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Abstract

Over the years, scholars have identified specific roles and responsibilities of adapted physical education (APE) teachers. In such capacities providing direct and indirect service to students with disabilities, APE teachers are expected to be effective. Some adapted and general physical education teachers have voiced concerns linked to their teaching and consulting. The purpose of this study was to determine and describe the job roles and responsibilities of APE teachers in service delivery at urban city schools. A second purpose was to determine whether or not these APE teachers had job-related concerns. If so, what were their concerns?

Participants were six experienced itinerant APE teachers (all women) from the same urban school district in the Midwestern USA. The theoretical framework for this study was concerns theory as originally conceptualized by Fuller (1969) and later modified for applicability to physical education contexts by McBride (1993). Concerns theory posits that teachers have concerns and the level of concerns depend on: (a) their experiences; (b) individual differences; and (c) type of innovations (Fuller et al., 1969; Hall et al., 1973).

A collective case study methodology based on an interpretive paradigm was used (Stake, 2000). Data were collected from two face-to-face interviews and field notes taken during nonparticipant observations, pre/post lesson conferences, and stimulated recall sessions. One interview was conducted starting data collection, followed by ten
nonparticipant observations of each teacher’s teaching behaviors, and ending with another interview. Data were analyzed using the constant comparative approach (Goetz & LeCompte, 1981). Findings were presented descriptively and in narrative as recurring themes. These APE teachers: (a) described their primary roles and responsibilities as teaching students with disabilities; (b) viewed themselves as effective; (c) viewed coursework and hands-on experiences as beneficial to their practice; (d) felt that professional interactions and relationships with other professionals were individually contrived and contextually driven—some interactions were collaborative and supportive while at other times teachers felt disrespected, disregarded or marginalized; (e) had concerns characteristic of the self, task, and impact stages of Fuller’s (1969) concerns theory; and (f) expressed high levels of job satisfaction.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The history of the adapted physical education (APE) profession is a progression from medical gymnastics before 1900 through a transition to sport, than to corrective physical education and finally to APE (Winnick, 2000). Sherrill (2004) reported that the populations served in public schools’ corrective APE programs expanded to include: (a) persons with all disability types; (b) all types of institutions (not only segregated or residential), thereby creating a trend away from residential placement resulting in the increased enrollment of students with disabilities mostly mental retardation in public schools; and (c) a broader range of activities creating benefits children would accrue from participating in sport, dance, and aquatics adapted to their special needs.

In American schools, a host of professionals work in collaboration to make school life meaningful for individuals with disabilities. APE specialists are one such group of individuals that work with individuals who have varying disabilities in physical activity contexts. Sherrill (2004) explained that specialists typically work as partners with generalists (e.g., general physical education [GPE] teachers) or members of multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, or crossdisciplinary teams to perform direct service in planning, assessment, preparation/paperwork/meetings, teaching/counseling/coaching,
evaluation, consultation, and advocacy (PAPTE-CA). Often, school systems assign generic names to overall job roles or positions with commonly used synonyms for direct service APE personnel (Sherrill, 2004). These include:

1. **Resource teacher**: refers to a teacher who serves a single school, team-teaches with GPE teachers and provides instruction for individuals with disabilities not in GPE.

2. **Itinerant teacher**: refers to a teacher who works in several different schools but performs essentially the same job functions as a resource teacher.

3. **Consulting teacher**: refers to a teacher who travels from school to school and does some direct service delivery but mostly provides support services to GPE teachers and help them learn how to adapt instruction (Sherrill, 2004, p.66).

Additional roles of APE specialists include conducting inservice training (e.g. workshops and learning experiences for school district personnel) and administrative responsibilities. Jansma and French (1994) also explained the roles of APE teachers as that of itinerant teachers who travel to and from different schools to provide direct instruction and consultant services for individuals with disabilities. Hazekamp and Huebner (1989) discussed roles and responsibilities of APE teachers that define both the knowledge base and practical output related to students who are visually impaired, specifying that the APE specialist: (a) is knowledgeable about unique educational needs in the area of sensori-motor skills; (b) works closely with the teacher of students who are visually impaired, the orientation and mobility (O&M) specialist, and the occupational therapist (OT) and/or physical therapist (PT) to share needed information and coordinate services of these service providers; (c) is familiar with specialized or adapted equipment; and (d) involves students in appropriate physical activities that can be applied in daily life.
Rabbette (1996) noted that the primary roles of APE teachers, OTs, and PTs differ; but their roles do intersect at various points however. For example, gross motor development is an area where PT and APE teachers share commonalities in serving youth with disabilities. There was also no major difference among roles of the three specialists on the responsibility of sensory-perceptual skills and the holistic development of the child.

To properly carry out their job-related roles and responsibilities, APE teachers need training whereby they can acquire skills and knowledge to meet the needs, interests, and abilities of their students. In that regard, the literature reveals the importance of competency-based programs for teachers during their professional preparation. Since the mid to late 1970s, there have been policies and federal personnel preparation funding opportunities available from federal and state governments to support and ensure effective APE teacher preparation. Over the years, numerous APE teachers have had the opportunity to be trained in such programs, some of which have been described as exemplary. Of such programs, Ellery and Stewart (2000) surveyed 18 that had received federal funding in the USA in 1998. They reported that these programs typically had received funding for more than 15 years, offered coursework from an average of three different academic disciplines, and graduates were employed within 12 months of their graduation (Ellery & Stewart, 2000). However notwithstanding Ellery and Stewart’s findings, Krueger, DiRocco, and Felix (2000) found that not all APE teachers properly or effectively carry out their roles and responsibilities.

Further, there have been multiple federal grants that support competency-based special education teacher education personnel training. Similarly federal grants have been available which support competency-based professional preparation in APE (Jansma &
Several variables seem to be interconnected: (a) the APE teacher competency-based professional preparation, (b) funding (federal grants to promote preparation), and (c) learner outcomes. For those APE teachers who graduate as competent teachers and who can effect change for better learner outcomes funds spent on their training is justified. This is not always the case, however. On this point, Kelly and Gansneder (1998) conducted a national study to determine the preparation perceptions, job demographics, and decision-making roles of APE teachers (an important focus for this study). They had 293 APE teachers respond to a national survey, which represents 51% return rate. Kelly and Gansneder reported that these teachers emphasized a greater need for training in teaching, motor development, and continuing education. Fifty-six percent of the APE teachers who worked in urban settings served an average of 4.4 schools and reported an average caseload of 104 students. These APE teachers worked an average of 36.1 hours per week, while 52% of their time was spent providing direct APE services and 26% of it was in providing indirect APE instruction. They worked with all school-age groups and students with all types and severity of disabilities.

Jansma and Surburg (1995) were very emphatic that teacher education reform and accountability in education have triggered broad-scale changes in the way teachers teach, the way pupils learn, the way teacher educators train, and the way educational leaders lead at all levels of education in the United States. These are components of education that are intertwined. Supporting documents include reports such as *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) and *A Call for Change in Teacher Education* (National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education, 1985), which gave rise to a call to formulate appropriate standards related to pupil achievement,
learner outcomes, and teacher competence. Jansma and Surburg (1995) stated that such reports have influenced the US federal government to develop national education goals.

Speaking of indirect services, Block and Conaster (1999) suggested a need exists to broaden the knowledge base in APE consulting. They spoke to issues of definitions and characteristics of consulting, review of theoretical foundations of two common consulting models, and four of the most common roles of APE consultants (advocacy, trainer, fact finder, and process specialist). They defined a four-step consulting process (entry, diagnosis, implementation, and disengagement); and identified four key concerns to APE consulting (time constraints to consult, lack of administrative support, negative attitudes, and expectations of consultee (Block, 2000; Block & Conaster, 1999; Sherrill, 2004).

Moreover, student outcomes in GPE and APE are important issues for study and practice (Block, 2000; Sherrill, 2004). The extant literature emphasizes the importance of effective teaching behaviors and practices (Hodge, Ammah, Casebolt, LaMaster, & O’Sullivan, 2004; McLeish, 1981; Siedentop, 1989; Siedentop & Tannehill, 2000; Tsangaridou & O’Sullivan, 1997). Moreover while teachers seek to influence student learning, students also influence teachers’ behaviors; thus it is a reciprocal relationship (Kiphard, 1983; Sherrill, 2004). The extant physical education literature also emphasizes the importance of training APE teachers to perform effectively (Block, 2000; Block & Conaster, 1999; Sherrill, 2004). To ensure that APE teachers receive appropriate training to acquire requisite knowledge to teach effectively, the Adapted Physical Education National Standards (APENS) were developed (Kelly, 1995).

At a point of interest one would like to critically look at what has been documented as roles and responsibilities of APE teachers. Further, it is important to find out what the
teachers themselves describe as their roles and responsibilities. Moreover, the issue of concerns of APE teachers becomes important when trying to determine what they describe as their job roles and responsibilities. Today additional research is needed to better understand teachers’ concerns in teaching of students with varied disabilities (Hodge et al., 2004; Lienert, Sherrill, & Myers, 2001).

Hazekamp and Huebner (1989) identified several problems in the day-to-day roles and responsibilities of itinerant APE teachers. For example, itinerant APE teachers, especially those who are novice teachers, must establish their own program structures and schedules. This is somewhat different from more stable school-based GPE and classroom teachers who typically: (a) are assigned a room and mailbox; (b) have a relatively homogeneous group of students (grade level-wise); (c) are given a set of textbooks and teachers’ manuals, and classroom equipment and supplies; and (d) usually have their structures and schedules predetermined on a more permanent basis than itinerant APE teachers. APE teachers may only receive information about lists of students who may range in ability from severely disabled to gifted, vary in age, and be located at several different school sites that may or may not be in close geographic proximity. Typically, itinerant APE teachers consult with classroom teachers and school administrators to set up a schedule in which the best times to pull students out of their classes are coordinated with the times that appropriate rooms are available for their use. Moreover, APE teachers must transport and carry in and out materials and equipment at each school. Most important, they must determine which needs of the students ought to be addressed.

Fuller’s 1969 study revealed that teachers have concerns about their jobs. Fuller did extensive study on concerns of teachers and established a theoretical foundation of
teachers’ concerns. Included in the factors leading to Fuller’s series of studies were the issues of a lack of motivation shown by undergraduate preservice teachers, and the opinion that many education courses were not relevant to the needs of preservice teachers. The primary question asked was: What are the concerns of inexperienced teachers and whether the concerns are maintained or change over time with experience? Numerous studies indicate that teacher concerns change over time (Fessler, 1995; Fuller, 1969; Katz, 1986). Fuller (1969) concluded that teachers with more experience typically have different perceptions than preservice or novice teachers beginning their careers.

Several related studies were conducted and compared by Fuller (1969). The consistency of the various results despite the diverse populations involved led to Fuller’s conclusion that there were three stages of teachers’ concerns, namely: (a) pre-teaching phase (student-teachers rarely have specific concerns related to teaching or self), (b) early teaching phase (they have concerns about self), and (c) late concerns (they have concerns associated with student learning).

Hall, Wallace, and Dossett (1973), McBride (1993) in physical education, and more recently Lienert et al. (2001) completed studies on concerns of teachers. Hall et al. (1973) built on the initial concerns model of Fuller (1969) and developed the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) and stages of concern (SoC), which represented a process by which an educational institution adopts and views an innovation. More recently, Lienert et al. (2001) extended the CBAM to include the dynamic systems model that comprises interrelationships among concerns, personal variables, and contextual variables. McBride (1993) developed the Teachers’ Concerns Questionnaire Physical Education (TCQ-PE) because he realized that Fuller’s conceptualization was applicable
to most teachers but the questions asked did not fully and specifically apply to physical education teachers and their contexts. McBride (1993) therefore developed TCQ-PE as a model for learning about the concerns of teachers in physical education contexts. Nonetheless, he described physical education teachers’ concerns using the same stages as originally identified by Fuller (1969), which were: self, task, and impact. However, there is void of research on APE teachers who work in urban schools and their concerns on teaching students with disabilities.

Still today, many schools and school districts are culturally, ethnically, economically, and racially segregated and unequal (Toppo, 2004). For example, students who attend urban public city schools often do so in dilapidated school buildings and detrimental school conditions. In fact for years, scholars have identified numerous concerns facing urban schools to include: (a) large overcrowded classes; (b) social and disciplinary problems; (c) large percentages of poor students, who are mostly students of color; (d) deteriorating and aging educational infrastructures; and (e) poor levels of involvement of parents compared to their suburban counterparts (Argon, 1998; Noguera, 2003).

Moreover, students of color (e.g., African, African American, Asia/Pacific American, Hispanic students) now comprise an ever increasing proportion of public school students, and many within urban schools. The populations of urban inner-city schools are overwhelmingly comprised of students of color (Noguera, 2003). Related to the current study: (a) more youth of color are served in special education than would be expected from the proportion of students of color in the general school population, (b) improvised African American youth are 2.3 times more likely to be identified by their teacher as having mental retardation than their White American classmates, (c) African Americans
comprise 16% of elementary and secondary enrollments, and yet they constitute 21% of the total enrollments in special education, (d) the drop-out rate is 68% higher for students of color than for White American students, (e) more than 50% of students of color in large cities drop out of school, (f) students of color comprise more than 50% of K-12 public school enrollment in seven states, yet teacher candidates of color enrollment in teacher training programs is less than 15% in all but six states, and (g) while African American students constitute 28% of the total enrollment in special education, only 11.2% of those enrolled in special education (preservice) professional preparation programs are African Americans (Individuals with Disabilities Educational Act; IDEA, 1997, p. 41). In short, although, the proportion of African American and Hispanic students served in special education continues to increase, the number of teachers and related service personnel of color trained in our colleges and universities continues to decrease (IDEA, 1997). Student enrollments in special education programs directly impact APE program enrollments as both provide services for students with disabilities.

In recent years, physical education scholars have called for teachers to be trained such that they are culturally competent to teach in urban schools and trained to teach a diversity of students with and without disabilities (Burden, Hodge, O’Bryant, & Harrison, 2004; Hodge, Tannehill, & Kluge, 2003; Knop, Tannehill, & O’Sullivan, 2001; Stroot & Whipple, 2003). Nonetheless, the extant literature is void on the question of what are the roles and responsibilities of APE teachers who work in urban schools. The extant literature is also void on the question of what concerns, if any, do these teachers have associated with teaching a diversity of students in urban schools. There is no question from the Ellery and Stewart’s (2000) study that graduates from APE programs secure
employment but there is a lack of literature on how APE teachers go about their job-related roles and responsibilities particularly in urban public city schools. Moreover, few studies have been published on APE teachers’ effectiveness or job-related concerns (Kelly & Gansneder, 1998; Kelly, 1994; Solomon & Lee, 1991) and even less is known about APE teachers’ concerns associated with working in urban contexts.

**Purpose and Theoretical Framework**

The purpose of this study was to determine and describe the job roles and responsibilities of APE teachers in itinerant service delivery (teaching/consulting) at urban public city schools. A second purpose of the study was to determine whether or not APE teachers had any job-related concerns. If so, what were their concerns?

Concerns theory initially developed by Fuller (1969) and later modified by McBride (1993) was used as the theoretical framework for this study. Concerns theory was used to better understand and explain findings associated with teachers’ expressed concerns. More specifically, concerns theory posits that teachers have concerns that are job-related (Fuller, 1969; McBride, 1993). The level of concern may depend on: (a) the teacher’s experience (Fuller, 1969), (b) individual differences (Hall et al., 1973; Lienert et al., 2001); and (c) innovations (e.g., changes to methods of teaching) (Hall et al., 1973; Knowles, 1981). It is important to know what concerns APE teachers may have and whether or not such concerns affect job performance.

**Research Objectives**

The overarching aim of this study was to describe the roles and responsibilities, and any concerns of itinerant APE teachers in an urban school district. To that aim, the following research objectives guided the study.
1. To determine and describe the roles and responsibilities of itinerant APE teachers.
2. To determine and describe how itinerant APE teachers execute their roles and responsibilities.
3. To determine and describe itinerant APE teachers’ views on how effective they do their jobs.
4. To determine and describe how knowledge acquired during professional preparation (preservice) and development (inservice) influence itinerant APE teachers in doing their jobs.
5. To determine and describe itinerant APE teachers’ professional interactions and relationships with parents, individualized educational program (IEP) team members, and other persons with whom they work.
6. To determine and describe any job-related concerns which hinder itinerant APE teachers’ consulting and/or teaching effectiveness.
7. To determine and describe itinerant APE teachers’ views on how their jobs could improve and their overall job satisfaction.

