total enterprise and the swift rush of events make easy generalizations risky.

Anyone proposing to develop a valid status report about the state of teacher education for physical education specialists also would have to make a series of very difficult and sensitive discriminations. For every one of those 700 institutions a reporter would have to recognize the difference between:

Innovations on Paper (plans and proposals)	---and---	Innovations in Place and Operating
Rearrangements of Existing Program Elements, Tinkering and Relabeling	---and---	Innovations of Substance (change in basic program elements)
Temporary Change (one-shot experiments)	---and---	Permanent Adjustment of Program
Enthusiastic Rhetoric about Change (Talk)	---and---	Commitment to Change
Change in General Teacher Education Programs	---and---	Change in the Preparation of Physical Education Specialists
Normative Descriptions of Program Change (what should be)	---and---	Behavioral Description of Program Change (what is)

[1] These notes are not intended to represent a scholarly paper. The topics treated neither are examined in depth nor related within a theoretical framework. The purpose here is to provide a stimulus for discussion of teacher education within a workshop setting.

As a salient (and painful) example of the difficulties involved some of you will recall one address at the 1972 Lake Ozark National Conference on Professional Preparation of the Elementary Specialist in which the speaker assured the conferees that a new federal program called Teacher Renewal would be a powerful and revolutionary factor in teacher preparation for the coming decade (34). The unwary speaker, assuming that money appropriated by Congress was money spent, had failed to make the first and easiest discrimination--"Paper plans are different from operating programs." Teacher Renewal died quietly of Presidential strangulation. On a less grand scale the same pitfalls await the unwary reporter who hopes to capture the reality of even a single training program.

The need for careful distinctions in mind, however, there is a great deal of useful information which can be obtained from visiting programs in the field. Further, given a protective injection of healthy scepticism there is a rich mine of information to be found in program reports and the teacher education literature.

Aside from obvious resources such as JOHPER, The Physical Educator, Phi Delta Kappan, and Quest,[2] there are specialized journals and organizations which can provide an avalanche of information related to teacher education.[3] The Association of

[2] Quest Monograph XVIII "Teaching Teachers" (41) is a good starting place for any survey of trends in the preparation of physical educators.

[3] Some of these have been listed in the reference section of this paper with mailing addresses for inquiries about publication sales and subscriptions.

Teacher Educators (ATE) (13) maintains a long list of publications including a distinguished series of Bulletins and Research Bulletins related to special issues in teacher education. The latest Bulletin to be issued (No. 37) is both an interesting prospectus for the development of teacher-leaders and a perceptive analysis of existing provisions for teacher training (10).

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) (9) now is the new home of the Journal of Teacher Education. Long a pedestrian publication of unever quality which gathered dust on library shelves, the Journal has acquired a lively new format and an aggressive editorial policy. The old exhortative essays on "How we do it at Coalshaft College" have disappeared in favor of thematic issues focusing on theoretical models, technical analysis and the hard issues of money, politics and technology.

The AACTE also is home for the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education and (since 1973) Health, Physical Education and Recreation. In addition to its vast repository of research reports, program descriptions and scholarly material related to teacher education, ERIC now is producing the first trickle of reference materials in physical education. The first annotated bibliography, produced under the direction of Marvin Eyler (21), has been completed and physical education at long last is on-stream in the world's largest educational information retrieval system.

AACTE also maintains its own extensive list of publications.

This includes the 10 volume series on Performance (Competency) Based Teacher Education, now a standard reference for all teacher educators.

Three publications dealing directly with teacher education are available through AAHPER Publication-Sales. These include reports of the New Orleans (4) and Lake Ozark (3) conferences, and a somewhat older publication dealing with the preparation of elementary school physical education teachers (2).

The two conference reports constitute the most recent and ambitious attempts of AAHPER to come to grips with the problems of professional preparation. These documents deserve close attention from everyone employed in college level training programs. My own reactions to the work of these conferences are available both in print (34) and on audio tape (35). As you might suspect there was cause for both praise and disappointment.

Despite a recent JOHPER article which described the New Orleans report as "featuring the best of what is currently being done," (15) the reader will find astonishingly little within the covers which relates directly to the process of teacher education. The program planning committees of both recent conferences had difficulty disentangling curriculum (what teachers teach), competence (what teachers know or can do) and teacher education (the process of teaching teachers how to teach). This confusion produced mischievous results at the conferences and severely weakened the usefulness of the documents produced.

For better or for worse, one result of the national

conferences was to bring the word "competency" into the vocabulary of physical education. While there are no full-scale CBTE programs operating in physical education there certainly are hundreds of college departments engaged in defining teacher competence and introducing one or more of the logistic or technologic innovations which characterize CBTE (25).[4]

In their enthusiastic response to CBTE, many teacher educators in physical education made (implicitly or explicitly) five key assumptions.

