

Georgia State University

ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

---

Kinesiology Dissertations

Department of Kinesiology and Health

---

Spring 5-12-2017

## A Descriptive Profile of Dance Curriculum in Physical Education Teacher Education Programs

Jenee M. Marquis  
*Georgia State University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/kin\\_health\\_diss](https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/kin_health_diss)

---

### Recommended Citation

Marquis, Jenee M., "A Descriptive Profile of Dance Curriculum in Physical Education Teacher Education Programs." Dissertation, Georgia State University, 2017.  
doi: <https://doi.org/10.57709/10123790>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Kinesiology and Health at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Kinesiology Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@gsu.edu](mailto:scholarworks@gsu.edu).

## ACCEPTANCE

This dissertation, A DESCRIPTIVE PROFILE OF DANCE CURRICULUM IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS, by JENÉE MARQUIS, was prepared under the direction of the candidate's Dissertation Advisory Committee. It is accepted by the committee members in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree, Doctor of Philosophy, in the College of Education and Human Development, Georgia State University.

The Dissertation Advisory Committee and the student's Department Chairperson, as representatives of the faculty, certify that this dissertation has met all standards of excellence and scholarship as determined by the faculty.

---

Michael Metzler, Ph.D.  
Committee Chair

---

Jacalyn Lund, Ph.D.  
Committee Member

---

Betty Block, Ph.D.  
Committee Member

---

Date

---

Mark Geil, Ph.D.  
Chairperson, Department of Kinesiology and Health

---

Paul A. Alberto, Ph.D.  
Dean  
College of Education and Human Development

---

Shannon Barrett-Williams, Ph.D.  
Committee Member

---

Rachel Gurvitch, Ed.D.  
Committee Member

## AUTHOR'S STATEMENT

By presenting this dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the advanced degree from Georgia State University, I agree that the library of Georgia State University shall make it available for inspection and circulation in accordance with its regulations governing materials of this type. I agree that permission to quote, to copy from, or to publish this dissertation may be granted by the professor under whose direction it was written, by the College of Education and Human Development's Director of Graduate Studies, or by me. Such quoting, copying, or publishing must be solely for scholarly purposes and will not involve potential financial gain. It is understood that any copying from or publication of this dissertation which involves potential financial gain will not be allowed without my written permission.

---

Jenée Marie Marquis

## **NOTICE TO BORROWERS**

All dissertations deposited in the Georgia State University library must be used in accordance with the stipulations prescribed by the author in the preceding statement. The author of this dissertation is:

Jenée Marie Marquis  
1108 Pughes Creek Way  
Lawrenceville, GA 30045

The director of this dissertation is:

Dr. Michael W. Metzler  
Department of Kinesiology and Health  
College of Education and Human Development  
Georgia State University  
Atlanta, GA 30303

## CURRICULUM VITAE

Jenée Marquis

ADDRESS: 1108 Pughes Creek Way  
Lawrenceville, GA 30045

### EDUCATION:

Ph.D.	2016	Georgia State University Kinesiology and Health Kinesiology – Physical Education Teacher Education
Master’s Degree	2013	Georgia State University Kinesiology and Health Health and Physical Education
Bachelor’s Degree	2007	Georgia State University Arts and Sciences Art History

### PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

2013-present	Graduate Research Assistant Georgia State University
2013-2015	Graduate Teaching Assistant Georgia State University
2013-2015	Editorial Assistant <i>Quest</i>
2011-2013	Graduate Research Assistant Georgia State University

### PRESENTATIONS AND PUBLICATIONS:

Marquis, J. & Metzler, M. (in press). Curricular space allocated for dance content in physical education teacher education programs: A literature review. *Quest*.  
doi:10.1080/00336297.2016.1256223

- Metzler, M., Diamond, E., Hunt, K., Jackson, J., Marquis, J., Trent, M. (2016, April). *Instructional alignment in college teaching: A pilot study*. Poster presentation at the Conference on Scholarly Teaching. Atlanta, GA.
- Metzler, M., Diamond, E., Hunt, K., Jackson, J., Marquis, J., Trent, M. (2016, March). *Instructional alignment in college teaching: A pilot study*. Poster presentation at the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons Conference. Savannah, GA.
- Metzler, M., Barrett-Williams, S., Hunt, K., Marquis, J., Trent, M. (2015, October). *The plausibility and feasibility of a 2-year HOPE CSPAP implementation*. Presentation at the PETE/HETE Conference. Atlanta, GA.
- Trent, M., Hunt, K., Marquis, J., Jackson, J., Yao, A., Burgess, J. (2015, October). *Envisioning the future of PETE: What does your program stand for?* Presentation at the PETE/HETE Conference. Atlanta, GA.
- Metzler, M., Barrett-Williams, S., Hunt, K., Marquis, J., & Trent, M. (2015, March). *First flight of the fledgling: Advancing comprehensive school physical activity program research*. Presentation at the SHAPE America National Convention. Seattle, WA.
- Metzler, M., Hunt, K., Barrett-Williams, S., Trent, M., & Marquis, J. (2015, February). *Implementing and evaluating a comprehensive school physical activity program (CSPAP): Year 1 results*. Poster Presentation at the Active Living Research Conference. San Diego, CA.
- Marquis, J. (2015, February). *Bhangra beats! Incorporating Indian dance into physical education*. Presentation at the SHAPE America Southern District Conference. Atlanta, GA.
- Marquis, J. (2015, February). *Shake and shimmy! How to incorporate belly dance into your physical education curriculum*. Presentation at the SHAPE America Southern District Conference. Atlanta, GA.
- Marquis, J. & Gurvitch, R. (2015). *Shake it out! Belly dancing in physical education*. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 86(8), 14-21.
- Hunt, K., Trent, M., Jackson, J., Marquis, J., Barrett-Williams, S., Gurvitch, R., Metzler, M. (2015). *The effect of content delivery media on student engagement and learning outcomes*. *Journal of Effective Teaching*, 16(1), 5-18.

## PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES AND ORGANIZATIONS

2015	National Dance Education Organization
2013	National Association for Kinesiology in Higher Education
2011	Society of Health and Physical Educators
2011	Georgia Association of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance
2011	Georgia Association of Educators

# A DESCRIPTIVE PROFILE OF DANCE CURRICULUM IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

by

JENÉE MARQUIS

Under the Direction of Dr. Michael W. Metzler

## ABSTRACT

Dance as a content area has received little attention within physical education teacher education (PETE) research. To date, there has been only one study, conducted in 1992, that examined dance courses within PETE programs. In order for PETE faculty to make informed programmatic decisions about the role of dance education within PETE and P-12 physical education, the findings of this study must be updated. The primary purpose of this mixed methods study is to gather current descriptive information about dance courses in PETE programs. A secondary purpose of this study is to uncover both personnel and institutional elements that act as either facilitators or inhibitors of dance instruction within PETE programs. Data collected via an online questionnaire (n = 580, 17.9% return rate) revealed that a quarter of respondents (25.8%, n = 23) neither offered nor required dance courses in their PETE program and 67.4% (n = 60) of institutions required at

least one course that contained dance content in their program. The top five dance content areas taught are rhythmic activities (88.9%), line dance (70.4%), folk/world dance (61.1%), creative dance (61.1%), and square dance (48.1%). Data also revealed that PE major students gained pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) from writing lesson plans (89.5%), student learning outcomes and assessments (71.1%), learning the history of dance and/or dance appreciation (39.5%) as well as theories of dance education (29.0%). Over half of dance courses (51.1%) are taught by a member of the Professoriate or the Department Chair and the mean tenure of dance course instructors is 9.2 years. Last, the questionnaire revealed that the strongest facilitator of dance instruction was instructor expertise (27.9%) and the strongest inhibitor of dance instruction was lack of curricular space (15.1%) which was corroborated by the interview data. Furthermore the interview data, which was coded using Descriptive Coding coupled with Phenomenological and Thematic Analysis, found that interviewee's highly valued dance as both a lifelong physical activity and as an essential component to a P-12 PE program.

**INDEX WORDS:** physical education teacher education, dance, content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, mixed methods, curricular space, teacher knowledge base



A DESCRIPTIVE PROFILE OF DANCE CURRICULUM IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION  
TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

by

JENÉE MARQUIS

A Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the

Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Kinesiology

in

Kinesiology and Health Department

in

the College of Education and Human Development

Georgia State University

Atlanta, GA  
2016

Copyright by  
Jenée M. Marquis  
2016

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I would like to acknowledge my advisor, Dr. Michael Metzler and his wife Mrs. Teresa Metzler. Without their continued support and guidance both academically and personally I would have given up on this venture a long time ago. Second, I would like to thank all of the members of my doctoral committee; Dr. Shannon Barrett-Williams, Dr. Jacalyn Lund, Dr. Rachel Gurvitch, and Dr. Betty Block. Their belief and faith in me, both as an educator and researcher, and their dedication to seeing me through this journey means more to me than I can say. I would also like to acknowledge and thank my father Daniel Marquis, my mother Gisele Marquis, my brother Joel and sister-in-law Angelina Marquis, my nieces Kaden and Maddison, my nephew Madoc, the Cubby Hole Kids of Georgia State University, the Golden Girls, my High Museum of Art crew, my sisters and brothers in dance, and my number one fan and partner in crime, Jay Adams. Thank you all for your assurance in my abilities and your patience with me as I undertook this challenge. Thank you all for believing in me when I did not and, most importantly, for loving me even when I drove you crazy. Let's make America nasty again in 2020.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>LIST OF TABLES.....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>1 CURRICULAR SPACE ALLOCATED FOR DANCE CONTENT IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS: A LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
<b>Review.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>2 A DESCRIPTIVE PROFILE OF DANCE CURRICULUM IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Methodology .....</b>	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.1</b>
<b>Purpose and Research Questions.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Results .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Discussion.....</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>Conclusions and Recommendations.....</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>80</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

1.1 Dance and Rhythm Vocabulary within the National Standards.....	4
1.2 Frequency of Dance and Rhythm Outcomes by Grade Level.....	5
2.1 Questionnaire Participants by SHAPE America District.....	45
2.2 Questionnaire Participants by Institutional Enrollment.....	45
2.3 Questionnaire Participants by Institution Type.....	46
2.4 Questionnaire Participants by Gender.....	46
2.5 Questionnaire Participants by Highest Educational Degree Completed.....	46
2.6 Questionnaire Participants by Total Number of Years Teaching in Higher Education.....	46
2.7 Questionnaire Participants by Total Number of Years Teaching in PETE.....	47
2.8 Questionnaire Participants by Current Position Title.....	47
2.9 Institutional Demographics of Interview Participants.....	47
2.10 Personal Demographics of Interview Participants.....	48
2.11 Curricular Space Allocated to Dance Courses by Program Certification Type.....	51
2.12 Frequency of Dance Content Knowledge.....	51
2.13 Frequency of Dance Pedagogical Content Knowledge.....	52
2.14 Student Learning Activities.....	52
2.15 Pedagogical Strategies Employed.....	52
2.16 Assessments Employed.....	53
2.17 Instructor’s Formal Content Knowledge Training in Dance.....	54
2.18 Instructor’s Formal Pedagogical Content Knowledge Training in Dance.....	54
2.19 Facilitators and Inhibitors of Dance Instruction.....	55
2.20 Qualitative Data Codes, Themes, and Sample Interviewee Statements.....	56

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

CK	Content Knowledge
GTA	Graduate Teaching Assistant
IRB	Institutional Review Board
NASPE	National Association for Sport and Physical Education
NDA	National Dance Association
PA	Physical Activity
PE	Physical Education
PCK	Pedagogical Content Knowledge
PETE	Physical Education Teacher Education
PE-PCK	Physical Education-Pedagogical Content Knowledge
PK	Pedagogical Knowledge
SHAPE	Society of Health and Physical Educators
SPSS	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences

# **1 CURRICULAR SPACE ALLOCATED FOR DANCE CONTENT IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS:**

## **A LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Introduction**

Dance is a form of lifelong physical activity that can be practiced and enjoyed by everyone. Proponents of dance education within physical education (PE) argue that teaching dance can positively affect students in all three learning domains (Bolen, Heatherly, Ratliff, & McCulloch-Vinson, 2012; Pangrazi & Beighle, 2016). Within the psychomotor domain, research has shown that engaging in various forms of dance can improve children's movement repertoire, develop coordination and balance, increase overall physical activity frequency in adolescents, and boost students' flexibility, strength and overall fitness levels (Chen & Cone, 2003; Cone & Cone, 2003; O'Neill, Pate, & Liese, 2011; Pangrazi, 2016). More aerobic forms of dance and combining dance with technology, as with the case of exergaming, has the potential to increase daily physical activity levels and can promote weight loss or maintenance (Zan & Ping, 2014). Cognitively, dance can foster creativity and self-expression, increase focus and self-awareness, promote quick decision making and critical thinking, offer a sense of ownership and autonomy, and even improve academic performance (Chen & Cone, 2003; Linthicum, 2009; Lorenzo-Lasa, R. Ideishi, & S. Ideishi, 2007; Pangrazi & Beighle, 2016; Ross, 2006). Also, integrating dance content with classroom subjects, such as science or language arts, can help motivate students and promote transfer of learning to other content areas (Linthicum, 2009; Wirszyła & Gorecki, 1998). From an affective perspective, dance can help students learn cooperation, social etiquette, respect for others, increase confidence, improve listening skills and can deepen appreciation for others, particularly in learning multicultural or folk dances (Bolen et al., 2012; Lorenzo-Lasa et

al., 2007; Pangrazi & Beighle, 2016; Ross, 2006; Ward, 2013). Last, from a critical lens, teaching dance in PE can open avenues for class discussions on gender issues, cultural competency, and social justice (Gard, 2003; Ward, 2013).

In the 1930s, dance education within the P-12 school system became officially housed within the PE curriculum through increased dance advocacy within the American Physical Education Association (Murray, 1968). The largest professional association of health and physical educators within the United States, the Society for Health and Physical Educators (SHAPE America), has continued to incorporate dance standards into the national grade level outcomes for P-12 physical education, created in part to assist physical educators in designing and assessing physical education program content.

In 1994, the National Dance Standards were published in the report *National Standards for Arts Education: What Every Young American Should Know and Be Able To Do in the Arts*. This undertaking was developed by the Consortium of National Arts Education Associations (CNAEA) which included the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAHPERD), the National Dance Association (NDA, now dissolved), the National Art Education Association (NAEA), and the Music Educators National Conference (MENC). The purpose of these standards was to “render, in operational terms, the value and importance of the arts for the educational well-being of our young people and our country” (Mahlmann, J., 1994, p. 12). Since one of the sponsoring agencies for this report included AAHPERD, it could be argued that the arts standards were also meant, in part, to complement the National Physical Education Standards and were intended to assist both dance and physical educators when planning for their dance curriculum. However, this document is distinctly labeled as arts education standards and nowhere within the report is physical education mentioned. Also, the electronic version of the



National Dance Standards are not housed on the SHAPE America website and, along with the National Adapted PE/PA Standards, are maintained on an external website separate from SHAPE America (SHAPE America, 2013). The organization that contains the National Dance Standards is the ArtsEdge program of The Kennedy Center and the standards are filed under “Standards in Dance, Music, Theater, and Visual Arts” (n.d.). Given that the dance standards are linked so strongly to the arts standards in these two public mediums, it is reasonable to ask how many physical education teacher education (PETE) faculty and/or P-12 physical educators are aware of the National Dance Standards and, if they are, how many actually reference them when planning for their dance curriculum? Therefore, with such questions surrounding their frequency of use by PETE and P-12 physical educators, the authors chose not to include further discussion of the National Dance Standards within the confines of this manuscript and are solely focusing on the National Physical Education Standards.

An examination of the grade level outcomes as determined by SHAPE America (SHAPE America, 2013) reveals the extent to which dance skills, knowledge, and dispositions should be emphasized in P-12 PE. For the purpose of this particular analysis, the authors employed the Operational Definition of Activity Categories provided by SHAPE America in the Grade Level Outcomes document. SHAPE America delineates Dance and Rhythm Activities to include “activities that focus on dance or rhythms and might include, but are not limited to dance forms such as creative movement/dance, ballet, modern, ethnic/folk, hip hop, Latin, line, ballroom, social and square” (SHAPE America, 2013). However, for the following literature review we will apply the umbrella term of “dance” to denote both dance and rhythmic activities. Table 1.1 illustrates the placement and frequency in which the terms “dance” or “rhythm” appear in the grade level outcomes for P-12 physical education.

Table 1.1: Dance and Rhythm Vocabulary within the National Standards

<b>Standard 1: The physically literate individual demonstrates competency in a variety of motor skills and movement patterns.</b>		
Elementary School	Middle School	High School
E1.4 E1.5a E3.5 E5.K - 5 E7.5 E8.1 E8.5 E10.5 E11.2 - 5 E12.3	M1.6 – 8	H2.L1 – 2
<b>Standard 2: The physically literate individual applies knowledge of concepts, principles, strategies, and tactics related to movement and performance.</b>		
Elementary School	Middle School	High School
E1.Kb – 2 E1.5 E2.2 E2.4 – 5 E3.5c E4.3a – b E4.4 – 5	M12.6 – 7	H1.L1 – 2 H4.L1 – 2
<b>Standard 3: The physically literate individual demonstrates knowledge and skills to achieve and maintain a health-enhancing level of physical activity and fitness.</b>		
Elementary School	Middle School	High School
No outcome mentioning rhythms/dance knowledge, skills, or dispositions.	M3.6 M3.8 M4.6 M5.6 M5.8	H6.L1 – 2
<b>Standard 4: The physically literate individual exhibits responsible personal and social behavior that respects self and others.</b>		
Elementary School	Middle School	High School
No outcome mentioning rhythms/dance knowledge, skills, or dispositions.	M6.6 – 8	H2.L1 H4.L1 H5.L1 – 2
<b>Standard 5: The physically literate individual recognizes the value of physical activity for health, enjoyment, challenge, self-expression and/or social interaction.</b>		
Elementary School	Middle School	High School
E2.5 E3.2	No outcome mentioning rhythms/dance knowledge, skills, or dispositions.	H3.L1 – 2 H4.L1 – 2

Table 1.2 represents the total number of grade level outcomes in elementary, middle, and high school as well as the total number of outcomes specifically related to rhythms/dance within each level (expressed as both a number and as a percent). Outcomes at the elementary school level stating “Developmentally appropriate/emerging outcomes first appear in Grade...” are not included in the total calculations, but sub-elements of outcomes (i.e. 4a, 4b, 4c) are incorporated. Outcomes at the high school level written as “If the outcome was not achieved in Level 1, it should be a focus in Level 2” are included, but outcomes written as “...is a focus in Level 2” are excluded in the total outcome calculations.