*Significance of the Study*

The need to provide physical education to persons with disabilities is well documented and mandated in Public Law 105-17, IDEA (1997) and now Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA) of 2004. Increasingly, scholars have discussed the issue of physical education programming in both APE and GPE settings as important environments that should provide opportunities for students with disabilities to learn in safe, satisfying, and successful ways (Block, 1995, 2000; Hodge et al., 2004; Hodge, Murata, Block, & Lieberman, 2003; Sherrill, 2004). To which, Block (1995, 2000),
Hodge, Murata, et al. (2003), and Sherrill (2004) offer guidelines to physical education teachers to better ensure effective teaching occurs in such environments. There is much research focusing on the motor performance and behaviors of children with various disabilities and those without disabilities in physical education settings (Block & Zeman, 1996), yet research focused on what APE teachers do in teaching such students as they carry out their various roles and responsibilities is limited.

Given that the APE teacher is a ‘hub’ around which the success of APE service delivery is dependent it is of importance to conduct research on what they view as their roles and responsibilities, and any concerns that hindered their effectiveness. Empirical revelation of what exists in APE teachers’ jobs is necessary to influence policy, programmatic change in professional preparation, and also to address professional issues that might impede teachers’ efficacy and in-turn student learning.

Limitations/Delimitations of the Study

A major limitation of this study is that all participants were women APE teachers. This limits this study as plausibly males may have given different descriptions of their roles and responsibilities, or any concerns they may have had. Another limitation was that only APE teachers from the same selected urban school district were used in the study. This limits the study in that other urban school districts as well as other school settings or conditions in rural and suburban school districts may differ. However, for purposes of feasibility in the conduct of this study, the researcher delimited the case studies to APE teachers in the same large urban public school district located in the Midwestern USA, which only had six women itinerant APE teachers employed at the time of data collection.
**Definition of Terms**

The following key terms were used throughout this document and to ensure clarity of meanings and usages the terms are defined below.

*Collaboration.* In this study collaboration was operationally defined to mean interactions and relationships that involved shared or reciprocal nature of assistance from some or all members of the educational team as well as parent(s) of student(s).

*Direct Service.* Service or instruction provided as a primary role to the student with disability (Jansma & French, 1994; Kelly & Gansneder, 1998, Sherrill, 2004).

*Impact Concerns.* Based on concerns theory, these concerns refer to “recognizing and confronting social and emotional needs of the students, individualizing instruction, motivating students and so on” (McBride et al., 1986, p. 150).

*Indirect Service.* Services provided other than those of the primary physical education teacher providing instruction to the student with disability for example, information given through consultation (Kelly & Gansneder, 1998).

*Interdisciplinary Team.* This team approach refers to cooperation between two or more persons from different disciplines in a joint project such as conducting assessments, providing services, working to make placement decisions (Sherrill, 2004). The basic difference between multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary teams is that the interdisciplinary approach advocates establishing formal communication channels and assigning (e.g., a case manager in an effort to avoid compartmentalization and fragmentation) of services but only directs the information flow without providing or monitoring services (McCormick & Goldman, 1988).
**Itinerant APE teacher.** An APE teacher who travels from school to school to provide services to the student with disability (Kelly & Gansneder, 1998).

**Multidisciplinary Team.** This team approach refers to the involvement of professionals from many disciplines. Each discipline provides evaluation or assessment but communication across disciplines is nonexistent. There is a more independent approach and evaluation results might be collected or collated by a professional who might interpret the result with that discipline’s bias (McCormick & Goldman, 1988; Sherrill, 2004). Multidisciplinary team approach is mandated in PL 94-142.

**Responsibilities.** A responsibility refers to obligation and is synonymous to duty. Responsibility therefore, refers to a particular task, trust, or acts such as teaching tasks. For which one is accountable or answerable such as ensuring the safety of kids is a responsibility of a teacher (Webster’s New World Dictionary of American Language, 1959).

**Roles.** A role is a function or office assumed by someone such as the role of an itinerant adapted physical education teacher (Webster’s New World Dictionary of American Language, 1959).

**Self Concern.** In accord with concerns theory, this concern refers to the “teacher’s own adequacy and survival as a teacher—about class control, survival, being observed, and about fear of failure” (McBride, Boggess, & Griffey, 1986, p. 150).

**Task Concerns.** This refers to teachers’ concerns at a “mastery stage, dealing with lack of instructional materials, scheduling and time, and so on” (McBride et al., 1986, p. 150). The task stage focuses on the limitations and frustrations encountered in teaching.
Transdisciplinary/Crossdisciplinary Team. These team approaches refer to holistic, multi-goal, multi-level sharing in which disciplinary boundaries are crossed and the coordination of efforts are maximized (Sherrill, 2004). In this model initial assessment is done individually but additionally members are expected to contribute to the treatment program such that at the point of implementation one or two team members have the responsibility to effect the treatment with the others available on continuous basis for consultation or direct assistance. The child is not removed from the classroom (McCormick and Goldman, 1988).
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

The education of youth with disabilities in physical education settings has become a commonplace practice with the passage of Public Law 94-142, Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EHA) of 1975. This law mandates free and appropriate education for all students with disabilities (reauthorized as PL 105-17 IDEA of 1997 and now HR 1350 IDEIA, 2004), and identified physical education as a direct service (IDEIA, 2004; Sherrill, 2004; Winnick, 1995). The tenet of the law that specifies placement in the least restrictive environment (LRE) has also given rise to alternative placement options. The LRE mandate supports inclusive programming (Salend, 2000; Sherrill, 1994).

Today, students with disabilities are often included in GPE programs (Block, 1999, 2000; DePauw & Doll-Tepper, 2000). The work of APE teachers whether in self-contained or inclusive GPE settings involves indirect and direct services. They are expected to carry out their roles and responsibilities effectively (Krueger et al., 2000). Scholars assert that the efficacy of APE teachers relates to indirect (consulting) and direct (teaching) services they render either in their own schools or other settings (Block, 1995; Sherrill, 2004). Webster (1993) asked, “What exemplary behaviors or attributes do teachers exhibit that makes them effective?” Is it personality, planning skills, methods of
instruction, or something else? His contention was that administrators, teachers, and parents could easily identify teachers they consider effective in instruction and management.

This chapter highlights the literature on (a) teachers’ roles and responsibilities (indirect and direct services), (b) teaching effectiveness, (c) legal obligation to teach school-age youth with disabilities, (d) professional preparation and development, (e) barriers and concerns of physical education teachers in teaching students with disabilities, and (f) tenets of the concerns theory (Fuller, 1969) and its modified version—Concern-Based Adoption Model [CBAM; Hall et al., 1973]. Concerns theory (Fuller, 1969) was used as the theoretical framework for this study to better understand any concerns APE teachers might articulate in providing direct and indirect services (itinerant and consultant). The chapter ends with a summary.

**Teachers’ Roles and Responsibilities**

Rabbette (1996) argued that little was known of the role responsibilities, levels of collaboration, and service delivery modes utilized by APE teachers, physical therapists (PT), and occupational therapists (OT) to provide motor development services to preschool children. She sought to identify the perceived primary intervention roles of APE, PT, and OT specialists. Participants were surveyed on a scale which measured levels of perceived responsibility on ten primary intervention components. APE specialists were perceived as being primarily responsible for teaching games and basic movements, as well as fitness to youth with disabilities. PTs were perceived as being primarily responsible for manipulating range of movement and posture control of clients,
including youth with disabilities. OTs were thought to be responsible for teaching independent living skills and fine motor skills of individuals with disabilities.

Rabbette (1996) found that the role responsibilities of these professionals were significantly different from one another except with gross motor development responsibility that was shared by APE and PT specialists. Moreover, there were no significant differences between the three groups on the responsibility of sensory-perceptual skills and the development of the whole child. Rabbette however reported differences in service delivery models, levels of collaborative teaming, and professional interaction. APE teachers had the lowest level of interaction with other professionals than did the OTs and PTs. Notably, APE specialists most often worked independently in their service delivery. Again, the literature categorizes the role responsibilities of APE teachers under indirect and direct service (Sherrill, 2004).

**Indirect Services**

The work of APE teachers as itinerant teachers and consultants has been well documented in the literature (Conaster & Block, 1998; Jansma & French, 1994; Sherrill, 2004). Kelly and Gansneder (1998) asserted that indirect services could be labeled as itinerant or consultant. This means the APE teacher provides services other than those of the primary physical education teacher providing the instruction to the students with disability; for example, providing information, assessment, or other assistance. Kelly and Gansneder (1998) reported nationally 59% of APE teachers provide indirect services.

Over the past decade, literature on the importance of consultancy in APE has emerged and a consultancy model was posited (Block & Zeman, 1996; Heikinaro-Johansson, Sherrill, French, & Huukha, 1995; Heikinaro-Johansson & Vogler, 1996). APE
consultants typically provide indirect services by developing a cooperative, problem-solving relationship with other teachers and paraprofessionals, who in turn work directly with students with disabilities and the total ecosystem (Heikinaho-Johansson et al., 1995).

Kelly and Gansnader (1998) reported that less than half (42%) of the APE teachers surveyed nationwide worked in only one school, 10% in two schools, and 42% of them in three or more schools. This shows that most APE teachers work as itinerant teachers (traveling from school to school). Relatedly, Lytle and Collier (2002) examined APE specialists’ perception on the consultation process. They found that: (a) consultation interactions varied greatly because of the dynamic nature of the educational environment; (b) consultation was more prevalent with middle and high school students; (c) APE consultation occurred on a continuum from proximal to distal dependent on the degree of interaction between the APE specialist, the general education teacher, and the student; and (d) the effectiveness of consultation was dependent upon the general education teacher’s attitude and the APE specialist’s communication skills and competencies.

Direct Services

Sherrill (2004) asserts that APE teachers work primarily in four types of roles where they engage in: (a) delivering direct services such as teaching, (b) consulting and resource room functions, (c) conducting in-service training, and (d) conducting administrative and research activities. Kelly and Gansneder (1998) asserted that in the direct service role the job of the APE teacher is primarily teaching of students with disabilities. Jansma and French (1994) also emphasized the roles of APE teachers as that of itinerant teachers who travel to and from different schools to provide direct instruction and consultant services. The literature indicates some overlapping of an itinerant position both as indirect and
direct services (Kelly & Gansneder, 1998; Jansma & French, 1994). However, the point of intersection reflects the fact that direct service delivery is when the APE teacher has the primary role of working directly with students with disabilities. Itinerant teachers who travel from school to school to teach and/or consult are therefore carrying out a primary function in their roles and responsibilities.

Miller (1981) indicated that direct service of APE teachers includes, but is not limited to teaching of: physical fitness (including muscular strength); motor fitness; fundamental motor skills’ play; posture; rhythms and dance; individual games and sports; and group games and sports. There is an extensive list of direct roles and responsibilities of APE teachers (when teachers have a primary role or responsibility to work with a student). The bottom line is what Kelly and Gansneder (1998) described as direct service, which is where the teacher is the primary provider of physical education for the student.

**Teaching Effectiveness**

Physical education teachers including APE specialists are expected to demonstrate effective teaching behaviors whenever providing direct service. This means, for example, structuring the lesson to maximize the amount of time in direct practice by each student at a level which ensures a continuing development of the skill compatible with a minimal number of mistakes (McLeish, 1981). Webster (1993) explained that teaching effectiveness is tied to student learning but in physical education it is difficult to quantify student learning. Teacher effectiveness has been inferred from measures like academic learning time in physical education (ALT-PE; Siedentop, Birdwell, & Metzler, 1979; Siedentop, Tousignant, & Parker, 1982).
Before the mid to late 1980s, there was limited research available that identified or studied effective teaching behaviors in either APE or GPE settings (Vogler, Martine, & DePaepe, 1989; Webster, 1993). Prior to that period, a few scholars asserted that there was no appreciable difference in teacher behavior when interacting with students without disabilities in general education classes compared to classes comprised of students with disabilities (Mawdsley, 1977; Miller, 1985; Taylor & Loovis, 1978; Webster, 1993). But, Rizzo and Lavay (2000) argued that many APE and GPE teachers used inappropriate techniques when teaching student with disabilities in physical education classes.

Over the years, scholars have used different methods to examine teaching effectiveness in physical education with students with and without disabilities (Aufderheide, 1983; Block & Vogler, 1994; Vogler, Koranda, & Romance, 2000). Heikinaro-Johansson and Vogler (1996) claimed that effective teaching implies adapting the curriculum to individual needs so as to minimize failure and preserve ego strength. Curricular adaptations refers to any modification to the general education curriculum used to promote student success in learning appropriate skills matching a student’s skill level and the lesson content (Block & Vogler, 1994). In a related vein, instructional modifications are modifications made to the presentation of information and material.

Some approaches that have been used successfully in physical education contexts for students with and without disabilities include cooperative learning, direct instruction, strategies intervention model, and movement education (Block, 2000; Block & Vogler, 1994). Aufderheide (1983) found that individualized instruction resulted in improved ALT-PE for elementary-age students with disabilities who were integrated into a GPE setting as opposed to students who were integrated into GPE classes but received no
individualized instruction. Consistently, the use of peer tutoring has been found to also improve achievement levels of both students with and without disabilities in integrated settings (Block, 1995; Houston-Wilson, Dunn, et al., 1997; Sherrill, Heikinaro-Johansson, & Slininger, 1994; Webster, 1987, 1993).

Vogler, van der Mars, Cusimano, and Darst (1992) studied teaching effectiveness with elementary students with disabilities who were integrated into GPE classes. They reported that (a) the teachers’ behaviors differed little as a function of either experience or expertise, (b) students with disabilities were significantly less motor appropriate and more off-task than were the students without disabilities, and (c) neither teachers’ experience or expertise altered those differences. More recently, Vogler et al. (2000) examined the efficacy of a GPE program in which a people resource model (i.e., an APE specialist) was used to provide instruction for a child with severe cerebral palsy. They reported that this model was highly effective in time engagement and management using ALT-PE to quantify student behaviors. Moreover, the qualitative nature of inclusion was one of widespread social acceptance and successful motor participation.

The extant literature on teaching effectiveness describes specific teacher acts linked to achievement outcomes of students in physical education settings. To this, Siedentop and Tannehill (2000) summarized key variables that typify effective teachers as: (a) belief in their own efficacy; (b) allocates sufficient time and opportunity to learn, and covers appropriate content; (c) communicates high, realistic expectations and students receive adequate instruction and practice time to learn their roles; (d) establishes positive approaches to class management and student engagement; (e) designs meaningful, success-oriented tasks; (f) creates and sustains a brisk pace and maintains momentum; (g)
communicates content with clear, brief demonstrations and explanations, followed with sufficient guided practice, and provides feedback and checks for understanding; (h) actively supervises students progress and practice; (i) holds students accountable for appropriate participation; (j) communicates with clarity and enthusiasm, and exhibits equitable support of all students; and (k) use student input and ongoing assessment to inform their practice. Scholars also assert that effective teachers reflect to inform their practice (Tsangaridou & O’Sullivan, 1997).

Moreover, to acquire efficacy in teaching students with disabilities requires professional preparation and experience teaching such students (Hodge, Davis, Woodard, & Sherrill, 2002). Such training should ensure that teachers learn to adapt and modify instruction, equipment, and activities (Sherrill et al., 1994) and effectively use supports particularly for teaching students with moderate to severe disabilities (Houston-Wilson et al., 1997).

**Legal Obligation to Teach School-Age Youth with Disabilities**

Dunn and McCubbin (1991) pointed out that physical education appears in the definition of special education within Public Law 94-142 (EHA of 1975) to mean “specifically designed instruction, at no cost to the parent, to meet the unique needs of an individual with disability, including classroom instruction, instruction in physical education, home instruction, and instruction in hospitals and institutions” (Federal Register, August, 1977 p. 42480). They also pointed out that Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, now Public Law 101-336, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 stresses the importance of providing physical education and extracurricular activities for individuals with special needs (i.e., disabilities). Section 504
emphasizes that “a recipient that offers physical education courses or that operates or sponsors intercollegiate, club, or intramural athletics shall provide to qualified [individuals with disability] equal opportunities for comparable participation in these activities” (Federal Register, May 1977, p. 22683).

