

## History, Philosophy, and Sociology Perspectives in Physical Education Teacher Education: A Delphi Study

**Amanda A. Metcalf**

School of Education Health and Human Performance  
Fairmont State University  
1201 Locust Ave (Education Building 351), Fairmont  
WV 26554, USA

**Susan M. Ross**

Executive Director of Academic Programs and Support Services  
Fairmont State University  
1201 Locust Ave (Hardway Building 207)  
Fairmont, WV 26554, USA

**Sean M. Bulger**

Associate Dean of Graduate and Online Education  
College of Physical Activity and Sport Sciences  
West Virginia University  
375 Birch Street (PAS 267), Morgantown  
WV, USA

**Andrew H. Hawkins**

Emeritus Professor  
College of Physical Activity and Sport Sciences  
West Virginia University  
375 Birch Street, Morgantown  
WV, USA

### Abstract

*There is limited research to inform curriculum developers as they make decisions about including HPSS competencies in physical education teacher education (PETE). The purpose of this study was to generate expert consensus regarding the most theoretically important and pedagogically relevant HPSS competencies that pre-service physical educators need to learn and to determine how this content should be structured and delivered within the PETE curriculum. Expert consensus identified 27 essential HPSS competencies for inclusion in the PETE curriculum. Panelists recommended infusing HPSS knowledge within the PETE curriculum to allow prospective physical educators to make more meaningful connections between the content and school-based applications. The findings included factors that impact the perceived value of HPSS as related to pre-service professional preparation and related implications for preparing physical educators.*

**Keywords:** Delphi method, kinesiology, teacher preparation, physical education History, Philosophy, and Sociology Perspectives in Physical Education Teacher Education: A Delphi Study

### 1. Introduction

Faculty has long-recognized disciplinary course work in the area of history, philosophy, and sociology of sport (HPSS) as important foundational components of the physical education teacher education (PETE) curriculum. Inclusion of the HPSS knowledge base within the PETE curriculum is thought to contribute to prospective teacher's understanding and appreciation of physical education and sport from different perspectives (Siedentop, 2009). For example, studying physical education from a historical perspective seeks to enhance physical educators understanding of people (e.g., Catherine Beecher,

Dudley Sargent, William Anderson) and significant developments (e.g., disciplinary movement, growth in sports, Title IX), and patterns of change that have shaped the content and direction of sport and physical education throughout the years (Harris, 1989; Wuest & Fiset, 2015). Studying physical education from a philosophical perspective aims to support physical educators' ability to create learning experiences that (a) are meaningful, (b) aligned with societal values, (c) seek to eliminate disparities, and (d) lead to more positive sporting experiences for all involved. Whereas, studying physical education from a sociological perspective seeks to provide physical educators with a more comprehensive perspective on how sport is impacted by social institutions (e.g., education, family, media), social trends (e.g., economic, political, cultural), and subcultures (e.g., minorities, children/youth, girls/women).

The *National Conference on Undergraduate Professional Preparation* held in 1963 marked initial efforts to generate concepts and competencies for PETE programs (AAHPER, 1974). Subsequently, Franklin Henry's call for making an academic discipline of physical education (Henry, 1964) propelled a major shift in the intellectual foundation of physical education. By the 1960's, the formalization of a theoretical and scholarly body of knowledge for physical education became an agenda of the disciplinary movement (Siedentop & van der Mars, 2011, p. 59). As a result, the physical education academic literature and programmatic essays gave scholarly expression to defining a disciplinary base that supported the preparation of physical education teachers (Abernathy & Waltz, 1964; Henry, 1964, Zeigler & McCristal, 1967). These events set the stage for the beginning of HPSS as critical subdisciplines within the PETE curriculum (Sage, 1997), revealing general consensus about the conceptual and practical importance of historical, philosophical, and sociocultural knowledge for physical educators. Even decades later, *The National Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards* (National Association for Sport and Physical Education [NASPE], 2008), which articulates professional consensus regarding the knowledge and skills physical educator graduates are expected to acquire through teacher preparation; continue to view history, philosophy, and sociological content as critical sources of knowledge in the preparation of physical educators.

However, despite initial support for inclusion of HPSS content, shifting enrollment trends in undergraduate physical education (now kinesiology) departments during the late 1970's and early 1980's halted the growth of these specialized areas (Marett, Siler, Pavlacka, & Shapiro, 1984). The most significant trend was the decline of physical education teacher education majors and increase in non-teacher majors (e.g., athletic training, exercise science, sport management) within physical education departments (Marett, Siler, Pavlacka, & Shapiro, 1984; Rink, 2007). To better serve the academic needs of non-teaching majors, academic curriculums began to place a stronger emphasis on exercise scientific-based content (e.g., biomechanics, exercise physiology, motor behavior) and hire faculty with a science background to teach such courses (Buck, Jable, & Floyd, 2004, Marett et al., 1984;). As more science courses were added in departments, the social science (HPSS) content within PETE curriculum became marginalized and even disappeared at some institutions (Freeman, 2013; Marett et al., 1984).

Although some physical education departments continue to include HPSS courses, issues concerning "who" is qualified to teach HPSS, and "what" HPSS content should be included within the PETE curriculum remain. Gill (2007) explained that few physical education/kinesiology departments actually employ scholars in the area of history and the content is rarely taught in an integrated manner. Gill (2007) further acknowledged "there are few historical-cultural scholars to build the subdisciplinary knowledge base and advance understanding of kinesiology from a historical or socio-cultural perspective" (p. 280). Kretchmar (1990) contends many PETE programs provide very little historical, sociocultural, and philosophical content to enhance prospective physical educators understanding of the problems related to work in school-based settings and possible solutions. While Ennis (2010) reminds us "faculty need to be keenly aware not only of the content that is currently taught but also to identify valid content that is *not* taught" (p. 83).