Table 1.2: Frequency of Dance and Rhythm Outcomes by Grade Level

<b>Level</b>	<b>Total Outcomes</b>	<b>Rhythms/Dance Outcomes</b>	<b>%</b>
Elementary	287	32	11.15%
Middle	201	13	6.47%
High	59	16	27.12%
Totals	547	61	11.15%

There are some ambiguities in Table 1.2 that may lead one to assume that there is little emphasis of rhythms/dance activities across the physical education standards. It should be noted that of the outcomes do not mention rhythms/dance specifically, such as Standard 3 at the elementary school level; sports or games content are also not specifically mentioned in that standard. In addition, while several outcomes across all three levels do not mention rhythms/dance explicitly, they could be interpreted to potentially embrace dance content. For example, Standard 4 at the elementary level lists outcomes that demonstrate personal responsibility, such as “Follows directions in group settings” (S4.E1.K) and “Works independently for extended periods of time” (S4.E2.3). These outcomes do not refer to any particular content and therefore could include rhythms/dance activities. Another example is Standard 5 at the middle school level which defines

outcomes for self-expression and enjoyment as “Identifies how self-expression and physical activity are related” (S5.M5.6) and “Identifies and participates in an enjoyable activity that prompts individual self-expression” (S5.M5.8). Both of these outcomes could easily encompass rhythms/dance activities. Therefore, the presence (and resulting overall percentage) of rhythms/dance outcomes in P-12 PE has the capacity to increase depending on the interpretation of the PE content included within the more ambiguously worded outcomes. If today’s physical educators are expected to teach dance in accordance with outcomes established by SHAPE America, it is essential to know both the quantity and quality of dance instruction in P-12 schools today to assess whether or not those outcomes are being achieved.

Using these grade level outcomes as a guide allows us to construct a framework for the content knowledge (CK) and pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) that physical educators need in order to effectively teach this content to their students. Within the realm of PETE, activity based/movement content courses are the primary avenue by which preservice physical educators supposedly learn the CK found in P-12 school PE curriculum, yet how many credit hours within PETE programs are actually allotted to the teaching of physical activity performance skills and knowledge? There has been literature to suggest that PETE programs place too much emphasis on pedagogical knowledge (PK), or the “broad principles and strategies of classroom management and organization that appear to transcend subject matter” and not enough on CK (Shulman, 1987, p. 8). Vickers (1987) argues:

The focus in teacher education has been on developing skills in the process of teaching. Subject matter is presented in separate degree and course experiences and is most often not integrated into teacher education programs in a systematic and deliberate fashion. (p. 180)

Despite the fact that Vickers' article was published almost 30 years ago, the argument for more courses in skill acquisition in PETE remains. In Siedentop's Keynote Address given at the C&I Academy Conference in 1989 (published in 2002) he begs the question, what CK is included in the domain of physical education? He asserts that PETE has "given up the historic content knowledge in our field, and, in doing so, have virtually eliminated the possibility of developing a serious body of pedagogical content knowledge for the teaching of physical education" (Siedentop, 2002, p. 368). The link between CK and PCK is inextricable as PCK is moot without CK. Siedentop (2002) claims that CK courses in PETE programs have been significantly reduced and the very nature of these courses have been changed "so that they can be passed off as skill analysis or pedagogy courses" in order to make them "more palatable for curriculum review committees" (p. 371). He goes on to contend that the reason for this shift from content to pedagogy is due to the belief that "sport performance coursework is not worthy of academic status" and the root problem facing PETE programs is that "the direct study of sport skill and strategy through experiential learning is not considered to be of sufficient academic quality to form the core of an undergraduate degree program" (Siedentop, 2002, p. 372). As a result, PETE programs have produced subpar physical education teachers who "are ill equipped to teach anything beyond a beginning unit of activity" (Siedentop, 2002, p. 372). The debate over the content of physical education has resulted in the lack of a "grand macro-theory of what physical education should be" and therefore, "the norm in PETE has been to present all sides of the debate, with the implicit notion that individual teachers will make reasoned decisions based on their personal situations" (Siedentop & Locke, 1997, p. 29). The absence of a strong and cohesive program theory has granted PETE the freedom to "add content to an already cluttered, coverage-oriented, teacher education curriculum" (Siedentop & Locke, 1997, p. 29).

In alignment with scholars of the previous generation, several current authors have come to the consensus that preservice physical educators are in need of more content/subject matter knowledge, though there is debate over the format of preservice CK courses. In 2013, Johnson wrote about the value of physical performance within PETE programs. He used John Dewey's philosophy of experience to argue that the current "hierarchy of educational subject matter" values "mind over body" and "thinking over doing" (Johnson, 2013, p. 485). As a consequence, this school of thought has led to a PETE curriculum that limits activity based courses in favor of theory and/or science courses, thus devaluing the importance of physical skill and experience (Johnson, 2013). Johnson (2013) argues that "leaders do not need to emphasize theoretical knowledge over practical knowledge to improve the status of physical education in educational institutions" (p.494). Instead, Johnson concludes that "activity performance courses deserve a much stronger presence in PETE curricula" and that "exploring and using information in action and performance is what really matters" (2013, p. 494). Last, Johnson (2013) expresses concern that PETE programs will be unable to successfully prepare future physical educators "without building their skillful performance capabilities because someone cannot be considered educated and knowledgeable in physical education unless they can perform the content well" (p. 494). More recently, Johnson (2015) employed the concept of "lived body knowledge" by way of Maurice Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of the lived body. Johnson (2015) argued that "lived body knowledge cannot be learned in lecture rooms" (p. 233) and that from this perspective the "scientific dimensions of physical activity are not superior to the practice of physical activity" (p. 234). Johnson goes on to state that preservice physical educators must not only "obtain propositional or theoretical knowledge about physical activity; a preservice teacher should also experience physical activity in ways that would generally differentiate the preservice teacher from others

who have not or are not pursuing a degree in physical education” (p. 235). Last, Johnson contended that the study of physical education “includes study of both the objective body and the lived body engaged in physical activity” (p. 235).

Taking a slightly different approach, Ayvazo, Ward, and Stuhr (2010) discussed CK by focusing not only on how to play a sport or execute a particular skill as having a deep understanding of how to play a sport does not necessarily translate to the ability to sequence tasks and progressions for the beginner learner. Therefore, they suggested that CK courses within PETE include learning activities that help preservice teachers “learn the content progressively” (p. 42). The authors also recommended that CK courses should “teach and enhance the teacher candidate’s (TC) ability to perform the techniques and tactics associated with the sport” and in order to facilitate this, “there must be sufficient opportunities to learn” (2010, p. 43). Last, the authors contended that preservice physical educators often “do not get enough practice recognizing errors and prescribing appropriate progressions” and to remedy this, PETE students need more time to analyze performances via observations and video clips (Ayvazo et al., 2010, p. 43).

In order to evaluate the current role dance content plays within P-12 PE, we must first begin by examining the curricular space afforded to the development of dance CK and PCK in the PETE curriculum. This examination will provide a foundation by which we can determine if future physical educators are being adequately prepared to teach this content area to their own students upon graduation. Therefore, the purpose of this review is to (a) examine empirical studies of curricular space allocated to activity based/movement content knowledge courses in PETE preservice programs in the United States, (b) examine empirical studies of curricular space allocated to dance education within PETE preservice programs in the United States, and (c) suggest

avenues of future research and methodological considerations for dance instruction and education in PETE preservice program curricula.

### **Theoretical Framework**

This review is grounded in Shulman's description of the knowledge base needed for teachers. He outlines seven categories that are the grounds for teacher understanding: content knowledge, general pedagogical content knowledge, curriculum knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, knowledge of learners and their characteristics, knowledge of educational contexts, and knowledge of educational ends, purposes, and values (Shulman, 1987). This literature review will focus solely on the role of CK and PCK courses within PETE. CK as defined by Shulman (1986) is "the amount and organization of knowledge per se in the mind of the teacher" (p. 9). Furthermore, in terms of subject matter specifics "the ways of discussing the content structure of knowledge differ. To think properly about content knowledge requires going beyond knowledge of the facts or concepts of the domain. It requires understanding the structures of the subject matter" (Shulman, 1986, p. 9). Therefore, teachers need not only know the cognitive knowledge and/or physical performance skills needed within their subject domain, they must also "be able to explain why a particular proposition is deemed warranted, why it is worth knowing, and how it relates to other propositions, both within the discipline and without, both in theory and in practice" (Shulman, 1986, p. 9).

PCK, as a subset of CK "represents the blending of content and pedagogy into an understanding of how particular topics, problems, or issues are organized, represented, and adapted to the diverse interests and abilities of learners, and presented for instruction" (Shulman, 1987, p. 8). In other words, PCK is a teacher's ability to translate subject matter in such a way that makes



it comprehensible to students as well as having “an understanding of what makes the learning of specific topics easy or difficult: the conceptions and preconceptions that students of different ages and backgrounds bring with them to the learning of those most frequently taught topics and lessons” (Shulman, 1987, p. 9). By examining the historical trends in credit hour allocation of activity based and dance courses within PETE, we can discover potential relationships between CK and PCK expertise (or lack thereof) and the current P-12 PE curriculum.

## **Methods**

### **Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria**

This review examines empirical studies conducted since 1990 on the allocation of curricular space within PETE preservice programs in the United States, with a focus on curricular space allotted to activity based/movement content knowledge courses. For the purpose of this review, an “activity based/movement content knowledge course” is defined as any course within a PETE preservice program in which students acquire the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to engage in or perform a particular sport, game, dance or other physical activity. Courses that include both CK and PCK are also included in this definition, but courses that focus solely on generic pedagogical knowledge (PK) are not. Studies were excluded from this review if they were conducted prior to 1990, since publication of the National Standards for Physical Education did not occur until 1995 (NASPE, 1995). In addition, studies that examined PETE preservice programs outside of the United States were not included because the structure of PETE preservice programs worldwide varies too greatly to produce an accurate comparison of data across international programs.

## Search Procedures

The databases that were utilized had a topic focus of education, kinesiology, fitness and health, or sports and were accessible online through the University System of Georgia or via internet access through a Google search with no additional cost to purchase the manuscript. The databases employed within the search were Academic Search Complete, Education Source, Google Scholar, ProQuest Education, and SportDiscus. Also, dance education journals and dance research journals, discovered through a Google search, also yielded several sources which were chosen for further searching. This list was comprised of the *Journal of Dance Education*, *Research in Dance Education*, and *Dance Education in Practice*. Although the aim of the above journals focuses on dance within an arts education context, the authors chose to include them in the search using the rationale that there may have been empirical articles published within them that bolstered the Mehrhof and Ermler study or contained content matter related to it.

Key search terms that were employed in each of the databases and journals above included the following word combinations: “curriculum and physical education teacher education”, “curricular space and physical education teacher education”, “curricular space and physical education, dance and physical education”, “dance and physical education teacher education”, “curriculum and dance and physical education teacher education”, “curriculum and dance and physical education”, “dance and benefits of and physical education”, and “dance and benefits of physical education teacher education”. Practitioner journals, such as the *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, were also included within the search but articles were only included if they met all of the inclusion criteria. As a result, the following journals are represented within this review: *Physical Educator* (five studies), *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education* (three

studies) and *ICHPER -- SD Journal of Research in Health, Physical Education, Recreation, Sport & Dance* (one study).

### **Limitations**

Due to the specifications of the scope of the review, very few search results were included. There were three strong limiting factors to the inclusion criteria that contributed to only a select few journals being eligible for inclusion: the timeframe (1990 to present), the location (U.S. PETE only), and the type of manuscript (empirical).

## **Results**

### **Curricular Space in PETE**

Eight studies matching all of the above criteria are included in this review. These studies are organized by the methodology employed and are categorized as follows: document analysis, survey, and a combination of document analysis and survey.

**Document analysis.** Bahneman (1996) reviewed curricular materials from 29 institutions that offered both undergraduate and doctoral degrees in physical education to determine current curricular offerings and to compare the similarities and differences among this particular group of institutions. Data in the study included the course and credit hour requirements at both the institutional level and at the major level. Courses at the major level are defined as those that are taken once a student is admitted into the physical education program and are organized by Bahneman (1996) into the following categories: (a) Professional Foundations, (b) Scientific Foundations, (c) Activities, (d) Curriculum and Instruction, and (e) Practica. Bahneman also examined the purpose of the PETE programs as defined by their objectives and/or philosophy statement. In

regards to PETE credit requirements for activity and/or movement content courses, the following courses were required by all 29 institutions: rhythmic activities, which included low-organized games (M=2.4 credit hours), track/field (M=2.1 credit hours), volleyball (M=1.9 credit hours), and basketball (M=1.7 credit hours). Rounding out the top five, softball (including baseball) was required 28 institutions at a mean of 1.5 credit hours. Although Bahneman offered no suggestions or recommendations for improving PETE program curricula, he concluded that this result, coupled with the remainder of the analysis, indicated that there are more similarities than differences in curricular offerings among the PETE programs that participated in the study.

**Survey.** The first survey of PETE preservice program curricula, completed by Strand in 1992, profiled program practices in an attempt to answer the question, “do public school physical education teachers simply teach the activities they were taught to teach in their university courses?” (p. 104). Strand analyzed 113 institutions in the United States that offered a bachelor’s, master’s, or doctoral degree in physical education. The administered questionnaire gathered data on various aspects of teacher preparation such as coaching, skill/activity courses, peer/pre-student teaching, and student teaching. Considering only the skill/activity course results, Strand (1992) found that institutions on a semester calendar required a mean of 9.29 credit hours of activity courses whereas institutions on a quarter calendar required a mean of 14.21 credit hours; however, when calculating the overall number of minutes spent in class, semester-based institutions offered almost 375 more minutes of class time than did institutions on a quarter calendar. In terms of required activity courses, gymnastics and swimming ranked the highest at 68% and 60% respectively with volleyball (55%), soccer (54%), and tennis (53%) rounding out the top five. Strand asserts that the most commonly taught activities in public schools based on prior research (see Mathesius, 1990; Reed, 1987; Rice, 1998; Ross, Dotson, Gilbert & Katz, 1985 as

cited in Strand, 1992) are basketball, soccer, football, volleyball, and softball and thus led him to ask the question, are PETE faculty preparing physical educators in the wrong physical activities?

Furthering Strand's earlier work, Hetland and Strand (2010) situated their analysis of PETE preservice program curricular space within the Central District of the United States in order to: (a) provide a general profile of PETE preservice programs, and (b) highlight program similarities and differences. Utilizing an online survey, 44 of the petitioned 72 institutions responded (58% response rate). Items on the survey requested information regarding student demographics, curricular items (which are defined as curricular and/or technology options like curriculum models, Physical Best, pedometers, and heart-rate monitors that are embedded into PETE programs), observations/field experiences/student teaching, fitness/skill testing, and simulated peer and P-12 teaching experiences. The curricular space results revealed that students completed a mean of 8.93 hours of "professional activity courses" (out of a mean of 122.70 total hours needed for degree completion, or 7.28%). Forty-five percent of these courses were offered as multiple-credit (more than one credit hour) and were categorized by type (individual, dual, team, and combative sports and physical activities) followed by 20% of multiple-credit courses that were categorized by grade level (elementary, middle, or high school). Among other recommendations, the authors suggested that PETE preservice programs place a greater emphasis on the inclusion of lifetime activities as well as physical and health-related activities into the curriculum, a suggestion formerly endorsed in an earlier study of P-12 physical educators by Collier and Hebert (2004).

The Collier and Hebert (2004) survey of PETE program graduates was intended to provide PETE faculty with assistance in making curricular decisions in their preservice programs based on the perceived importance and value of various courses and experiences expressed by in-

service P-12 physical educators. Using a Likert scale questionnaire, researchers surveyed 359 P-12 physical educators (from the Pacific Northwest and the state of Wisconsin) on a variety of topics pertaining to their preservice preparation, such as personal demographics, the value of teaching approaches and certifications, as well as the importance of selected teaching skills, activity based competencies, course work, programming areas, and in-service training topics. In terms of activity based competencies, 31% of those surveyed believed that more emphasis should be given to exercise and health-related fitness, 29% favored fundamental motor skills, and 25% valued lifelong leisure activities in the PETE initial certification curriculum. Only 1.5% of respondents indicated that dance should receive more emphasis in preservice PETE. In summary, the authors proposed that PETE faculty examine current curricular offerings in traditional team and individual sport skills and suggested incorporating more activities that may appeal to the broad range of interests of today's P-12 PE students.

Hill and Brodin (2004) surveyed PETE preservice program graduates for potential use in aiding PETE faculty in determining curricular offerings. Similar to the Collier and Hebert (2004) survey, their participants were asked via a Likert scale questionnaire to provide information regarding demographics, the content of their PETE preservice curriculum, the perceived value of that curriculum, as well as any difficulties experienced by them during their initial year of teaching. One hundred and thirty-two surveys were completed by current P-12 physical educators in the state of Washington (37.7% return rate). Reporting only on the data concerning movement/activity based content knowledge, 93.1% of respondents reported that sports skills/knowledge were included in their preservice curriculum and 93.4% of respondents felt that

sports skills/knowledge concepts were either “somewhat valuable” or “very valuable” in preparing them to teach. Finally, the teaching of sports skills was rated as the area of least difficulty experienced during the respondents’ first year of teaching (7.8%).

Ayers and Housner (2008) surveyed 116 PETE preservice programs in order to acquire descriptive information about institutional characteristics, PETE student demographics, program requirements (number and type of credit hours required within the program and the minors offered and/or required within the program) and curricular space. Focusing on program requirements, the mean number of credit hours required for PETE preservice programs was 129.75 with a mean of 9.61 hours (7.4% of curricular time) dedicated to sports and/or physical activity content courses. There was no further breakdown regarding which physical activity or movement content courses were required and how many hours were dedicated to those courses. In their discussion, the authors expressed concern that not enough time was being spent teaching sport and physical activities to preservice physical educators, especially considering the increasing popularity of newer, alternative physical activities available to youth such as rock climbing, roller blading, and exergaming.