Of importance, Dunn and McCubbin (1991) asserted that passage of IDEA (now IDEIA of 2004) and ADA has led many colleges and universities to increase their course offerings in APE. In fact, some institutions created programs with special emphasis on the preparation of personnel to teach physical education to students with disabilities. IDEA has influenced teacher education programs through curricular modifications for preparing teachers to work with students with disabilities (Dempsey, 1987, 1990).

Consequently the U. S. Department of Education has recognized the need for better teacher training and has allocated funds to improve the knowledge and skills of teachers of special education, including APE. A portion of the funds has also been made available to train APE doctoral level leadership personnel in hopes of preparing them for faculty positions at colleges and universities nationwide, such that they can prepare teachers who develop effective instructional strategies for youth receiving special education. Still today, there is a continuous need for high quality training of APE teachers.

Professional Preparation and Development

Historically and contemporarily, the growth of special education including APE teacher preparation programs has and continues to be directly tied with federal legislation and funding via grants (Dempsey, 1987, 1990; Jansma & Surburg, 1995). As Stevenson, Hebler, and Reynolds (1976) noted since 1950 there has been a 600% increase in the number of specialized teachers employed to educate individuals with disabilities and a
corresponding increase in the number of special education administrators, supervisors, and teacher educators. Consistent trends indicate that there still is a need for specialized teachers, including APE specialists (Kelly & Gansneder, 1998).

APE teachers must be adequately prepared to teach students with mild to severe disabilities and have a belief in their own efficacy. In connection with preparing APE teachers to more effectively carry out their roles and responsibilities the federal government has allocated grants to institutions for better preparing teachers. Ellery and Stewart (2000) explained that federal funding of APE personnel preparation programs was first made available in Title V, Section 501, of Public Law 90-170, the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act (1967). Ellery and Stewart further explained that Title V of this legislation authorized the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants available to institutions of higher education for research and personnel preparation in physical education and recreation for individuals with mental retardation. This funding initiative was later extended to include all disabilities. From 1983 to 1995, funds were granted and distributed to programs that focused on inservice training of existing physical education teachers, preservice training of APE teachers, training of leadership personnel in the field of APE (i.e. doctoral students), and special projects like curriculum development and technology innovation (Ellery & Stewart, 2000).

The purpose of the survey conducted by Ellery and Stewart (2000) was to: (a) provide a geographical description of programs receiving federal funding for APE personnel preparation, (b) provide a demographic profile of students entering federally funded APE personnel programs, (c) describe the training opportunities and graduation standards of
federally funded APE personnel preparation programs, (d) describe the employment rates for student graduating from federally funded APE personnel programs, and (e) describe the positions accepted by students graduating from federally funded APE personnel preparation programs. It must be noted that the authors specifically investigated only federally funded programs that focused on teacher training at the master’s and doctoral degree levels. The participants were the project coordinators of the 13 master’s degree level APE teacher preparation programs and five doctoral degree level APE leadership preparation programs at institutions of higher education. Data were collected twice over consecutive years and verified by various follow-up strategies.

The data for master’s degree programs indicated that 73% (8 of 13 project coordinators) had received federal funding for more than 15 years, 9% (1) had received funding between 10 and 14 years, and 18% had received funding between 5 and 9 years. The 13 master’s level preparation programs were also located in institutions of higher education across 10 states. These master’s level programs graduated a total of 201 APE professionals, an average of 4.0-graduation rate per institution each year. More females (60%) graduated compared to 40% males and age differences indicated that 47% of the graduates were between 20 and 25 years of age, 40% between 26 and 30 years of age, 9% between 30 and 35 years of age, 3% were between 36 and 40 years of age, and 1% was over 40 years of age.

McCubbin and Dunn (2000) emphasized the need for more and better prepared APE doctoral students to enter faculty positions in higher education. There is the assumption here that a better prepared faculty could in-turn better prepare graduate and undergraduate APE teachers. The study of Ellery and Stewart (2000) involved 13
master’s level and five doctoral level APE programs that received federal funding in the U.S. and they indicated that in general these programs: (a) had received funding for more than 15 years, (b) offered coursework from an average of three different academic disciplines, (c) had a high graduation to employment rate within 12 months of graduation, (d) had about one third of the graduates representing a recognized minority group (e.g. African American), (e) had graduates predominantly female, and (f) doctoral level leadership programs geographically distributed across the U.S.

Undoubtedly, the roles and responsibilities of APE teachers were and continue to be supported with the enactment of the aforementioned laws and a history of advocacy for individuals with disabilities. Further, the development of the APE profession has a strong link with passage of laws against discrimination and calls for equity and social justice. Classical litigation (lawsuits) such as (a) the 1954 Brown et al. versus Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas case on school desegregation, and (b) the 1972 class-action suit of the Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Citizens (PARC) vs. the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and subsequent advocacies have been strong forces in the passing of such laws (Salend, 2000; Sherrill, 2004; Winnick, 1995).

Today’s APE teachers are advocates for both self-contained APE and inclusive GPE programming (Sherrill, 2004). Sherrill (2004) suggest that such advocacy should begin with learning about state physical education requirements and examining its implementation in schools. Typically, APE specialists hold a bachelor’s degree in GPE and a master’s degree in APE, whereas APE professionals employed as administrators in large or affluent school districts often have doctoral degrees. Moreover, APE specialists usually have four types of roles: (a) delivering direct service, (b) consulting and resource
room functions, (c) conducting in-service training, (d) carrying out administrative functions, and (e) conducting research and disseminating scholarship.

Historically speaking, Hooley (1964) argued that professionals needed to take action to establish competencies for physical educators working with individuals with disabilities. In subsequent years, articles authored by Stein (1969), Moseley (1977), Geddes and Seaman (1978), and the California State Task Force on Standards for Professional Preparation in APE (1978) identified competencies necessary for professional performance. The many different competencies that were recommended varied and created some inconsistencies across APE training programs. It was therefore, imperative that consistency in training programs be established (Ersing & Wheeler, 1971). Ersing and Wheeler (1971) argued that a critical examination of APE curriculum and courses be carried out at the college and university levels to guide professional preparation of APE professionals. Aufsesser (1981) believed that graduate programs should offer 12-15 academic units of APE in addition to practicum, required internships, and core courses for all masters’ degree students. French, Jansma, and Winnick (1978) suggested that there were several unique and essential competencies (assessment, program development and implementation, and inter-professional preparation) for APE teachers, which required in-depth training beyond a GPE background. The idea of ‘more than basic training’, was also emphasized by Aharoni (1981).

Auxter, Pyfer, and Huettig (2001) insist APE specialists should have training in APE classes as well as applied anatomy and physiology. They further suggested that graduate training in APE would strengthen this background. Consistently, scholars have asserted that field based and practicum experiences should be coupled with coursework

**Competencies and Standards in Adapted Physical Education**

The need for developing competencies in APE at this point cannot be overemphasized. According to Jansma and Surburg (1995), development of APE competency-based standards is due to teacher education reform and renewed emphasis on accountability in education, which triggered broad-scale changes in the way teachers teach, the way students learn, the way teacher educators train, and the way educational leaders lead at all levels of education in the USA.

Jansma and Surburg (1995) emphasized the importance of a competent knowledge base for APE teachers focusing on competency guidelines at the doctoral professional preparation level. These competencies cut across two role areas (educator and researcher) and four other role areas (administrator, movement scientist, advocate, and pedagogue). Jansma and Surburg stated that the advance of the competencies has been due to teacher education reform and accountability in education which triggered broad scale changes in the way teachers teach, the way pupils learn, the way teacher educators train, and the way educational leaders lead at all levels of education in the USA. The implication of reform and accountability have had direct relation and effect on teacher preparation programs by precipitating the formation of competencies and the APE national standards as a source of guidance to APE teachers at all levels.
In discussing several education models that have had influence on teacher preparation programs, Jansma and Suburg identified the competency-based model as a dominant educational model in the USA. In APE the competency-based model has influenced several programs, for example, specific undergraduate concentrations (Moseley, 1977), undergraduate programs (French, Jansma, Puthoff, & Winnick, 1976), and a focus of literature at the undergraduate (French, Jansma, & Winnick, 1978) and graduate (Sherrill, 1988) levels. The Adapted Physical Activity Council (APAC, 1993) has issued competency-related guidelines for APE. In fact, competency based professional preparation is the expectation in the United States Department of Education (Office of Special Education Programs, 1993) relative to granting of funds for personnel training of APE professionals at all levels (Jansma & Surburg, 1995; McCubbin & Dunn, 2000). Guidelines were proposed resulting in 38 competencies across the generic areas of research and teaching of APE and the listing of 41 additional competencies across four other areas (administration, movement science, advocacy, and pedagogy).

Thus, the publication and endorsement of national standards in APE has been long overdue (Kelly, 1995). The National Consortium for Physical Education and Recreation for Individuals with Disabilities (NCPERID) sponsors the Adapted Physical Education National Standards (APENS) and the Adapted Physical Education National Certificate Examination (NCPERID, 1995). The purpose of APENS is to ensure that qualified APE instructors provide physical education instruction to students with disabilities (Kelly, 1995). The national standards were designed to reflect the roles and responsibilities that practicing APE teachers perform. The determination of these roles and responsibilities
was accomplished through a nationwide needs assessment involving a stratified sample of 575 practicing APE professionals (Kelly, 1994).

Information gathered from this needs assessment led to identification of 15 broad standard areas, which served as the basis of the APE national standards. The NCPERID (1995) endorsed APE national standards are: (a) human development, (b) motor behavior, (c) exercise science, (d) measurement and evaluation, (e) history and philosophy, (f) unique attributes of learners, (g) curriculum theory and development, (h) assessment, (i) instructional design and planning, (j) teaching, (k) consultation and staff development, (l) student and program evaluation, (m) continuing education, (n) ethics, and (o) communication (Kelly, 1995). To be eligible to take the APENS certification examination, candidates must submit application and evidence that (a) they have earned a baccalaureate degree with a major in physical education, (b) they have taken and passed a survey course in APE, (c) they have performed a minimum of 200 hours of instruction in physical education to school-age individuals with disabilities, and (d) they have valid current teaching certificate in physical education. The examination is to ensure that teachers coming into APE have acquired a certain minimal knowledge base needed to be able to work with individuals with disabilities. Every APE teacher needs to be accredited as having been approved as certified APE teacher (Kelly, 1995).

APE Service in Schools and Preparedness of APE Teachers to Deliver Services

Kelly and Gansneder (1998) explained that a primary goal of the APENS project was to conduct a national survey to determine (a) who was providing APE services, (b) the role and responsibilities teachers were being asked to perform, and (c) whether teachers thought they were prepared for their jobs. Kelly and Gansneder summarized the literature
under job-related teaching efficacy and consulting concerns (behavioral management). Their summary of the extant literature indicated that all completed research focused on assessing state-level needs. Also, most studies addressed three issues: (a) general physical educators’ attitudes toward teaching students with disabilities; (b) their perceived ability to meet these students’ needs; and/or (c) the types of training and staff development services that had been provided to general physical educators. Kelly and Gansneder stated that the literature offered little insight into the roles and responsibilities of APE teachers nationally therefore the purpose of their study was to conduct a national survey of practicing APE teachers. A proportionate number of APE teachers were selected from each state based on the state population and size. The sample of 575 teachers from the 50 states identified were obtained by asking one or more NCPERID members in each state to supply names and addresses of APE teachers who were qualified to design and implement physical education programs for students with disabilities.

The survey design used by Kelly and Gansneder (1998) followed a comprehensive review of the literature to identify previous surveys draft relevant questions across four categories. The final instrument for the national survey contained 249 questions and was designed to collect information in the following areas: education (29 questions), job demographics (51 questions), roles (149 questions), and training (29 questions). The surveys were mailed in blocks until a total of 575 surveys were mailed. Out of this total 354 teachers returned their surveys but 61 of them did not complete 25% or more of the questions and were dropped reducing the total to 293 (51% return rate).

Kelly and Gansneder (1998) reported that of the 293 respondents, 92% had undergraduate degrees; 74% had master’s degrees, and 5% doctoral degrees. Most (80%)
had an undergraduate major in physical education and 52% had a physical education related major in their master’s degree program. The data presented indicated that all of the respondents had bachelor degrees and they taught APE. The teachers were to consider their coursework as 100% and divide this amount across four categories: scientific foundations, behavioral and educational foundations, planning and implementation, and professional development. A reflection on their coursework indicated the respondents expressed a desire for more emphasis on planning and implementation. With this category and further breakdown into sub-areas and sub-content teachers emphasized a greater need for training in teaching, motor development, continuing education, human development, and unique attributes of learners (rank order). The bottom five sub-content areas on the list were: (a) historical and philosophical development, (b) ethics, (c) consultation and staff development, (d) evaluation and, (e) psychosocial dimensions. Though, a review of percent allocations showed that teachers believed every sub-content area was important.

From the job demographics reported by Kelly and Gansneder (1998), it is revealed that a total of 56% of the respondents worked in urban settings, 33% in non-urban (rural) schools, and a small number of 5% in both urban and rural settings. Their job roles and responsibilities were perceived in terms of direct and indirect APE services. Direct service was operationally defined as APE taught solely by the APE specialist in the school and was the primary physical education teacher providing instruction. On the other hand, indirect service was defined as itinerant or consultant providing information, assessment, or other assistance but not teaching the children directly, the actual physical education services were taught by another person.
A total of 93% of the respondents reported providing direct services and 59% indirect services. Out of the average contracted working hours of 36.1 hour per week, direct service provision amounted to 18.7 hours while indirect service was 9.5 hours per week, and an average of 13.7 hours per week on outside responsibilities. These data indicate that more direct services were provided by APE teachers than indirect services. A total of 61% of the teachers reported outside work obligations and such responsibilities included serving on curriculum committees, coaching disability sports, providing-after school programs, performing other teaching duties, bus/lunch duty, coaching and fund-raising tasks. The data further indicated that about 42% of the teachers work in only one school, 10% in two schools, and 42% in three or more schools. On average 4.4 schools were served and teachers reported an average caseload of 104 students. Also on average, 52% of teachers’ time was spent providing direct APE services and 26% for indirect APE instruction to all age groups as well as all degrees of disabilities.

McCubbin and Dunn (2000) analyzed the professional preparation and employment demand for APE leadership personnel. More specifically, they conducted an electronic analysis of the *Chronicle of Higher Education* for the purpose of determining the number of advertised positions in APE from 1991 to 1998. All higher education positions that advertised a need for a faculty member with APE training were identified. The data recorded included: name of institution, location, closing date, degree requirement, tenure or fixed-term appointment, teaching responsibilities other than APE, and other job expectations, for example, scholarship and research. These data were intended to assess the nature of job responsibilities and expectations. Data collected from advertised positions in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* between 1991 and 1998 indicated 87
professionals completed dissertations in APE while 173 positions were advertised for expertise in APE. These data show a need exists for additional doctoral personnel trained in APE to be qualified for and accept higher education faculty positions in the USA.

Kelly and Gansneder (1998) also asked APE teachers (direct service focus) to report on the percentage of students they were involved with for eligibility services, placement decisions, IEP decisions, and instructional content decisions. Results were that less than half of the teachers were involved in eligibility and placement decisions but an increase in overall percent involvement regarding IEP and instructional decisions were noted. In contrast as to indirect services, teachers reported no-involvement in decision-making for the students they served. Teachers indicated that placement decisions were influenced by professional judgment (about two thirds of teachers). This was followed by IEP reports, input from physical education teachers and classroom teachers. Most teachers did not use any formal assessment data in making decisions for placement.

Teachers also indicated sources of decision-making regarding instructional content. About 88% of the teachers used student ability and 85% professional judgment, as sources for deciding what instructional content should be taught. The question posed here addresses the issue of how students’ abilities (skill performance) were determined without being assessed. Some teachers stated they did not assess students because it was not required. Physical education is mandatory for individuals with disabilities (PL 105-17, IDEA 1997), and so is assessment, but a serious view of a need to conduct regular assessments in physical education is not always shown by practicing APE teachers.

Vogler et al. (1992) reported that experience is an important variable associated with teacher competency for effectively dealing with the unique problems that typify some
children with disabilities. This assertion also supports existing literature on the need for better preparation of teachers who teach students with disabilities in inclusive physical education settings. Rizzo and Vispoel (1991) indicated that academic preparation (coursework in APE) and years of teaching students with disabilities had significant positive correlations with perceived competence. They also indicated that institutions responsible for the professional preparation of physical educators could play an important role in enhancing physical educators’ positive attitude toward perceived competence in teaching students with disabilities.