There are also questions regarding the best approach to deliver HPSS content within the PETE curriculum - whether to deliver the content as a single 3-credit hour *History, Philosophy, and Sociology of Sport* course or three separate courses (e.g., History of Sport, Philosophy of Sport, Sociology of Sport). Hawkins (2008) pointed out that most programs relegate philosophical content to "minor introductory courses taught to undergraduates who are ill-prepared to wrestle with its implications" (p. 346). Hoffman (2005) suggests that separating sub-disciplinary content across three different courses may lead to fragmentation, making it difficult for pre-service physical educators to develop an integrated knowledge base for use in professional practice. Conversely, teaching HPSS content in a single 3-credit hour stand-alone course may limit preservice physical educator's ability to make explicit connections between important ideas, concepts, and/or perspectives that intersect across these bodies of knowledge. The lack of consensus regarding HPSS content and the delivery of the content suggest many PETE programs have been unable to conceptualize the utility of the content as it applies to the preparation of beginning physical educators.

Accordingly, PETE programs may be eliminating potentially worthwhile HPSS content from the curriculum or teaching it in ways that are of little benefit to prospective physical education teachers.

However, there is reason to suggest the present view of *History, Philosophy, and Sociology* (HPS) subject matter does not fully complement broader role of the physical education profession in promoting physical activity initiatives. For example, the proposed undergraduate sociology content supported by the *National Association for Sport and Physical Education* (NASPE, 2009) narrowly focuses on sport; hence the title *Sport Sociology*. The goal of sport sociology coursework is to “investigate the complex connections among sport, society, and cultures” (NASPE, 2009, p. 1). Gill (2007) contends the label of “sport” suggests a more elite focus that promotes division, rather than integration of movement and physical activity. Similarly, Siedentop (2009) recognizes that coursework in history and philosophy tends to focus more exclusively on sport, rather than a broader perspective inclusive of fitness and physical education. While there may be philosophical disagreements concerning whether “sport” should serve as a focal or complimentary emphasis in HPS, the primary focus for PETE programs should be on defining HPS competencies that will influence, enhance, and contribute to the effectiveness of physical education graduates.

It has become clear that the supported goal of physical education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is to develop youth who will come to enjoy and foster a physical active lifestyle (NASPE, 2004; 2011; Rink, 2008; Siedentop, 2010). In achieving this goal, a position statement released by NASPE (2011) titled *Physical Education is Critical to the Development of the Whole Child* recognize the importance of emphasizing the cognitive and affective aspects of development in physical education programs, as opposed to only narrowly focusing on the psychomotor aspects. Fostering whole child development implies physical educators are capable of emotionally connecting with and reaching all students, including those in need of most attention – the unfit, unskilled, alienated, uninterested, unmotivated, insecure, and economically disadvantaged (McCaughy, 2009). There are concerns, however, that PETE programs are so focused on scientific content (e.g., biomechanics, exercise physiology, motor behavior) and the technical aspect of teaching that they are producing teachers who are unable to move youth in deep and emotional ways because they ignore the thinking and feeling side (McCaughy, 2009). In examining the concept of a “cool” physical education, McCaughy (2009) points out students want more than just sports – they want equity, choices and ownership, and teachers who are interested in them personally. A standardized “one size fits all” industrial age approach to physical education fails to meet the diverse needs of school-age youth who need it the most. Making a meaning impact on the long-term development of all youth will require preparing physical educators who understand the broader impact of sociocultural issues (e.g., obesity, diversity, poverty, bullying, substance abuse) on the teaching-learning environment. Although teacher educators can indirectly contribute to a larger mission of cultivating whole child development through sociocultural content, the essential curriculum content and competencies for accomplishing this goal remain undefined.

In the process of curriculum revision, questions concerning the educational value and worth of content knowledge for academic majors in reference to time and place are critical for curriculum decision-making (Ennis, 2010). The progress of physical education as a discipline and profession necessitates systematic decision making regarding the essential competencies that should be included in the PETE curriculum (Ross, Metcalf, Bulger, Housner, 2014). In previous research a modified Delphi method was employed to identify critical motor learning and development competencies that are critical in preparing physical education teachers (Ross, Metcalf, Bulger, Housner, 2014). This previous line of research initiated meaningful discussion among experts in motor learning and development, PETE, and K-12 physical educators that resulted in defining motor learning and development competencies for inclusion in the PETE curriculum. The purpose of the present study is to extend this line of research by generating expert consensus regarding the critical theoretically and pedagogically relevant HPSS competencies that pre-service physical educators need to learn within the undergraduate PETE curriculum. A secondary purpose was to determine how HPSS content should be structured and delivered within the PETE curriculum. The present study represents the continuation of an existing line of research regarding the foundational subdisciplines and PETE (Bulger & Housner, 2007; Ross, Metcalf, Bulger, & Housner, 2014).