**Document analysis and survey.** Beginning with the Georgia State University (GSU) HPETE Assessment Project completed by Metzler, Tjeerdsma, and Walker (2000) included both document analysis and surveys from the 1996 – 1999 HPETE preservice cohorts in order to gauge the effectiveness of (and make potential revisions to) that preservice HPETE. A contextual analysis of the program was completed and included elements such as a student profile, the program’s design and structure, learning activities within the program, HPETE faculty experience and expertise, cooperating teachers and student teaching sites, and administrative/resource support. Looking first at the analysis of the program’s design and structure, the authors calculated

that 72 quarter hours (1996-1998 cohort) and 45 semester hours (1999 cohort) were spent in HPE Major courses which are taken after completion of a student's University Core Curriculum as the student begins their Teacher Education program. Major courses were subdivided into movement content (47 quarter hours, 29 semester hours) and methods and curriculum (25 quarter hours, 16 semester hours). Honing in on the learning activities offered within the Major's activity courses, the authors reported that three activity courses were required in the program which focused on performance skills, analytic skills, tactics, and rules. One Major course was dedicated to content and pedagogy in rhythmic activities and one Major course focused on content and pedagogy for adventure education. What is unknown is how many credit hours per quarter or semester were allocated to each of these courses or how the course instructors defined "rhythmic activities". The authors discussed the challenges associated with a recent credit hour reduction which cut program time previously devoted to content and methods courses and student teaching and suggested that the outcomes of this project could allow them to refine the program considering the recently imposed program hour reduction at the time of the study.

Second, Kim, Lee, Ward, and Li (2015) took a critical lens to the time allocation, purpose, focus, and pedagogical tasks found in movement content knowledge courses in PETE pre-service programs. The authors define movement content as "knowledge of movement forms and knowledge of techniques and/or tactics of movement as well as the ability to perform movement" (Kim et al., 2015, p. 60). For the purposes of this review, only the time allocation results of the movement courses will be analyzed. A purposeful sampling of 26 PETE preservice programs, recommended based on the quality of their graduates, was selected by the research team from across the United States. The researchers analyzed a combination of each program's formal cur-



riculum (as listed on the institution's website), two movement course syllabi from each institution (51 total syllabi, as one institution only offered one movement content course), and collected additional questionnaire information from program coordinators. The results indicated that the overall mean time allocated to movement content knowledge courses was 10.4% of the total credit hours (mean of 13.4 hours within a total mean of 126.8 program hours). Thirteen of the programs offered three credit hour configurations for these courses, nine programs offered two credit hours, and four programs offered one credit hour per course. Results also showed that, on average, four different content areas were covered in each syllabus. The above data, along with additional results from the study, indicate a great disparity in the examined curriculums on the amount of time dedicated to developing content knowledge. The researchers concluded that the 10.4% of curricular space allotted to movement content knowledge was insufficient for preservice P-12 physical educators and recommended a strengthening of movement content courses within PETE preservice curriculum as part of an overall strategy to improve teacher effectiveness.

## **Themes**

Despite the sizable chronological span of the reviewed studies above (1992 – 2015) and the range of methodologies utilized across studies, one can extract two primary themes related to curricular allocation of movement/activity based content courses in PETE preservice programs in the United States: curricular space/time (in the form of credit hours) and content. Researchers in three of the eight studies above discussed either time dedicated to overall major hours (Metzler, Tjeerdsma, & Walker, 2000) or time dedicated to teaching preservice PETE majors fundamental physical activity and movement content (Ayers & Housner, 2008; Kim, Lee, Ward, & Li, 2015). Likewise, similarities can be found in the number of credit hours allocated to movement/activity

based content across PETE preservice programs. Strand (1992), Hetland and Strand (2010), and Ayers and Housner (2008) all found that an estimation of nine total credit hours are allotted to movement/activity based courses. The most recent study by Kim, Lee, Ward, and Li (2015) revealed slightly higher credit hours for activity courses ( $M=13.4$ ), but these courses made up only 10.4% of major credit hours. In Bahneman's (1996) survey, he noted that the number of credit hours dedicated to movement/activity content ranged anywhere between one to four hours depending on the institution. Last, in the GSU HPETE Assessment Project contextual analysis Metzler, Tjeerdsma, and Walker (2000) noted that three courses in the major curriculum were dedicated to movement/activity based content whereas two other activity courses (rhythmic activities and adventure education) combined content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge. Taking into consideration the results from Hill and Brodin (2004) concerning the value placed on sports skills and movement knowledge by P-12 physical educators, one may ask why more time is not dedicated to movement/activity based courses?

Turning to content within movement/activity-based courses, Strand (1992), Hetland and Strand (2010), and Collier and Hebert (2004) examined the appropriateness of content taught in movement/activity based courses in PETE preservice curricula. In 1992, Strand found that the top five activity based courses taught in PETE preservice programs were gymnastics, swimming, volleyball, soccer, and tennis and asked if PETE preservice programs were properly preparing future physical educators in movement content areas that are (a) feasible in public schools and (b) that appeal to P-12 students. Collier and Hebert (2004) and Hetland and Strand (2010) further recommended that more emphasis should be placed in preservice programs on exercise, health-related physical activities, fundamental motor skills, and lifetime physical activities rather than traditional team and individual sports. Given Bahneman's (1996) results indicating that the top

five movement/activity based courses required in PETE preservice programs at the time were rhythmic activities (which included low-organized games), track and field, volleyball, basketball, and softball and Strand's (1992) study findings one can see the predominance of traditional team and individual sports taught in PETE preservice programs which contradicts the findings and recommendations of more recent studies (Collier & Hebert, 2004; Hetland & Strand, 2010) which call for more lifetime, exercise, and health-related activity courses. Clearly, more research needs to be conducted to investigate the current content offerings of movement/activity based courses in PETE preservice programs today. Keeping in mind the themes of curricular space and content, this review now turns to an examination of empirical studies investigating time allocation for dance content (including performance, methods, and pedagogy) in preservice PETE programs.

### **Dance Content in PETE**

To date, there has been only one study completed in the United States that explored dance content knowledge courses in initial certification PETE programs. Mehrhof and Ermler (1992) conducted a survey of 245 colleges and universities to verify the state of dance instruction in preservice PETE programs. The questionnaire consisted of items regarding the number of semester hours of dance required by the program, the types of dances taught, the dance training of the university faculty member responsible for teaching the course(s), and the methods of dance instruction. Results showed that 169 (69%) of the institutions required some form of dance training whereas the remaining 76 (31%) institutions did not. Regarding the number of credit hours allocated for dance content, of 165 institutions that responded to this question, 6 institutions (3.6%) required one-half semester hour, 46 institutions (27.9%) required one semester hour, 60 institutions (36.4%) required two semester hours, 36 institutions (21.8%) required 3 semester hours and

the remaining 17 institutions (10.3%) required four or more semester hours. The calculated mean of the total number of semester hours required by all 165 institutions equals 2.09 hours. The most frequently taught forms of dance at the institutions were folk (61.2%), square (58.4%), social (48.6%), basic rhythms (45.3%), and aerobic (37.6%). Among the PETE faculty responsible for conducting the dance courses at their institution, 85% reported feeling confident in their ability to teach dance and 50% of them had 10 or more semester hours of professional preparation in dance. Most institutions reported employing several different methods of dance instruction in their programs. The breakdown of frequencies is as follows: 139 (56.7%) employed skill development as a method, 142 (58.0%) reported teaching of curricular methods, 104 (42.4%) utilized skills tests and 79 (32.2%) reported dance appreciation as an instructional method. The questionnaire also asked how important dance education was in the overall PETE preservice program. Respondents reported that 16% of institutions felt dance was an integral part of the program, 58% reported that dance should be a part of the program, and 21% of respondents felt that dance education was not as important as sports education.

Mehrhof and Ermler (1992) conclude with four implications for PETE faculty. First, they propose that the university personnel responsible for teaching dance should concentrate on a fewer number of dance forms in the hopes that a more narrowed and focused exposure with a basic foundation will foster higher levels of confidence in preservice PETE program graduates. Second, they suggest that dance education for physical educators be solely focused on elementary school level dance in the areas of basic rhythms, folk dance, children's creative dance, and square dance since instruction at the elementary level has the potentiality to encourage further interest and learning of other dance forms in older grades. Third, they recommend a team teaching approach by sport and dance educators to better integrate dance content into PETE preservice

programs. Fourth, the authors pose several questions for further consideration, (1) which dance forms should be taught to preservice PETE students, (2) what should be the required number of hours of dance instruction in PETE preservice programs, and (3) should dance education remain as a component of PETE preservice program curricula? This study was conducted almost 25 years ago and thus reflects the culture of dance education in PETE at that point in time. Therefore, before the questions posed by Mehrhof and Ermler can be examined further and a discussion about the current role of dance in PETE programs can be introduced, these statistics desperately need to be updated to inform researchers of contemporary dance education practices within PETE.

### **Discussion**

Siedentop (2002) claims that “in distancing ourselves from sport performance as the central core of our content area, we have effectively disavowed our tradition which focuses on and value the physical as experience” (p. 373). The infusion of the sub disciplines of kinesiology such as biomechanics, anatomy, exercise physiology, and others into the PETE curriculum coupled with the devaluing of physical activity and sport as an academic subject has led to a decline in content courses for preservice physical educators (Siedentop, 2002). As Siedentop (2002) succinctly points out, kinesiology is not a P-12 school subject and therefore “cannot logically serve as the content knowledge base for pre-professional preparation in physical education” (p. 374). In order to build the argument for augmenting P-12 PE curricular requirements, PETE programs must “prepare teachers who create and sustain good school programs” which are defined as those programs that are “inclusive, focused on the development of activity competencies about which students are confident and enthusiastic, and linked to community opportunities in ways that lead

to voluntary participation” (Siedentop & Locke, 1997, p. 27). Therefore, an effective PETE program will not consist of courses that are irrelevant to P-12 PE curricular content and will instead “be defined by a limited conceptual framework . . . The conceptual framework should have a limited number of derivative themes and core abilities that all teacher candidates should achieve” (Siedentop & Locke, 1997, p. 30). Defining and fleshing out that framework comes down to PETE faculty, clinical educators, and P-12 practitioners collaborating to decide what content *should* be taught in physical education (Siedentop & Locke, 1997).

Johnson (2013) resonates with Siedentop and Locke (1997) when he refers to the field “securing academic respect” by highlighting “theoretical knowledge at the expense of practical knowledge” (p. 490). He argues that “activity/performance courses and field/practical experiences deserve significant attention in PETE curricula” and that “the field can and must emphasize skillful performance as a principle outcome” (p. 490). Therefore, PETE programs should emphasize “becoming skillful in two primary ways—performing physical education content and teaching physical education content” (p. 490). He then goes on to highlight the importance of skillful movement and performance in Standard 2 of the National Standards for Beginning Physical Education Teachers (published in 2008 and currently are under revision) and rebuts those who claim that “teachers do not need to be skillful performers of the content to teach the content” (Johnson, 2013, p. 493). He states that “being able to articulate isolated knowledge of facts and technical information about physical education content does not adequately equate to intelligence. Instead, exploring and using information in action and performance is what really matters” (Johnson, 2013, p. 494). Johnson (2013) cites the example:

A physical education teacher who can explicitly state the performance cues for a volleyball forearm pass or describe the energy systems involved in volleyball performance but

cannot consistently execute quality forearm passes in a volleyball match or personally design and follow a training program to improve volleyball performance cannot be called “physically educated”. (p. 493)

Drawing from Dewey, Johnson (2013) calls on performance as authentic experience that “has the potential to intensify content knowledge acquisition that will eventually enable one to teach the content” (p. 493).

Based on the empirical research cited previously in addition with the enduring concerns of preeminent PETE scholars such as Johnson, Locke, Siedentop, and Vickers, there appears to be (at least) four areas of needed research on dance instruction and education in preservice PETE programs that can contribute to the decluttering of PETE curriculum:

1. Dance content continues to be represented in the National Physical Education Standards and grade level outcomes in P-12 PE, so the first step is to find out how that content is currently being addressed in PETE preservice program curricula and subsequently in P-12 PE curricula (SHAPE America, 2013).

2. There needs to be research designed to examine the possible relationship between the physical activity/movement content that physical educators are taught in their preservice programs, specifically in regards to dance content and the content that these graduates eventually offer at their schools.

3. If such a relationship exists, then the underlying factors that can both facilitate and inhibit dance education and instruction within PETE preservice programs and, subsequently, in P-12 PE must be thoroughly examined.

4. If dance content stays within the realm of P-12 PE, then PETE faculty need to determine what type of content and how much curricular space should be included in PETE preservice programs to develop physical educators who are competent and confident to teach dance.

### **Future Research**

In his 1986 article, Shulman called for the enrichment of teacher education programs through the employment of case study research that blends principles, cases, and professional judgement in order to “provide teachers with a rich body of prototypes, precedents, and parables from which to reason” (Shulman, 1986, p. 14). Future studies in alignment with this literature review should begin by examining current dance education required by PETE preservice programs, their impact on current dance instruction practices within P-12 PE and their alignment with the SHAPE America Grade Level Outcomes (SHAPE America, 2013). From there, potential relationships between PETE preservice curricula and P-12 PE curricula can be explored. Analyzing those relationships can give rise to new lines of inquiry that highlights the reasons given by PETE faculty and P-12 teachers for their inclusion or exclusion of dance content in their programs. Any found marginalization of dance content in PETE preservice curricula should prompt a dialogue regarding the overall importance of dance within PETE preservice programs. The larger picture of possible consequences (both positive and negative) of any exclusionary practices in dance can also be evaluated along with the impact this exclusion may have on future physical educators and P-12 students. While some of the above-mentioned studies lend themselves well to quantitative data collection methods and analysis (i.e. survey), utilization of a mixed methodology that incorporates qualitative components such as interviews, focus groups, and fieldwork would paint a more holistic picture of what is happening in PETE and P-12 PE programs. The results of such comprehensive research have the potential to generate productive



and informed conversations that can better apprise PETE faculty on curricular decision-making and could open up avenues for a broader discussion on the placement of dance education within PE.

## References

- Ayvazo, S., Ward, P., & Stuhr, P. T. (2010). Teaching and assessing content knowledge in pre-service physical education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 81(4), 40-44.
- Ayers, S. F., & Housner, L. D. (2008). A descriptive analysis of undergraduate PETE programs. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 27(1), 51-67.
- Bahneman, C. P. (1996). An analysis of the undergraduate physical education teacher certification requirements within institutions which offer a doctoral degree in physical education. *Physical Educator*, 53(4), 198.
- Bolen, Y., Heatherly, B., Ratliff, J., & McCulloch-Vinson, B. (2012). Benefits of social/ballroom dance – What can elementary students gain? *Review of Higher Education and Self-Learning*, 5(14), 21-24.
- Chen, W., & Cone, T. (2003). Links between children's use of critical thinking and an expert teacher's teaching in creative dance. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 22(2), 169-185.
- Collier, D., & Hebert, F. (2004). Undergraduate physical education teacher preparation: What practitioners tell us. *Physical Educator*, 61(2), 102-112.
- Cone, S. L., & Cone, T. P. (2003). Dancing, learning, creating, knowing. *Teaching Elementary Physical Education*, 14(5), 7-11.
- Gard, M. (2003). Being someone else: Using dance in anti-oppressive teaching. *Educational Review*, 55(2), 211-223. doi: 10.1080/0013191032000072236
- Hetland, K. M., & Strand, B. N. (2010). A descriptive analysis of undergraduate pete programs in the central district. *ICHPER -- SD Journal of Research in Health, Physical Education, Recreation, Sport & Dance*, 5(1), 3-9.
- Hill, G., & Brodin, K. L. (2004). Physical education teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of university coursework in preparation for teaching. *Physical Educator*, 61(2), 75-87.
- Johnson, T. G. (2013). The value of performance in physical education teacher education. *Quest*, 65, 485-497. doi: 10.1080/00336297.2013.811093
- Johnson, T. G. (2015). Lived body knowledge: Disciplinary knowledge for preservice physical education teachers. *Quest*, 67(2), 227-239. doi: 10.1080/00336297.2015.1017589
- The Kennedy Center. (n.d.). *Standards*. Retrieved from <http://artsedge.kennedy-center.org/educators/standards>

- Kim, I., Lee, Y. S., Ward, P., & Li, W. (2015). A critical examination of movement content knowledge courses in physical education teacher education programs. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 34(1), 59-75.
- Linthicum, K. (2009). When movement spells success: An L.A. elementary school uses dance to sharpen minds. *Dance Magazine*, 83(3), 54-55.
- Lorenzo-Lasa, R., Ideishi, R. I., Ideishi, S. K. (2007). Facilitating preschool learning and movement through dance. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 35(1), 25-31. doi: 10.1007/s10643-007-0172-9
- Mahlmann, J. J. (1994). *National standards for arts education: What every young American should know and be able to do in the arts*. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference Publications Sales.
- Mehrhof, J. H., & Ermler, K. (1992). Dance education for undergraduate physical education majors. *Physical Educator*, 49(1), 23.
- Metzler, M. W., Tjeerdsma, B. L., & Walker, T. M. (2000). Contextual analysis of the gsu pete program. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 19(4), 431-450.
- Murray, R. L. (Ed.). (1968). *Designs for dance*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation (NEA).
- National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE). (1995). *Moving into the future: national standards for physical education: a guide to content and assessment*. Reston, VA: NASPE.
- O'Neill, J. R., Pate, R. R., Liese, A. D. (2011). Descriptive epidemiology of dance participation in adolescents. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 82(3), 373-380.
- Pangrazi, R. P., & Beighle, A. (2016). *Dynamic physical education for school children* (18<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.
- Ross, J. (2006). Teaching dance: One man's journey. *Teaching Elementary Physical Education*, 17(3), 12-14.
- SHAPE America. (2013). *Grade-level outcomes for P-12 physical education*. Retrieved from [http://www.shapeamerica.org/standards/pe/upload/GradeLevelOutcomes\\_K12PE.pdf](http://www.shapeamerica.org/standards/pe/upload/GradeLevelOutcomes_K12PE.pdf)
- SHAPE America. (2016). *National standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.shapeamerica.org/standards/>
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4-14. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1175860>

- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-21.
- Siedentop, D. (2002). Content knowledge for physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 21, 368-377.
- Siedentop, D., Locke, L. (1997). Making a difference for physical education; what professors and practitioners must build together. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 68(4), 25-33. doi: 10.1080/07303084.1997.10604923
- Strand, B. N. (1992). A descriptive profile of teacher preparation practices in physical education teacher education. *Physical Educator*, 49(2), 104-113.
- Vickers, J. N. (1987). The role of subject matter in the preparation of teachers in physical education. *Quest*, 39, 179-184.
- Ward, S. A. (2013). African dance aesthetics in a P-12 dance setting: From history to social justice. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 84(7), 31-34.
- Wirszyla, C., & Gorecki, J. (1998). Teaching dance in physical education. *Strategies: A Journal for Physical and Sport Educators*, 12(1), 13-16. doi: 10.1080/08924562.1998.10591365
- Zan, G., & Ping, X. (2014). Effects of exergaming based exercise on urban children's physical activity participation and body composition. *Journal of Physical Activity & Health*, 11(5), 992-998. doi: 10.1123/jpah.2012-0228

## 2 A DESCRIPTIVE PROFILE OF DANCE CURRICULUM IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

### Methodology

#### Conceptual Framework

The guiding frameworks for this study are a combination of Shulman's knowledge base for teachers, You's (2011) theory of Physical Education Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PE-PCK), and the National Standards for Initial Physical Education Teacher Education by the National Association of Sport and Physical Education (NASPE, 2008), now known as the Society for Health and Physical Educators (SHAPE America). The intent of Shulman's knowledge base for teachers was to answer the questions, "What are the sources of the knowledge base for teaching? In what terms can these sources be conceptualized? What are the implications for teaching policy and educational reform?" (Shulman, 1987, p. 4). Shulman begins by broadly describing what teaching is, "Teaching necessarily begins with a teacher's understanding of what is to be learned how it is to be taught . . . Teaching ends with a new comprehension by both the teacher and the student" (Shulman, 1987, p. 7). Shulman then goes on to state that this definition is too simplistic and that in order to know what comprehension is or looks like regarding student performance, we must first define what knowledge underlies "the teacher understanding needed to promote comprehension among students" (Shulman, 1987, p. 8). This concept of teacher understanding first and foremost is at the crux of Shulman's argument and, as Siedentop and others have maintained in PETE, teacher understanding regarding CK is notably lacking, and as a by-product teacher understanding in PCK suffers as well.