1. A list exists which includes the basic competencies which physical education teachers should possess (and if it does not, teacher educators can quickly develop such a list through conferences, committees, task forces, discussion groups and hard work).

2. Techniques exist to evaluate objectively whether or not a teacher possesses a particular competence (and if they do not, such measures can be developed by any competent specialist in tests and measurement).

3. If properly reviewed, our research literature will show which teacher competencies are causally related to student learning in the psychomotor domain (and if it does not, physical education researchers will quickly interest themselves in that problem).

4. If what physical educators should teach and how physical education teachers should teach can be satisfactorily established (at least to the level of developing basic guidelines), then the question of how to teach teachers to be competent will resolve itself (or already has been resolved by the methods of teacher preparation presently in use).

5. Developing and operating a competency system of teacher preparation will not cost any more than

[4] Readers interested in a thorough introduction to CBTE may consult item (31) while those requiring a comprehensive bibliography of CBTE materials may use item (42).

> the present system (or, at least, will create a severe drain on resources only during the design and start-up stages).

None of the key assumptions proved to be true. While some competency statements appropriate for classroom teachers now are available (18) no behaviorized lists exist in physical education. Competence evaluation techniques are not yet perfected and have proven fiendishly difficult to standardize (30, 31). Half a century of research tells little about competence in the classroom and less about teacher competence in the gymnasium (40). Further, physical education researchers with the requisite skill in behavioral sciences have absolutely no interest in the question of teacher competence. Traditional methods of teacher education serve us indifferently now and are not designed to serve CBTE at all (35, 36). Finally, on the basis of early experience, the cost of converting a single, average-sized teacher education program to full CBTE operation runs between 5 and 6 million dollars (Operating costs may run as much as 150% higher than traditional programs) and for most physical education departments that settles that (11).

As a consequence of these problems, operationalized CBTE systems never look like the idealized models. Various parts of the CBTE system are grafted onto existing systems. One interesting example has been the introduction of Competency Based Instruction (CBI) (22) or Personalized Systems of Instruction (PSI) (44) into physical education methods courses as an alternative strategy for teaching sport skills. Although there has

been some confusion on the matter, teacher preparation programs which equip pre-service trainees with a working knowledge of CBI or PSI are not necessarily also engaged in CBTE.

The CBTE mandates which appeared in many states (based either on legislation or education department policy) were reflections of concerns in the general public about educational accountability, rather than endorsements of CBTE as a strategy for training teachers. For the most part, such mandates have turned out to be paper tigers, largely because they were unworkable (legislators and state department personnel were not immune to the same faulty assumptions which have plagued teacher educators in physical education).

When a CBTE mandate can be satisfied by taking the content outlines of existing courses, recasting them as lists of competence objectives stated with appropriate behavior adjectives, and shipping the whole package off to the state capital (where there barely is enough staff to get the material properly filed, much less actually read it or perform field checks), then no one really is held accountable for anything -- except performing a lot of troublesome paperwork.

The heart of the problem for college faculties interested in CBTE is the identification of teacher competencies. It has proven difficult to generate statements which honestly meet the behavioral and empirical presumptions of CBTE and which at the same time evoke much comfort or consensus among physical educators. The skills required for the task simply have not been acquired or

widely practiced. Value presumptions must be identified, alternative patterns of ends and means for the teaching act must be laid out in an adequate theoretical framework, the teaching act must be analyzed into component parts and a hierarchical taxonomy created, existing research must be used in combination with experience and practical art to produce probability statements (leaps of faith) about the consequences of specific teacher behaviors, and throughout these complicated processes the language of behavior must be used with impeccable attention to consistency and detail. The competence required of teachers to think creatively and systematically about the competence required of teachers, is considerable indeed. Physical educators need feel no particular guilt over their initial difficulties, however, as misery is endemic in teacher education right now (38).

The experience of college faculties presently suffering through the discomfort of midwifing a list of teacher competencies suggests a fairly standard scenario for events.

1. Under pressure from external sources (a state department of education, a higher administrative unit in the college, a Dean or Chairman, or a small group of faculty converts) the faculty undertakes to write out some competence statements applicable to their own trainees. Work may proceed in a total group or through a number of subcommittees (usually divided by subject matter areas).

2. The effort fails and amidst great confusion and considerable ill-feeling the idea of CBTE is repudiated (a document of some sort may be produced but it commands no one's loyalty).