## 2. Method

The Delphi method is a structured communication process aimed at collecting expert knowledge on a topic and reaching consensus of agreement when available information is incomplete or interdisciplinary in nature (Sandrey & Bulger, 2008). The Delphi consists of administering a series of questionnaires or “rounds” interspersed with controlled feedback until pre-defined consensus is reached (Ziglio, 1996). The study employed a two-round Delphi protocol as the approach to achieve consensus among a group of experts regarding the critical history, philosophy, and sociology competencies that should be included in the PETE curriculum. Administration of the Delphi consisted of three phases: (1) recruiting qualified experts, (2) questionnaire development and pilot study, and (2) Delphi study procedures.

## 2.1 Participants

Because the success of the Delphi method rests on the collective judgment of well-informed participants, the initial step was to identify potential experts whose knowledge, insight, and practical experience would make a valuable contribution to the study. For the purpose of this study, Delphi participants were selected based on their unique perspectives related to the theoretical and applied value history, philosophy, and sociology in the preparation of physical education teachers. Delphi participants consisted of three different groups - HPSS specialists, physical education teacher educators, and K-12 physical educators; all considered experts in their respective area of study. The identification and recruitment process resulted in a total of 158 potential Delphi participants, which included (a) history of sport specialists (N = 8), (b) philosophy of sport specialists (N = 8), (b) sociology of sport specialists (N = 9), (c) teacher educators (N = 58), and (d) physical education teachers (N = 64). A final group of 25 experts was randomly selected and recruited from a larger pool of potential Delphi participants using the following inclusion criteria:

1. History (n = 5), philosophy (n = 5), and sociology (n = 5) of sport specialists were employed as faculty members within a Kinesiology/Physical Education department; and was identified as a HPSS specialists by the AAKPE, or board members from the History, Philosophy, and Sociology of Sport Academy of NASPE.
2. Physical education teacher educators (n = 5) were employed as faculty members at doctoral granting universities, and identified as a teacher education expert by a fellow of the *National Academy of Kinesiology* or NASPE board member of the *Curriculum and Instruction Academy*.
3. Physical education teachers (n = 5) honored by NASPE (now SHAPE America) as district or national teachers of the year.

## 2.2 Questionnaire Development and Pilot Study

A pilot study was employed to construct a valid and complete questionnaire for implementation in the Delphi study that followed. The initial questionnaire was derived from a current list of 32 philosophy of sport competencies recommended by the Sport Philosophy Academy of NASPE (2004). An additional 9 history, 21 sociology, and 9 philosophy of sport competencies were from a list of knowledge, skills, and abilities recommended by the *American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation* (AAHPER, 1974). An open response section was added to end the questionnaire requesting pilot study participants to add any history, philosophy, and sociology competencies that would provide higher level of content validity, keeping in mind the ultimate goal was to produce a comprehensive list of theoretical and applied competencies for potential inclusion in the PETE undergraduate curriculum. The questionnaire contained 71 competencies for initial review and an open response section.

Following approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB), seven participants were randomly selected from the pool of prospective Delphi participants and agreed to participate in the Pilot study. The group consisted of one history of sport specialist, one philosophy of sport specialist, one sociology of sport specialist, two teacher educators, and two K-12 physical education teachers. Pilot study participants rated the original list of 71 HPSS competencies for content validity using a 5-point Likert scale: (4 to 5) item was a valid theoretical HPSS competency that could be incorporated into the PETE undergraduate curriculum, (3) item was neutral or undecided, and (2 or 1) item lacked curricular importance and should be removed (Bulger & Housner, 2007). In order to meet the criteria for inclusion on the survey, each item needed to receive a mean rating of three or higher in terms of content validity by at least 75% of respondents (Bulger & Housner, 2007). Participants were also asked to add any competencies that would provide a higher level of content validity and completeness to the questionnaire.

Analysis of results from the pilot study feedback resulted in all 71 HPSS competencies meeting the criteria for inclusion in the final survey. Pilot feedback also resulted in the addition of three new competencies related to: (a) human movement and the development of political, social, economic, and cultural patterns of historical societies; (b) responsibility of one's actions, opinions, and outcomes when engaging in sports; and (c) the way sport interfaces with race, ethnicity, gender, and class. Following the completion of the pilot study, the final list of 74 HPSS competencies were reorganized into a questionnaire format and used in the Delphi study that followed.

## 2.3 Delphi Study Procedures

The study employed a two-round Delphi quantitative-qualitative research design. Researchers collected quantitative data through the administration of two rounds of questioning in which expert panelists rated a list of 74 competencies in terms of its theoretical importance within the

PETE undergraduate curriculum and pedagogical relevance as related to teaching K-12 school-based physical education. Each item's theoretical importance and pedagogical relevance were rated using the following five-point Likert scale: (5) *strongly agree*, (4) *agree*, (3) *no opinion*, (2) *disagree*, and (1) *strongly disagree*. The conclusion of the second round was representative of final group consensus. Delphi literature indicates that two to four iterations are appropriate for reaching consensus; however, response exhaustion and attrition are more likely to occur after two rounds (Keeny, Hasson, & McKenna, 2006). Thus, two rounds of questionnaire circulation were determined to be most appropriate due to the extensive list of HPSS competencies requiring evaluation.

Qualitative data was obtained through follow-up interviews with a small group of Delphi participants to validate and expand on data findings, as well share views on how HPSS content should be structured and delivered within the PETE curriculum. The following subsections describe the Delphi administrative procedures: (a) Participant Recruitment, (b) Round I, (c) Round II, and (d) Verification Interviews.