The National Standards for Initial Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) (SHAPE America, 2008) and the National Grade Level Outcomes for PE (SHAPE America,

2013) both serve as benchmarks to guide PETE faculty and physical educators in planning, implementing, and assessing developmentally appropriate curriculum for their respective programs. The National Standards for Initial PETE (SHAPE America, 2008) have thus given the profession one piece of Shulman's paradigm, that of "teacher understanding needed to promote comprehension". Likewise, the National Grade Level Outcomes (SHAPE America, 2013) provide the PETE profession with what student comprehension looks like for each of the five standards in PE for grades P-12. Therefore, by employing Shulman's knowledge base for teachers, focusing in particular on content knowledge (CK) and pedagogical content knowledge (PCK), along with You's (2011) updated theory of PE-PCK, and the National Standards for Initial PETE (SHAPE America, 2008), this study will provide a preliminary assessment of how PETE programs are addressing dance education and how those practices align with the frameworks outlined above.

### **Purpose and Research Questions**

Due to the paucity of empirical evidence regarding dance education within PETE as is evidenced in the Literature Review, the primary purpose of this study is to gather current descriptive information about dance courses in PETE programs, including program and faculty demographics, curricular space allotted to dance courses, the content found within those courses, and the faculty expertise teaching those courses. A secondary purpose of this study is to uncover both personnel and institutional elements that act as facilitators to or inhibitors of dance instruction within PETE programs.

The overarching research question for this study is: How are CK and PCK for dance acquired within initial certification PETE programs in the United States? In order to provide a full

description of current dance instruction practices in PETE, several sub-questions will be satisfied: (a) How much curricular space is allocated to dance content within PETE programs? (b) What is the curriculum of dance courses in PETE, including CK and PCK? (c) Of the colleges/universities that offer dance courses within their PETE programs, what is the level of expertise of the individual(s) responsible for teaching those courses within the department? And (d) how do institutional and personnel elements either facilitate or inhibit dance instruction in PETE programs?

### **Significance**

The teaching of dance within preschool through 12<sup>th</sup> grade physical education (P-12 PE) programs can be debated as it is a content area that is embedded in gender equity issues (see Downey, 1997; Gard, 2001; Gard, 2003; Hill & Hannon, 2008), a perceived lack of teacher competence in movement performance (see Bibik, 1993; Kovar, Mehrof, & Ermler, 1995), and a perceived lack of popularity amongst students (see O'Neill, Pate, & Liese, 2011; Ross, 2006). The discussion of dance and its place in PE has waxed and waned over the years with no clear result leading to a well-defined location within the school curriculum (Cone & Cone, 2007). Despite the larger contextual issues surrounding it, dance content continues to be housed within P-12 PE and represented within the SHAPE America National Standards and Grade Level Outcomes (SHAPE America, 2013).

In order to paint a full portrait of dance instruction as it stands today in P-12 schools and how it has reached this point, we must take a step back and first examine the dance CK and PCK that physical educators are being taught within their teacher certification programs. The last known empirical research examining dance instruction within PETE was conducted almost 25

years ago by Mehrhof and Ermler (1992). In order for PETE faculty and P-12 physical educators to commence in a critical dialogue about the role of dance in PETE and P-12 PE, the statistics from Mehrhof and Ermler's (1992) report must be updated.

## **Participants**

The participant pool for this study is purposeful and the sampling frame is a census of all departments in U.S. colleges and universities that currently offer an accredited undergraduate and/or graduate PETE program that leads to initial teacher certification within that institution's respective state. Non-probability sampling is used as this study is investigating only college and university programs that contain these specifications. A census approach is possible for this study as the population pool is not very large and it is reasonable to include all of the population elements (Scheaffer, Mendenhall III, & Ott, 2006). The sampling frame was obtained via an excel spreadsheet that was compiled two years ago of all current program coordinators, department chairs, and/or primary contacts of U.S. PETE programs as part of a previous research study. The accuracy of the email addresses on the list was verified through the utilization of a software program called Email Checker which allows individuals to upload and validate .csv files of email addresses. The finalized, authenticated email addresses (n = 615) composed the potential sampling units for the study.

## **Instruments**

**Online questionnaire.** The confidential, online questionnaire was designed to align with the primary and sub research questions of the study (as outlined in the Purpose and Research Questions section), and are also based on Shulman's knowledge base for teachers and SHAPE



America's Standards for Initial PETE (SHAPE America, 2008). The questionnaire was developed using Qualtrics® software which is an online survey design instrument. The text of the questions and answers is at an appropriate reading level for the adult participants of the survey who, due to their respective positions within their institutions have (at least) a Master's or equivalent graduate level degree and thus should be able to comprehend text higher than an 8.0 grade level. The questionnaire is divided into five sections, which are outlined in the documentation of waiver of consent and are also listed as headers throughout the questionnaire. The five sections are as follows: (a) participant demographics, (b) PETE program general descriptives, (c) dance course matrix, (d) inhibitors and facilitators of dance instruction, and (e) invitation to participate in a semi-structured telephone (or Skype®) interview. Question types utilized in the questionnaire are primarily demographic questions and psychographic questions focusing on opinions. Answer formats included in the questionnaire are a combination of multiple choice, free response, and Likert scale. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix D. During the validation process of the questionnaire, it was determined that it should take participants no more than 20 minutes to complete the questionnaire in one sitting. The questionnaire was open for a time period of three weeks, from 9:00a.m. (EST) on October 27<sup>th</sup> through 11:59p.m. (EST) on Thursday, November 17<sup>th</sup>.

In order to reduce the likelihood of nonresponse errors, an introductory cover email was sent first to the pool of potential participants (see Appendix A). Also, a series of periodic email reminders was administered to the pool of potential participants within the sample frame. The first reminder email to the potential pool of participants was distributed one week after the initial introductory email, asking those individuals who have not already completed the questionnaire to complete the questionnaire within the next seven days. The second reminder email was sent two

weeks after the initial email and the third and final reminder email was sent 24 hours before the questionnaire closed. All respondents who completed the questionnaire received a personalized thank you email.

Prior to each questionnaire being submitted to Qualtrics® for reporting, participants were asked if they would like to volunteer for a follow up, semi-structured telephone (or Skype®) interview with the primary author to discuss the participant's personal and professional experiences with and opinions of dance instruction within PETE. Survey respondents were informed that the semi-structured interview would take no more than one hour to complete and that they would be contacted via email personally to schedule a convenient date/time for the interview based on the participant's schedule.

**Semi-structured interviews.** Semi-structured interviews were employed via either telephone or Skype® as per each interviewee's preference as the second method of data collection. The inclusion of semi-structured interviews provided an opportunity to further flesh out the quantitative data and was also utilized as a method of triangulation for questionnaire responses. Interviews can be a powerful data collection instrument and can provide in-depth material on participants' feelings, opinions, and their interpretation of the world around them (Merriam, 2009). As mentioned above, the interviews were semi-structured in nature. This fluidity and flexibility of a semi-structured interview allowed each interview to be tailored with probing questions to help either gain depth, clarity, or elaboration during the interview (Merriam, 2009). A semi-structured interview style also allowed freedom to change the wording or order of questions as needed, thus permitting the interviewer to respond to unique situations as they arose within the interview (Merriam, 2009). Like the online questionnaire, the interview questions were subdi-

vided into categories to ensure their alignment with the study research questions and sub-questions, in particular research sub-question (d) How do institutional and personnel elements either facilitate or inhibit dance instruction in PETE programs? Drawing from the fourth section of the online questionnaire, a list of primary interview questions was composed to serve as a guiding framework for the semi-structured interviews. The question types utilized within the semi-structured interview were a combination of ideal position questions, interpretive questions, and Devil's advocate questions (Merriam, 2009). Ideal position questions were employed to ask the interviewee to describe an idyllic situation (Merriam, 2009). For example, "If you could revamp your PETE program to include more dance content, what would you include and why?" Interpretive questions provided an opportunity to gather interviewee's interpretations of situations and events, clarify statements, and probe further into answers (Merriam, 2009). Last, Devil's Advocate questions were utilized to gather information by challenging the interview participant to "consider an opposing view or an explanation to a situation" (Merriam, 2009, p. 98). An interviewer can use Devil's Advocate questions to suss out interviewee's personal feelings and opinions on the research topic by utilizing language that neutralizes the topic and "depersonalizes the issue" without antagonizing or baiting the interviewee (Merriam, 2009, p. 98). Refer to Appendix E for a copy of the primary interview questions.

### **Validity and Reliability**

**Online questionnaire.** The online questionnaire was validated for content by a panel of three independent expert dance educators including Dr. Betty Block from Texas A&M University-Commerce, Dr. Tarin Hampton from Norfolk State University, and former National Dance Association (NDA) President Dr. Fran Anthony Meyer. First, the literature review, research

questions and sub-questions were shared with each expert. The panel then took the online questionnaire separately to determine content validity. Content validity is the extent to which an instrument accurately measures the construct it is designed to measure (Scheaffer, Mendenhall, & Ott, 2006). The experts were asked to provide their feedback as to how well the questions posed in the questionnaire aligned with the research questions of the study as well as the clarity, design, readability, and overall user-friendliness of the questionnaire. Reliability for the online questionnaire was calculated utilizing the most conventional measure of internal consistency, Cronbach's *Alpha* (Santos, 1999). Cronbach's *Alpha* is designed to measure the mean correlation of items in a survey instrument that measure underlying constructs (Santos, 1999). For the purposes of this study, a Cronbach's *Alpha* score of  $r \geq 0.70$  was used as an acceptable level of reliability.

**Semi-structured interview questions.** Validity is an abstract concept and can be difficult to define in qualitative research due to the wide array of theoretical and analytical lens that can be applied to data analysis and interpretation (Merriam, 2009). Therefore, a quantitative method was chosen as the validation process for the semi-structured interview questions. Similarly to the online questionnaire, the interview questions were reviewed by two dance educators (Dr. Fran Meyer and Dr. Betty Block). Each expert was emailed a copy of the interview questions and was asked to provide their critical feedback on the alignment of the questions with the research questions, as well as the structure and clarity of the questions.

In order to validate the results of the interviewee's responses, Wolcott's (1994) purview about the "absurdity of validity" was adopted (p. 364). According to Wolcott (1994), validity as a quantitative construct cannot be achieved when conducting qualitative research. Wolcott (1994) argued that the researcher must instead seek "a quality that points more to identifying critical elements and wringing plausible interpretations from them" (p. 366). In order to comply

with Wolcott's aim for validity, triangulation of multiple data sources were employed to measure the congruency of responses in section four of the online questionnaire and interviewee responses to questions that arise from section four of the questionnaire (Merriam, 2009). Triangulation involved identifying critical elements or statements from interviewees and seeing if those statements, once coded, align with the data trends from the questionnaire to form consistent interpretations of the data. Another strategy utilized to increase internal validity was to engage in member checks with the interviewees. Each interviewee was contacted after their interview had been transcribed and asked to review their transcript. This process also provided an opportunity for the interviewee to clarify any ambiguous statements made and allowed the interviewee to insert any additional commentary (via the Tracking application in Microsoft Word®) or provide additional information they may not have originally shared during the interview.

Like validity, the notion of reliability as it is traditionally defined is also problematic in qualitative research. In a strictly quantitative study, reliability is the "extent to which research findings can be replicated" (Merriam, 2009, p. 220). This is difficult when conducting research in the social sciences and with human subjects because "human behavior is never static" and conventional reliability is "based on the assumption that there is a single reality and that studying it repeatedly will yield the same results" (Merriam, 2009, p. 220). Since qualitative research seeks to "describe and explain the world as those in the world experience it", reliability was determined by the "dependability" or "consistency" of results (Merriam, 2009, p. 221). In other words, determining reliability for this study utilized the same methods as establishing internal validity whereby the results of the interview data were checked to determine if they were consistent with the quantitative data collected (Merriam, 2009).

## Procedures

There were two methods of data collection for this mixed methods study. The first was a self-administered, confidential online questionnaire and the second was a semi-structured telephone (or Skype®) interview.

**Introduction of researcher.** The cover email outlined the purpose and benefits of the study, implored the potential participant for their assistance in advancing the body of knowledge on this topic, and concluded with a hyperlink to the questionnaire. A sample of the introductory email is located in Appendix A. The semi-structured interviews provided an avenue to directly interact with the self-selected participants. The primary author, who conducted all of the interviews, was forthcoming with all of the interviewees by disclosing her own subjectivity towards the topic which fostered a rapport with the interviewees and was also the most ethical course of action. As a professional dancer and dance instructor for a number of years, the primary author has an emic perspective on this topic, meaning that she comes from an insider or “native” view point as opposed to an outsider (or etic) perspective (Prasad, 2005). This emic perspective includes a combination of congruent, and sometimes competing, identities as a performer, dance student, dance educator, Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA) teaching future physical educators, and future PETE faculty member. The amalgamation of these various selves served to customize each interview and made the participants feel comfortable through the sharing of teaching and learning anecdotes and personal experiences. It is understood that the various perspectives and opinions of the interview participants do not necessarily reflect those of their institutions. As such it was the aim of the study to learn about the personal experiences, attitudes, beliefs, and opinions on dance education of the interviewees through the interviews which were then analyzed under a thematic and phenomenological lens (discussed in the Analysis section below). It

was important that the formatting of the interviews were semi-structured to allow for probing and/or to skip questions when necessary and to provide a more conversational tone whereby the primary author could share her own stories and experiences to encourage and/or commiserate with each interviewee as appropriate (Roulston, 2011).

**Informed consent.** There were two procedures in place to ensure protection of human subjects that complied with Georgia State University's Institutional Review Board (IRB). The first method of data collection was online and as such, it was impossible to obtain a signed consent form from participants. Instead, a waiver of documentation of consent was employed (Georgia State University, 2015). A sample of the waiver of documentation of consent can be found in Appendix B. The second measure of participant consent was received verbally by survey participants who agreed to take part in the semi-structured telephone (or Skype®) interview at the conclusion of the online questionnaire.

## **Analysis**

**Online questionnaire.** Once the time period for completing the online questionnaire expired, the completed questionnaire data was downloaded from Qualtrics® into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences® (SPSS) software. Each questionnaire respondent was assigned a number (i.e. Respondent 1, Respondent 2, Respondent 3, etc.) in order to maintain confidentiality of the participants. Then, descriptive statistics reports consisting of frequency counts and means were run to discover the demographic trends of: (a) the questionnaire respondents themselves, (b) their respective institutions, (c) their PETE programs, and (d) the dance courses required and/or offered in their PETE program.

**Semi-structured interviews.** As mentioned previously, member checks were conducted after transcribing the interviews to ensure accuracy and consistency of data representation. All interviews were transcribed utilizing Transana® 2.60 software. Each interview recording and transcript was assigned a number (i.e. Interviewee 1, Interviewee 2, Interviewee 3, etc.) to ensure participant anonymity. All audio recordings and transcripts were stored on a hard drive and once an audio recording was transcribed, it was deleted from the hard drive. Any identifying markers of the interviewee that may have been inadvertently stated in the interview (such as name, institution, state of residence, etc.) was removed. Analysis of the qualitative data was completed utilizing NVivo® Version 11 coding software.

The analysis process for the interviews consisted of First Cycle coding utilizing Descriptive Coding followed by a Theming of the Data. As stated by Saldaña (2013), “First Cycle coding methods are those processes that happen during initial coding of data” and are divided into several types (p. 58). Descriptive Coding is categorized as an Elemental coding method which contains simple, yet pointed filters for reviewing data (Saldaña, 2013). Descriptive Coding specifically is a popular method of First Cycle coding that “assigns basic labels to data to provide an inventory of their topics” which is typically a noun or short phrase, and is often used as a first step in analysis (Saldaña, 2013, p. 83). The research questions of the study were utilized as a guide to help find key words to employ as Descriptive Codes. Then, Theming of the Data was employed to take the shorter codes developed during the First Cycle and expand upon them with an “extended thematic statement” whose purpose is to identify “what a unit of data is about and/or what it means” (Saldaña, 2013, p. 175). These themes were uncovered by extracting verbatim statements from the interviews which were tied to the Descriptive Codes, assigning a



meaning to the statements by the primary author, organizing the meanings into themes, and then expanding on those themes in conjunction with the quantitative data (Saldaña, 2013).

Since the primary goal of the qualitative data was to triangulate and expand upon the quantitative data, the themes were analyzed through a combination of Thematic Analysis and Phenomenological Analysis. Phenomenology seeks to reach the root of one's lived experience, the essence of that experience, and how one makes sense or meaning from that experience (Grbich, 2013). A classical phenomenological approach to data analysis aims to describe the "structures of the world and how people act and react to them" and, in particular, "the structure of consciousness, intentionality, and essences in an external world" (Grbich, 2013, p. 97). Therefore, analysis of the interview data aimed to examine the interviewee's experiences of and opinions and beliefs about dance education in the realms of both higher education settings and in P-12 PE settings. Thematic Analysis of the data provided a method by which themes were extracted post-coding that oriented to answering the research questions and that focused on participant perspectives and the phenomenon of study (Roulston, 2010). Further discussion on the resulting codes and themes from the interview data can be found in the Results and Discussion sections.