3. Time passes and a number of internal forces begin to work.

a. Talk about competence tends to focus attention on the particular adequacy (and inadequacy) of present graduates, which leads to some uneasiness.

b. Skill course instructors become interested in CBI and begin to define sport skills in terms of competence statements. This leads naturally to treating methods for teaching skills in roughly the same way, and skill course focus shifts gradually from how to perform skills to how to teach skills.

c. Larger field experience components are introduced into the program as a "more practical" alternative to CBTE, but the question of what teacher behaviors to observe or which teacher behaviors to practice in field settings grows more obvious each semester. This leads to more uneasiness.

d. Amidst continuing talk about CBTE in professional journals and meetings, the faculty begins to feel that they ought to have been able to identify at least some satisfactory competencies and a willingness to explore how to do it begins to grow.

4. Someone on the staff discovers that it is absolutely impossible to develop teacher competency statements without first mastering the art of creating behavioral statements. The sale of paperbound books by authors such as Mager and Popham rises sharply.

5. A faculty member teaching in the professional core area (curriculum, methods, principles or organization and administration) defects and converts the course outline to behaviorally stated objectives for student learning. Often the same faculty member also begins to employ CBI or PSI to reach the objectives. Colleagues note that some of the things students have to learn in the maverick course look suspiciously like things all teachers of physical education should know or be able to do.

6. There is a quick rise in the reading of other people's course outlines and faculty dialogue about content for courses required in the training program grows.

7. Some members of the faculty now want to make another try (usually with more modest goals) and seek out reference materials and sources of consultant assistance.

8. Work begins again, usually with a step-wise plan to address the task by stages over a long period of time. A few statements are produced which most of the faculty can subscribe to and simple forms of field testing are applied to test validity.

And so it goes. Slowly, painfully, and with many a discouraging moment, the faculty hammers out a vision of what a good physical educator might be. It still is too early to know whether these visions can be shaped into the stuff of new and more effective processes for training physical education teachers. It seems probable that on balance most programs will come out ahead, even if a full CBTE system turns out to be impossible or undesirable.

A few college departments of physical education have jumped in head first, as in the case of the new University of Northern Florida at Jacksonville. The small faculty at UNF had the opportunity to start CBTE from scratch and have made substantial progress in some areas. In programs that are substantially committed to CBTE it is the logistics of operating a field based program, individualization of instruction through modular program technology, development of instructional materials and creation of competence testing instruments which provide the serious problems.

It is disappointing though perhaps not surprising to find faculties committed to CBTE still worrying the perennial problems of grading, individual skill development, faculty FTE standards and admission policies. Clearly, CBTE is no panacea for the

resident difficulties in running a college program. Nevertheless, student morale in innovative programs seems particularly high. There is a great deal of "togetherness" spirit that cuts across student - faculty lines. This appears to be a consequence both of the novelty provided by a creative adventure, and the sense of joint enterprise. Certainly, the atmosphere in schools attempting major curriculum innovations typically is more conducive to genuine faculty student dialogue and process revisions based on critical feedback, than is the case in more conventional preparation programs.

One reason for the enthusiasm shown by participants in many programs has been the expansion of field experiences for pre-service trainees. Everyone seems to be seeking ways to put students into actual work settings for observation, modified forms of participation and full internships (8, 19, 28, 32). Cadet teaching, long in disfavor, has been recussitated. Saturday and evening community service programs and sport camps have been developed specifically to serve as settings for work experience by majors. A host of different cooperative relationships with public and private schools have been cultivated by college departments with an eye to obtaining access to the world of work for their major students. One college department is providing sport skill instruction for high school physical education leader's clubs in order to obtain learner subjects for majors enrolled in methods courses.

In the mass of opinion, enthusiasm (and hard evidence)

supporting the value of field experiences it is difficult to find a dissenting voice. There is plenty of uneasiness about the quality of what is observed or participated in as field experience, and more than a little confusion about the role of the teacher educator in making field experiences a meaningful part of professional growth. But for the moment everyone seems happy with the new discovery -- it is easier to learn about teaching by doing it than by just sitting in a class while someone talks about doing it!

Over time, however, it is inevitable that one of the problems which has bedeviled student teaching will emerge as an issue in some of the new field experiences. There is reason to believe that participation in work settings tends to rigidify student assumptions about the nature of teaching, particularly its basic value presumptions. All social institutions have ways of conditioning novices to accept the status quo of values, but few possess indoctrination machinery so subtle and powerful as the socialization forces of the school. Crucial assumptions about pupil control, for example, are taught with swift and uniform success (12, 46) and physical education teachers accept the control values of the system just as readily as classroom teachers (14).