Solomon and Lee (1991) also contrasted planning behaviors between expert and novice APE teachers. They sought to determine whether expert \((n = 4)\) and novice \((n = 4)\) teachers varying in experience and expertise differed in the information they needed to plan a lesson and how they conceptualized a lesson. Participants were to plan evidence of their knowledge base and repertoire of teaching strategies. The experienced teachers had contingency plans based on the actions and abilities exhibited by the students while in contrast the novice teachers generated plans that were unidirectional and failed to accommodate the range of ability levels in their classes. This study suggests that experience is an indicator of more thoughtful daily planning for lessons and a sign of teacher efficacy.

**Barriers and Concerns of Teachers in Physical Education Settings**

Much of the research in physical education on effective teaching has been conducted in GPE classrooms (Vogler, Martinek, & DePaepe, 1983; Webster, 1993) with increasing attention given to inclusive practices (Block & Zeman, 1996; Hodge et al., 2004; LaMaster, Gill, Kinchin, & Siedentop, 1998; Lienert et al., 2001). For example, LaMaster
et al. (1998) examined the inclusion practices of effective elementary GPE teachers. These teachers were considered effective based on findings of a previous study (Siedentop, 1989). Of the six teachers, five had taken one undergraduate APE course, while none of them had taken graduate level APE course work during their professional preparation. Much of their knowledge about inclusion had come from staff development workshops and direct experiences teaching students with disabilities in their classes. LaMaster et al. findings revealed four recurring themes: (a) multiple teaching styles, (b) teachers' concerns about student outcomes, (c) teachers' frustrations, and (d) differences in these teachers' inclusion practices. They also reported that schools provided little support for inclusion and teachers felt inadequately prepared to teach inclusive GPE classes. LaMaster et al. concluded that these teachers had concerns with respect to:

1. Resources and personnel were not being provided to assist these physical educators with inclusion (administrative and financial support inadequate).

2. These GPE teachers had insufficient APE course preparation (courses should focus on specific disability including clinical work to feel competent teaching students with disabilities).

3. These GPE teachers professional development was inadequate to allow them to successfully deal with inclusion on a daily bases (need for inclusive issues pertinent to physical educators) (LaMaster et al., 1998).

Block and Zeman (1996) also conducted a study with the same GPE teachers considered effective by Siedentop (1989). They reported that these teachers had concerns about their efficacy as they had received insufficient APE course work preparation. To which, Block and Zeman suggested that PETE programs ought to ensure that trainees
engage in clinical work (i.e., field based internships and/or practicum experiences working directly with students who have various disabilities) at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. More specifically, Block and Zeman suggested that physical educators need the following: (a) staff development that focused on inclusive issues that are pertinent to physical educators, (b) undergraduate coursework and clinical experiences focused on specific disabilities and how to create sound inclusive practices, (c) comprehensive graduate coursework and clinical experiences that addresses APE programming, and (d) administrative and financial support in securing resources and personnel to ensure successful inclusive practice.

In accord with IDEA and more recently IDEIA (2004), teachers are not only responsible for developing individualized educational plans (IEP) but also for developing individualized transition plans (ITP) for students with disabilities. To which, Krueger et al. (2000) examined obstacles APE specialists encountered when developing ITP. Participants were 155 APE specialists (response rate was 75%). Results indicated that only 21% \((n = 33)\) of the APE specialists had written ITP and 64% \((n = 78)\) of the specialists reported that they had not written an ITP and had not been asked to be part of transition planning. APE specialists who had written ITP indicated that lack of adequate transportation, social isolation, and budget restrictions were their greatest concerns to implementing ITP.

Concerns have been identified in the literature as to indirect services (consultation) as well. For example, Lytle and Collier (2002) found that consultation was used inappropriately in some school districts. As the only placement option offered administrators used consultation to serve more children thereby increasing caseload of
the consultants (more children above the expected number for consultations). Consultants believed that many teachers or instructional assistants were unwilling to modify their curriculum in other to make it more effective for the student with disability. The frustration that the APE specialist could not always be at the site to help with implementation, and the distance between schools in rural areas was of concern with itinerant APE specialists (Lytle & Collier, 2002). Other frustrations included concerns about scheduling students for services, lack of quality physical education in general education classrooms, and difficulty in contacting people due to scheduling conflicts. Other concerns noted in the literature included teachers’ apathetic attitudes toward work and lack of adequate time allocated for teaching (Karge, McClure, & Patton, 1995).

The extant literature also mentions barriers and concerns relating to teaching students with disabilities in inclusive GPE settings (Hodge et al., 2004; Lieberman, Houston-Wilson, & Kozub, 2002; Lienert et al., 2001). For example, Lieberman et al. (2002) examined perceived barriers to including students with visual impairments in GPE. The following were noted as barriers (in order of most perceived barriers): (a) inadequate professional preparation, (b) lack of equipment, (c) programming/curriculum difficulties, (d) limited time in schedule, (e) inadequate communication, (f) storage of qualified teacher/personnel, (g) pace of units, (h) teacher over-protectiveness, (i) limited expectations, (j) medical excuses, (k) parental overprotectiveness, and (l) teacher apathy.

Additional concerns on teaching students with disabilities center on the interactions of students with and without disabilities with one another and their learning (Block & Zeman, 1996), and behavior management issues (Dunn & Fredericks, 1985). Dunn and Fredericks (1985) emphasized that the successful integration of individuals with
disabilities into GPE classes depends upon the teacher’s ability to create a favorable learning environment in which both the student with and without disability learn and practice specific motor and physical fitness tasks. They perceive the numerous interactional situations that may be problematic include students without disabilities negative response to their peers who have disabilities and vice versa, as well as the teacher’s own inexperience with behavior management techniques.

Over the years, scholars have provided guidelines to address classroom management and organization, as well as interaction and behavior variables. Thus, an abundance of literature is available to help teachers demonstrate effective physical education pedagogy for students with and without disabilities, this includes guidelines on how to organize classes and set rules and routines, and use of reinforcement for behavior management for example (Hodge, Murata et al., 2003; Lavay, French, & Henderson, 1997; Rink, 1993; Siedentop, 1991; Siedentop & Tannehill, 2000; Sherrill, 2004). Dunn and Fredericks (1985) contended that behavior management techniques have been employed in physical activity programs to help children with disabilities but few studies have analyzed the effect of using these techniques to remediate inappropriate behavior in the gym. In recent years, however, a lot of information has been written on behavior management in APE (Hodge, Murata et al., 2003; Lavay et al., 1997).

**Concerns Theory**

The postulation of concerns theory is credited to the pioneering work of Fuller (1969) in regard to teacher concerns, specifically in research on shifts in concerns experienced by undergraduate teacher education majors. Fuller (1969) studied the motivation of learners that influences their learning (taking into consideration goals of particular learner
in particular situations). Arguably, teacher preparation is in the greatest need of information on how to motivate students. In short, teacher education courses are admittedly not regarded as the most interesting on the campus (Fuller, 1969). Fuller (1969) pointed out that some are of the opinion that many education courses are not relevant to the needs of teachers is common in the academic community, in legislatures, and among the public at large. In line with this argument, the possibility is that students learn what they want to learn but have difficulty learning what does not interest them.

As Fuller (1969) stated, while many questions are on the minds of educators, one of the most important is, “What are concerns of inexperienced undergraduates?” The purpose of Fuller’s (1969) study was twofold: (a) to examine intensively the developing concerns of small groups’ of prospective teachers, and (b) to reexamine the findings of other investigators in the hope of discovering what teachers are concerned about and whether their concerns can be conceptualized in some useful way. Fuller (1969) recounted that there had been considerable speculation about teachers’ concerns and problems some of which included: (a) whether measured attitudes of preferences change over the period of student teaching, or are related to effectiveness, or teaching behavior; (b) student-teachers’ classroom activities, self concepts, or discomfort; and (c) other concerns related to difficulties in maintaining discipline, about inadequate equipment, social background of schools in which they taught, about their own unwise job placement, about depressing effects of neighborhood areas and aggressive attitudes of parents towards teachers, and about class control and evaluations by their inspectors.
Early Research on Concerns

Fuller’s synthesis of the literature (1969) revealed that beginning teachers are concerned about class control, about their own content adequacy, about the situations in which they teach, and about evaluations by their supervisors and their students, and their evaluations of their students. The consistency of the findings were seen as remarkable (a) in light of the different populations surveyed (i.e. undergraduate students, teachers, new teachers in England, women elementary education majors, home economics students); and (b) not only in the similarity of concerns expressed but in the absence of concern about topics which are usually included in education courses such as instructional design, methods of presenting subject matter, assessment of student learning, dynamics of children behaviors, and so on.

Fuller (1969) argued that the discrepancy between what teachers say they need and what is supplied them warranted a closer look because there were several possibilities that could be underlying factors. In order to take such possibilities into account, Fuller studied the concerns of small groups of student-teachers intensively, then other groups were surveyed, and finally other researchers’ investigations were reanalyzed and interpreted in light of the findings.

Fuller’s First Study

Fuller’s (1969) original study involved two groups of student-teachers where the supervisor agreed to substitute group-counseling sessions for the conventional weekly student teaching seminar. One group of six student-teachers met two hours each week in a semester during student-teaching with a counseling psychologist. They were guaranteed confidentiality and were told to discuss anything they wanted to talk about (all sessions
were tape recorded and typescripts later made). The second group (eight student-teachers) went through the same procedure but was co-counseled by two counseling psychologists (to check one another). The statements of these two groups were classified according to main topics, which were inductively categorized from the typescripts. A third group of seven student-teachers was similarly counseled and tape recorded during a third semester of student-teaching but statements were not categorized.

Results from the original study indicated that these student-teachers had concerns with: (a) the parameters of the new school situation and with discipline during early weeks of their internships, and (b) concern with student and student learning during later weeks. A parsimonious division rather than categorization by topics indicated (a) self (concern with self protection and adequacy) on class control, subject matter adequacy, finding a place in the power structure of the school and understanding expectations of supervisors, principals, and parents; and (b) concern with students’ learning, progress and ways in which the teacher could ensure progress. By looking at concern with self and with pupils, Fuller found that student-teachers were, during the first three weeks concerned mostly with their own self shiffting to more concern about their students toward the end of their student-teaching experience.

*Fuller’s Second Study*

Fuller’s (1969) next study related to written concern statements and involved twenty-nine different student-teachers supervised by four different supervisors. The students were asked by counseling psychologist to write ‘what you are concerned about now’ at the beginning of informal luncheons followed by discussions. The group was surveyed at two-week intervals to solicit responses at the beginning and end of the semester.
Participants’ responses were classified into three categories: (a) where do I stand? How adequate am I? How do others think I’m doing? (b) Problem behavior of students (class control). Why do they do that? (c) Are students learning? How does what I do affect their gain? The result generally indicated that all the student teachers were concerned with self-adequacy and/or class control and none were concerned primarily with what students were learning.

Further Analysis of Findings

To further [re]analyze previous findings, Fuller (1969) regrouped data of eight other related studies in addition to the two aforementioned studies. All 10 studies were considered under early and late concerns. Relating to early concerns, Fuller (1969) examined six surveys dichotomizing them into self and student concerns. The result indicated that all six studies reporting early concerns related to concerns with self, while none reported concerns with students. The studies on inservice teachers revealed that discipline was the most serious concern (36% of the 113 participants had concerns on disciplinary issues); 22% of the teachers named subject matter as a concern, and only 13% of these teachers named concerns on students’ learning or methods of adjusting subject matter to individual students. These data revealed that 78% of the student teachers examined showed concern with self and 22% showed concern with student learning.

Fuller (1969) noted three points considering all ten studies: (a) their obvious consistency with one another despite the fact that diverse populations were surveyed over a 36-year period; (b) none of these studies support the proposition that beginning teachers are concerned with instructional design, methods of presenting subject matter, assessment of pupil learning, or with tailoring content to individual pupils; and (c) findings about
beginning in-service teachers are similar to those about preservice teachers (i.e. relative to self concerns). Both preservice and new inservice teachers had principal concerns classified as concerns with ‘self’, a similarity that supports findings that concerns and perceived problems change little during student teaching. Fuller (1969) indicated that it might be argued that everyone is always concerned with self and that experienced as well as inexperienced teachers are no different. Therefore the questions asked: Do these self concerns persist? Do teachers continue to be pre-occupied throughout their teaching life with problems of self-adequacy? Fuller (1969) turned to studies of experienced teachers to answer these and other questions.

To further understand teachers’ late concerns two studies were reexamined. When the data for the first study were regrouped, it revealed that experienced teachers were significantly less often concerned with maintaining discipline and with criticism from inspectors. The second study indicated that more experienced teachers are concerned about students’ progress. A comparison of early and late concerns indicated that early concerns were mostly self-concerns and late concerns were mostly concerns about students (when early and late concerns are defined in terms of extreme groups). However, early and late concerns were not so clearly distinguishable when early and late concerns were defined in terms of pre and post student-teacher concerns.

Based on results of his work, Fuller (1969) proposed a developmental conceptualization of teachers’ concerns. This model had three phases as follows:

1. **Pre-Teaching Phase** – where student-teachers rarely had specific concerns related to teaching (just anticipation and apprehension). This was a period of non-concern.
2. **Early Teaching Phase** – concern with self, which consists of a set of covert concerns (Where do I stand?) and a set of overt concerns (How adequate am I?).

3. **Late Concerns** – concern with pupils, characteristic of experienced mastery teachers focusing on pupil learning and professional development.

**Development of Concerns-Based Model**

The pioneering work of Fuller on teacher concerns served as the basis for development of the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) by Hall et al. (1973) and the stages of concern (SoC) about the innovation dimension. While the work of Fuller (1969) focused directly on teachers’ concerns as they taught, the work of Hall et al. (1973) focused on the adoption process within educational settings. The CBAM is a representation of the process by which an educational institution adopts an innovation, views adoption as a developmental process involving complex interaction between an adopting institution, and a user and resource system (Hall et al., 1973).

It is further explained that the resource system is usually a formal organization where expert knowledge of the innovation is available to the user system. This interaction is referred to as collaborative linkage and is ideally characterized by open communication, which allows the resource system to assess the individual user’s needs and concerns, and to select personalized intervention strategies based on the assessment. Hall et al. (1973) contended that an individual teacher might use a curriculum innovation while the rest of the school system does not, or a school system may use an innovation but may still have individual classrooms or schools where the innovation is not used or is used in a manner not intended by the developer. The authors stated that concerns and satisfactions of student-teachers and inservice teachers have been the subject of many studies since 1952.
Some of these studies have examined anxiety in relation to discipline from the perspective of experienced and beginning (inexperienced) teachers. Findings based on a series of group counseling sessions and in-depth interviews show that concerns and satisfactions differ significantly between experienced and inexperienced teachers.

To which, Hall et al. (1973) identified seven stages of concern. These stages were: (a) refocusing (an exploration of more universal benefits from the innovation); (b) collaboration (focus is on coordination and cooperation regarding use of the innovation); (c) consequence (focus is on impact of the innovation on students); (d) management (focus is on organizing, managing, scheduling, and time); (e) personal (the individual is uncertain about the demands of the innovation); (f) informational (a general awareness of the innovation and interest in learning more detail is indicated); and awareness (little concern about or involvement with the innovation is indicated).

 Applying Concerns Theory to Teaching in Inclusive Settings

In recent years, literature on teachers’ concerns regarding inclusion has emerged in physical education. Lienert et al. (2001) conducted a qualitative cross-cultural comparison analysis of GPE teachers’ concerns about integrating children with disabilities in GPE classes in two countries, Germany and the United States of America (USA). The authors used concerns theory and CBAM to guide their research. Using a qualitative approach, data were collected from semistructured interviews with 30 GPE teachers (who had students with disabilities in their GPE classes) in Berlin (7 males, 9 females) and in the Dallas-Fort Worth (DFW) area (2 males, 12 females). Purposive sampling focused on diversity of personal background and diversity of work environment was used for the selection of participants. Diversity was sought regarding gender, age,
years of teaching physical education, years of teaching integrated physical education, formal preparation in adapted physical activity, class size, ratio of students with and without disabilities, availability of support, and type of school district.

The lead researcher interviewed each participant in most cases in schools where the teachers taught. The interviews lasted on average 60 minutes and were supplemented by observations. The interviews were tape recorded, transcribed, and sent back to the participants for corrections and validation purposes. Interview data were analyzed using grounded theory procedures and techniques. A two-step coding process involving (a) open coding to identify and code themes, and (b) analysis of data for relationships between the themes were utilized.