## **Results**

### **Questionnaire Data**

**Institutional demographics.** From the original total potential participant pool of 615 institutions of higher education in the United States that offered initial teacher certification in physical education, 580 programs were verified that still offered initial teacher certification in PE and also had accurate contact information. The potential participant pool was thus reduced from 615 to 580 after the initial introductory email was distributed and updated PETE program information

from a number of potential participants was received. A total of 110 participants responded to the online questionnaire. Of those 110 responses, four participants chose not to give their consent and therefore did not complete the survey. Another two participants failed to provide any response to the informed consent question and as such, their responses were discarded. Therefore, the total number of returned questionnaires was 104 which gives a response rate of 17.9%. The calculated margin of error for that sample and rate is +/- 8%. While that appears high, it is likely that some of the emails were not actually received (e.g. sent to spam) or were sent to people who were not currently in a PETE leadership position and not forwarded to appropriate other potential participants. Therefore, it is not possible to determine a truly definitive sample size and margin of error. The IP addresses of the survey respondents were utilized to conduct an internet search that generated the geographic location and institutional enrollment numbers of the questionnaire participants. Institutional information for 102 of the 104 questionnaire participants was gathered. Two of the survey respondents completed the questionnaire on a mobile device and therefore no IP information was discovered for tracking purposes. Table 2.1 depicts the frequency of the geographic regions of questionnaire participants, which were determined by utilizing the six SHAPE America districts (Central, Eastern, Midwest, Northwest, Southwest, and Southern). Table 2.1. also depicts the overall percentage of respondents from the number of potential participants in each SHAPE America district. Table 2.2 illustrates the enrollment size of the institution and Table 2.3 displays the frequency and percent of public versus private institutions as determined by The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research, 2015).

**Respondent demographics.** Demographic information about the survey respondents include their gender (Table 2.4), highest educational degree completed (Table 2.5), total number of

years working in higher education (Table 2.6), total number of years teaching in PETE (Table 2.7), and current position title (Table 2.8). Table 2.9 represents the geographic location, institutional enrollment size, and public/private classification of the self-selected interview participants from the online questionnaire and Table 2.10 depicts the interviewee's personal demographic information including gender, highest educational degree completed, total number of years working in higher education, total number of years teaching PETE, and current position title. It should be noted that a total of 19 survey participants volunteered to be interviewed (18.3%). However, due to time restrictions with the data collection period and various scheduling and communication conflicts with the volunteers, only eight questionnaire participants were interviewed for the study (7.7%).

Table 2.1: Questionnaire Participants by SHAPE America Districts

<b>SHAPE District</b>	<b>Participants by District (Freq. and %)</b>		<b>Total Participant Pool (Freq. and %)</b>	
Central	18	17.3%	95	18.9%
Eastern	8	7.7%	75	10.7%
Midwest	16	15.4%	117	13.7%
Northwest	9	8.6%	26	34.6%
Southwest	8	7.7%	40	20.0%
Southern	43	41.4%	225	19.1%
Unknown	2	1.9%	2	0.0%
Total	104	100%	580	N/A

Table 2.2: Questionnaire Participants by Institutional Enrollment

<b>Institutional Enrollment Range</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
< 5,000	41	39.4%
5,001 – 10,000	18	17.3%
10,001 – 15,000	11	10.65%
15,001 – 20,000	11	10.65%
20,001 – 25,000	4	3.8%
25,001 – 30,000	7	6.7%
> 30,001	10	9.6%
Unknown	2	1.9%
Total	104	100%

Table 2.3: Questionnaire Participants by Institution Type

<b>Institution Type</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
Public	59	56.7%
Private	43	41.4%
Unknown	2	1.9%
Total	104	100%

Table 2.4: Questionnaire Participants by Gender

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
Male	42	40.4%
Female	58	55.8%
No response	4	3.8%
Total	104	100%

Table 2.5: Questionnaire Participants by Highest Educational Degree Completed

<b>Education Level</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
Bachelor's degree	1	1.0%
Graduate or professional degree	16	15.4%
Doctoral degree (PhD or EdD)	82	78.8%
No response	5	4.8%
Total	104	100%

Table 2.6: Questionnaire Participants by Total Number of Years Teaching in Higher Education

<b>Years</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
0	0	0.0%
> 1	0	0.0%
1	0	0.0%
2	0	0.0%
3	2	1.9%
4	0	0.0%
5	2	1.9%
6	3	2.9%
7	1	1.0%
8	1	1.0%
9	4	3.8%
10	8	7.7%
11-15	12	11.5%
16-20	22	21.2%
21-25	19	18.3%
26-30	8	7.7%
> 30	15	14.4%
No response	7	6.7%
Total	104	100%

Table 2.7: Questionnaire Participants by Total number of Years Teaching in PETE

<b>Years</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
0	2	1.9%
> 1	0	0.0%
1	0	0.0%
2	1	1.0%
3	2	1.9%
4	1	1.0%
5	1	1.0%
6	3	2.9%
7	1	1.0%
8	2	1.9%
9	4	3.8%
10	6	5.8%
11-15	18	17.3%
16-20	16	15.4%
21-25	17	16.3%
26-30	8	7.7%
> 30	15	14.4%
No response	7	6.7%
Total	104	100%

Table 2.8: Questionnaire Participants by Current Position Title

<b>Position Title</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
Program Coordinator	6	5.8%
Clinical Instructor	4	3.8%
Associate Professor	20	19.2%
Assistant Professor	12	11.5%
Professor	18	17.3%
Department Chair	10	9.6%
Full Time Administrator	2	1.9%
Multiple Positions (2)	22	21.2%
Multiple Positions (3)	3	2.9%
Multiple Positions (4)	1	1.0%
No response	6	5.8%
Total	104	100%

Table 2.9: Institutional Demographics of Interview Participants

<b>Interview Participant (IE)</b>	<b>SHAPE District</b>	<b>Institutional Enrollment Range</b>	<b>Institution Type</b>
IE 1	Southern	< 5,000	Private
IE 2	Southern	> 30,001	Public
IE 3	Northwest	15,001 – 20,000	Public
IE 4	Southern	5,001 – 10,000	Public

IE 5	Southern	< 5,000	Private
IE 6	Northwest	10,001 – 15,000	Public
IE 7	Eastern	5,001 – 10,000	Public
IE 8	Midwest	15,001 – 20,000	Public

Table 2.10: Personal Demographics of Interview Participants

Interview Participant (IE)	Gender	Highest Degree Completed	Current Position Title	Total Years Teaching in Higher Education	Total Years Teaching in PETE
IE 1	Female	Doctoral degree	Associate Professor	> 30	26 – 30
IE 2	Female	Doctoral degree	Multiple Positions (4)	16 – 20	16 – 20
IE 3	Female	Graduate or professional degree	Assistant Professor	> 30	> 30
IE 4	Female	Doctoral degree	Associate Professor	21 – 25	11 – 15
IE 5	Female	Graduate or professional degree	Program Coordinator	11 – 15	11 – 15
IE 6	Female	Doctoral degree	Professor	26 – 30	26 – 30
IE 7	Female	Doctoral degree	Multiple Positions (2)	16 – 20	16 – 20
IE 8	Female	Doctoral degree	Multiple Positions (3)	16 – 20	11 – 15

As is evidenced by the information presented in the above tables, the institutional characteristics of the questionnaire participants are representative across geographic regions, enrollment size, and institution type. As for the individual questionnaire participants, there is a nearly even percentage of male and female respondents. The majority of questionnaire participants hold a doctorate degree (78.8%) and have spent ten years or more teaching in higher education (80.8%) and PETE (76.9%). Almost half of questionnaire participants (48.0%) hold the title of Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, or Professor and a quarter of participants (25.1%) hold multiple positions within their institution.

**PETE program demographics.** Turning to overall demographics of respondents' PETE programs, 92.6% of programs are accredited by an agency that is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education. Over half of programs (66.3%) offer dual teacher certifications in Health and

Physical Education whereas 30.4% of programs only offer certification in Physical Education and 3.3% of programs offer separate certifications for Physical Education and Health Education. Program enrollment sizes range from five students to 178 students, with a mean program enrollment of 44 students. The vast majority of credit hour allocation for PETE programs is by semester (96.7%) and the total number of major hours (defined as credit hours that are taken once a student is accepted into the PETE program) is mostly under 120 credit hours (67.5%) with the remainder of programs requiring between 121 to 180 major hours (32.5%). At the conclusion of the spring 2016 academic year, program graduates ranged from 0 to 32 with 42.7% of programs graduating between 0 – 5 students, 32.6% of programs graduating between 6 – 10 students, 5.6% of programs graduating between 11 – 15 students, 9.0% of programs graduating between 16 – 20 students, and 10.0% of programs graduating over 21 students. Also, the majority of programs (78.6%) have between 71 – 100% job placement rate for students after graduation. Last, the number of tenured faculty members within PETE programs ranged from zero to seven with the majority of programs (81%) having between one to four tenured faculty and the mean number of tenured faculty at 2.2. The number of non-tenured faculty members ranged between zero to eight with 84.2% of programs having between zero and four non-tenured faculty and the mean number of non-tenured faculty falling at 2.4.

The overarching research question of the study is how CK and PCK for dance is currently acquired within initial certification PETE programs in the United States? In order to address this question, several sub-questions were devised. First, how much curricular space is allocated to dance content within PETE programs? Second, what is the curriculum (content) of dance courses in PETE? Third, what is the level of expertise of the individual(s) responsible for teaching those

courses within the department? Last, how do various institutional and personnel elements either facilitate or inhibit dance instruction in PETE programs?

**Curricular space for dance courses.** Results from the questionnaire showed that a quarter of respondents (25.8%,  $n = 23$ ) neither offered nor required dance courses in their PE teacher certification program. Six institutions (6.7%) offered dance courses to PE majors, but did not require them. Last, 67.4% ( $n = 60$ ) institutions required at least one course that contained dance content in their PE program. The vast majority of those who completed the dance course matrix (49 out of 52) required only one dance course in their PETE program and five programs required two dance courses. The most dance courses required of any institution for their PE majors was three (two programs). Of the institutions that required or offered dance courses, only one program offered four or more non-required dance course options. The credit hours allocations for the courses ranged as follows, 0.5 hours (one program), 1.0 hour (14 programs), 2.0 hours (18 programs), 3.0 hours (18 programs), and 4.0 hours (one program) with the mean course hour allotment at 2.09 credit hours. Of those credit hours, the time dedicated to dance content was divided into full quarter, full semester, partial quarter, and partial semester options for respondents. In alignment with the mean number of courses offered, data employed from the first three courses in the matrix found that 40 PETE programs (72.7%) utilized a full semester on dance content, eight programs (14.6%) spent a full quarter on dance content, and seven programs (12.7%) spent a partial semester on dance content ( $n = 55$ ). Analysis was also conducted on the certification type offered in each program that required dance courses for its majors (PE only, PE and Health, or Other) and the amount of curricular space allocated to those courses from each participant who completed the dance matrix. These results can be found in Table 2.11.



**Content of dance courses.** In order to determine the focus and content of dance courses two aspects were asked about in the questionnaire; CK covered in the course and PCK covered in the course. Again, taking responses from the first three courses in the matrix, the data showed that 36 (69.2%) programs offered four or more content areas within a single dance course with dance forms ranging from rhythmic activities and fitness dances to tap, ballet, and folk dances (a full breakdown of frequencies of dance content taught in descending order of popularity can be found in Table 2.12 below). Seven programs (13.5%) focused on one dance form only per course, four programs (7.7%) covered two dance topics in one course, and five programs (9.6%) covered three dance content areas per course. It is clear from the data that rhythmic activities, line dances, folk/world dances, and creative dance dominate the curricula.

Table 2.11: Curricular Space Allocated to Dance Courses by Program Certification Type

<b>Certification Type</b>	<b>Mean Credit Hours</b>
Physical Education only	2.2
Health and Physical Education	2.0
Other	0.0

Table 2.12: Frequency of Dance Content Knowledge

<b>Dance Content Knowledge (CK)</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
Rhythmic Activities	48	88.9%
Line Dance	38	70.4%
Folk/World Dance	33	61.1%
Creative Dance	33	61.1%
Other	29	53.7%
Square Dance	26	48.1%
Fitness Dances (i.e. Zumba)	19	35.2%
Ballroom Dance	17	31.5%
Hip Hop	15	27.8%
Jazz	10	18.5%
Modern/Contemporary	10	18.5%
Ballet	9	16.7%
Electronic Dance Games (i.e. Dance Dance Revolution, etc.)	7	13.0%
Tap Dance	4	7.4%

Table 2.13: Frequency of Dance Pedagogical Content Knowledge

<b>Dance Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK)</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
Writing lesson and/or unit plans	34	89.5%
Writing student learning outcomes	27	71.1%
Learning about the history of dance and/or dance appreciation	15	39.5%
Learning theories of dance education	11	29.0%

The data also revealed that instructors incorporated several different types of PCK in various combinations within each dance course offered, as is evidenced by Table 2.13 above. It is also clear based on the frequency data depicted in Tables 2.14 through 2.16, that students in these courses engaged in learning activities and were exposed to pedagogical strategies that addressed several domains of Howard Gardner's Theory of Multiple Intelligences including spatial-visual, musical, verbal-linguistic, and bodily-kinesthetic (Gardner, 2006). Also, the assessments employed in these courses addressed all three learning domains and involved a combination of lower and higher order thinking skills according to Bloom's Taxonomy ("Bloom's Taxonomy", n.d.).

Table 2.14: Student Learning Activities

<b>Learning Activity</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
Individual and/or group skill practice	46	88.5
Peer teaching	39	76.9
Viewing multimedia (videos, PowerPoint, etc.)	34	65.4
Listening to lectures	30	57.7
Reading from textbook or instructor selected readings	27	51.9
Taking notes	23	44.2
Field experiences	20	38.5
Self teaching	17	32.7
Journals/writing prompts	9	17.3

Table 2.15: Pedagogical Strategies Employed

<b>Pedagogical Strategy</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
Instructor demonstrations	43	86.0%
Student demonstrations	40	80.0%
Lectures	36	72.0%
PowerPoint	27	54.0%
Videos/animations	25	50.0%
Online programs/apps	9	18.0%
Guest speaker/demonstrations	9	18.0%

Table 2.16: Assessments Employed

Assessment	Frequency	Percent (%)
Cognitive knowledge test/quiz	42	80.0%
Skill/technique test	35	67.3%
Individual and/or group performance (live)	28	53.9%
Student created dance	23	44.2%
Choreographic rubric	17	32.7%
Peer assessment	13	25.0%
Self-assessment	11	21.2%
Student portfolio	9	17.3%
Individual and/or group performance (recorded)	9	17.3%
Research project/presentation	4	7.7%

**Instructor descriptives.** The third sub-question focuses on instructor characteristics, specifically the academic rank of the person who teaches the course, where are they located within the institution, how long have they been teaching the course, and how did they acquire their CK and PCK for teaching the course? Of the 47 total participants who answered these questions, 24 courses were taught by full time faculty or the department chair (51.1%), 14 courses were taught by an Adjunct Faculty member (29.8%), five courses were taught by Clinical Instructors (10.6%), and four courses were taught by Graduate Teaching Assistants (8.5%). Of the respondents that answered where the instructor was situated within the university system ( $n = 46$ ), 33 instructors were located inside of the PETE program at their institution (71.7%), eight instructors were located outside of the institution completely (17.4%), and five instructors were located inside of the institution but outside of the PETE program (10.9%). Instructor experience in higher education ranged from less than one year to over 25 years, with a mean of 9.2 years. As with the previously analyzed characteristics of these dance courses, the formalized training of the course instructors is both varied and comprehensive with all instructors listed having obtained their CK and PCK in dance from multiple sources. Tables 2.17 and 2.18 illustrate the frequencies of course instructors'

formal CK and PCK knowledge acquisition. It should be noted that none of the questionnaire participants chose “self” as course instructor, despite the fact that several of the interviewees did teach the dance courses at their institution, therefore one must be cautious in interpreting the data below as some of it could be considered speculative from the questionnaire respondent.

Table 2.17: Instructors’ Formal Content Knowledge Training in Dance

<b>Content Knowledge Source</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
Previous higher education courses	38	82.6%
Conference workshops	32	69.6%
In-service professional development	23	50.0%
Recreational/studio classes	22	47.8%
Self-taught	18	39.1%
Private instruction	10	23.9%
Retreats/camps	5	10.9%
Unknown	4	8.7%

Table 2.18: Instructors’ Formal Pedagogical Content Knowledge Training in Dance

<b>Pedagogical Content Knowledge Source</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
Previous higher education courses	35	77.8%
Conference workshops	27	60.0%
In-service professional development	23	51.1%
Self-taught	18	40.0%
Mentor	6	13.3%
Unknown	6	13.3%

**Facilitators and inhibitors to dance instruction.** The final research sub-question asked for participants’ opinions on the degree to which various personnel and institutional factors either inhibited or facilitated dance instruction at their institution. Table 2.19 (page 55) depicts the frequency and percentage of respondents’ opinions on several factors that may inhibit or facilitate dance instruction.

Table 2.19: Facilitators and Inhibitors of Dance Instruction

	Strong facilitator	Moderate facilitator	Small facilitator	Neither facilitates nor inhibits	Small Inhibitor	Moderate inhibitor	Strong inhibitor
Curricular space	18/20.9%	13/15.1%	7/8.1%	22/25.6%	9/10.4%	4/4.7%	13/15.1%
Expertise of Instructors	24/27.9%	10/11.6%	8/9.3%	20/23.6%	5/5.8%	10/11.6%	9/10.5%
Administrative support	16/18.6%	8/9.3%	10/11.6%	42/48.8%	4/4.7%	2/2.3%	4/4.7%
Facilities/equipment resources	18/20.9%	14/16.3%	13/15.1%	28/32.6%	8/9.3%	2/2.3%	3/3.5%
Perceived popularity of content area by students	8/9.3%	16/18.6%	4/4.7%	36/41.9%	11/12.8%	6/7.0%	5/5.8%
Perceived value of content area by department Faculty	22/25.6%	22/25.6%	11/12.8%	17/19.8%	6/7.0%	6/7.0%	2/2.3%
Field experience opportunities	12/14.1%	9/10.6%	8/9.4%	40/47.1%	8/9.4%	4/4.7%	4/4.7%
State requirements and/or regulations	15/17.7%	9/10.6%	14/16.5%	38/44.7%	2/2.4%	0/0.0%	7/8.2%

## Interview Data

There were originally 19 self-selected interview volunteers from the 104 completed questionnaires (18.3% response rate). Due to scheduling and communication conflicts only eight participants were interviewed for the study (7.7%). The qualitative data for this study was first coded using Descriptive Coding. The data were then organized into themes and subsequent meaning and interpretation was generated from those themes. During analysis, several patterns emerged from the interview data that did not fit within the confines of the research questions and the purpose of this study, and were not analyzed for this study.