If young teachers are to change and improve physical education as it now exists in the schools, they must enter the schools with a clear understanding of the weaknesses in the present system and without having accepted status quo values as "given" facts of life. Even though teacher educators may attempt to equip

graduates with workable tools for effecting peaceful change, to some degree change in physical education will depend on producing teachers who are unsuited to the present system. Some field experiences provide powerful indoctrination which will convert preservice trainees into young teachers who will fit in all too quietly -- without disturbing anyone or anything.

It is not an unrelated fact that some of the most satisfactory field experiences evolve when students and faculty can create their own world of work, relatively free from the impingements of an in-place system. College sponsored on-campus programs for service to various community populations are one example, but the most intriguing examples arise from the takeover strategy. The preparation staff and their major students simply assume responsibility for an entire physical education program, usually creating a program where none had existed before. Elementary schools, private schools and schools in troubled inner-city areas are common targets. Here, at least, the operating values and assumptions about learners and learning are those of the training institution. While such takeover field programs are anything but completely free from the assumptions found in conventional programs (if only because teacher educators were themselves socialized in such programs), the run-it-yourself situation does provide greater opportunity to experiment with alternative ways of thinking about teaching physical education without suffering the immediate imposition of social sanctions.

Attention to currents of influence in field settings raises the perennial question of the role of the cooperating teacher. Few teacher educators now believe that a satisfactory cooperating teacher is any teacher generally recognized as above average in competence who happens to be willing to nurture a trainee through practice teaching. It generally is recognized that either cooperating teachers directly and specifically reinforce the values of the training program or the trainee comes quickly to reject the perspective imported from the college as idealistic and impractical in solving problems in the real world (20). The more numerous and more extensive field experiences become, the more opportunities there are for the student to reject the training program perspective.

Two solutions are possible in resolving the problem presented by cooperating teachers with dissonant values. The cooperating teacher can be removed from supervisory responsibility altogether, creating a neutral zone in which trainees may work under the guidance of training program agents. Alternately, the training program staff may attempt to construct an influence system to bring cooperating teachers into closer agreement with basic assumptions about training goals.

One college preparation program now operates a special graduate level certificate program for cooperating teachers The 12 units of work may be credited toward a higher degree, but are intended as a self-contained training program. Experiences are explicitly related to the value perspectives of the training staff and the role to be assumed by cooperating teachers in

supporting and guiding practice teachers from that particular program.

Training program insiders know that the cooperating teacher problem really exists for many staff members playing roles as college supervisors of student teachers. At the absolute bottom of the professorial pecking order, college supervisors often are out of touch with the training program and rarely have been equipped with a clear model of what constitutes effective teacher behavior. As a consequence, supervisors often have reinforced student teachers for inconsequential behaviors drawn from random bits of personal prejudice or rigid and simplistic models of good teaching. When supervisors do attempt to represent the training program perspective they often scissor the student teacher in a role-conflict situation. If the student pleases the supervisor, the cooperating teacher (a powerful and potentially dangerous figure) is alienated, and vice versa.

Much recent attention to new models for supervision promise new hope in this area of professional preparation (24). When the triad of student, cooperating teacher and college supervisor can be coordinated in an effort to pursue goals understood and accepted by all three parties, powerful influences can be created (24).

Amidst all of the variations on the CBTE theme, one new pattern has begun to emerge. It consists of the following central elements.

1. A required pre-program sequence is developed usually containing a field experience, some skill courses and an introduction to physical education

based on a self-analysis and job-analysis career choice model. Entry is open and non-selective. The number of required credits typically is small to avoid the problem of curricular entrapment.

2. A matriculation procedure or program entry point is established and articulated with a selection system. Entry to the sequence of major courses is limited although recycling and reapplication may be possible. Selection tends to include information obtained during the pre-program field experience.

3. A professional training program is developed which centers around a schedule blocking strategy. Credits drawn from discontinued professional courses are used to create a substantial block of credit-bearing schedule time within which to create field experiences and special learning modules. Instruction within the block tends strongly to stress logical relationships of subject matter rather than traditional course structures (example: Principles of exercise physiology related to cardio-vascular stress are taught in conjunction with a skill instruction unit for track). Content of the block may be organized around units identified as teacher competencies or the concept of specified competencies may be ignored completely. In any case, there is much stress on practical applications of knowledge to professional operation. Sequencing of experiences is heavily stressed as entering cohorts of students proceed through block units in uniform fashion.

A relatively pure example of this strategy is the undergraduate program at the Ohio State University (39). Seven sequential quarters subsequent to matriculation (in the sophomore year) are blocked so as to provide half a day, five days each week for professional preparation learning activities. All but a handfull of professional courses in physical education (including the entire academic core of applied physical and behavioral sciences) have been absorbed into block modules.