The results of the interviews and subsequent data analysis revealed that these teachers reported concerns at only four (personal, management, consequences, and collaboration) of the seven stages of the concerns model. The explanation of this result was that the teachers already had experience with integration and had progressed through the awareness and informational stages. No teacher expressed concerns regarding the last stage (refocusing) of the CBAM. Teachers from Germany and USA differed in their personal concerns as to uncertainty and worry about everyday demands and competence to meet these demands. Only one teacher from Germany had training in APE courses but fewer of them expressed personal concerns than those teachers from DFW (USA).

Noteworthy is that the teachers from DFW described several trial and error coping strategies and tried to overcome their personal concern stage by collaborating with paraprofessionals and consulting with APE specialists. Personal concerns in the study were related to prior experience, perceived adequacy of professional preparation,
attitudes toward disability and integration, self-confidence, perceived competency, class size, percentage of students with and without disabilities, type and severity of disabilities, and availability of support personnel (Lienert et al., 2001).

Management concerns for teachers from Germany and USA were similar and most of their concerns fell into this category and were mostly contextual. For example, one concern by all teachers from Germany was lack of government funding that affected hiring of teachers, increased class sizes, affected purchasing of equipment, and reduced paid leaves for attending in-service training. The advantage sought by administrators of placing students with behavioral problems into integrated settings due to smaller class sizes taught by two teachers was also a concern for these teachers. Inadequate facilities and equipment were areas of concern expressed by almost all teachers from both Berlin and DFW. In the Berlin schools, for example, two classes frequently shared the same gym. This situation was especially difficult for integrated classes because many students with disabilities have difficulties adjusting in a crowded gym (Lienert et al., 2001).

Lienert et al. also indicated that some teachers from the DFW area expressed concern about the APE teachers’ inability to visit their schools regularly even though their support was important to the success of integration. One teacher explained that they had only one APE teacher in the school district who traveled to some 17 to 18 grade schools, junior high schools, and high schools, which made it problematic and nearly impossible for more visits to a particular school. Lienert et al. (2001) also indicated that on the consequence concerns stage many of the teachers (from both Berlin and DFW) mentioned positive effects of integration over negative effects. However, concerns were expressed about how age, psychosocial development of students, and curriculum
demands differentially affected educational outcomes. For example, some of the teachers from both Germany and USA made similar remarks that in the early stages (first three or four grades) students with and without disabilities work together but start drifting apart as they grow older and activities become more complex or more competitive when winning is of the essence to students.

An important positive affect of integration mentioned by almost all participants was social benefits of students with and without disabilities. The teachers from Germany and USA stressed the importance of collaboration within a supportive school atmosphere but the type of collaboration and the participants involved were different across the two countries. Teachers from DFW were more concerned about collaboration with the APE teachers, paraprofessionals and with other teachers, and with lack of motivation demonstrated by some professionals. For these teachers there were no true refocusing concerns as described by Hall et al (1973). Other concerns expressed by these teachers yet not fitting into the CBAM included lack of specific teaching competence (assessing, goal setting, individualizing) and safety.

Moreover, Lienert et al. (2001) discussed their findings in accord with the theoretical framework of CBAM. They suggested that based on their findings the CBAM should be revised or that new models should be developed to include assessment of specific perceived teaching competency and safety concerns. Another contention was that the underlying assumption of CBAM that people faced with an innovation exhibit a profile of concerns cross-setting several stages as well as a linear development of concerns along the proposed stages was not supported by their findings. Lienert et al.’s (2001) study supports the notion of a profile of concerns but raised doubts about a linear development
of concerns on integration issues. They indicated that some stages may be skipped or that concerns may occur equally at two stages at the same time.

In addition, CBAM posits that concerns at one level must be reduced to a certain degree before concerns at the next level will fully develop. Lienert et al. (2001) asserted that this proposition is questionable. Their findings suggest that concerns may be related not only in inverse proportion but also proportionally. For example, management concerns (e.g., large class sizes) linked to consequence or outcome concerns directly because a reduction in the class size that made individualized instruction difficult related directly to limited learning outcomes, especially for students with disabilities. The authors further suggested that in most cases personal and contextual variables are constantly interacting and influencing teachers’ concerns so it was impossible to analyze stages of concern without examining variables that influence concerns.

*Extending Concerns Theory*

In extending concerns theory, Lienert et al. (2001) posited a dynamic systems model that emphasizes interrelationships among concerns, personal variables, and contextual variables. The authors graphically illustrated concerns, personal variables, and contextual variables with circles that touch each other and explained that these three interrelate to each other. In this case, they differed from the linearity of hierarchical listing of the stages or levels of concern from 0-6 by Hall et al. (1973) which were: (0) *awareness*, (1) *information*, (2) *personal*, (3) *management*, (4) *consequence*, (5) *collaboration*, and (6) *refocusing*. There seem to be one major advantage in the dynamical systems model in that the circles indicate a more flexible approach of looking at concerns as affecting and
being affected by other variables. It also points out that some concerns are influenced differently than others.

One other advantage of using the dynamic systems model is the fact that individuals differ and therefore the varied levels of concern would also differ from person to person as captured in the model. This is not likely to be the case in the linear hierarchical listing of CBAM. The dynamic systems model has the advantage of taking contextual factors into account as affecting individual’s concerns. There is also the advantage that stages of concerns may not develop necessarily in linear direction and therefore some stages may be skipped or concerns may occur equally at two stages at the same time. The dynamic systems model has been recommended by Lienert et al. (2001) to be used by researchers. For example, this model would be an appropriate theoretical framework to use if one is investigating interrelationships among concerns, individuals, and contextual variables in an integrated setting.

**Additional Studies Utilizing Concerns Theory**

Knowles (1981) utilized a case study approach to examine concerns of teachers about implementing individualized instruction in physical education settings. The purpose was to train teachers to individualize physical education lessons as specified by PL 94-142 (now HR 1350 IDEIA, 2004). The participants were 15 teachers who taught GPE classes that included students with disabilities. The teachers volunteered for the training and they were divided geographically into two clusters of eight and seven. The 35-item questionnaire of the Stage of Concern (SoC) Questionnaire was used and each item was scored on a Likert scale to measure teachers’ concerns.
Knowles used inservice programs to train teachers to individualize physical education as specified by law. The content of the program reflected new regulations for teacher certification in Texas including: (a) overview mandates of P.L. 94-142, (b) psychomotor assessment, (c) individualized educational programming in physical education, and (d) managing individualized instruction in the least restrictive environment in physical education. The training program consisted of seven 2½ hour group sessions and four individual consultant visits during a seven-week block. The ‘I CAN’ programming and assessment materials were adapted for use. The investigator conducted the formal group sessions in each cluster while three trained consultants conducted four individual visits. A Pretest-Posttest Non-Randomized Group Design was used to determine the effects of the in-service program on teachers’ Stage of Concern about the innovation of individualized instruction in physical education. Teachers’ stages of concern were measured immediately prior to and immediately after the seven-week training.

A percentile table was used to score the stages of concern questionnaire data and a stage of concern profile was developed for each teacher. The profile provided an overview of the teacher’s concerns and reflected the relative intensity of each stage of concern about individualizing instruction. The profiles from the pretest and posttest were compared to identify changes in teachers’ concerns as a possible result of the intervention (i.e., seven-week in-service training). By examining the total group concerns’ profiles before and after the workshops it was evident that the hypothesized pattern occurred. That is, nonusers of an innovation had relatively more intense Stage 0, 1, and 2 concerns, with low intensity Stages 4, 5, and 6 concerns. The intense concerns of the teachers prior
to the workshop interventions were mainly awareness (Stage 0), information (Stage 1), and personal (Stage 2) with a slight peaking of collaboration (Stage 5).

The data show a substantial decrease in those stages at the end of the 7-week training intervention. Stages 3, 4, and 5 results indicated that teachers did not have enough experience with the innovation to change the intensity (Knowles, 1981). There was a slight increase in Stage 6 from pre- to post- workshop training. Knowles posited that (a) change is a process that takes time, (b) each person adapts to change in different ways, and (c) attendance at workshop training does not guarantee that an innovation will be influential.

McBride (1993) argued that research on physical education teachers’ concerns had been limited and results were mixed. He further indicated that research with physical educators was not always consistent with Fuller’s (1969) predictions and consequently there was debate about the concerns model. Commenting on Fuller’s model, McBride further defined the three stages as self, task, and impact. To this, he explained that the (a) self stage present concerns about a teacher’s own adequacy and survival in the teaching environment, (b) task stage is viewed as the mastery stage of teaching and deals with concerns about the daily tasks of teaching, and (c) the impact stage reflects teacher concern for and about student learning. McBride reiterated that even though three distinct categories are identified and defined, some overlapping could be expected in the sense that human characteristics are variable and attempts to classify them into separate and distinct constructs may not always be successful.

McBride (1993) also emphasized that concerns research conducted in physical education at the time had used the Teacher Concerns Questionnaire (TCQ) based on
Fuller’s concerns theory, which was designed to assess classroom teachers concerns. He argued that the TCQ instrument therefore, might not be as appropriate for use in the physical education settings. One important reason given was that the uniqueness of a movement oriented environment in which teachers must often deal with large numbers of students as well as inadequate facilities and equipment, and where they must also tend to carry out administrative duties normally not encountered by classroom teachers might be elements the TCQ may fail to identify. McBride’s study was to identify routine task concerns of secondary physical education teachers for a planned adaptation of the TCQ.

McBride’s (1993) study was conducted in three phases of data analysis and interpretations, and was directed toward identification of task concerns encountered by a sample of secondary school physical educators. First, analysis of the data from the first phase resulted in identification of 10 routine tasks of teaching. The second phase involved administering a 10-item task questionnaire with a 5-point Likert scale, which was distributed to 500 physical educators (302 returned, 60% response rate). Subject to data analysis, five task items were selected for the planned adaptation of the original TCQ. The third and final phase subjected the TCQ-PE to a test-retest reliability procedure with 31 experienced physical educators. The teachers in this last phase were 17 men and 14 women averaging 10.3 years of experience teaching.

For reliability purposes, the TCQ-PE was assessed using a one-week test-retest reliability procedure. The intra-class total test correlation coefficient was $r = .94$. Individual scale reliability correlation coefficients were for; self = .93, task = .94, and impact = .89. These coefficients indicate a strong reliability of the TCQ-PE subscales for use with physical education teachers.
Chapter Summary

There is limited research on APE teachers’ roles, responsibilities, and any concerns they may have in carrying out their work. Most of the literature in this area focuses on teaching effectiveness (models and teaching styles) and about students with disabilities. But, there is also the need to continuously study APE teachers to understand how they think about and describe the roles and responsibilities of their jobs and what concerns they may have to better prepare them to more effectively do their work.

The roles and responsibilities of APE teachers in school settings are in three main capacities: (a) resource teacher, (b) itinerant teacher, and (c) consultant (Sherrill, 1998). Kelly and Gansneder (1998) discussed these roles and responsibilities in terms of direct and indirect services (i.e., itinerant and consulting services as indirect and direct service as when the primary job of the teacher is to teach the student with disability). Within the consultation service, the teacher provides information, for example to GPE teacher or classroom teacher to adapt teaching to include or assist the student with disability. In direct service, APE teachers are expected to be effective pedagogists. Scholars insist that effective teachers adapt curriculum to individual needs to minimize failure and enhance learning (Block & Vogler, 1994; Heikinaho-Johansson & Vogler, 1996).

The issue of competency in APE professional preparation is well-documented (Dempsey, 1987, 1990; Kelly, 1994; Kelly & Gansneder, 1998; Jansma & Surburg, 1995; McCubbin & Dunn, 2000). To ensure competency-based teaching by APE teachers, studies reveal the need to diversify preservice experiences (Hodge, Tannehill et al., 2003; Hodge et al., 2002). In recent years, studies have consistently revealed that APE and GPE
teachers have concerns in executing their roles but such studies are limited (Hodge et al., 2004; Lienert et al., 2001; Lieberman et al., 2002; Lytle & Collier, 2002).

The concerns theory has several underpinnings (Fuller, 1969). A critical issue is that teachers have concerns, starting from preservice or novice teachers (beginning teachers) and on to experienced teachers. The literature indicates that concerns differ at each stage of development (Fuller, 1969; Hall et al., 1973). Moreover, recent research has also indicated that even though the stages seem unique an individual may intersect with more than one stage concurrently (Lienert et al., 2001; McBride, 1993).
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to determine and describe the job roles and responsibilities of APE teachers in itinerant service at urban public city schools. A second purpose was to determine whether or not these APE teachers had any job-related concerns. If so, what were their concerns? This chapter presents the methods and procedures used to address the purposes and research objectives of this study.

Research Design

This study uses a descriptive-qualitative collective case study approach to determine and describe the job roles and responsibilities of itinerant APE teachers and any concerns they may have related to their work. In using a collective case study approach, Stake (2000) asserted that “a researcher may jointly study a number of cases in order to investigate a phenomenon, population, or general condition” (p. 437). Stake continued to explain that, “Individual cases in the collection may or may not be known in advance to manifest some common characteristic. They may be similar or dissimilar, redundancy and variety each important” (p. 437). A collection of case studies are selected “because it is believed that understanding them will lead to better understanding, perhaps better theorizing, about a still larger collection of cases” (Stake, 2000, p. 437). The naturalistic or qualitative design, according to Strauss and Carbin (1990), is appropriate when
diminutive information is known about an area of study. To successfully translate or interpret the information, the researcher works to understand the other’s world and then translates the text of lived actions into a meaningful account (Glesne, 1999). The current study sought to understand how the participants, from their own descriptions, make meaning of their job roles and responsibilities. A second purpose was to determine whether or not these APE teachers had job-related concerns and if so, to interpret their concerns.

Glesne (1999) portrays a world in which reality is socially constructed, complex, and ever changing. This paradigm is employed to get at the description of the teachers from their own perspectives. Schwandt (1997) explained that, “reality is represented by individual schemas that become interpreted as truths/realities” therefore, “knowledge is understood through an interpretation of these individually contrived schemas”. To understand the nature of constructed realities, Glesne (1999) made it explicit that qualitative researchers interact and talk with participants about their perceptions, seek out the variety of perspectives, and do not try to reduce the multiple interpretations to a norm. It is important to understand how individuals make meaning because the epistemology of knowledge is based on the view of the knower. The emphasis therefore is the epistemology of the knower’s authentic ways of knowing and being. This knowledge base is determined appropriate for this study so that the researcher could obtain the information from the emic (insider’s) perspective.

**Participant/Site Selection**

Participants ($N = 6$) represent a census of the APE teachers who were employed in the same large urban school district in the Midwestern USA. This particular urban school
district was purposively selected because of its location, which was in close proximity to the researcher and central to other urban school districts in the state. This school district was also selected because of the diversity of students with and without disabilities served and because of the accessibility of the APE teachers who agreed to participate in the study. Stated differently, these six teachers represent the total number of all APE teachers in the school district purposively selected for this study. Patton (2002) stated, “The purpose of purposive sampling is to select information-rich cases whose study will illuminate the questions understudy” (p. 169). In the current cases, studied was a census of all six APE teachers employed in the same school district. These teachers regularly taught students with mild to severe disabilities in their classes. Pseudonyms were used to identify all participants (i.e., Pam, Amy, Natalie, Mary, Beth, and Sue) and schools mentioned.

To gain access to these teachers and the schools under study, The Ohio State University’s Behavioral Sciences Institutional Review Board granted permission to conduct this study (Appendix A). This was forwarded to the district’s school board and they also approved the study (Appendix B). An introductory letter was used as proof of the district’s approval to solicit participants for the study (Appendix C). To which all six of the district’s APE teachers volunteered to participate and signed consent forms (Appendix D) indicating their willingness to do so.

Data Collection

Data collection occurred during winter and spring quarters of 2004. Data collection instruments included: (a) a demographic data sheet, (b) teacher interview schedules to complete two separate semistructured interviews with each participant, and (c) a
nonparticipant observer who collected data from pre and post-lesson conferences, stimulated recall sessions, and he also drafted field notes during class observations. To collect data, the first set of interview questions was developed by reflecting on the research objectives and the purpose of the study and reflecting on the theoretical framework (Fuller, 1969; McBride, 1993).