Table 2.20 depicts the resulting descriptive codes, their corresponding themes, and some sample verbatim statements taken from the interviews that align with the corresponding code and theme.

Table 2.20: Qualitative Data Codes, Themes, and Sample Interviewee Statements

Codes	Themes	Sample Interviewee Statements
Curricular space	Curricular space means to provide (or greatly reduce) access to content and knowledge through manipulation of the variable of time.	<p>I would go through how to build a fitness like a step aerobics routine, listening to the beat, the eight counts and then eventually then we added that course in curriculum because we thought that students were still too weak and it was still not enough. So that class is a two credit and it is literally half of the semester is gymnastics and half of semester is dance. (Interviewee 2, November 2, 2016)</p> <p>The total number of credits for students graduating in our K-12 program has changed over the years. And so at one point, I believed that the students are required to take this basic one-credit activity social dance class prior to teaching the methods of teaching dance or rhythms course. And then at one point, the one credit activity class prerequisite went away. (Interviewee 3, November 1, 2016)</p>

		<p>How can we do it, what will we cut out? And when that fails, we combine a dance to that program. It would have to be a five-year program. I don't know that it would be...that there would be that many people that wanted to do it. (Interviewee 4, November 10, 2016)</p> <p>We have one dance course. We've gone down from two to one where we're trying to evolve and our focus used to be, more totally on educational dance. We had educational dance class at the 1000 level and then we had advanced performance educational dance at the 3000 level and we needed to make sure that we weren't having too many hours in our program so we limited the one hour at 1000 level. (Interviewee 8, November 9, 2016)</p>
Content Knowledge (CK)	CK is one's body of understanding of a sport, game, dance, or other skillful activity that is gained through the physical experience of performing that activity.	<p>I'd like to have more courses in content areas but as far as importance I think we just have to remain current with the trends and what we're teaching our students. (Interviewee 3, November 1, 2016)</p> <p>My personal philosophy is that you give them at least a taste of almost everything. And so you give them a taste of ballroom dancing, you give them a taste of ballet, you give them a taste of jazz dance, and you give them a taste of aerobics. You give them at least a taste of everything. And then if they're interested, they will pick it up more. So in my opinion, that's the best that we can do is to try to give them at least a taste of everything. (Interviewee 5, November 2, 2016)</p> <p>So our students only really get an overview that sort of evident on one it's what I hate which kind of...I hate sort of multi-activity curriculum but in many ways it's just that for them...you know the idea behind it, I think the premise behind it is that if you expose to a lot of activities they'll find something they</p>

		<p>like. And my caveat to that is they don't have a chance to learn anything to know if they like it. (Interviewee 7, November 11, 2016)</p> <p>We've incorporated some rhythm so we really brought some drumming in a little bit to show them what drumming is so that they understand that aspect of it too in terms of rhythm. (Interviewee 8, November 9, 2016)</p>
<p>Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK)</p>	<p>PCK is the difference between a dance expert and a dance educator for future physical educators.</p>	<p>I try to link that with my students (the importance of cueing with my students) and so I think that the methods of teaching dance class is really, really important because it helps foster better practices in other classes that they will take as well. (Interviewee 3, November 1, 2016)</p> <p>I'm a firm believer in having students do presentations on that. And I feel like the more presentations they do on all content area, they get better about being able to do it in front of a group... And I think that's a big, big key, is getting up in front of the group and being okay with either not doing it perfectly or practicing until you get it done well. (Interviewee 5, November 2, 2016)</p> <p>We have two other courses where they do end up teaching and applying those things. We have a movement fundamental course in which we really focus on the Laban Framework and get people ready for fundamental movement. And so, one section of that is more creative dance and then in the elementary methods course they have a unit on dance because they're going out and teaching dance...in the practicum that's tied to that class. (Interviewee 6, November 9, 2016)</p> <p>I go over all the dances with them...it's like a two-day span of time, and I teach the basic steps and they're on their own to teach it.</p>



		They can come to me and have me work with them all they want, but they teach it. (Interviewee 7, November 11, 2016)
Instructors	Instructors are challenged with getting students to “buy into” dance content and get them out of their comfort zone.	<p>She takes them from basic bunny hop all the way up to samba, rhumba, different types of dances, group dances, and she doesn't take no for an answer. By golly, they're gonna have the grade forms, they're gonna have whatever because she's worked so much in that area... And she's very positive about that and she's very excited about that and the kids buy into it. (Interviewee 1, November 1, 2016)</p> <p>So that's a discussion we have with our students here when we talk about the hidden curriculum and the null curriculum. What is not there sends a message to the students as well. I always use dance when I talk about that and I say, “If you do not teach dance then you're telling your students that dance is not important and dance is not something that they should pursue”. (Interviewee 2, November 2, 2016)</p> <p>I attend conferences every year. And I'm always interested in sessions that have to do with dance, any fashion that has to do with dance...But I guess for me right now, it's either reading professional journals like either JOPERD or Strategies and attending workshops, state, national, regional conferences. That's what really keeps me afloat right now. (Interviewee 3, November 1, 2016)</p> <p>So we have very strong faculty in that program and they have taught the children's dance but they also have adjunct faculty that are content experts. (Interviewee 6, November 9, 2016)</p>
Facilitators	Facilitators mean that dance as a content area is supported and valued and is thus made accessible to students.	We just have to make sure that we give enough support to the people that are doing the teaching and making sure that they have the facilities that they need to have and we try and do that. (Interviewee 1, November 1, 2016)

		<p>It is really when I got here...that I realized the importance of dance in the curriculum here...So I started to teach and we knew that our students were weak in that and that a lot of students were reluctant to teach that content and we really made it a point...really wanted to start to integrate dance in almost like any classes. (Interviewee 2, November 2, 2016)</p> <p>I think if you have a really strong proponents for dance in your higher education and you have people who have expertise and the experience that way you're more than likely going to get it in the program and I just think it's critical. (Interviewee 6, November 9, 2016)</p> <p>I expect that it's the department, the PETE faculty that value it. I'm not so sure that the other administrators and some other people think it's not valuable because we could just get anybody to teach it. That's not necessarily true either. (Interviewee 8, November 9, 2016)</p>
Inhibitors	Inhibitors are having one's "hands tied" by lack of time, expertise, and/or support.	<p>The biggest problem once again comes to credit hours and that is where the issues... will come. Sometimes your hands are just tied. (Interviewee 1, November 1, 2016)</p> <p>Now we have the new SLOs. And there are mention of rhythmic activities in every year...So I don't know how those teachers will either not meet that element or they will have to go out of their way to finally do something about it. But since there's not much accountability, the odds are that that element of the standards will not be covered. (Interviewee 2, November 2, 2016)</p> <p>We can only have them here for 120 hours and we try to give them a very well-rounded program. And that includes dance, which includes aquatics, it includes sports, it includes</p>

		<p>recreational activities and games and outdoor education. So I feel like we're spread thin and we're doing the best we can. (Interviewee 5, November 2, 2016)</p> <p>So we're always faced with how to reduce hours for the kids so students can get out of here in four years not having to cram in a fifth year. (Interviewee 8, November 9, 2016)</p>
--	--	--

## Discussion

This study was designed to examine a perceived lack of current information on dance education practices within PETE programs, with the last study conducted almost 25 years ago by Mehrhof and Ermler (1992). Therefore, this discussion will focus on (a) the comparison of the results of this study with Mehrhof and Ermler's results, (b) how dance education as it stands today aligns with Shulman's (1987) knowledge base for teachers and You's (2011) concept of PE-PCK for physical educators, and (c) an examination of how PETE programs are preparing future physical educators to meet SHAPE America's National Standards for Initial PETE (2008) in dance education. The ensuing discussion is organized by the sub-research questions of this study on curricular space, content, the dance course instructors, and the facilitators and inhibitors of dance education within PETE.

### Curricular Space

In Mehrhof and Ermler's (1992) questionnaire of 245 institutions of higher education on the dance content covered within their preservice PETE programs, their results showed that 69% of the institutions required some form of dance training. The results of this study revealed that there has not been a significant change in terms of the percentage of institutions that require or offer dance courses for their PE majors ( $n = 66, 74.1\%$ ). The results of this study indicate that the

mean number of credit hours allocated for dance courses are exactly equal to Mehrhof and Ermler's results at 2.09 credit hours. To put it simply, nothing has changed in regards to the time spent on dance instruction today.

This apparent shift away from CK in PETE stems from the argument made by Franklin Henry in 1964 when he advocated for reform in PETE curricula that focused on "the discipline of physical education as the content knowledge base for physical education" thus departing from the traditional CK paradigm of the knowledge and skills needed to successfully participate in various physical activities to instead favor the study of PE and its various sub-disciplines (exercise physiology, anatomy, biomechanics, and so forth) as a discipline in and of itself (in Siedentop, 2002, p. 369). Despite concerns voiced by PETE professionals (see Locke, 1977 and Griffey, 1987), PETE programs were folded into the body of "Kinesiology" and in ensuing years, PETE curricula has subsequently reduced or eliminated subject-specific CK courses in favor of topics such as motor learning, biomechanics, exercise physiology, sport history, and the like (Siedentop, 2002). According to Siedentop (2002), the major issue with incorporating so many sub-disciplines of kinesiology in the PETE curricula is that "the discipline of kinesiology is not taught in schools and, therefore, that discipline cannot logically serve as the content knowledge base for pre-professional preparation in physical education" (p. 374). However, one theory that supports this transformation of PETE curricula from a CK to a PK focus is that "there is a general belief that sport performance coursework is not worthy of academic status" and that "the direct study of sport skill and strategy through experiential learning is not considered to be of sufficient academic quality to form the core of an undergraduate degree program" (Siedentop, 2002, p. 371). As the profession has continued to distance itself from sport knowledge and skill and the experience of sport and physical activity, the consequence has been that PETE is better

equipped to “prepare teachers who are pedagogically more skillful than ever, but who, in many cases, are so unprepared in the content area that they would be described as ‘ignorant’” (Siedentop, 2002, p. 369).

The more curricular space that is dedicated to the disciplines of kinesiology and other non-pedagogy/theory-based courses, the less space there is available for CK and PCK for PE as a discipline in and of itself. A common theme that ran through all of the interviews was the lack of satisfactory curricular space for teaching more CK. The theme revealed that curricular space means to provide (or greatly reduce, in this case) access to content and knowledge through manipulation of the variable of time. All of the interviewees expressed frustration over the continued struggle to find more credit hours to accommodate all of the curricular requirements necessary to meet university and department requirements, national standards, and teacher certification regulations. Scientific and Theoretical Knowledge (Standard 1) of the National Standards for Initial PETE states that “physical education teacher candidates know and apply discipline-specific scientific and theoretical concepts critical to the development of physically educated individuals” which includes physiological, biomechanical, and motor development theories among others (SHAPE America, 2008, p. 1). However, the remaining standards have a heavy emphasis on the skillful demonstration of CK (Standard 2), utilization of PK and PCK in content planning, implementation and delivery, as well as student management and assessment (Standards 3 through 5), and professional disposition (Standard 6) which lists a series of behaviors that have no link with the discipline of kinesiology but do call upon personal beliefs about PE as a profession and discipline. Can the issue of curricular space be rectified such that all of the above Standards are met satisfactorily in all content areas of PE within a four year program?

## **Content**

Turning to the content of dance courses within PETE (both CK and PCK), the current study gathered much more descriptive data than the previous study from 1992 due in part to its methodological design. The data revealed that rhythmic activities (92.3%), line dances (73.1%), folk/world dances (63.5%), creative dance (63.5%), and square dance (50.0%) dominate the curricula. Similar to Mehrhof and Ermler's results where the most frequently taught forms of dance were folk (61.2%), square (58.4%), social (48.6%), basic rhythms (45.3%), and aerobic (37.6%), this study shows that folk dances, rhythmic activities, and square dances still hold a strong place in the curriculum and despite the fact that fitness dances did not make the top five curricular choices in this study, it was the sixth most popular choice. It is unclear as to whether social dances in Mehrhof and Ermler's study includes line dances as we know them today and so an accurate comparison between those results cannot be made. However, one of Mehrhof and Ermler's (1992) recommendations for PETE programs was to include a stronger focus on children's creative dance and rhythmic activities at the elementary, which is illustrated in the results of this study. Whether or not this spike in the teaching of rhythmic activities is due in part to Mehrhof and Ermler's recommendations remains to be seen.

The previous study also touched on pedagogical methods utilized by course instructors. Researchers found that 139 instructors (56.7%) employed skill development as a method, 142 (58.0%) reported teaching of curricular methods, 104 (42.4%) utilized skills tests and 79 (32.2%) reported dance appreciation as an instructional method. In addition to pedagogical strategies employed, this study also addressed the type and amount of PCK, student learning activities, and assessments utilized in dance courses. As can be seen from the Results section, not only did the in-

structors in this study make use of the techniques outlined above, they also employed field experiences, peer teaching, individual and group performances, lesson planning and assessment writing among other pedagogical strategies.

In his description of a knowledge base for teachers, Shulman (1987) defined content knowledge (CK) as “the knowledge, understanding, skill, and disposition that are to be learned by school children” (pp. 8-9). In Shulman’s view, teachers must have:

Not only depth of understanding with respect to the particular subjects taught, but also a broad liberal education that serves as a framework for old learning as a facilitator for new understanding. The teacher has special responsibilities in relation to content knowledge, serving as the primary source of student understanding of subject matter. (p. 9)

CK as it pertains to competencies of initial physical educators is addressed in Standard 2 of the National Standards for Initial PETE (SHAPE America, 2008). Standard 2: Skill-Based and Fitness-Based Competence states, “Physical education teacher candidates are physically educated individuals with the knowledge and skills necessary to demonstrate competent movement performances and health-enhancing fitness as delineated in the NASPE K – 12 Standards” (NASPE, 2008, p. 1). In P-12 PE CK is not as easily defined as in other school subject areas and continues to be a source of debate in the field of PETE, as noted by Siedentop (2002). Siedentop argued that teacher educators have “largely given up the historic content knowledge” of PE and have thusly “virtually eliminated the possibility of developing a serious body of pedagogical content knowledge for teaching physical education” (p. 368). Shulman (1986) and Siedentop (2002) have both noted the increased emphasis of pedagogical knowledge (PK) within teacher education programs and a lack of equivalent emphasis on CK.

The blending of CK and PK, coined pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) by Shulman (1987), is “that special amalgam of content and pedagogy that is uniquely the province of teachers, their own special form of professional understanding” (p. 8). In his 1985 Presidential Address at the American Educational Research Association, “Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching” (originally printed in 1986 and reprinted in 2013 by permission of SAGE Publications), Shulman proposes a “missing paradigm” in research on teaching and teacher education which is “the content of the lessons taught, the questions asked, and the explanations offered” and is centered on how novice (and experienced) teachers transform their subject matter expertise into a form that students can comprehend (p. 5). Shulman (1986) goes on to state:

Mere content knowledge is likely to be as useless pedagogically as content-free skill. But to blend properly the two aspects of a teacher’s capacities requires that we pay as much attention to the content aspects of teaching as we have recently devoted to the elements of teaching process. (p. 5)

Building on Shulman’s initial framework of PCK in education, You (2011) outlined a body of PCK for PE (PE-PCK). The six domains of PE-PCK by You (2011) include six domains; (1) Knowledge of PE as a subject, (2) Knowledge of the PE curriculum, (3) Knowledge of teaching methods in PE, (4) Knowledge of students’ learning of physical activity (PA), (5) Knowledge of PE assessment, and (6) Knowledge of instructional environments in PE. According to You (2011), PE-PCK should guide “teachers and teacher educators in ongoing professional learning in physical education” and that professional learning “enhances teachers’ desire to continually improve their instruction in physical education” (para. 34). You, along with Siedentop (2002) and Rink (2007), agrees that a lack of disciplinary knowledge, or CK, within PETE has led to an inadequate preparation of physical educators. You (2011) defines PE-PCK as:



Synthesized knowledge as it is embodied in the various functioning parts of physical education teachers' knowledge; the concept is further explained as an action-based knowledge of how to teach meaningfully intended educational contents in physical education so that students may holistically understand, perform, and appreciate physical activity. (para. 41)

A lack of CK within PETE creates a gap between PK and meaningful, relevant PE-PCK as expressed by Siedentop (2002) "You can't have pedagogical content knowledge without content knowledge" (p. 368).

Comparing the results of this study with You's (2011) concept of PE-PCK, it can be argued that due to the overabundance of courses required for PETE programs coupled with stringent regulations of major credit hours (see Curricular Space above) dance courses, when required, include as many different styles of dance as possible in the hopes that an exposure curriculum will spark students' interest in at least one form of dance that they can then go on to initiate as a unit of instruction in their future classrooms. As was pointed out by one interviewee, the unintended result of this strategy is that students fail to actually learn the content adequately enough in order to gain the confidence to teach it. However, despite the perpetual issue of curricular space and its detriment to CK courses in PETE, the curricula of the dance courses themselves regarding the various forms of PCK covered, the student learning activities, and assessments employed by instructors all support You's tenets of PE-PCK, particularly knowledge of PE as a subject, knowledge of PE curriculum, knowledge of teaching methods in PE, and knowledge of PE assessment.

Therefore, while the time spent on CK development in dance can still be considered insufficient, especially given the number of dance styles tackled in each course and the lack of dance course requirements (often just one course required), the instructors in those courses are making the best with the time that is given to them by enmeshing a wide variety of strategies for teaching and learning that directly relate to attaining subject matter specific PCK. The data revealed by the interviews conducted also support this position. The two themes of CK as a body of understanding of a skillful activity that is gained through the physical experience of performing that activity and PCK as the difference between a dance expert and a dance educator for future physical educators is illustrated by the verbatim interviewee statements in the Results section. On the whole, the interviewees felt that exposing students to a variety of dance styles would be more beneficial if the instructors had adequate time to thoroughly teach and assess each style. However, they all also noted the importance and emphasis on peer teaching and other field experiences where students had the opportunity to utilize their PCK in order to gain confidence and become more comfortable with teaching the subject matter. The instructors of these courses play a large role in how dance content should be addressed in order to best prepare future physical educators to effectively teach this subject.

### **Instructors**

Mehrhof and Ermler's study (1992) examined only two variables regarding the instructors of dance courses; their confidence level and the amount of professional preparation in dance content. Among the PETE faculty responsible for conducting the dance courses at their institution, 85% reported feeling confident in their ability to teach dance and 50% of them had 10 or more semester hours of professional preparation in dance. This study covered more dimensions including the various sources of CK and PCK obtained by dance course instructors as well as their position

within their institution and their amount of teaching experience in dance courses. Of the 47 participants who answered these questions in the questionnaire, the results indicated that over half of courses were taught by a member of the Professoriate or the department chair and that the mean instructor tenure was 9.2 years. It is difficult to compare these results from those gathered by the previous study as the variables do not align, however, it is important to note that previous and ongoing professional preparation, whether it is in the form of in-service development, attending conferences, having private instruction or taking higher education courses, plays a key role in the comfort and enjoyment level of the instructor in teaching this content.