In the Ohio State program some professors serve as advisors to cohort groups, remaining with an entering class of students as they pass through the seven blocks, while other members of the faculty serve as block coordinators working to organize the content and logistics of instructional modules through which the cohort groups pass in sequence. Other professors coordinate the pre-program field experience, the selection and guidance system, and relations with field sites used in various block experiences. All members of the faculty (including cohort advisors and block coordinators) are responsible for teaching instructional modules as their personal subject matter specialties appear in the study components of various blocks.

The resurgence of interest in selective admissions to professional programs (27) has roused a number of neglected issues in physical education. What are the characteristics of a desirable preservice trainee? At what point should screening take place? What criterial measures are appropriate? Should self-selection be systematically encouraged?

College grades, English proficiency, speech proficiency and academic references (none of which have much validity in predicting success in teaching) still dominate selection in teacher education programs across the nation. Cut-off scores for the National Teacher Examination (also without demonstrable validity) and GPA requirements predictably have begun to rise. In physical education the almost reflexive responses of physical fitness and sport skill testing (7) have appeared. That standards such as

personal grooming and hair length have been reintroduced as part of preservice student evaluation strains credibility, but there it is (16).

The use of student performance in field settings where reactions to the teaching role, clientele population and institutional environment can be recorded, are an obvious though infrequently used element in selection. The fact that so much emphasis has been placed on selection at entry and so little (none at all) on demonstrating competence at exit, tells more about the lack of real gains for CBTE in physical education than any other index.

Much of the current interest in selection arises from alleged conditions in the teacher job market. Elementary school enrollments are declining and will do so until the latter part of the decade. At that point the same decrease will reach the secondary schools. Responses to this fact by governmental agencies, teacher training institutions and individual candidates have ranged from outright panic to studied indifference (1). The whole matter of predicting employment trends is extremely complicated. Anyone who makes simple, pat suggestions for what must be done about the number of teachers to be trained either is ignorant of basic facts or a charlatan.

The feeling of many educators is that the important question to be faced is not supply and demand, but quality. No one yet has demonstrated a surplus of qualified teachers. The surplus we have is one of job applicants over available positions when taken by broad categories. In contrast, ample evidence attests both to

severe shortages of teachers in some specific educational roles and declining indices of educational quality.

Here are some facts for the physical education teacher educator to consider before pushing the panic button and severely restricting enrollments. Taken by sex, specialization and geographic areas, there is evidence which suggests that most qualified graduates from accredited physical education programs will continue to find jobs. Our own experience at the University of Massachusetts is that although as few as 30 to 40% of a June graduating class finds placement by September, 65 to 70% find employment in physical education or education-related jobs within the next year. Geographic mobility and preparation for alternative teaching assignments appear to be key factors in job placement.

The potential market for elementary school specialists is enormous. Only 36% of the total population over age 22 report any experience with physical education in elementary school (17). It is probable that barely a dozen out of 100 elementary school children ever see a trained physical education teacher prior to the 8th grade. The majority of elementary school children still have no formal physical education.

The number of unemployed teacher education graduates from colleges in the South Central and South Atlantic states is the lowest in the nation. The 5-10% of students in graduating classes from Southern teacher training colleges who remain unemployed after the first year consist largely of those who refuse to leave their hometowns.

The fall issue of the Journal of Teacher Education contains some interesting statistics concerning the overproduction (or underconsumption) of teachers (1). One half of all the communities in the USA have no kindergartens in their public schools. Pre-school education is almost non-existant in large areas of the country. Physically and mentally handicapped children still are classified as educationally deprived. One half of the adult population over 25 can be classed as functionally illiterate. In the average secondary school there is one counselor to 500 students. If the educational needs of all groups which will demand new educational services over the next decade (pre-school, adults and special populations) are added together, on the conservative assumption of a 50 to 1 student teacher ratio, we will require more than a million more teachers than we presently have available. Finally, all of the statistics so far available show elementary school enrollments rising again by 1978, with predictions of teacher shortages by the 1980s. While the job market indeed is tighter than in recent years, it is relevant to point out that the class of 1978 was this year's freshman class.

It seems clear that the supply and demand body-count is a relatively minor statistic within an expanding and extremely complicated delivery system. At the worst, physical education teacher educators now have a moment of respite from the demands of expansion, in which to attend to the vital questions of what constitutes good teaching, how to help young students acquire needed skills, and how to help them grow confidently into pro-

fessional maturity.