For content validation purposes, the initial interview questions were presented first to two doctoral students who had experience in qualitative research and also to an established APE scholar in this area of study for their ratings and feedback on content. Corrections were made for a second review. For further review two APE scholars who have in-depth knowledge in research and experience as journal editors critiqued the interview questions. After further corrections were made the interview guide was deemed valid (Yun & Ulrich, 2002).

The researcher scheduled a meeting with all six APE teachers and a timetable to conduct the interviews with each teacher was determined. The interviews were conducted in private either in a room at the district’s Special Education office building or at the varied schools where the participants taught. The researcher assured the participants of their confidentiality and anonymity, and used pseudonyms to avoid revealing their identities to anyone.

*Demographic Data.* A demographic data sheet was used for compiling information such as teachers’ certification or licensure, years of teaching and teaching background, courses and workshops attended after initial baccalaureate degree, gender, and ethnicity (Appendix E). Specifically, on an initial visit with the participants demographic data were collected using a 16-item demographic data sheet (Appendix E).
**Semistructured Interviews.** To elicit verbal responses on their roles and responsibilities, and any job related concerns, two separate interviews were conducted with each teacher. The researcher used a 35-item interview questionnaire (Appendix F) to conduct the first set of teacher interviews, which occurred at the beginning of the study and prior to multiple nonparticipant observations. This was followed by 10 direct observations of each APE teacher’s lessons over a 12-week period. During the nonparticipant observations field notes were taken and later used to revise where deemed warranted the original interview questions for use in the second set of teacher interviews. The second set of teacher interviews were conducted using a 20-item interview questionnaire (Appendix G), which was designed to seek clarity or confirm the teachers’ responses from the initial interviews as well as to add clarity or confirm field notes taken during the observations of these teachers’ lessons.

**Nonparticipant Observations.** Nonparticipant observations are a common data collection strategy often used in qualitative research. Adler and Adler (1994) suggested that a researcher uses all of the senses during an observation session to collect in-depth information. In this study, the multiple observation sessions focused on individual teaching-learning behaviors to confirm or clarify teachers’ initial interview responses. The role of a nonparticipant observer was assumed by the researcher for all observations (Glesne, 1999). That means the researcher was positioned to take field notes from the teaching-learning episodes without actually taken part in the practical lesson. Each teacher was observed 10 times over a period of 12 weeks to help develop the next set of interview questions. As Adler and Adler (1994) suggested, the initial observations were not focused on any particular set of teacher behaviors. As the researcher became more
familiar with the school contexts and teachers, he directed his focus more sharply on
critical incidents and teacher behaviors relating more specifically to the research
objectives allowing a shift toward “deeper, narrower, proportion of people, behaviors,
times, spaces, feelings, structures and/or process” (Adler & Adler, 1994, p. 381). In sum,
the nonparticipant observations helped to provide links between the teachers’ actual
behaviors in their classes and what they described as their roles and responsibilities, and
any concerns they had.

**Stimulated Recall.** On some occasions immediately following observation of a
particular teacher’s lesson, the researcher used a stimulated recall strategy with the
teacher to get at additional information or clarification of critical events that occurred
during the teaching episode observed. Shavelson, Webb, and Burstein (1986) described
stimulated recall as a technique for gathering retrospective reports of verbal and
nonverbal thought processes under conditions of explicit and information rich recall cues
on critical or noteworthy well-circumscribed events. In this study, at the end of a
particular observational session the teacher was prompted via questioning techniques or
asked directly to describe and/or provide clarity to certain critical or noteworthy event(s)
that occurred as they reflected on the event(s). For example, on one occasion where
safety was a concern the APE teacher was asked, “Why did the students have to skate on
the carpet?” The teacher’s response indicated that for novice or beginners the carpet
slows down the speed of skating and reduces the potential danger and risk. Questions on
behavioral issues were also used to prompted discussion around critical events. For
example, a teacher was asked, “Do you always have a behavior problem with that
particular girl?” All responses to stimulated recall prompting were recorded for analysis purposes.

For this study, the researcher used interview transcripts but anticipated access to such records as unit and lesson plans, teacher notes, and documents discussing rules and regulations for the job either on school basis or from the school board. This was believed to help as sources of information to cross check other data that might have bearing on the job roles and responsibilities or concerns of the participants as were revealed through the interviews and observations.

*Procedures*

After receiving university and school district approvals to conduct the study, the participants were asked to and did sign and date consent forms indicating their willingness to participate. Each individual teacher was contacted by telephone to be made aware that the researcher would visit her at a particular school location. Some teachers did not give the phone numbers to their various school locations but granted permission to the researcher that he could come out to their schools and observe whenever he sought to collect data and there was an APE class to be held. This particular decision to arrive for observations without a specific timetable or prior notification for some teachers later created some problems of going to a school location to be told that the teacher had asked for permission to be absent from school on that particular day, for example.

Two semistructured interviews were conducted that typically took 40-minutes to complete. Each teacher chose a confidential and quiet place in the district’s special education office building or their school locations for the interview to be conducted. Interviews occurred through verbal exchange with prompts for clarification or
completeness of response depending on the answer given to the open ended questions. In detail the first interview focused on background, professional development and experiences (teaching demographics), and how these variables influence the participants’ pedagogies (Appendix E). A second interview subsequent to completion of the nonparticipant observations was directed to gather more explicit information and clarity to the first interview responses and lessons observed. All interviews were audio taped, transcribed, and analyzed via constant comparative analysis (Glasser & Strauss, 1967).

Issues of Credibility

Credibility refers to the truth, value or believability of the findings that have been established by the researcher through prolonged observations, engagements or participation with informants, or the situation in which cumulative knowing is the believable or lived-through experiences of those studied (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Leininger, 1994). To meet the criteria of credibility in the current study multiple data collection sources were used over a 12-week period, which allowed for collecting different types of thick (detail) descriptive-qualitative data. That is, the researcher attempted to view (triangulate) the phenomena from numerous dimensions using interview transcripts, nonparticipant observations: pre and post lesson conferences, stimulated recall, and field notes as data sources (Denzin, 1994). Steps were also taken to reduce observer/researcher effect by purposefully interacting closely with the participants prior to the collection of data. The researcher frequented the multiple school settings in order to best understand the school contexts prior to data collection to ensure credibility. In short, the following procedures were used to establish trustworthiness: (a) triangulation,
(b) confirmability, (c) peer debriefing, (d) negative case analysis, (e) member checking, and (f) transferability.

**Trustworthiness.** The issue of trustworthiness poses several questions that relate to credibility. Lincoln and Guba (1985) asked questions such as: “How can an inquirer persuade the audience and also self that the findings of an inquiry are worth paying attention to or worth taking into account?” “What arguments could be raised or criteria invoked or what questions asked would be persuasive regarding the issue at stake?” Trustworthiness is established through the use of a variety of methods for gathering data. Glesne (1999) posited that the use of multiple data-collection methods contribute to data trustworthiness. Trustworthiness in the current study was established through triangulation, member checking, peer debriefing, and negative case analysis.

**Triangulation.** Patton (2002) echoed that triangulation is one of the processes by which the researcher guards against the accusation that the findings of a study are just artifacts of a single method, single source, or an investigator’s biases. Denzin (1989) indicated that triangulation might be accomplished using different data sources, theories, methods, or investigations. Glesne (1999) posited that the use of multiple data-collection methods contribute to the trustworthiness of the data. Berg (1995) reiterated that the purpose of triangulation is not the simple combination of different kinds of data but the attempt to relate them so as to counteract the threats of validity identified in each. This was the approach taken in the current study.

The current study utilized different sources of data, which were interview transcriptions, observations (field notes), and comments from pre and post conferences with stimulated recall. However, no teaching notes and unit or lesson plans from the
teachers were secured as was originally expected. Data collected allowed for comparing and contrasting different data types from multiple data sources (e.g., interview responses from different teachers compared and contrasted with observed teacher behaviors and varied contexts) to identify consistent and inconsistent information. The study was conducted over a 12-week period and in that time trusting relationships were developed between the participants and the researcher, of which led to enhance confidence in the trustworthiness of the data.

**Confirmability.** Another important verification method of checking the data was through what is termed *confirmability*. To ensure how plausible the data were the researcher confirmed the data by repeating interview questions immediately to compare responses and by repeating some questions in the second interview. Confirmability refers to the repeated direct participatory and documented evidence observed or obtained from primary informant sources (Leininger, 1994). Lincoln and Guba (1985) refer to this method as “audit trails” that implies that, a researcher may want to know whether the information obtained from the informant is true or is the same.

Leininger (1994) contends that confirmability could be done by periodic confirmed informant checks and feedback sessions directly from the participant. Teacher responses that were inconsistent were noted and analyzed whether they fell under negative cases (cases that did not fall under any of the emerging themes).

**Peer Debriefing.** Peer debriefing is a process whereby the researcher invites people to comment on the findings and interpretations (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 2002). Two individuals were used in this capacity as *debriefers*. A doctoral student who has conducted a series of qualitative studies was used in a peer debriefing capacity through
discussions and affirmations of the researcher’s findings and interpretations. The second peer debriefer was a member of the researcher’s committee who also read the raw data, preliminary analysis, and interpretations of case narratives. A series of meetings were held with the committee member periodically at different phases of the process of gathering, analyzing, and interpreting the data, and writing the narratives. Generally, the peer debriefs crosscheck the researcher’s findings and interpretations and subsequently give comments and suggestions for clarity and completeness.

**Negative Case Analysis.** Negative case analysis was a method used to look for negative or outlier cases or data from the trend of organizing the data. The negative cases were cases that did not comparably fit into the emerging themes. This helped to group and compare emerging themes and for evaluating the researcher’s interpretation of data.

**Member Checking.** Member checking is a method of making available to the participants their data and the researcher’s data interpretations (Patton, 2002). First, all interview transcripts were made available to the respective participants to give their individual comments, and for possible corrections before data analysis. Again, a second member check occurred after all the participants’ individual cases were analyzed for confirmability purposes. That is, a second member checking was done such that each teacher could confirm the accuracy of the data and researcher’s interpretations.

**Transferability.** Janesick (1994) proclaimed that qualitative designs are holistic because they begin with a search for understanding. The ultimate goal of qualitative inquiry is to portray the complex pattern of what is being studied in sufficient depth and detail so that those who have not experienced it can understand it. While a qualitative study may not aim at generalizing the findings it, however, should have detail that can
allow transferability (Denzin, 1994; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Transferability refers to the extent to which the findings could relate to other individuals, contexts or findings from other studies. In view of this, the current study utilized thick rich descriptions of settings, participants, multiple observations of lessons, and credible data to assist readers in determining if findings in the current study relate to their settings or situations.

**Data Analysis**

Procedures used for collecting and analyzing the data have direct linkages to address the research objectives that guided the study. For this study, case analysis and cross case analysis of the field notes, interviews, and nonparticipant observer field notes and notes taken during pre and post lesson conferences and from stimulated recall sessions were all analyzed. If and when teachers expressed job-related concerns Fuller’s stages of concern model was used to better understand and interpret these concerns. In according with Fuller’s (1969) stages, teachers in early stages of concern are those in the self-category, those in the middle stages of development have concerns in the task category, and those in the later stages of concern have greater concerns in the impact category.

More specifically, data analysis procedures occurred as individual teachers interviews were transcribed and analyzed with relation to the data from observations and other data sources. Each participant’s interviews and observations were considered as a different case. After individual teacher’s cases were analyzed a cross case analysis (comparing themes for individuals across other participants) was completed. Notable descriptive findings and recurring themes emerging from the data were identified through constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).
Goetz and LeCompte (1981) pointed out that constant comparison as a strategy combines inductive category coding with a simultaneous comparison of all social incidents observed. As social phenomena are recorded and classified, they are also compared across categories. There is the discovery of relationships, thus themes emerge which begins with an analysis of initial observations that undergoes continuous refinement throughout the data collection and analysis process and continuously feeds back into the process of category coding. As events are constantly compared with previous events, new typological dimensions and new relationships may be discovered.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) emphasized that constant comparison procedures provide an excellent fit of continuous and simultaneous collection and processing of data. In the present study, this approach enabled the researcher to compare and contrast data gathered from the teachers’ responses during the first and second interviews as well as across multiple observations from individual cases and across all participants and their school locations. This approach also helped identify negative cases; that is, cases that do not neatly fit into emerging themes (Guba & Lincoln, 1989).

**Chapter Summary**

In sum, this study was conducted using a qualitative approach (collective case studies) based on the interpretive paradigm to describe the roles and responsibilities, and any concerns of itinerant APE teachers from a large urban school district. Specifically, a collective case study methodology was chosen as a means to obtain data that would be authentic and meaningful in addressing the research objectives. Participants in the study were a census of six experienced women APE teachers who worked in the same large urban school district. Data were collected through interviews and nonparticipant
observations where the researcher drafted field notes and took notes during pre and post lesson conferences and stimulated recall sessions with the respective teachers. Data were analyzed using constant comparative procedures, first as individual cases, and second using cross case analyses of all six teachers to compare and contrast overall findings and emerging recurring themes. Trustworthiness of findings was established through triangulation, peer debriefing, and member checking.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to determine and describe the job roles and responsibilities of APE teachers in itinerant service delivery (teaching/consulting) at urban public city schools. A second purpose was to determine whether or not APE teachers had any job-related concerns. If so, what were their concerns? To address these purposes, data were collected and analyzed based on face-to-face interviews, nonparticipant observer’s field notes, and notes taken during pre/post lesson conferences and stimulated recall sessions. Seven major objectives guided the study.

1. To determine and describe the roles and responsibilities of itinerant APE teachers.
2. To determine and describe how itinerant APE teachers execute their roles and responsibilities.
3. To determine and describe itinerant APE teachers’ views on how effective they do their jobs.
4. To determine and describe how knowledge acquired during professional preparation (preservice) and development (inservice) influence itinerant APE teachers in their jobs.
5. To determine and describe itinerant APE teacher’s professional interactions and relationships with parents of students, individualized education program (IEP) team members, and other persons with whom they work.

6. To determine and describe any job-related concerns, which hinder itinerant APE teachers’ consulting and/or teaching effectiveness.

7. To determine and describe itinerant APE teachers’ views on how their jobs might be improved and their overall job satisfaction.

This chapter presents: (a) a description of the school district and school contexts; (b) overview of the teachers’ professional preparation, careers, and school contexts; (c) general overview of teachers’ views and actions, (d) findings from each individual case including teachers’ professional preparation, teachers’ careers, and demographic information on their school contexts; (e) findings specific to each research objective for each of the collective cases; and (f) collective findings from cross case analysis of all six cases (teachers) including the overall findings across cases specific to each research objective and teaching behaviors of individual teachers. The findings were extracted from analysis of the multiple data sources of face-to-face interviews (transcripts), nonparticipant observations (field notes), and researcher’s notes taken during or immediately after pre/post-lesson conferences and stimulated recall. Themes that emerged from the data are presented as they correspond to the research objectives.

During winter 2004, the researcher visited the Office of Special Education to make contact with the supervisor in charge of the APE teachers within the selected urban school district. All six APE teachers in the district were identified and agreed to participate in the study. The visit was held after the researcher had received the school
district’s and his university’s institutional review board’s approval to conduct the study. The supervisor accepted the invitation and scheduled a date to meet with the researcher and district’s six APE teachers, who later became participants.

At that meeting the researcher explained the study’s purpose, procedures to be used for data collection and analysis, how the information would be used, and how the names and data would be treated during and after completion of the research. All six APE teachers received and volunteering signed consent forms to participate in this study. Each participant handed to the researcher a copy of her weekly class schedule and these were used to plan a schedule for conducting interviews and nonparticipant observations.

**Description of School District and School Contexts**

All six APE teachers in the study were employed in the same urban school district. The school district was comprised of mostly lower to middle class families in an urban community located in the center of a major city in a Midwestern state. This large school district was comprised more than 62,000 students in some 144 schools (http://www.columbus.k12.oh.us). The local community consisted of families representing a diversity of cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds. All schools used in this study were co-educational. Bus transportation was available for students traveling more than three miles to and from their various schools.