Four of the interviewees for this study spoke very highly of the dance course instructors at their institution, three of the interviewees taught the dance courses themselves, and one interviewee did not have dance courses at their institution. All of the interviewees discussed the challenges faced by instructors with getting students to “buy into” dance content and getting students out of their comfort zone. Of the interviewees who taught the dance courses themselves, they were self-deprecating and continually made mention of their rudimentary dance skills. However, all of the interviewees expressed the intrinsic joy they experienced when dancing and how having a positive attitude towards dance along with clear expectations for students and having strong expertise in dance *education* was invaluable for dance course instructors. It was generally agreed that an extensive CK background was a useful attribute in an instructor, but more importantly is that instructor’s ability to connect content and pedagogy into praxis for their students.

Last, taking into account You’s (2011) outline of PE-PCK and the Standards for Initial PETE (SHAPE America, 2008) which were both discussed in depth previously, it is evident that by the results of this study that the instructors of dance courses within PETE are demonstrating an extensive understanding of the learning processes for beginning teachers and are employing authentic

and valid pedagogical methods, student learning activities, and assessments. A next step in this examination would be to analyze how effective these instructors are (discussed below in Conclusions and Recommendations).

### **Facilitators and Inhibitors**

In this study there was some overlap between the three strongest facilitators of dance instruction its three strongest inhibitors. Instructor expertise ranked first as the strongest facilitator at 27.9%, followed by perceived value of content area by department faculty (25.6%) and curricular space and equipment/facilities tied for third at 20.9%. Conversely, curricular space was the strongest inhibitor of instruction (15.1%), followed by instructor expertise at 10.5%, then state requirements and/or regulations at 8.2%. These results may seem confusing initially as how can one factor (curricular space) act as both a facilitator and inhibitor to dance instruction. It should be noted that the responses to this section of the questionnaire are independent and therefore some individuals believed curricular space to be an inhibitor whereas others believed it to be a facilitator. In this study, all of the elements had the ability to be chosen as either a facilitator or inhibitor independently; they are not mutually exclusive choices. A facilitator is defined within the confines of this study as dance as a content area being supported and valued and is thus made accessible to students. The majority of the interviewees discussed how important they believed dance is, not only as a part of the PE curriculum, but also in life as a form of physical activity, self-expression, socialization, and enjoyment. Several interviewees commented that dance is an essential component to P-12 PE because it is not only a lifelong form of PA that students will come into contact with long after leaving school (i.e. weddings, birthday celebrations, etc.), it also offers an aesthetic element, a dualism that straddles both the creative arts and PE/PA realm. Holding such

strong beliefs on the efficacy of the teaching and learning of dance helped the interviewees advocate for incorporating as much dance content as allowable into their programs (as time constraints dictated). This support for dance education in PETE by faculty coupled with strong instructors capable of marrying CK and PCK (see discussion above in Instructors) has great potential to influence the shape and focus of a PETE program. Unfortunately in PETE there never seems to be enough time to accomplish it all.

Curricular space has long been an issue in PETE (see Ayers & Housner, 2008; Kim, Lee, Ward, & Li, 2015; Metzler, Tjeerdsma, & Walker, 2000; Siedentop & Locke, 1997; and Wiegard, Bulger, & Mohr, 2004), so it is not surprising that it played a major role in the findings of this study. The theme of inhibitors is defined as having one's "hands tied" by lack of time, expertise, and/or support. Time (in the form of curricular space) appeared to be the primary driving force behind many curricular decisions as conveyed by all of the interviewees. In their 1997 article, Siedentop and Locke offered A Teacher Educator's Guide to the Minimum Conditions Required for PETE. The three weightiest variables in the guide (of which there were 10) were focus, faculty consensus, and time (or credits) (p. 31). According to Siedentop and Locke, the focus required for PETE is "enough to ensure that the programs are persistently and explicitly about something" and it "requires provision of both the content and the pedagogical knowledge required to teach a particular kind of physical education" (p. 31). The focus of a program should be on students obtaining CK and PK for PE, a sentiment that is also echoed in Standards 2 through 5 of SHAPE America's Initial PETE Standards (2008) and was voiced as an important facet of an effective PETE program by interviewees. Faculty consensus is "enough to ensure program focus and cohesiveness. This requires that everyone accept the same line on program content, processes, and priori-

ties” (p. 31). As is evidenced by the results of the questionnaire and the opinions of the interviewees, being able to defend curricular decisions and advocate for change with the support of key stakeholders in the department is crucial in ensuring program focus. Last, time (or credits) is “enough to prepare graduates who can safely be employed as novices with good prospects for survival and success. This requires sufficient time to learn both content (sport and physical activity) and content-specific pedagogy” (p. 31). The key phrases within this definition are “sufficient time” and “content and content-specific pedagogy” which, in the case of this study, equates to sufficient time to learn dance CK and PCK. All of the interviewees lamented over the lack of space in their already over-crowded curriculum. A few of the interviewees offered dual certification in Health and PE in their programs, others required coaching, aquatics, or driver education classes in conjunction with the traditional PETE content, methods, and kinesiology courses.

Despite the fact that Siedentop and Locke’s article was written almost two decades ago, it can be argued that these conditions (time, faculty, and focus) are just as relevant and as problematic to PETE in 2016 as they were in 1997. In this current study, curricular space (time) was the greatest variable which limited dance instruction and, in turn, faculty support and expertise were perceived as the two greatest assets to dance education in PETE. In their article, Siedentop and Locke go on to state that an effective PETE program should be “defined by a limited conceptual framework” and “the conceptual framework should have a limited number of derivative themes and core abilities that all teacher candidates should achieve” (1997, p. 30). Revisiting the SHAPE America Initial PETE Standards (2008), it is clear that these “core abilities” have been defined and the argument can be made that the achievement of these standards and the CK and PCK present in them should drive the focus of a PETE program rather than other factors.

## **Limitations**

There were four main limitations to this study that could have skewed both the quantitative and qualitative results. First, although forced validation measures were put in place when the questionnaire was built in Qualtrics®, some of the respondents were able to skip mandatory questions, which provided inconsistent frequency counts across the questions. Second, since none of the questionnaire respondents acknowledged themselves as instructors of the dance courses within their department, questions they answered on the dance course matrix could have arisen from pure conjecture and therefore may not have been entirely accurate. Third, as previously mentioned, the interview participants were self-selected and as such they had a strong, and in this case positive, saliency to the topic being discussed as they all asserted their beliefs on the importance they placed on dance as a lifetime physical activity and as a content area within PE. Last, no follow up phone calls or emails were made to the potential participant pool in an attempt to further reduce the non-response rate of the questionnaire aside from the automated reminder emails outlined in the study methodology.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

In summation, a mixed methods study was conducted to describe how dance education was addressed within PETE programs in the U.S. today, looking specifically at the following variables: curricular space, CK, PCK, instructor characteristics, and the various facilitators and inhibitors to dance instruction in PETE. After constructing, validating, and disseminating a comprehensive online questionnaire addressing the above research areas to a potential participant pool of 580 PETE programs with 104 returned questionnaires, (17.9% response rate), the data revealed that a quarter of PETE programs (25.8%,  $n = 23$ ) neither offered nor required dance courses and that 67.4% ( $n = 60$ ) of institutions required at least one course that contained dance content in their program. The top five dance content areas taught are rhythmic activities (88.9%), line dance

(70.4%), folk/world dance (61.1%), creative dance (61.1%), and other (53.7%). Data also indicated that PE major students gained PCK from writing lesson plans (89.5%), student learning outcomes and assessments (71.1%), learning the history of dance and/or dance appreciation (39.5%) as well as theories of dance education (29.0%). Over half of dance courses (51.1%) are taught by a member of the Professoriate or the Department Chair and the tenure of dance course instructors is a mean of 9.2 years. The questionnaire also evidenced that the strongest facilitator of dance instruction according to participants was instructor expertise (27.9%) and the strongest inhibitor of dance instruction was lack of curricular space (15.1%) which was corroborated by the interview data. Furthermore the interview data, which comprised of eight semi-structured telephone interviews from self-selected questionnaire participants and was analyzed through a combination of Thematic Analysis and a Phenomenological lens, served to bolster and further validated the data gleaned from the questionnaire. Six themes were formulated and interpreted from descriptive codes that aligned with the research questions:

1. Curricular space means to provide (or greatly reduce) access to content and knowledge through manipulation of the variable of time, in the form of credit hours.
2. CK is one's understanding of a sport, game, dance, or other skillful activity that is gained through the physical experience of performing that activity.
3. PCK is the difference between a dance expert and a dance educator for future physical educators.
4. Instructors are challenged with getting students to "buy into" dance content and get them out of their comfort zone.
5. Facilitators mean that dance as a content area is supported and valued and is thus made accessible to students.



6. Inhibitors are having one's "hands tied" by lack of time, expertise, and/or support.

The purpose of these themes was to define and describe the phenomenon that is dance education within PETE based on the interviews conducted.

Last, recommendations on the following lines of inquiry can serve as a basis for future research efforts in this area:

1. Adapt the online questionnaire for P-12 physical educators and replicate the survey and interviews at the P-12 level in order to learn more about current dance education practices in schools. Mainly, if there is a correlation between what physical education teacher candidates learned from their dance courses in their PETE programs and how they approach dance content in their own PE programs, if at all.

2. In order to discover student-centered perspectives on the teaching and learning of dance in PETE and P-12 PE, employ other qualitative data collection methods such as field notes, participant observation, and focus groups to further flesh out the opinions, beliefs, and values of dance education by various stakeholders.

3. Triangulate data gathered from the current study along with the first research recommendation to discover if there are any significant gaps or bridges between university course work and P-12 PE teaching experiences in dance education and theorizing any correlations found between the data points.

4. Analyze the additional patterns that emerged from the semi-structured interview data of the current study that did not fit within the confines of the research questions and create a second manuscript that focuses solely on these new themes.

## References

- Ayers, S. F., & Housner, L. D. (2008). A descriptive analysis of undergraduate PETE programs. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 27(1), 51-67.
- Bahneman, C. P. (1996). An analysis of the undergraduate physical education teacher certification requirements within institutions which offer a doctoral degree in physical education. *Physical Educator*, 53(4), 198.
- Bibik, J. M. (1993). Pedagogical considerations regarding perceptions of dance competence. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 12, 266-285.
- Bloom's Taxonomy. (n.d.). Bloom's taxonomy.org: Featuring the work of dr. benjamin bloom and howard gardner. Retrieved from <http://www.bloomstaxonomy.org/>
- Cone, T. P., & Cone, S. L. (2007). Dance education: Dual or dueling identities. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 78(1), 6-7, 13.
- Downey, P. (1997). Promote equity: Include dance. *Journal CAHPERD*, 63(2), 12–16.
- Gard, M. (2001). Dancing around the “problem” of boys and dance. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 22(2), 213–225.
- Gard, M. (2003). Moving and belonging: Dance, sport and sexuality. *Sex Education* 3(2), 105-118. doi: 10.1080/1468181032000092401
- Gardner, H. (2006). *Multiple intelligences: New horizons in theory and practice* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Georgia State University (GSU). (2015). *Institutional review board: Policies and procedures for faculty, staff, and student researches*. Retrieved from <http://ursa.research.gsu.edu/files/2013/10/IRB-Manual.pdf>
- Grbich, C. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis: An introduction*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.

- Griffey, D. (1987). The future of graduate study in teacher preparation in physical education. *Quest*, 39, 174-178.
- Hetland, K. M., & Strand, B. N. (2010). A descriptive analysis of undergraduate pete programs in the central district. *ICHPER -- SD Journal of Research in Health, Physical Education, Recreation, Sport & Dance*, 5(1), 3-9.
- Hill, G., & Brodin, K. L. (2004). Physical education teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of university coursework in preparation for teaching. *Physical Educator*, 61(2), 75-87.
- Hill, G., & Hannon, J. C. (2008). An analysis of middle school students' physical education physical activity preferences. *Physical Educator* 65(4), 180-194.
- Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research. (2015). Carnegie classification of institutions of higher education. Retrieved from <http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/lookup/lookup.php>
- Kim, I., Lee, Y. S., Ward, P., & Li, W. (2015). A critical examination of movement content knowledge courses in physical education teacher education programs. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 34(1), 59-75.
- Kovar, S. K., Mehrhof, J. H., & Ermler, K. L. (1995). An investigation of the rhythmic awareness of physical education teaching majors. *Physical Educator*, 52, 40-46.
- Locke, L. F. (1977). From research and the disciplines to practice and the profession: One more time. *Proceedings NCPEAM*. Orlando, FL.
- Mehrhof, J. H., & Ermler, K. L. (1992). Dance education for undergraduate physical education majors. *Physical Educator*, 49(1), 23.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Metzler, M. W., Tjeerdsma, B. L., & Walker, T. M. (2000). Contextual analysis of the gsu pete program. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 19(4), 431-450.

- National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE). (2008). *2008 national initial physical education teacher education standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=9jpRd%2B5aH84%3D&tabid=676>
- O'Neill, J. R., Pate, R. R., & Liese, A. D. (2011). Descriptive epidemiology of dance participation in adolescents. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 82(3), 373-380.
- Prasad, P. (2005). *Crafting qualitative research: Working in the postpositivist traditions*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Rink, J. (2007). What knowledge is of most worth? Perspectives on kinesiology from pedagogy. *Quest*, 59, 100-110. doi: 10.1080/00336297.2007.10483540
- Ross, J. (2006). Teaching dance: One man's journey. *Teaching Elementary Physical Education*, 17(3), 12-14.
- Roulston, K. (2011). *Reflective interviewing: A guide to theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Santos, J. R. (1999). Cronbach's alpha: A tool for assessing the reliability of scales. *Journal of Extension*, 37(2). Retrieved from <http://www.joe.org/joe/1999april/tt3.php>
- Scheaffer, R. L., Mendenhall III, W., & Ott, R. L. (2006). *Elementary survey sampling* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Brooks/Cole.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4-14. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1175860>
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-21.

- Siedentop, D., Locke, L. (1997). Making a difference for physical education; what professors and practitioners must build together. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 68(4), 25-33. doi: 10.1080/07303084.1997.10604923
- Siedentop, D. (2002). Content knowledge for physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 21, 368-377.
- Society for Health and Physical Education America (SHAPE). (2008). National standards for initial physical education teacher education. Retrieved from <http://www.shapeamerica.org/accreditation/upload/2008-National-Initial-Physical-Education-Teacher-Education-Standards-Edited-1-5-12.pdf>
- Society for Health and Physical Education America (SHAPE). (2013). Grade-level outcomes for P-12 physical education. Retrieved from [http://www.shapeamerica.org/standards/pe/upload/GradeLevelOutcomes\\_K12PE.pdf](http://www.shapeamerica.org/standards/pe/upload/GradeLevelOutcomes_K12PE.pdf)
- Vickers, J. N. (1987). The role of subject matter in the preparation of teachers in physical education. *Quest*, 39, 179-184.
- Wolcott, H. F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis, and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- You, J. A. (2011). Portraying physical education-pedagogical content knowledge for the professional learning of physical educators. *Physical Educator*, 68(2), 98-112. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.gsu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=c9h&AN=60801365&site=eds-live>

## APPENDICES

### **Appendix A: Introductory email.**

Greetings,

My name is Jenée Marquis and I am a graduate student working towards my PhD in Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) at Georgia State University under the advisement of Dr. Michael Metzler. I am in the dissertation phase of my program and my research is focused on curricular space allotted to and the content of dance courses within PETE programs. There are two methods of data collection for this study. First, I have created and validated an online questionnaire that is designed to gather descriptive information about dance instructional practices within PETE programs. Second, I plan to conduct follow up telephone interviews with self-selected participants from the questionnaire to gather more information about the role that dance plays in PETE.

You have been selected as a potential participant for this research study because at one time your professional position was that of Program Coordinator, Department Chair, or Primary Contact of a PETE program and was thus included on a comprehensive list of PETE programs in the United States. If you are no longer in this role, I request that you please forward this email to the individual who is currently in the position of Program Coordinator or Primary Contact of your institution's PETE program, if known. If you are still within this role, I am asking for your assistance in helping me to better describe how content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge for dance education is approached in PETE. Once compiled, this updated profile of will allow researchers and PETE faculty to critically evaluate the current practices of dance instruction within PETE programs and can assist PETE faculty in making programmatic decisions concerning curricular space allocated to and the content of dance courses within Physical Education teacher certification programs.

The online, confidential questionnaire should take no more than 20 minutes of your time within one day to complete. At the conclusion of the survey, you will be invited to submit your email address if you are interested in participating in a telephone (or Skype®) interview with the Co-Principal Investigator (myself) to further discuss this topic. If you choose to participate in the telephone interview, I will contact you directly via email to schedule an interview at your convenience. The interview should last no longer than one hour on one day.

There is no compensation for completion of the online questionnaire or the telephone interview. Participation in this study is strictly voluntary. Participating in this survey will not pose any more risks than you would encounter on any normal day. Also, participation in this study will not have any positive or negative effect on your employment at your institution.

Below is a hyperlink to the survey, which you may copy and paste into your web browser. If you choose to participate in the survey, I ask that you please submit your completed survey within seven days.

[https://gsu.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV\\_2fyyJs1Mge27bJX](https://gsu.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_2fyyJs1Mge27bJX)

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 678-409-8848 or at 'jmarquis2@student.gsu.edu'. Or, you can contact Dr. Metzler at 404-413-8373, or by email at 'mmezler@gsu.edu'.

I thank you in advance for your consideration to assist us in expanding the knowledge base in this little known subject area.

Sincerely,

Jenée Marquis, M.Ed.  
Physical Education Teacher Education  
Department of Kinesiology and Health  
Georgia State University  
Atlanta, GA 30303

## **Appendix B: Waiver of documentation of consent for online questionnaire.**

### **Georgia State University Department of Kinesiology and Health Informed Consent**

**Title:** A Descriptive Profile of Dance Curriculum in Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) Programs

**Principal Investigator:** Michael Metzler, Ph.D.

**Co-Principal Investigator:** Jenee Marquis, M.Ed.

#### **I. PURPOSE:**

- You are invited to participate in a dissertation study.
- The purpose of this study is to gather descriptive information about dance curriculum within Physical Education teacher certification programs in the United States.
- Participation in this initial online survey will require no more than 20 minutes of your time during one day.