If total undergraduate enrollment must recede temporarily, the largest potential marketplace for teacher training services continues to grow in size and remains essentially untouched -- inservice teacher education. NEA surveys consistently report that active teachers consider inservice education to be one of their three top needs. Physical education teachers in the field want to change, improve and grow in their powers, but neither employers nor training institutions do much except use that beneficient impulse to serve their own ends. Masters degree programs for teachers are a wasteland of repetition, irrelevance, and boredom. Evenings, Saturdays and Summers, workshops and courses mandated by state law or district policy are suffered through, always on the teacher's own time and generally at the teacher's own expense. Providing relatively little opportunity for selection, planned and executed by college professors, taught in ways that violate every principle of good teaching, and generally devoid of any serious emphasis on improving teacher performance, existing provisions for inservice education often do not serve the teacher well.

None of the problems of inservice teacher education are insoluble. Joint teacher/school district/teacher educator planning and control of programs, provision for use of school facilities to conduct programs during the working day, close focus on professional performance, and a willingness by teacher educators to work directly with teachers in school settings,

could produce a demand for training services of almost unlimited dimensions.

Expanded field experiences for undergraduates and growing interest in the potential for inservice education are not the only forces pushing physical education teacher educators into the school arena. New certification laws are creating entry year systems in which graduates will serve a period of apprenticeship under the joint supervision of training college staffs and school district personnel. The existing NCATE accreditation system plus expanding use of the Interstate Compact and NASTDEC systems, provide a base for certification reciprocity between states which demands confirmation of teacher competence in an extended training and support period. This process will draw teacher educators into the world of work in increasing numbers. In at least one state, teacher organizations are making a major effort to have legislation passed which would require every teacher educator to return to the schools for a period of work every 5 years.

Another new complication faced by teacher education programs is the transfer phenomenon. In many institutions more than half of each graduating class consists of transfer students. This adds to the complicated problems faced in program design. None of the alternatives for handling transfers is entirely satisfactory. Transfer students may simply skip some of the experiences provided for 4 year students, may delay progress toward a degree by having to make up experiences provided only in the lower division, or may be served by entering an entirely separate set of training experiences.

In the Midwest, 69% of all community based Junior Colleges offer professional programs in physical education (29). The average program consists of 9 courses. While offerings remain on the whole relatively innocuous (health, first-aid, recreation, skills and sports officiating), it is clear that coordination soon will be required if a sensible overall preparation program is to result for students transferring from such institutions into four year colleges.

Teacher educators continue to wrestle mightily (though it would be fair to say with small success) with the problem of sport, dance and movement skills for major students. The basic problems and issues were established decades ago and we seem endlessly to be crossing and recrossing the same battlefield without ever settling the conflict.

Do teachers have to be able to perform the skills they teach? How should major students acquire a repertoire of performance skills? How should the question of scope versus depth be resolved? Should performance instruction be separated from or combined with instruction in teaching methods? Does each skill or skill area require separate attention to methods of instruction or will a single generic methods course suffice? Should college credit be awarded for instruction in skill? Should skill testing be employed as part of student selection? The litany of unresolved questions and professional equivocation seems long, perhaps because it is circular.

To further confound our confusion about skills it is possible

to suggest that we have yet to identify the really important elements in the teacher's handling of personal movement skills. If quality demonstration of a movement model for the purpose of instruction is all that is desired there is little real problem. Various visual aids may be substituted for teacher demonstration without appreciable loss in instructional efficiency (40). It can be argued, however, that teacher demonstrations are of vital importance quite aside from their specific role in motor learning and irrespective of their quality (given a necessary minimum).

When teachers do not perform learning tasks in front of students because they do not perform expertly, students learn the obvious lesson -- to avoid attempting new movement tasks because it is not OK to perform with less than expert skill (like a novice). Under these conditions, students also suspect that the teacher does not enjoy engaging in the sport or movement task and this is a conclusion with serious import given what is known about how students acquire values and attitudes.

Four skill related competencies are required for successful teaching: (1) enough performance skill to provide a simple model that establishes the gross framework, (2) enough knowledge about performance of the skill to identify important movement components (and in the case of open skills the crucial environmental cues which control performance), (3) enough experience with learning problems common to the particular skill to have evolved a repertoire of effective interventions (preferably appropriate to several different teaching styles) and, (4) enough personal confidence and

love of sport and movement to perform the skill with zest, playful unselfconsciousness, and obvious pleasure. Knowledge of general teaching methods, knowledge of kinesiology and biomechanics and high level performance skill probably contribute little to instructional competence at the introductory and intermediate levels of learning.