### **2.3.1 Participant selection**

Following IRB approval, potential Delphi participants were identified using the previously described criteria and invited to participate in the study through an email invitation that included an overview of the study procedures and a statement of informed consent. The initial list of participants included eight history of sport specialists, eight philosophy of sport specialists, nine sociology of sport specialists, fifty-eight teacher educators, and sixty-four physical education teachers. A follow-up telephone call was made a week after the initial e-mail contact to initiate further conversation regarding the study, as well as answer any questions or concerns. Following each refusal to participate or non-response, the researchers randomly selected another name from the larger participant pool until the final panel make-up was determined.

Based on recommendations of Bulger and Housner (2007), a preset experimental mortality standard was established to determine the effects of participant attrition on the results of the study. The results of the study would be considered compromised if 20% or more of Delphi participants failed to complete both rounds of the study. At the completion of this study, 24 of 25 participants completed both rounds of questionnaire circulation, therefore, participant attrition was not considered a negative factor in the results of this study.

**2.3.2 Round I.** Delphi participants agreeing to participate were sent an e-mail describing: (a) the Delphi study process and timeline, (b) their responsibilities, (c) the significance of their scholarly contributions, and (d) website link for accessing the online questionnaire. Instructions for completing the questionnaire were provided once they accessed the online portal. Panel members rated a set of HPSS competencies in terms of their theoretical importance and pedagogical relevance for prospective physical education teachers. Delphi participants were given 3 weeks for completing the first circulation of questionnaires. Participants failing to complete the questionnaire within the first two weeks of distribution were contacted via e-mail to reiterate the value of their contribution and encourage the prompt completion. Following the return of all Round I questionnaires, participant responses were recorded in a Microsoft Office Excel database where the mean group and individual rating for each survey item were calculated. Statistical representation of individual and group responses for each questionnaire item was fed back to panel members in the second round for further consideration.

**2.3.3 Round II.** The same questionnaire was fed back to panelists with the inclusion of personal and group mean rating scores next to each survey item. Panelists were instructed to consider the mean group rating for each survey item and rate each questionnaire item a second time in light of overall group statistical average. The administrative procedures for the return of the surveys, data recording, and provisions for feedback followed the same protocol as in the first round.

### **2.3.4 Verification interview.**

Following Round II, a single panelist was randomly chosen from each group to complete a telephone verification interview (n=5). The broad aim of the verification interview was to confirm quantitative findings and determine views regarding the incorporation of HPSS within the undergraduate PETE curriculum. Researchers asked each interviewee a series of open-ended questions pertaining to: (a) the preferred course format for content delivery – combined, standalone, or stranded throughout the curriculum, and (b) reflections on the final list of generated competencies. As part of the interview process, each interviewee was provided the opportunity to discuss any topic relative to this study to gain a better understanding of their unique views related to the role of HPSS within PETE.

### **3. Data Analysis**

Researchers used the data collected following Delphi Round II to arrive at group consensus. For this study, researchers defined consensus as the percentage of agreement the researchers were willing to accept as sufficient evidence for inclusion of each HPSS competency in the PETE curriculum. In order to achieve consensus each competency had to receive a mean rating of at least four or higher in the areas of importance and relevance by at least 75% of all participants at the conclusion of the second round (Bulger & Housner, 2007). Any competency failing to meet the established criteria was considered non-essential in nature and removed from the final list. These data were also analyzed to determine differences of opinion among HPSS specialists, teacher educators, and K-12 physical education teachers about the competencies.

A content analysis was used (Fleming & Monda-Amaya, 2001) to triangulate Delphi panelists' responses to open-ended questions. Because questionnaire data were limited and did not represent the different perspectives of individual panel members, an explanatory sequential approach (Creswell, Plano-Clark, Gutmann, & Hanson, 2003) was used to expand on quantitative findings. Interview data were transcribed and initially coded according to each participant's area of specialization. Open coding was used in repeated rounds of transcript document analysis to identify common ideas or themes.

### **4. Results**

Delphi panelists reached a consensus of agreement on a final list of 27 (36%) of the initial 74 HPSS competencies for possible inclusion in the undergraduate PETE curriculum. The quantitative results of the study relate to the following areas: (a) History of Sport, (b) Philosophy of Sport, and (c) Sociology of Sport. Table 1 includes a summary of the final list of competencies across all areas.

#### **4.1 History of Sport Content**

The Delphi panel members reached a consensus of agreement regarding one of 10 (1%) history of sport competencies included on the questionnaire. The competency group mean for theoretical importance was 4.08 and 4.17 for pedagogical relevance. The percentage of panel members who rated that competency as being of critical importance and relevance was 92%. The following competencies were considered both important and relevant by teacher educators, but not by the other panelists: (a) historic debates between the academic and professional disciplines of physical education (e.g., Is the purpose of physical education to generate new "scientific" knowledge to advance the academic discipline or to generate "applied knowledge" to serve the public's need for school physical education and/or sport opportunities?); (b) understanding why physical education has been renamed with new identifiers such as exercise science, human movement, sport science, and kinesiology; and (c) various types of dualistic and holistic arguments, such as whether the body can be trained and/or educated without impacting the mind and vice-versa.