A total of 615 institutions of higher education in the United States that offer initial teacher certification in Physical Education will be recruited for this study.

Once compiled, this updated profile of dance instruction within Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) programs will allow researchers and PETE faculty to critically evaluate the current practices of dance instruction within PETE programs and can assist PETE faculty in making programmatic decisions concerning curricular space allocated to and the content of dance courses within Physical Education teacher certification programs.

#### **II. PROCEDURES:**

- There are two avenues of data collection for this study. The first is a confidential online survey and the second is a follow up telephone interview with the Co-Principal Investigator (Co-PI)
- If you decide to participate in this study, it will require you to complete an online survey. The survey will take no more than 20 minutes during one day.
- At the completion of the survey, you will be asked if you would like to participate in a telephone (or Skype®) interview with the Co-PI to provide your opinion on the role of dance instruction within PETE programs and in P-12 Physical Education and to discuss the facilitators and inhibitors of dance education in PETE programs.
- Participation in the telephone interview is completely voluntary. You may choose to complete the survey and opt out of the telephone interview.

If you choose to participate in the interview, you will be prompted by the survey to submit your email address to the Co-PI, who will then contact you to schedule a date and time for the interview that is convenient for you. If you choose to participate in the interview, it will take no more than one hour of your time during one day.



The online survey is divided into five sections:

**A. Personal Demographics:** This section will include questions about your gender, education level, employee status, and professional experiences within higher education.

**B. PETE Program:** This section will ask demographic questions about your institution's Physical Education department, faculty, and students.

**C. Dance Course Matrix:** This matrix is designed to capture descriptive information about the dance courses included in your Physical Education teacher certification program such as the title of the course(s), content knowledge (CK) covered in the course(s), pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) covered in the course(s), instructional strategies utilized, assessments employed, and instructor characteristics. (If your Physical Education teacher certification program neither requires nor offers dance courses, you will have the option of skipping this section).

**D. Inhibitors and Facilitators of Instruction:** This section will ask your opinion on the various programmatic elements in your institution's Physical Education teacher certification program that may either inhibit or facilitate dance instruction.

**E. Invitation to Participate in Telephone Interview:** The survey will conclude with an invitation to participate in a voluntary telephone (or Skype®) interview with the Co-PI to discuss your opinions and beliefs about dance instruction for preservice Physical Educators and programmatic aspects that may either inhibit or facilitate dance instruction within Physical Education teacher certification programs. As previously stated, should you choose to participate in the interview, you will be prompted to submit your email address to the Co-PI, who will then contact you to schedule a date and time for the interview that is convenient for you. If you choose to participate in the interview, it will take no more than one hour of your time during one day.

### **III. RISKS:**

This study will not pose any more risks than you would encounter on any other normal day.

### **IV. BENEFITS:**

- Participation in this study will not benefit you personally.
- It will not have any positive or negative effect on your employment at your current institution.

We hope that the results of this study will allow researchers and PETE faculty to critically evaluate the current practices of dance instruction within PETE programs.

### **V. COMPENSATION:**

There is no compensation for completion of the online survey or the telephone interview.

### **VI. VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL:**

- Participation in this research is voluntary.
- You do not have to be in this study.

- If you decide to be in the study and change your mind, you have the right to drop out at any time.
- You may stop participating in the survey at any time.

Whatever you decide, you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your participation or withdrawal from the study will not have any positive or negative effect on your employment at your current institution.

#### **VII. CONFIDENTIALITY:**

- The online survey is confidential.
- Numeric codes will be assigned to survey participants to maintain confidentiality.
- Pseudonyms will be assigned to interview participants to maintain confidentiality.
- We will keep your responses private to the extent allowed by law.
- Ms. Jenee Marquis and Dr. Michael Metzler will have access to the information you provide. Information may also be shared with those who make sure the study is done correctly (Georgia State University Institutional Review Board).
- The electronic data will be stored on password-protected files.
- Despite precautions taken, information sent over the internet may not be secure.

The findings will be summarized and reported in group form. You will not be identified personally. Contact information, if given, will be stored separately from survey responses and used only by the Co-PI to corroborate survey responses with interview responses. Once interview participants have member checked their interview transcripts, the file with the contact information will be deleted.

#### **VIII. CONTACT PERSONS:**

- You can contact Ms. Jenee Marquis (678-409-8848 or [jmarquis2@student.gsu.edu](mailto:jmarquis2@student.gsu.edu)) if you have questions, concerns, or complaints about this study.
- You can also call if you think you have been harmed by the study.
- Call Ms. Susan Vogtner in the Georgia State University Office of Research Integrity at 404-413-3513 or [svogtner1@gsu.edu](mailto:svogtner1@gsu.edu) if you want to talk to someone who is not part of the study team.

You can talk about questions, concerns, offer input, obtain information, or suggestions about the study. You can also call Ms. Vogtner if you have questions or concerns about your rights in this study.

#### **IX. COPY OF CONSENT FORM:**

Please print or save a copy of this consent form for your records.

### **Appendix C: Semi-structured telephone interview verbal consent script.**

Hello, my name is Jenée Marquis and I am conducting a research study about dance instruction practices within Physical Education Teacher Education certification programs as a part of my dissertation and I am interested in learning more about your personal and professional experiences with dance instruction. The purpose of this research is to examine current dance education for preservice physical educators in order to assist PETE faculty in making programmatic decisions concerning curricular space allocated to and the content of dance courses within Physical Education teacher certification programs to better prepare preservice physical educators to teach dance in P-12 PE. Your participation will involve one informal, semi-structured telephone interview that will last no longer than one hour. This research has no known risks. This research will benefit the academic community because it will help us to better understand curricular decisions made within PETE programs based on your personal experiences and professional option. Your identity or personal information will not be disclosed in any publication that may result from the study. The information provided by you will remain strictly confidential. You or your institution will not be identified in any way by your answers. This conversation is being audio recorded for transcription purposes only. If you do not wish to be audio recorded please let me know and I will turn off the tape recorder and take written notes instead. All identifying information will be removed from any written notes and notes will be stored in a secured location. You may choose not to answer any question you do not wish to answer.

Do you agree to continue with this semi-structured interview?

Do you agree to be audio recorded?

[If “no”, do you consent to allow me to take written notes during the interview? All identifying markers from the notes will be removed and once the notes have been transcribed by myself onto a computer, a pseudonym will be assigned to the notes and the hand written notes will be shredded and disposed of in a secure shredded document receptacle.]

Do you have any questions before we get started?

**Appendix D: Online questionnaire.**

**The first set of questions is designed to gather your demographic information and your professional experience within higher education.**

**What is your gender?**

Male

Female

Prefer not to answer

**What is the highest level of education you have completed?**

Some high school, no degree

High school graduate or GED

Some college, no degree

Associate's degree

Bachelor's degree

Graduate or professional degree

Doctoral degree, PhD or EdD

Other

**Please enter the highest level of education you have completed in the text field below.**

TEXT FIELD

**What is your current position at your institution? Check all that apply. To choose multiple answers, press the Control key on your keyboard and click using your cursor (Ctrl + click).**

Graduate Assistant

Program Coordinator

Adjunct Faculty

Clinical Instructor

Associate Professor

Assistant Professor

Guest Lecturer

Professor

Department Chair

Full Time Administrator

Other

**Please enter the title of your current position in the text field below.**

TEXT FIELD

**How many years have you been in your current position?**

<1

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11-15

16-20

21-25

26-30

>30

**What are your primary job responsibilities within your current position? Check all that apply. To choose multiple answers, press the Control key on your keyboard and click using your cursor (Ctrl + click).**

Teach undergraduate level courses

Teach graduate level courses

Teach doctoral level courses

Student advisement

Supervise/coordinate field experiences

Research and publications

Professional service activities

Program coordinator/manager

Records keeping

Committee member

Business/office manager

Sponsor of student organization(s)

Other

**Please enter your other primary job responsibilities in the text field below. Please use a comma to indicate separate responsibilities.**

TEXT FIELD

**How many years have you taught in Physical Education Teacher Education?**

0

< 1

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11-15  
16-20  
21-25  
26-30  
> 30

**How many years have you taught in higher education total?**

0  
< 1  
1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11-15  
16-20  
21-25  
26-30  
> 30

**How many years have you been employed at your current institution?**

< 1  
1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6

7  
8  
9  
10  
11-15  
16-20  
21-25  
26-30  
> 30

**This next set of questions focuses on the characteristics of your institution's initial Physical Education teacher certification program.**

**Where is the Physical Education teacher certification program housed within your institution? (Examples: College of Education, College of Public Health, Institute of Motor Learning and Development, etc.)**

TEXT FIELD

**Is your Physical Education teacher certification program accredited by an agency (either regional, national, and/or specialized) that is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education?**

Yes

No

**Please enter the full name(s) of the accrediting agency (ies) under which your institution's Physical Education teacher certification program is accredited utilizing a comma to separate agency names if more than one.**

TEXT FIELD

**What teacher certification degree(s) in Physical Education does your institution confer? Check all that apply. To choose multiple answers, press the Control key on your keyboard and click using your cursor (Ctrl + click).**

Bachelor's degree

Master's degree

EdD

PhD

Other

**Please list the teacher certification degree(s) in Physical Education offered by your institution in the text field below.**

TEXT FIELD

**What areas of Health and Physical Education does your institution certify? Check all that apply. To choose multiple answers, press the Control key on your keyboard and click using your cursor (Ctrl + click).**

Health only

Physical Education only

Health and Physical Education

Other

**Please enter the area(s) of Health and Physical Education certified by your institution in the text field below.**

TEXT FIELD

**How many students are currently enrolled within your initial Physical Education teacher certification program?**

TEXT FIELD

**Is your Physical Education teacher certification program structured in quarter or semester hours?**

Quarter

Semester

**How many students graduated from your initial Physical Education teacher certification program at the conclusion of the 2015-2016 academic year (spring semester 2016)?**

TEXT FIELD

**In a typical year, what percentage of your Physical Education teacher certification program graduates go on to teach Physical Education in a P-12 setting?**

0-10%

11-20%

21-30%

31-40%

41-50%

51-60%

61-70%

71-80%

81-90%



91-100%  
Unknown

**What is the total number of tenured faculty within your Physical Education teacher certification program?**

0  
1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11-15  
16-20  
21-25  
26-30  
>30

**What is the total number of non-tenured faculty (not including Graduate Teaching Assistants or Graduate Research Assistants) within your Physical Education teacher certification program?**

0  
1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11-15  
16-20  
21-25  
26-30  
>30

**Does your Physical Education teacher certification program employ Graduate Teaching Assistants?**

Yes

No

**How many Graduate Teaching Assistants are currently employed within your institution's Physical Education teacher certification program?**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11-15

16-20

21-25

26-30

>30

**Overall how many major hours (defined as credit hours that are taken once a student is accepted into the Physical Education teacher certification program) are required to graduate from the program?**

< 80

81-90

91-100

101-110

111-120

121-130

131-140

141-150

151-160

161-170

171-180

181-190

191-200

**Using the choices below, please indicate the dance course requirement in your Physical Education teacher certification program.**

Dance courses are required of program majors.  
Dance courses are offered, but are not required.  
Dance courses are neither offered nor required.

**The following matrix is designed to gather descriptive information about the dance courses offered within your institution's Physical Education teacher certification program.**

**Please complete the matrix below for EACH of the dance courses offered within your institution's Physical Education teacher certification program.**

**Course is (choose one)**

Required

Not Required

**Institutional Course Code**

**Type course code below.**

TEXT FIELD

**Full Course Title**

**Type full course title below.**

TEXT FIELD

**Number of Credit Hours**

.5

1

2

3

4

5

6

> 6

**Credit Hour Allocation**

Full Quarter

Full Semester

Partial Quarter

Partial Semester

**Content Knowledge (CK) Addressed. Check all that apply.**

Rhythmic Activities  
 Square Dance  
 Line Dance  
 Folk/World Dance  
 Creative Dance  
 Fitness Dances (i.e. Zumba)  
 Electronic Dance Games (i.e. Dance Dance Revolution, etc.)  
 Ballroom Dance  
 Hip Hop  
 Jazz  
 Ballet  
 Tap  
 Modern/Contemporary  
 Other

**Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK) Addressed. Check all that apply.**

Writing lesson and/or unit plans  
 Writing student learning outcomes (SLOs)  
 Writing student assessments  
 Theories of dance education  
 History of dance and/or dance appreciation

**Pedagogical Strategies Utilized by Instructor. Check all that apply.**

Lectures  
 PowerPoint  
 Videos/Animations  
 Online programs/apps  
 Instructor demonstrations  
 Guest speaker/demonstrations  
 Student demonstrations

**Student Learning Activities. Check all that apply.**

Individual and/or group skill practice  
 Peer teaching  
 Self teaching  
 Listening to lectures  
 Taking notes  
 Viewing multimedia (videos, PowerPoint, etc.)  
 Reading from textbook or instructor selected readings  
 Field experiences  
 Journals/writing prompts

**Assessments employed. Check all that apply.**

Skill/technique test  
 Choreographic rubric  
 Cognitive knowledge test/quiz  
 Self-assessment  
 Peer assessment  
 Student journal  
 Research project/presentation  
 Student portfolio  
 Student created dance  
 Individual and/or group performance (live)  
 Individual and/or group performance (recorded)

**Course Instructor**

Department Chair  
 Professor  
 Assistant Professor  
 Associate Professor  
 Clinical Instructor  
 Adjunct Faculty  
 Graduate Teaching Assistant  
 Self  
 Guest Teaching Artist

**Location of Course Instructor**

Within the Physical Education department of the institution  
 Within the institution, but outside of the Physical Education department  
 Outside of the institution

**Instructor's Formal Content Knowledge Training in Dance. Check all that apply.**

Recreational/studio classes  
 Conference workshops  
 In-service professional development  
 Retreats/camps  
 Previous college courses  
 Private instruction  
 Self-taught  
 Unknown

**Instructor's Formal Pedagogical Content Knowledge Training in Dance. Check all that apply.**

Conference workshops

In-service professional development  
Previous college courses  
Mentor  
Self-taught  
Unknown

**Instructor's Tenure (Number of years teaching course)**

< 1

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11-15

16-20

21-25

>25

Unknown

**If you chose "self" as the course instructor for any of the courses on the previous page, please use the slider below to rate your comfort level on a scale of 1 - 9 in teaching this content area to preservice physical education majors with 1 being extremely uncomfortable and 9 being extremely comfortable.**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

This section is designed to gather data on the various factors in your institution's Physical Education teacher certification program that may either facilitate or inhibit dance instruction.

Please use the matrix below to classify each of the following factors by what degree each factor either inhibits or facilitates dance instruction within your institution's Physical Education teacher certification program.

	<b>Strong facilitator</b>	<b>Moderate facilitator</b>	<b>Small facilitator</b>	<b>Neither facilitates nor inhibits</b>	<b>Small inhibitor</b>	<b>Moderate inhibitor</b>	<b>Strong inhibitor</b>
<b>Curricular space</b>							
<b>Expertise of instructors</b>							
<b>Administrative support</b>							
<b>Facilities/equipment resources</b>							
<b>Perceived popularity of content area by students</b>							
<b>Perceived value of content area by department faculty</b>							
<b>Field experience opportunities</b>							
<b>State requirements and/or regulations</b>							

**Are there any other factors or components of your Physical Education teacher certification program not listed above that you believe may INHIBIT dance instruction at your institution?**

TEXT FIELD

**Are there any other factors or components of your Physical Education teacher certification program not listed above that you believe may FACILITATE dance instruction at your institution?**

TEXT FIELD

**Thank you for your participation in this survey. Would you be willing to take part in a telephone interview to further discuss the various inhibitors of and facilitators of dance instruction within your Physical Education teacher certification program?**

**If you choose to participate, you will receive a follow up email from the Co-Principal Investigator to schedule a date/time for the interview. Should you choose to participate, your identity will be kept confidential and all identifying markers from your interview will be removed during transcription. The interview should last no longer than one hour.**

Yes

No

**Please type your email address in the text field below and the Co-Principal Investigator will be in contact with you shortly.**

TEXT FIELD



### **Appendix E: Semi-structured telephone interview questions.**

1. Please begin by telling me a bit about your academic and professional history, particularly your experiences in PETE and/or P-12 PE.
2. Can you describe to me how dance content was approached within the context of your scholastic experiences, from kindergarten through college?
3. What are your own personal experiences with either the teaching of dance in P-12 PE and in PETE?
4. (If participant has taught dance in P-12 PE or PETE). Can you describe the biggest challenges or any critical moments you have had in teaching dance to students?
5. Likewise, can you describe your successes (if any) in teaching dance to students? What about those moments made them a success?
6. It has been theorized by some that dance is perceived by students and the public at large as “feminine” or “for girls”. Do you agree with this perception? Why or why not?
7. What aspects of dance could be viewed as “feminine” and why?
8. Overall, how would you describe the curricular space allotted to dance content knowledge (CK) and pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) courses that physical education majors receive at your current institution (if any)?
9. How would you describe the scope and depth of the content of dance CK and PCK courses that physical education majors receive at your institution?
10. Considering SHAPE America’s standards for PE, especially Standard 1 (the physically literate individual demonstrates competency in a variety of motor skills and movement patterns), Standard 2 (the physically literate individual applies knowledge of concepts, principles, strategies and tactics related to movement and performance), and Standard 5 (the physically literate individual recognizes the value of physical activity for health, enjoyment, challenge, self-expression and/or social interaction) along with SHAPE America’s Grade Level Outcomes for PE and any of your local or district standards for PE (if known), do you think the physical education majors within your home institution’s PETE program are receiving adequate preparation to teach dance once they graduate? Why or why not?
11. In your questionnaire, you noted that (X, Y, Z) factors inhibited dance instruction at your institution. Can you explain your reasoning for this answer?
12. In your questionnaire, you noted that (X, Y, Z) factors facilitated dance instruction at your institution. Can you explain your reasoning for this answer?
13. How do you define a strong, well-rounded P-12 PE curriculum?

14. Considering your previous definition, what content areas should be included to compose a strong, well-rounded P-12 PE curriculum? Why?
15. Some people would argue that dance education should be housed solely within the creative arts and be removed from PE, what do you think of this position and why?
16. Do you think physical education majors should have mandatory courses in dance CK and/or PCK? Why or why not?
17. Can you think of a reason (or reasons) that a P-12 physical educator would not include dance activities as a part of their curriculum?
18. Do you have any ideas or strategies as to how physical educators (and PETE) can make dance content more palatable to students (both P-12 and preservice physical educators)?
19. If you could revamp your PETE program to include more dance content, what would you include and why?