*School Contexts—High Schools.* The high schools were located throughout the local community with easy access. Each of the three high schools where data collection occurred had either an average-sized gymnasium with a capacity between 50-80 students for activity or very large gymnasiums with a capacity between 80-120 students for activity. At these schools there were other sport and physical activity facilities including
open track and field stadiums and sports fields (e.g., football, softball, and baseball fields). These high schools had physical education equipment rooms with sport and game equipment, for example, various sports/activity balls, rackets, and jump ropes. Generally, these schools were mostly comprised of students of color (on average 70%) and White students (on average 30%). Each high school had at least one or more GPE teachers who taught physical education classes separate from the APE program. All APE classes were self-contained and segregated from the GPE programs (i.e. APE classes taught exclusive only to students with disabilities). Typically, students attended APE and GPE classes twice a week. Most students received either reduced or free lunch at these schools.

School Contexts—Middle Schools. Some of these APE teachers taught in middle schools but none of them were observed during the observational period. Reasons for this was either the teacher requested for permission to be absent from school, a school activity that resulted in cancellation of the class or the APE teachers were at meetings of Special Olympics and therefore unavailable for class observations.

School Contexts—Elementary Schools. In all, observations took place at six elementary schools and these schools were: Circle View, Lakeside, Grand Abor, Clinton, Austin, and Olympus (pseudonyms were used). As reflective of the population in the district, students came from mostly low to middle income families. Students of African ancestry (e.g. African and African Americans) represented about 60% of the population in these schools. Over 80% of the students were either on reduced or free lunch programs. Typically, students attended physical education classes twice a week. Each elementary school had at least one GPE teacher and the APE classes were all self-contained and segregated from the GPE programs. Apart from Circle View Elementary,
which had a larger gymnasium, the remainder of the schools used a small gym that served dual purposes of dining hall and physical education settings. Daily lunch breaks interrupted the APE classes, which took away part of the time for the class especially those scheduled just before or immediately after the lunch period. Circle View Elementary School had an equipment room that was filled with footballs, tennis balls and nets, volleyballs, basketballs equipment for track and field. The other elementary schools had smaller equipment rooms that were congested. The preschools within the district where these APE teachers taught were housed in the respective elementary school buildings.

Overview of Teachers’ Professional Preparation, Careers, and School Contexts

APE Teachers’ Professional Preparation

All six participants had earned a bachelor degree in physical education. Four of these APE teachers had earned a master’s degree in APE and/or certification in APE. However, the remaining two teachers had earned APE certification. Amy was awarded her certificate on merit due to coursework taken towards a master’s degree in APE and also due to her certificate in teaching students who had learning disabilities and those with behavior disorders. Lastly, Sue had earned sufficient credits from graduate courses taken toward a master’s degree and as such was certificated in APE (Table 4.1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Total Yrs of Exp.</th>
<th>Years Experience at Positions</th>
<th>No. of Sch</th>
<th>Case Load</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Types/ Severity</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pam</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20 0 17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>M+H</td>
<td>MR, EB, VI, HI, (moderate)</td>
<td>Bel. Ave.</td>
<td>60 38 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14 8 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&gt;200</td>
<td>Pre-H</td>
<td>MR, Ortho (very low to functional)</td>
<td>Mid or Low</td>
<td>25 50 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15 5 4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&gt;135</td>
<td>Pre-M</td>
<td>CD, PD, Au, DS, CP (moderate to severe)</td>
<td>Low to Mid</td>
<td>45 30 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 0 4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&gt;75</td>
<td>Pre-H</td>
<td>MR with EB, PD (very severe)</td>
<td>Low to Mid</td>
<td>60 40 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14 10 14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&gt;100</td>
<td>Pre-H</td>
<td>Ortho (severe)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>80 10 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 0 4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&gt;90</td>
<td>Pre-H</td>
<td>CP, DS, MR, LCD, VI, HI (moderate to severe)</td>
<td>Low to Mid</td>
<td>65 20 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.1. Demographic Information on APE Teachers, Classes, and Students**

*Note. A = African American; APE = Adapted Physical Education; Au = Autism; Bel. Ave. = Below Average; CD = Cognitive Disability; CP = Cerebral Palsy; DS = Down Syndrome; EB = Emotional Behavior; GPE = General Physical Education; H = High; HI = Hearing Impairment; IT = Itinerant Teacher; LCD = Language Communication Deficit; M+H = Middle and High; MR = Mentally Retarded; W = White; O = Others; PD = Physical Disability; Pre-H = Preschool through High; Sch = Schools; SES = Socio-economic Status; VI = Visual Impairment.*
Table 4.1 shows that the most experienced teacher, Beth, among the six had taught for 24 years. In contrast, the least experienced teachers were Mary and Sue, who both had taught for four years. The length of experience as APE teachers ranged from 4 years to 20 years. In terms of teaching in itinerant positions 4 years teaching was the least (Amy, Natalie, Mary, and Sue) and the highest was 17 years for Pam in itinerant positions and Beth had taught 14 years as an itinerant APE teacher. Demographic data of itinerant experience also indicate that three of the teachers (e.g., Pam, Mary, and Sue) had never taught GPE. But Natalie had taught GPE for 5 years, Amy for 8 years, and Beth for 10 years. Descriptive data also revealed that the caseload for these teachers ranged from 80 students to more than 200 students with an average of 115 students with disabilities per teacher. On the average, these teachers taught at 9 different schools (Tables 4.1 and 4.2).

**General Overview of Teachers’ Views and Actions**

All teachers observed taught in self-contained APE classes (Tables 4.1 and 4.2). Only one teacher, Beth, had organized an inclusive basketball game at one of the schools she taught at. That game was well-patronized by faculty, staff, and students at the school. All six participants claimed to have had unit plans but none of them provided the researcher with either a unit plan or a copy of their written lesson plans. The teachers bolstered that novice teachers write lesson plans but felt that because they were experienced teachers they do not need to write lesson plans. It is questionable as to whether or not these teachers actually wrote and used lesson plans. Only one teacher explained that when she is charged with teaching a new or unfamiliar activity she tries to plan it on paper.
Typically, all six teachers’ lesson objectives centered on fun and movement activities. Lesson patterns for all teachers were similar in the order of delivery. That is, warm up, set induction, body of lesson (practice and/or game, which were not consistently observed as part of every lesson), and closure. Students’ opportunities for engaging in individual practices were limited across these teachers’ classes, but at least five of the teachers made some attempts in each lesson to teach and allow practice opportunities. However game play was a main component of every lesson observed. Set inductions to explain skill followed by demonstrations of intended skill or activity were regularly provided by all six teachers.

Along with that, all six teachers were concerned about the safety of their students. To avoid accidents, for example, teachers would place equipment not in use away from activity areas to prevent students from tripping over. They would also give instructions on the importance of safety. Moreover, the relatively large class sizes and the reluctance of some teacher aides to assist made class organization and management at times difficult for some of the teachers.

It appeared that the context of the different schools impacted the behavior of the teacher aides. For instance, at Circle View Elementary School and Ridgeview High School, about 80% of the teacher aides regularly assisted and supported in the activities and addressed students’ behavioral issues. These two schools seemed to have order and better discipline regarding attitude to work by both students and teachers. In contrast, at Austin High School and Maple High School such support from teacher aides did not occur. Even students’ movements from class to class (transition) and general comportment observed seemed lackadaisical.
Concerning behavior issues one teacher was seen giving time out to a student until the student calmed down to participate. All six teachers mostly gave feedback that was general (e.g. good job). Only two teachers, Amy and Sue occasionally gave corrective and specific feedback (e.g. swing your arm over the shoulder, Betty). In most cases, each of these teachers gave explicit instructions and task statements that could be understood by students as was apparent from the students’ responses.

Team game or cooperative activities emphasizing interactive skills were the dominant activities taught by all six teachers. Two teachers, Amy and Sue taught lessons that were creative using a toy head that could record (e.g., voices and names of students) and later played back. These two teachers used the same toy head but used it creatively different. For example, Amy asked her students to mention their names for the toy to record, and then two students would stand outside a circle. When the toy mentioned a student’s name he or she would chase the other until they got to their places in the circle. In a different way, Sue asked her students to record their names using the toy. When a student’s name was mentioned he or she would stand in the middle of a circle to perform an activity for the class to emulate. Pam, Amy, and Sue appropriately paired and grouped students using ability as a focus so that the students with mild disabilities could assist or encourage those with severe physical disabilities. All six teachers actively supervised their students and moved around the perimeters of the gymnasiums to monitor and supervise activities.

Generally, testing and assessing of movement skills were rare. In one lesson, students were asked to perform the standing broad jump but no measurement marks were on the floor to indicate or determine the distances jumped. The teacher aides who supervised that particular testing activity could only guess at estimates of distances. Although, not
observed in this study, all six APE teachers stated that they do indeed assess students’ motor performances but do so either at the start of the school year or when there was a need to check progress of students on IEP goals and recommend changes accordingly. The equipment situation was a general issue for all six teachers in terms of inadequate equipment, lack of proper equipment, and issues related to sharing the limited equipment that was available with other teachers. For example, Mary stated that because of limited access to equipment she did not get to teach a particular skill for a long time during the year. Moreover, it was difficult to revisit teaching a unit, tasks, or skills because another teacher might need the same equipment if they were teaching a similar unit, tasks, or skills. With two exceptions, gym space especially in the elementary schools was too small for the number of students in the classes. In contrast, all three high schools where observations took place had large gymnasiums with ample space for physical activities.

Case I: Pam

This section presents findings specific to the first case study. The purpose of this study was to determine and describe the job roles and responsibilities of APE teachers in itinerant service delivery (teaching/consulting) at urban public city schools. A second purpose was to determine whether or not APE teachers had any job-related concerns.

Pam’s Professional Preparation

Pam was a single, 46 year old White American female (Table 4.2). Pam had a bachelor’s degree in education with physical education teaching certification and a master’s degree in APE. Pam had a background in health and science with biology as a minor area of study. She completed both a bachelor and master’s degree in the 1980s and claimed that there was no APE training available where she had earned her bachelor
degree. Despite this, later, Pam had gained APE certification plus certificates in K-12 health and physical education (Table 4.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pam</th>
<th>Amy</th>
<th>Natalie</th>
<th>Mary</th>
<th>Beth</th>
<th>Sue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master (Ed)</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>APE</td>
<td>BD, LD</td>
<td>APE</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>APE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>GPE</td>
<td>APE</td>
<td>K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPE</td>
<td>GPE</td>
<td>GPE</td>
<td>GPE</td>
<td>GPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2. Teachers’ Demographic Data and Professional Preparation

Note: APE = Adapted Physical Education; BD = Behavior Disability; LD = Learning Disorder; GPE = General Physical Education; TR = Therapeutic Recreation

Pam: Demographics of Experiences, Responsibilities, and School Contexts

Pam had taught APE for 20 years, three years of the total years teaching in the same school building and 17 as an itinerant APE teacher. Pam claimed that she had never taught GPE classes. Interestingly, Pam explained that in 15 of her 17 years as an itinerant APE teacher she had taught in the same schools. Pam was responsible for four schools where she taught and did other assignments outside the teaching context for students with disabilities. At the time of this study, Pam taught at both elementary and secondary levels.
Pam taught a minimal of twenty students with disabilities at each school site. Describing types and degrees of students’ disabilities, Pam stated:

My students are MR [90% of them in a classroom for students with Mental Retardation]. Most have emotional behavior disabilities. I have a few visually impaired and hearing impaired, no orthopedic this year so majority of the students are in the moderate range of severity. Not too many mild or severe. (Pam, Interview 1)

One issue that Pam mentioned was that she taught only students with disabilities within non-inclusive (self-contained) settings. Occasionally, she did some peer tutoring but not at every school. Pam was uncertain in describing the socioeconomic status (SES) of the students at her school sites but she suggested below average SES. The ethnic composition of students in her classes were about 60% Blacks and 38% Whites with about 2% other ethnic groups, and the majority of the students were American born. Those other ethnic groups included students who were Latino/as, Middle Easterners, Somalis, Pakistani, but no Native Americans. In terms of gender, boys represented about 60% and girls 40% of the student population.

Case I—Research Objective 1—To Determine and Describe Pam’s Roles and Responsibilities

Pam’s primary role and responsibility was direct service delivery. Responses were consistent in terms of either direct or indirect service (teaching and consulting). Pam described her job roles and responsibilities.

Indirect Service

Pam’s response to whether or not she did consulting was:

Referrals we do. Most of us don’t do too much consulting work. Probably two teachers a year. At my schools, the students don’t do regular physical education so there isn’t much need for consultation. (Pam, Interview 1)
Direct Service

My main job roles and responsibilities as an itinerant APE teacher are to work with all of the mentally handicapped [MH] classes and provide APE services based on need. If they can be mainstreamed we do. If we think they need the split, we split. We determine based on assessment and behavior issues and things like that. Writing IEP goals and maintaining that, trying to learn the laws that change daily. Those are our basic responsibilities. (Pam, Interview 1)

Individualized Education Program (IEP)

Pam indicated that writing IEP goals was a responsibility she carried out. On attending IEP Team meetings she responded:

Very rare. You can’t [with one hundred and fifty kids]. It is a big workload. We attend if the parents want us or if we know there is an issue and the supervisor wants us there. Sometimes we are there for teacher conferences and if the IEP Team meeting is coinciding when we attend, but if I have to go to one hundred and fifty of them, we have to cancel class and that is not fair to the kids. I don’t even know why we write IEPs. (Pam, Interview 1)

Pam emphasized that teaching was one of the most important roles and responsibilities of an itinerant APE teacher. In terms of her role in providing indirect and direct services she thought both direct and indirect services were important so she could not say one was more or less important than the other.

Safety of Students

The issue of safety formed an integral and key component of Pam’s teaching. She regarded an awareness of safety with equipment, location, and student interactions when they played together as integral aspects of her role and responsibilities.

Planning and Documenting

Pam had mixed thoughts about documentation as part of her role. She acknowledged that planning was very important to her service delivery but her lesson plans, if written at
all, were very brief. To which she remarked, “I have planned for years …do not prepare such written lesson plans because I know what to teach” (Pam, Interview 2).

When asked to describe the issue of documentation (unit/lesson plans, IEP documents, students’ school records, assessment records) as either important or not so important she stated that documentation was not so important unless it was a behavior or safety issue that needed to be documented.

**Skill Teaching and Learning**

Pam identified teaching to facilitate skill acquisition, development, and proficiency as probably her most important role and responsibilities. She believed it contributed to the enjoyment of her students but it depended on the individual student. She also thought skill acquisition, development, and proficiency as important to the future success of her students in the area of fitness but not necessarily in motor activities for example throwing, jumping, and so on.

**Case I—Research Objective 2—To Determine and Describe how Pam Executed Her Roles and Responsibilities**

**Testing and Assessing**

As indicated previously, Pam did assessment based on the needs of individual students who were to be either mainstreamed or in self-contained classes; or if they needed to be grouped based on behavior issues. In the area of motor skills, Pam pointed out that she assessed her students using the Test of Gross Motor Development (TGMD; Ulrich, 2000) and AAPHERD Fitness Test. In terms of differences in roles and responsibilities (direct and indirect), Pam explained that she taught each class twice a week per school but whenever she did consultation, it was once a month.
Consulting

Explaining what she did during consultation she said:

If the teacher needs more help we go once every two weeks. Most of the time when we get referral for a consultation, it means the regular teacher doesn’t have any idea [about teaching the child with disability]. They are scared. We tell them to treat the child no differently and they get it. They end up not needing our help anymore. If they need special equipment, we help them. If the students fit in better with the regular than one-on-one we prefer them to be there. (Pam, Interview 1).

Inclusion Practices

Pam explained that APE teachers in this school district did not teach in inclusive settings, instead their classes were self-contained. In the preschool classes because the students were not labeled with a particular disability, she was not sure whether all of them had disabilities that needed APE services. However, the students were labeled in all other classes so she was sure of their disability per legal diagnosis. She explained that APE teachers in this school district served students who fell two standard deviations or more below the mean on formal standardized tests/assessments. Those students who were not eligible for receiving special education services including APE where taught in the general education contexts including GPE classes.

Rules and Routines

Pam explained that APE teachers in this school district did more direct service delivery (teaching) than indirect (consulting). In executing her direct service roles and responsibilities, Pam said she established rules and routines because students needed to know her expectations. She established rules and routines at the start of the school year, regularly repeated each rule throughout the school year, wrote and posted them on the gym walls and also reminded students daily of the rules.
Organization and Management

To organize and manage her classes for optimal success, Pam said she tried to keep everything as busy as possible. As she explained:

I don’t have down time in class but the problem I have is with using inadequate equipment sometimes for doing grouping and station activities. (Pam, Interview 1)

Pam noted that at their APE teachers meeting they frequently discussed details on what each of them would teach and when. By doing this they could best utilize the limited equipment available by either sharing or using it at different times according to their units. This arrangement helped to organize and manage her classes by knowing in advance what equipment was available and how to use the equipment more effectively considering the number of students in their classes. Pam explained that because students at different school levels do different things she tried to coordinate the activities so that she could teach similar activities at the various schools. She said:

If I am doing volleyball in high school, I do things with beach ball or balloon like tracking in elementary. It is similar but different. You can’t do it any other way. (Pam, Interview1).