#### **4.2 Philosophy of Sport Content**

The Delphi panel members reached a consensus of agreement regarding 17 of 41 (42%) philosophy of sport competencies. The group mean for these competencies ranged from 4.04 to 4.79 for importance and from 4.00 to 4.75 for relevance. The percentage of panel members rating these competencies as essential ranged from 79-100%. Five of the remaining items satisfied the necessary criteria for theoretical importance, but were not considered to be highly relevant for those preparing to teach physical education in a K-12 setting. Although rated as essential by HPSS specialists and K-12 physical education teachers, the following philosophy of sport competencies were rated as non-essential by PETE faculty: (a) the contribution of sport philosophy to the practice of sport and physical education; (b) history of sport and physical education as it relates to the changing values and philosophies in sport and physical education; (c) ethical issues in sport and physical education (e.g., intimidation, illicit performance enhancing drugs, commercialization in college athletics, burnout and dropout, sportsmanship, and gender equity); (d) ability to cogently argue (verbal and written) for or against a variety of issues in sport and physical education; (e) ability to offer new viewpoints on competitive and/or educational practices in sport and physical education in order to improve practices in sport and physical education; and (f) ability to formulate a personal philosophy of human movement.

#### **4.3 Sociology of Sport Content.**

The Delphi panel members reached a consensus of agreement regarding nine of 23 (39%) sociology of sport competencies included on the questionnaire. These group means ranged from 4.00 to 4.33 for importance, and from 4.00 to 4.29 for relevance. The percentage of panel members rating these competencies as being important and relevant for inclusion in the PETE curriculum ranged from 75-92%.

The following four sociology of sport competencies were rated as essential by HPSS specialists and K-12 physical education teachers, and non-essential by PETE faculty: (a) describe cultural influence upon developmental patterns of play, games, dance, and sport; (b) explain how play, games, dance, and sport may be utilized to facilitate change; (c) identify the nature and interpret the role and importance of socialization; and (d) describe and interpret the sociological trinity (the way sport interfaces with race, ethnicity, gender, and class). The following sociology of sport competencies were rated as essential by teacher educators, but not other panel members: (a) identify and evaluate the problems which arise in cooperation and competition group movement experiences; and (b) demonstrate and evaluate various roles in group movement activities (e.g., facilitator, blocker, information source).

#### 4.4 Verification Interviews

Qualitative results obtained from verification interviews revealed the following themes: (a) Course Delivery, (b) Curricular Space, (c) Instructor Preference, (d) Name Change, and (e) Competency Impact. The following section delineates the unique perceptions of panelists, as well as proposed recommendations.

##### 4.4.1 Course delivery.

Researchers asked panelists how PETE programs can best present HPSS content in the program of study – as a combined course or courses, three separate courses, or stranded within the curriculum. Of the five panel members interviewed, one panelist conveyed that HPSS content should be combined as one course within the PETE curriculum. Two panelists suggested teaching History and Philosophy of Sport as one course, and Sociology of Sport content as a stand-alone course, as well as having the content reiterated throughout the PETE curriculum. One panelist believed it would be “garbage if stranded” throughout the curriculum. This panelist suggested that HPSS content would be most valuable if taught as separate courses, rather than infusing the content as the primary means of students obtaining the knowledge.

##### 4.4.2 Curricular space.

All five interviewed panelists acknowledged that HPSS was not a focus in PETE due to lack of curricular space. One panelist noted that HPSS specialists are fighting for their space within the curriculum even though institutions have taught the content for several decades. Another panelist noted that HPSS professionals have done a poor job promoting their own value to PETE, and are suffering the consequences by getting squeezed out of the curriculum to make room for more skill-related courses. Both the teacher educator and K-12 physical education teacher agreed that the emphasis should be placed on more skill and health-related content in order to meet physical activity goals. For example, one panelist suggested that a curricular emphasis should be placed on *“the development of health-related skills students will be able to use for the rest of their lives.”* Another panelist stated that teacher education programs *“have to meet NCATE standards and there is barely room for all of that information, and when you add the semester taken away by student teaching, where do we put it?”*

##### 4.4.3 Instructor preference.

A lack of enthusiasm by PETE instructors was mentioned by three (philosophy, history, PETE) of the five panelists in reference to who should teach HPSS courses. One panelist suggested PETE faculty are not hired because of their knowledge of history, philosophy or sociology, yet are given the task of teaching these courses and have very little passion for the subject matter. Another panel member noted HPSS specialists need to instruct these content areas, however, proving the value of the content has been difficult. Similarly, another panelist stated the following:

*“This is a school by school thing as to what to include in the curriculum and if there is room. Usually specialists are needed to teach these areas; however, PETE tends to have people trained in pedagogy teach these courses that have no passion or interest in these areas. Therefore, it is difficult to prove these areas need to remain in the curriculum.”* Interviewed panelists with HPSS backgrounds agreed the content is best taught by specialists; whereas the teacher educator and physical education teacher did not have an instructor preference. The sociology panelist pointed to the fact that since there is now so few HPSS specialists within kinesiology departments, teacher educators have to assume the responsibility.

##### 4.4.4 Name change.

All panel members thought the name history of sport, philosophy of sport, and sociology of sport, or any combination thereof, was limiting and did not adequately represent the goals of physical education. It was suggested the term “sport” be changed to new terminology, such as “physical activity,” “physical education,” or “human movement.”

One panel member suggested *“the term sport should be used to complement, rather than define these content areas.”*

Another panelist stated: *“I believe sport is a limiting name. Physical education deals with meeting needs of individuals across a lifespan and sport and skills do not relate to life skills. So physical activity would better address the life skill needs to include wellness, nutrition, and makethings more relevant for students.”*

#### **4.4.5 Competency impact.**

To verify and expand on the quantitative data, each interviewee was asked questions pertaining to their views on the final list of competencies derived from the study. To improve the quantitative results, one panelist suggested adding the following competency and three sub-competencies in the PETE curriculum:

Identify the role and understand the cultural and ethnic influence games, sport, and play have in determining the meaning of the experience of physical activity.