One little understood competence is the ability to perceive movement. The work of Professor Shirl Hoffman at the University of Pittsburg suggests that individuals may differ in their abilities to hold the detail of an idealized movement model in conscious awareness, to perceive a difference between observed movements and an idealized model, and to identify the exact source of such discrepancies when a difference does exist. If these suggestions prove to be true and if any or all of the perceptual abilities prove to be modifiable through training, teacher educators will have a skill related competence which should correlate closely with the ability to produce skill learning.

One problem which does not appear to trouble teacher educators is the question of general education. This would be a refreshing switch except for the implacable fact that preservice trainees spend considerably more than half of their undergraduate careers in general education courses. The massive trend toward vocationalism among college students (27) guarantees that most preservice trainees will regard college requirements in the arts and sciences with the bored disinterest awarded any nonrelevant experience which must be suffered through to achieve some valued

goal. That teacher educators in physical education show no greater level of interest or concern about general education than that displayed by their students is difficult to understand. The New Orleans Conference report, for example, dispatched the liberal arts with exactly 27 words. The articulation of liberal and professional learning in a unified program of higher education is a dream that seems further away now than it ever has been.

A host of lesser matters ruffle the surface of teacher education. Instruments for the observation, recording and analysis of teacher behavior are beginning to appear in professional preparation (23, 33). The use of hardware such as videotape has become more common (26). The "systems" mystique has been applied to teaching physical education and generated a flood of implications (some of them very convincing) for teacher education (45). The development of concentration tracks (28) and programs leading to coaching certification (6, 37) are a continuing part of the scene.

At The Ohio State University Professor Daryl Siedentop continues to explore the powerful utility of behavior modification in the training of teachers. At least one recently published research study has demonstrated (convincingly) that elementary school children can be trained to modify teacher behavior through the application of simple reinforcements (making eye contact with the teacher, asking enthusiastic questions and sitting quietly when asked (43). Perhaps that will be the answer after all. It would be quicker, cheaper and surely a lot less chancy to train children to teach teachers how to teach than to keep on struggling to do it ourselves.

Two serious and generally unrecognized problems are, I believe, pivotal elements for improving the preparation of physical educators. First, 98% of all the teacher training programs in physical education which we will have one year from today, are in existence right now. Patterns of professional preparation are inherited not created, so talk about designing better ways to teach teachers has only limited value until we have confronted the problem of stimulating change in the teacher education we already have. Second, by concentrating on what ought to happen in teacher education we continue to ignore what is or is not actually going on in our programs. Teacher educators know surprisingly little about what's really going on: the forces that shape student values, how students feel about various program elements, how students see themselves as professionals in training (or if they do at all), and even how many students really intend to become teachers.

The study of teacher education as a socialization process is where physical educators must begin. Until progress has been made in that task, talk about whether a given program is good or bad, or what we ought to do or not do, is all a little silly. We are not on a field of play in which such terms even are meaningful, much less useful. Only with better information about how teachers really learn to teach, can we reach our hands into the social machinery with the confidence that we know how to help them learn better.

REFERENCES

(1) AACTE. "Surplus of Quantity? Shortage of Quality." Journal of Teacher Education. Vol. XXV. No. 3, Fall, 1974.

(2) AAHPER Professional Preparation of the Elementary School Physical Education Teacher. Washington, D.C.: AAHPER, 1969.

(3) AAHPER Preparing the Elementary School Specialist. Washington, D.C.: AAHPER, 1973.

(4) AAHPER Professional Preparation in Dance, Physical Education, Safety Education and School Health Education. Washington, D.C.: AAHPER, 1974.

(5) AAHPER "Directory of Professional Preparation Institutions." JOHPER (September, 1974) pp. 37-48.

(6) Adams, S.H. "A Practical Approach to Preparing Coaches." JOHPER (May, 1974) p. 65.

(7) Akers, J.B. & Takacs, R.F. "Innovative Approaches in Assessing the Competence of Prospective Physical Education Teachers." 77th NCPEAM Proceedings, 1974, pp. 95-101.

(8) Albertson, L.M. "A Field Experience Sequence." JOHPER (June, 1974) pp. 49-50.

(9) American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education. One Dupont Circle, Washington D.C., 20036.

(10) Andrew, M.D. Teacher Leadership: A Model for Change. ATE Bulletin No. 37. Washington, D.C.: Association of Teacher Educators, 1974.

(11) Andrews, T.E. "What We Know and What We Don't Know." in W.R. Houston (Ed.) Exploring Competency Based Education. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1974.

(12) Appleberry, J.B. & Hoy, W.K. "Pupil Control Ideology of Professional Personnel." Education Administration Quarterly. Vol. 3 (1969) pp. 74-85.

(13) Association of Teacher Educators. Suite 1201, 1701 K Street Northwest, Washington, D.C., 20006.