- a. Identify and interpret meaning and experiences of physical activity for various race and ethnic groups;
- b. Relate experiences of games, sport, and play for race and ethnic groups to society; and,
- c. Identify significant persons and events which contribute to present day understanding of games, sport, and play to race and ethnic groups.

These competencies were not added to the final list since consensus had already been determined; however, it would prove beneficial to include these competencies in future research. The removal of competencies from the final list was not recommended by any panel members during the interviews. It was clear from the verification interviews the panelists were split between HPSS and physical educators regarding their views on the impact of the final list of competencies for potential inclusion in the PETE curriculum. Both teacher educators and K-12 physical educators believed the final list of competencies were not relevant enough to evoke a curricular change throughout various PETE programs. One panelist stated, *“even though the competencies are important, I don’t see them having much impact since the curriculum focus is now on physical activity and movement-related content.”* Conversely, the HPSS specialists believed that the competencies generated from the study could enhance the PETE curriculum.

### **5. Discussion**

The primary purpose of this study was to bring together a multidisciplinary group of experts, and generate consensus regarding an initial list of HPSS competencies for potential inclusion in the undergraduate PETE curriculum. The resulting list of HPSS competencies is not intended to be an all-inclusive list for uniform adoption by PETE programs, but rather to inform the curriculum development process. It is ultimately the responsibility of PETE faculty and administrators to decide what content to include, and what content to exclude at their respective institution based on their view of good teaching and other available resources (NASPE, 2004, 2008, 2009, 2010). A secondary aim of the study was to engage in meaningful discussion pertaining to the structure and delivery of HPSS knowledge within the PETE curriculum. The results of this scholarly process produced findings for discussion in following areas: (a) Course Content, (b) Course Delivery, and (c) Future Directions.

#### **5.1 Course Content**

The present study examined history, philosophy, and sociology of “sport” competencies in relation to the PETE curriculum. Verification interviews revealed that Delphi panelists believed that HPSS of “physical activity” or “human movement” would better serve the goals of PETE programs. The findings suggest the present view of HPSS does not fully complement the goals of PETE and school-based physical educations in promoting physical activity initiatives. Verification interviews revealed that Delphi panelists believed that HPSS of “physical activity” or “human movement” would better serve the goals of PETE programs. For example, one panelist suggested the term “sport” used in conjunction with history, philosophy, and sociology offers only a limited view of what physical educators do in their professional practice. In the present study, the findings showed that teacher educators and K-12 physical education teachers observed the relationship between the identified HPSS competencies and the goals of physical education in achieving outcomes related to physical activity as divorced. For example, one panelist could not see the competencies having much impact since the curriculum focus in physical education is on movement forms and physical activity. Another panelist articulated that HPSS specialists need to do a better job at promoting the value of their subject matter, which includes demonstrating how history, philosophy, and sociology can make a valuable contribution to the larger mission of kinesiology and physical education programs in advancing human movement and physical activity concerns.

Taken together, there appears to be a need to establish a greater alignment between HPSS knowledge and outcomes related to physical activity and quality of life initiatives. This would require re-connecting with the professional mission of kinesiology and serving the PETE profession in a more integrated fashion (Gill, 2007).

However, it is important to understand that sports and games are inclusive categories of physical activity (Ainsworth et al., 1993) and provide an avenue of engaging youth in meaningful and purposeful physical activity (Hawkins, 2008). The results derived from panelist interviews, however, suggest the term “sport” should complement HPSS knowledge, rather than define it.

The verification interviews pointed to particular ideas or themes in history, philosophy, and sociology that were determined to be valuable and relevant for physical education majors. The themes identified through consensual agreement suggest there is a need to include content in PETE programs that foster a broader sociocultural perspective. Although skill-based content is critical (NASPE, 2008), the content necessary to produce physical educators who are capable of teaching in ways that make youth want to be physically active and remain physically active may be quite different. The findings suggest physical educators should come to understand cultural and societal values, youth socialization forces and processes, ethical issues and decision making, cultures and subcultures (e.g., race, gender, social class), and intrinsic and extrinsic factors associated with participating in various forms of physical activity (e.g., play, games, sport). As a change agent, findings from the study point to the need for developing physical educators who can: (a) promote physical education as a valuable and integral part of K-12 students’ overall education, (b) debate for or against various physical education issues, and (c) offer viewpoints to improve practices in physical education. The competencies identified in the present study can provide initial direction for physical education faculty seeking to include HPSS content within the undergraduate curriculum. In the same way, the competencies can potentially contribute to developing culturally competent physical education teachers who are capable of facilitating organizational change that supports quality programming for all students, not just the athletically gifted.

## **5.2 Content Delivery**

### **5.2.1 Course structure.**

Findings from the study suggest panelists had different views regarding how HPSS course content should be structured and delivered to physical education majors in the undergraduate curriculum. History, philosophy, and sociology of sport professionals saw more value in delivering content through stand-alone courses rather than other approaches. However, teacher educators and K-12 physical education teachers collectively pointed out issues with stand-alone course offerings which include (a) lack of curricular space, and (b) the need for a stronger focus on skill, physical activity, and fitness-related content in order to meet the NASPE standards. For example, one panelist noted PETE programs lack the faculty resources and curricular space to deliver HPSS content as three separate courses. The concerns expressed suggest that managing the disciplinary content within the PETE curriculum has become so complicated that decisions need to be made by PETE faculty regarding what content to include and what to eliminate based on the perceived relevance of the subject matter. Disciplinary content seen as having little curricular relevance could be removed from the PETE curriculum entirely, or delivered in combination with other courses to satisfy program accreditation requirements. In the present study, differences in panelists’ opinions relative to how HPSS course content should be structured and delivered were clearly linked to the perceived relevance of the subject matter. A possible alternative relates to the dual-listing of HPSS courses as meeting the college or university general education requirements. Pre-service teachers could then enroll in these courses as general education credits to preserve curricular space within the major. Added benefits to this approach include exposure of PETE disciplinary content to a broader student population, platform for recruitment into kinesiology-related majors, and generation of student credit hours.

Given the limited number of credit hours within the PETE curriculum, stranding has been advocated as a means of systematically infusing and revisiting fundamental disciplinary knowledge and skills within a wide variety of instructional contexts (Bulger, Housner, & Lee, 2008; Bulger, Mohr, Carson, Robert, & Wiegand, 2000). The results from the present study provide insight into essential HPSS concepts, themes, or perspectives that could be stranded throughout the undergraduate PETE curriculum. For example, ethical issues and decision making in sport and physical education could be a perspective introduced during the foundational semesters and stranded across a number of professional preparation course requirements, such as curriculum, assessment, adapted physical education, and/or student teaching seminar. Although there were differences in opinions regarding curriculum stranding, two panelists suggested infusing HPSS knowledge within the PETE curriculum to allow prospective physical educators to make more meaningful connections between the content and school-based applications. However, future research is needed to fully support the idea of stranding as an alternative means of delivering HPSS content within the PETE curriculum.

### **5.2.2 Instructor preference.**

Teacher preparation programs are also charged with making decisions on who should teach disciplinary courses within the PETE curriculum. Physical education faculty is not typically hired for their knowledge and expertise in HPSS. Nor

are HPSS professionals hired for their pedagogical knowledge and experience. The choice of who should teach the HPSS content varies from institution to institution based on faculty resources. Gill (2007) noted there are very few history and/or sociology scholars across the broader kinesiology discipline. Accordingly, PETE faculty are most likely relegated to teaching HPSS content at regional institutions, whereas, research-intensive doctoral granting institutions are more inclined to have specialists teach these courses. Although panelists voiced concerns about physical educators having a lack of passion for HPSS subject matter, it is unlikely HPSS specialists will be hired to serve the needs of physical education majors in the future if the body of knowledge does not share a common perspective or focus on youth physical activity. One panelist said that HPSS scholars have done a poor job of promoting the value of their subject matter in physical education. Thus, it is not surprising to find HPSS specialists questioning their place in the PETE curriculum where the content is either poorly understood, or not aligned with the academic needs of future teachers.

## 6. Future Directions

The results of this modified-Delphi study yielded a final set of 27 HPSS competencies viewed as essential for inclusion the PETE curriculum by the representative panel of experts. The competencies identified through consensual agreement can serve as a useful reference for curriculum development and evaluation, professional practice, and future research. The present study examined history, philosophy, and sociology of “sport” competencies in relation to the PETE curriculum. However, a follow-up study defining essential history, philosophy, and sociology concepts and competencies in specific relation to physical education and physical activity would prove useful. Future research would be Verification interviews revealed that Delphi panelists believed that HPSS of “physical activity” or “human movement” would better serve the goals of PETE programs. Accordingly, HPSS professionals recognized a need to do a better job at promoting the value of their subject matter. In essence, this would require demonstrating how history, philosophy, and sociology can make a valuable contribution to the larger mission of kinesiology and physical education programs in advancing human movement and physical activity concerns.

Looking into the near future, there is a need to specially examine how HPS content can contribute to PETE and physical education programs in facilitating physically active lifestyles among school-aged youth. This will require uncovering history, philosophy, and sociology content that is currently not included, but should be included, in the PETE curriculum. The findings from this study suggest philosophy and sociology would better serve physical education as a sociocultural body of knowledge, rather than dividing these areas into separate camps. The quantitative findings revealed knowledge pertaining to culture and social values as consistent themes across philosophy and sociology boundaries. Accordingly, sociocultural content related to youth physical activity could potentially provide a rich body of knowledge for inclusion in the PETE curriculum. Although the results of this study provide initial impetus for sociocultural content within PETE, future research in this area from a multidisciplinary perspective is needed and would prove valuable. The Delphi method, and its many variations represents a promising approach for facilitating an appropriate decision-making environment in which all ideas and perspectives are equally considered among academic scholars and practitioners across disciplinary landscapes.