(14) Barfield, V. The Pupil Control Ideology of Teachers in Selected Schools. unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1972.

(15) Barrow, H.M. "Professional Preparation: Anatomy of a Conference that Worked." JOHPER (September, 1974) p. 6.

(16) Baumgartner, T.A. & Carlson, R.P. "Screening and Evaluation Procedures for Majors." JOHPER (April, 1974) p. 83.

(17) Bucher, C.A. "National Adult Physical Fitness Survey: Some Implications." JOHPER (January, 1974) pp. 25-28.

(18) Dodl, N.R. et al. The Florida Catalogue of Teacher Competencies. Tallahassee: Florida State University, 1971 (available from Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative, Chipley, Fla.)

(19) Dougherty, N.J. IV "An Experience Based Teacher Training Program." JOHPER (February, 1973) pp. 57-58.

(20) Dreeben, R. The Nature of Teaching. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1970. (See particularly Chapter 5 "Settings for Teacher Training.")

(21) Eyler, M. A Selected, Annotated Bibliography on Physical Education. Part II of the PPER Series. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse for Teacher Education, AACTE, 1974.

(22) Freischlag, J. "Competency Based Instruction." JOHPER (January, 1974) pp. 29-31.

(23) Goldberger, M. "Studying your Teacher Behavior." JOHPER (March, 1974) pp. 33-36.

(24) Goldhammer, R. Clinical Supervision. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.

(25) Green, L. "What is Competency Based Education?" JOHPER (October, 1973) p. 87.

(26) Greenberg, J.S. "How Videotaping Improves Teacher Behavior." JOHPER (March, 1973) pp. 36-37.

(27) Haberman, M. Guidelines for the Selection of Students into Programs of Teacher Education. ATE Research Bulletin No. 11. Washington, D.C.: Association of Teacher Educators, 1972.

(28) Henschen, K.P. "A New Deal in Professional Preparation." JOHPER (May, 1974) pp. 65-66.

(29) Hodges, P.B. "Status and Structure of Physical Education in Public Two Year Colleges." JOHPER (June, 1974) pp. 13-15.

(30) Houston, W.R. (Ed.) Exploring Competency Based Education. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1974.

(31) Houston, W.R. & Howsam, B. (Eds.) Competency Based Teacher Education: Problems, Progress and Prospects. Palo Alto, Calif.: Science Research Associates, 1972.

(32) Kizer, D.L. "Physical Education Teaching Methods Made Meaningful." JOHPER (June, 1974) p. 50.

(33) Kraft, R.E. "An Analysis of Supervisor/Student Interaction." JOHPER (March, 1974) pp. 37-38.

(34) Locke, L.F. "Teacher Education: One Minute to Midnight?" in Preparing the Elementary School Specialist. Washington, D.C.: AAHPER, 1973.

(35) Locke, L.F. "Implications of the National Conference on Undergraduate Professional Preparation." (Evaluation Report Submitted to the Professional Preparation Panel) Unpublished Paper AAHPER National Conference, 1973. (Available as Tape No. 77, 1973 AAHPER Convention, Educational Media Services, Box 27022, Indianapolis, Ind. 46227).

(36) Locke, L.F. "Reportcard for a Professional Preparation Conference." Unpublished Paper AAHPER National Conference, 1973 (available from the author).

(37) Maetoza, M.G. Certification for High School Coaches. Washington, D.C.: AAHPER, 1970.

(38) McCarthy, D.J. New Perspectives for Teacher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

(39) Nelson, B. "A Model Teacher Preparation Program." JOHPER (February, 1973) pp. 55-57.

(40) Nixon, J. & Locke, L.F. "Research on Teaching Physical Education." R.M.W. Travers (Ed.) Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

(41) Quest Teaching Teachers. Monograph XVIII (May-June, 1972).

(42) Schmieder, A.A. "The Last Relatively Complete Tentative Bibliography on Competency Based Education." in J.R. Houston (Ed.) Exploring Competency Based Education. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1974.

(43) Sherman, T.M. & Cormier, W.H. "An Investigation of the Influence of Student Behavior on Teacher Behavior." Journal of Behavior Analysis. (Spring, 1974) pp. 11-21.

(44) Siedentop, D. "How to Use Personalized Systems of Instruction." 77th NCPEAM Proceedings, 1974, pp. 116-125.

(45) Singer, R. "A Systems Approach to Teaching Physical Education." JOHPER (September, 1974) pp. 33-36, 38.

(46) Willower, D.J. & Jones, R.G. "Control in an Educational Organization." in J.D. Raths (Ed.) Studying Teaching. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967.