## 7. References

- Abernathy, R., & Waltz, M. (1964). Toward A Discipline: First Steps First. *Quest*, 2(1), 1-7.
- Ainsworth, B. E., Haskell, W. L., Leon, A. S., Jacobs, D. R., Montoye, H. J., Sallis, J. F., & Paffenbarger, R. S. (1993). Compendium of physical activities: Classification of energy costs of human physical activities. *Medical & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 25(1), 71-80.
- American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation [AAHPER]. (1974). *Professional preparation in dance, physical education, recreation education, safety education, and school health education*. Washington, DC: AAHPER Publications-Sales.
- Bulger, S. M., & Housner, L. D. (2007). Modified Delphi investigation of exercise science in physical education teacher education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 26(1), 57-80.
- Bulger, S.M., Housner, L.D., & Lee, A.M. (2008). Curriculum alignment: A view from physical education teacher education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 79(7), 44-49.
- Bulger, S. M., Mohr, D. J., Carson, L. M., Robert, D. L., & Wiegand, R. L. (2000). Preparing prospective physical educators in exercise physiology. *Quest*, 52(2), 166-185.
- Corbin, C. B., & McKenzie, T. L. (2008). Physical activity promotion: A responsibility for both K-12 physical education and kinesiology. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 79(6), 47-50.

- Creswell, J. W., Plano-Clark, V. L., Gutmann, M., & Hanson, W. (2003). Advanced mixed methods research designs. In A. Tashakkon & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social & Behavioral Research* (pp. 209 – 240). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dalkey, N. C. (1967). Delphi. Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation.
- Eitzen, D. S., & Sage, G. H. (2008). *Sociology of North American sport* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Ennis, C. (2010). New Directions in Undergraduate and Graduate Education in Kinesiology and Physical Education. *Quest*, 62(1), 76-91.
- Fleming, J. L., & Monda-Amaya, L. E. (2001). Process variables critical for team effectiveness: A Delphi study of wrap around team members. *Remedial & Special Education*, 22(3), 158-171.
- Gill, D. (2007). Integration: The key to sustaining kinesiology in higher education. *Quest*, 59(3), 270-286.
- Harris, J. C. (1989). Suited up and stripped down: Perspectives for sociocultural sport studies. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 6, 335-347.
- Harris, J. C., & Kretchmar, R. S. (2005). Philosophy of physical activity. In S. J. Hoffman (Ed.), *Introduction to kinesiology: Studying physical activity* (pp. 147-175). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hasson, F., Keeney, S., & McKenna, H. (2000). Research guidelines for the Delphi survey technique. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 32(4), 1008-1015.
- Hawkins, A. (2008). Pragmatism, purpose, and play: Struggle for the soul of physical education. *Quest*, 60(3), 345-356.
- Henry, F. M. (1964). Physical education: An academic discipline. *Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation*, 35(7), 32–33, 69.
- Hoffman, S. J. (2005). *Introduction to kinesiology: Studying physical activity* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Keeny, S., Hasson, F., & McKenna H. (2006). Consulting the oracle: Ten lessons from using the Delphi technique in nursing research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 53(2), 205-212.
- Kretchmar, S. R. (1990). Commentary: Riding the juggernaut. *Quest*, 42(3), 330-334.
- Lang, T. (1998). *An overview of four futures methodologies*. Retrieved from <http://www.futures.hawaii.edu/publications/half-fried-ideas/J7/LANG.pdf>
- Linstone, H., & Turoff, M. (1975). *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Marett, J., Siler, W., Pavlacka, J., & Shapiro, R. (1984). Current status of kinesiology and biomechanics in sports. In R. Shapiro & J. R. Marett (Eds.), *Proceedings of the second national symposium on teaching kinesiology and biomechanics in sports* (pp. 95-96). Colorado Springs, CO: USOC and Kinesiology Academy of NASPE.
- Mechikoff, R. A., & Estes, S. G. (2005). *A history and philosophy of sport and physical education: From ancient civilizations to the modern world* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- National Association for Sport and Physical Education [NASPE]. (2004). *Minimum competencies for teaching undergraduate sport philosophy courses*. Reston, VA: Author.
- National Association for Sport and Physical Education [NASPE]. (2009). *Guidelines for teaching undergraduate sport sociology*. Reston, VA: Author.
- National Association for Sport and Physical Education [NASPE]. (2008). *National initial physical education teacher education standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=9jpRd%2B5aH84%3D&tabid=676>
- National Association for Sport and Physical Education [NASPE]. (2010). *Suggested guidelines for teaching undergraduate history of physical education and sport in a physical education teacher education program*. Reston, VA: Author.
- Ross, S. M., Metcalf, A. A., Bulger, S. M., & Housner, L. D. (2014). Modified Delphi investigation of motor development and learning in physical education teacher education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 85, 316-329.
- Sage, G. H. (1997). Physical education, sociology, and sociology of sport: points of intersection. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 14(4), 317 - 339.
- Sandrey, M. A., & Bulger, S. M. (2008). The Delphi method: An approach for facilitating evidence based practice in athletic training. *Athletic Training Education Journal*, 3(4), 1-8.
- Schmidt, W. C. (1997). World-Wide Web survey research: Benefits, potential problems, and solutions. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 29(2), 274-279.
- Siedentop, D. (2009). *Introduction to physical education, fitness and sport* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Vernon W. (2009). The Delphi technique: A review. *International Journal of Therapy & Rehabilitation*, 16(2), 69-76.

- Zhang, Y. (1999). Using the Internet for survey research. *Society for Information Science*, 51(1), 57-68.
- Zeigler, E. F., & McCristal, K. (1967). A history of the Big Ten Body-of- Knowledge Project in Physical Education. *Quest*, 9, 79-84.
- Ziglio, E. (1996). The Delphi method and its contribution to decision-making. In M. Adler & E. Ziglio (Eds.), *Gazing into the oracle: The Delphi method and its application to social policy and public health* (pp. 3-33). Bristol, PA: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.