Pam said that safety was a key component of her teaching. Further, she explained that when executing her roles and responsibilities if students’ safety were threatened due to inappropriate behavior she would put that student in time out or removed the student’s sticker, and she would review the rules again with the student. To further ensure safety she made use of teacher aides if they were present and were ready and willing to assist.

Executing Her Roles and Responsibilities: What Pam Said and Did

For this study, 10 teaching sessions were observed to determine and describe the roles and responsibilities executed by Pam. During pre-observation conferences, Pam always
explained what she intended to teach and her lesson objectives for that day. For example, an objective was promoting teamwork and cooperation. The activities for that particular lesson were *Top Ball* and *Five a Side Flat Ball*. Pam executed this particular teaching episode with enthusiasm, starting with warm up activities using stretching exercises and jogging, continuing with set induction where she explained the activity of *Top Ball*. To this, she explained how the students could play best if each player contributed by holding the edge of the piece of cloth. The class size was 22 students and 8 teacher aides were present. Even though Pam attempted to organize the students to participate meaningfully, there were too many students in the available space around the piece of cloth to do so well. This grouping caused a congested situation and resulted in some behavioral problems such as students pushing one another. Only 2 of the 8 teacher aides attempted to assist with this situation, the rest of them sat and continued talking to one another.

Students were successful at rolling the ball from one end of the cloth to the other end so long as they all cooperated and did what was expected of them. Pam extended the cloth by adding more cloths and spreading the students along the length. This eased the congestion but changed the task degree of difficulty. The difficulty of guiding the ball to roll from one end of the cloth to the other was very obvious and the students’ success depended on everybody being attentive and raising the side to the same height as the one opposite. This increased level of difficulty rather increased the fun because students wanted to be successful which required greater work and cooperation. A few more teacher aides helped at this point.

The notes taken after a stimulated recall session following a class of which Pam explained her lesson were:
I felt I did a good job overall because there was some level of cooperation. However, I had problems with organization and managing the whole class initially. My plan was to engage them in small groups to roll the ball but the aides didn’t want to help. When I joined the groups to have a longer distance I realized the difficulty but then it was more fun. Well, some of the aides finally assisted but I can’t tell them anything. They are paid whether they decide to help or not. We have complained a lot but nothing seem to change so we work with those who are ready to (Pam, comments from stimulated recall).

**IEP Writing and Evaluation**

To her responsibilities in the preparation or writing of IEPs, Pam claimed that she wrote annual IEPs, but stated that each student’s IEP was reviewed and as warranted updated at least four times each year as an ongoing responsibility. Explicitly, Pam explained:

> We write the IEPs ahead of time…I know most of their IEPs are due late October beginning November so the first month of the school I assess. I write up goals. I’ve had most of the kids before so I know where they are. I give the goals to the teacher. When the IEP meeting comes up, if there is an issue, which there usually isn’t, we would most likely know ahead of time. I’d say at least 50% if not 70% of our parents never attend an IEP meeting. We send it through the mail and it is sent back to us. (Pam, Interview 1)

Pam further explained that if she was given responsibility for teaching a new student with disabilities that she had never had in her class before she had 30 days to assess the child. And if they were attaining set standards in their IEP really fast, she wrote an addendum. Pam explained of IEP writing.

> We try to write it across the school year. We used to write, “Improve soccer skills” but we only work on soccer for part of the school year so we can’t write goals like that anymore. Instead we would write, “Will follow the rules for these various sports…” “He accomplished these in these four areas…” So it is pretty broad that they will fit in there hopefully somewhere. Unless we really overshoot them, then we would add an addendum. Most of our kids never master that stuff. They’ll master some individual skills. By the time they get to high school we work on fitness. You can’t really judge fitness because you can’t make them do it. They never truly master but they progress through it. They try to get better each
time. ‘He still can’t catch a ball but he knows the move or whatever’. (Pam, Interview 1).

Pam further indicated that as part of her responsibilities she evaluated students every nine weeks for grading and wrote progress reports by referencing students’ goals and checking where they had progressed. The report was later turned over to the parents.

**Case I—Research Objective 3—To Determine and Describe Pam’s Views on How Effective She did Her Job**

Pam asserted that she was very effective and the variables that facilitated her teaching and consulting effectiveness included being flexible, the ability to change and adapt activities even on the spot, being consistent, the ability to manage a classroom appropriately, and being a good planner. Additionally, being prepared, having a good rapport with students, and the ability to individualize instruction well were all hallmarks of effective ways of doing her job, said Pam. She, however, admitted that her greatest weakness was communication with people in general. Nonetheless, she realized that communication is an effective means of getting information across and exchanging ideas with people therefore good communication may contribute to teaching effectiveness.

**Case I—Research Objective 4—To Determine and Describe How Knowledge Acquired During Professional Preparation (Preservice) and Development (Inservice) had Influenced Pam in Doing Her Job**

*Pam’s Professional Preparation*

As indicated earlier, Pam had earned both a bachelor degree (BA) in GPE and a master’s degree (MA) in APE. During her undergraduate matriculation she had no APE
coursework. Some time ago Pam had received APE certification. Reflecting on her professional preparation as the knowledge base influencing her job, Pam stated:

In my field experience in graduate school we taught at least two different places every day. These were helpful experience because they were hands-on teaching. Computer courses were also important. (Pam, Interview 1)

By giving a general description of her PETE and APE teacher preparation in terms of preparing her to do her job, Pam said:

Definitely you need the basic background of PE to lay the foundation. In graduate school the foundation was laid more with the medical perspective and helps you to understand how you can change activities. For example, with CP you learn why you can’t do specific things…I had a great graduate school experience. We covered the field experiences, medical part, school experiences, ideas, and adaptation. (Pam, Interview 1)

_Inservice Workshops and Conferences_

Pam said she did not think she missed anything during her teacher preparation in terms of experiences and knowledge needed to teach. The additional knowledge base she described as influencing her job regarded workshops and conferences at state and district levels. Pam said she benefited from workshops but to what degree depended on the focus of workshop that is whether it was related more to APE or GPE programming. Pam has only one chance per school year to attend an inservice workshop because her school district allows only one professional development day. Pam said she got most job-related information from workshops rather than coursework at this stage of her career.

Linking her knowledge base to her practice Pam concluded that field experiences, workshops, and conferences continue to be her primary sources of knowledge, which directly impacts her teaching.
Case I—Research Objective 5—To Determine and Describe Pam’s Professional Interactions and Relationships with Parents, IEP Team Members, and Other Persons with Whom She Worked

Parents

According to Pam, she rarely talked to parents or families members of her students. Attending IEP meetings where places to probably meet parents, but Pam said she taught in four schools and served over one hundred students so there was no way to go to every IEP meeting, which would also mean absences from classes. Her main job was to teach but if parents wanted her there at particular IEP meeting she would go. For the most part she wrote her IEP goals but rarely actually talked with students’ parents.

Pam also stated that even though she rarely interacts with parents there was some collaboration if need be. In describing some collaborative interactions she said,

If there is an issue then probably yes. The classroom teachers would talk to the parents…unless there is a serious problem we will not talk to the parents because their teachers take care of it. Most of the parent teacher conferences I just sit there for three hours and it is because most of the parents do not have concern for the kids (Pam, Interview 1).

Co-Workers and Other Teachers

Describing meetings with coworkers such as the GPE department chair regarding her roles and responsibilities, Pam said:

Our supervisor meets with us every other week and talks to us. For the group of APE people, there are six of us and we meet once every week. There are PE meetings with the district every year. We have been included in those meetings, 99% of it doesn’t pertain to us but they see our face and know who we are. They see APE class as a behavior dumping ground but APE has nothing to do with behavior. (Pam, Interview 1)
Pam described interactions and professional relationships with various school personnel and APE colleagues as collaborative. For instance, with the APE staff, Pam felt that they do interact at meetings and it has been collaborative because they discuss issues about certain kids, how to handle problems in a gym, addressing issues of scheduling and APE programming, Special Olympics, how to write IEPs, how to evaluate, or any other issue that may come up regarding their roles and responsibilities.

With other teachers in the schools, where she teaches, her description was:

We interact with physical education colleagues when gearing up at the beginning of the year. That is a downfall of our job. We interact with classroom teachers that we work with but if you are at a school early you don’t interact. When we are forgotten our best friends are custodians. They help us get into the gym or know if we have been kicked out. (Pam, Interview 1)

Pam asserted that there was a collaborative relationship with the classroom teachers of the students she taught in APE classes but not with the regular teaching staff at the schools. Pam’s description of interactions and relationships with administrators (e.g. school building principals) seemed communicative but not collaborative for obvious reasons. She had this to say:

The principal and other teachers forget who you are…Well, you have to collaborate with the principal to get the gym. She has to schedule with music and art and other teachers. I’m only at school half an hour. You don’t have time to do things. You have to get ready for your next class. I interact not too much since I’m only part time. You interact when there is a problem. For the most part you wave as you go by. (Pam, Interview 1)

Pam continued:

The principals don’t supervise you. They know you’ve done your job. They might walk in. It would have been nice if you were considered part of the school but you’re not. I’ve been in schools for fifteen years now and there’s only one school that knows I’m a part of it. They have my name on the roster. The other schools I am not a part of. They don’t think of me. If they take the gym and you go to
complain, they think of you as a babysitter. They are very disrespectful in a lot of ways… (Pam, Interview 1)

Other Professionals

According to Pam, she did not interact with other professionals (e.g. occupational therapists [OT] and physical therapists [PT]) that worked with students she taught who had disabilities. She commented that most of the time these professionals were in the schools when she was not there. However, she explained that other APE teachers interacted more with OT and PT when they worked with students with orthopedic disabilities. Pam did not have any such students. Then again the therapists’ relationships were collaborative with other APE teachers.

Case I—Research Objective 6—To Determine and Describe any Job-Related Concerns, which Hindered Pam’s Consulting and/or Teaching Effectiveness

Concerns

Pam responded in a specific way as to variables that hindered her teaching or consulting effectiveness. She had this to say:

Getting kicked out of the gym. That happens all the time without knowing ahead of time. Sometimes lack of equipment. We have assistants in the classroom and sometimes we don’t have them. In one school I have thirty-two mentally handicapped students in one room. I can’t run the gym class at one time. It’s also managing the aides. If you don’t manage them, then the kids watch them, like if they are talking all the time. If you have good assistants the class goes beautifully. If you have bad assistants, the class goes bad. I’m trying to manage behavior and if I don’t have help then I have to change how I do things. The kids are losing out if they’re [aides] not doing their job. (Pam, Interview 1)

Support

Pam’s voiced concerns revealed support as lacking or inadequate. One such area of support mentioned was inadequacy of inservice workshops and conferences. As she noted
“there are not many conferences out there and we are given only one professional
development day.” She said it was up to her supervisor to decide which conference to
attend or to arrange for the APE teachers. Pam further explained that the supervisor knew
of their meetings and they always informed him but he had been in charge of five
departments and preoccupied too much so to attend their meetings, so therefore they
maintained themselves professionally.

Later, Pam discussed her concerns about a lack of reliable assistance from teacher
aides. She said:

They come in to assist but it’s where their heart is. You can’t change them. They
know what their job is. You share your expectations with them but you can’t
make them do it. Sometimes you want to tell them to leave. You’re fighting that
issue all the time. (Interview 1)

Pam added that some teacher aides were very good and effective, others not so good,
but there was a very big need for their consistent assistance.

In one of Pam’s teaching sessions, which focused on baseball and broad jump, the
following field notes were taken:

Students warmed up by jogging and stretching. After warm-up students were put
into three groups, two playing baseball and the third, which was also substitution
group for the baseball, were doing broad jumps. There were eight aides but the
teacher was working with the baseball group by herself. Only three aides were
working with the students doing the broad jumps. The broad jump was supposed
to be done by all students. The aides kept pulling out students playing baseball
and substituting them with students who completed the broad jumps. One large
boy [might weigh over two-hundred-and-fifty pounds] who was not verbal and
could barely lift his feet when walking was asked to jump and he could not even
do an increased step from his normal walking step. There was a take-off line but
no marks in the direction of jump to give even estimated distances (Field notes,
Lesson # 2).

It was obvious that the teacher aides could do better with the broad jump. Pam was
asked during the post observation conference whether or not the broad jump was for a
purpose other than doing a class activity because there was no marking for distances.

Responding to stimulated recall inquiry Pam’s post-lesson comments were:

Some of them [teacher aides] seem to think they know everything already so they would not listen to what they really have to do. We needed some of them to participate in the coming Special Olympics for all our schools. They were to put spots there to check the distances so that we could select but didn’t. I don’t blame those who helped much because others were sitting watching and talking (Pam, Lesson # 2).

Equipment

Pam had mentioned that equipment was at times a concern, and she later explained:

We try to do a yearly plan so I’m not doing soccer when someone else is. We don’t have any money. We have to make our own money by selling Easter candy mainly to teachers and families to get our own equipment. We get $2000 a year from budget and once in a while they find money at the end of the year and they give us a couple of dollars but that doesn’t buy much… They [District Board of Education] don’t buy equipment for physical education generally. Some of our schools let us use their equipment. They should always let us use it, but some of them [GPE teachers] lock it up and don’t let us touch it. I disagree with that but it’s hard to fight it. (Pam, Interview 1)

Pam continued:

It’s not that they don’t trust us but if they leave it unlocked then anyone else in the school can use it. They don’t take care of it and leave it out on the playground. Or those teachers [GPE teachers] are in 2 or 3 schools and might take equipment from one school to another, so it’s not there…Well, we seem pretty good with equipment right now. The reason we have equipment in some of our schools now is the district is now in a second year of a grant and one of our APE teachers went through the grant process and got us a couple of thousand dollars last year with which we bought some equipment. (Pam, Interview 1).

And yet Pam still had a concern about equipment as a variable adversely affecting her teaching:

Having to carry equipment around definitely affects you. Its one of the low points of the job and it hurts your body. You are carrying it in and out of four or five schools a day depending on what you are doing. Some of that stuff is heavy. You can’t leave it at the school. (Pam, Interview 1)
Transportation (Traveling)

Responding to the question of the numerous travels between one school and another, Pam explained:

Weather and accidents are time elements. Sometimes you are late. We try when we schedule to have enough time to set up. It is part of the job, the nature of the beast and something you have to deal with but fortunately we are reimbursed for mileage. We get the government rate not the lower rate some schools pay. Traveling to schools is tiring. Your supervisor sometimes says you have all these hours you’re not doing anything but it takes time to travel, load and unload. They would understand if they were with us day to day. That is definitely a big variable. (Interview 1)

Pam’s Professional Interactions and Relationships

Another concern Pam talked about was limited professional interaction with administrators and other teachers in the schools. She stated she did not interact much with any of the principals except to the extent necessary for scheduling, otherwise they mostly waved in greeting to each other and occasionally the principal would pass by the gym.

Pam said her lack of communication with the principals and others was a hindrance but the biggest concern was “Lack of respect from building staff who do not think that we are as important as they are …Kicking me out of the gym due to some program” (Pam, Interview 2).

Case 1—Research Objective 7—To Determine and Describe Pam’s Views on How Her Job could be Improved and Her Overall Job Satisfaction

Professional Preparation

Pam mentioned that field experiences in her PETE program had the most significant impact on her efficacy to meet the demands of her roles and responsibilities as an itinerant APE teacher. She pointed out that in her undergraduate PETE program they did
not have much experience teaching in the schools until she was a senior. She thought that might have changed but definitely it is an area that could greatly improve the job effectiveness.

Support: Interactions in the Schools

As far as interactions that could improve her job, Pam argued that teacher aides could be more effective by being more involved and not just sitting around and talking with one another. As she argued:

School building teachers should respect us; if the principal doesn’t then it is worse from teachers. There is always a communication problem and this needs to be improved. (Pam, Interview 2)

Collaboration

The extent of collaboration resulting from interactions and relationships seemed to be a social concern. Pam and the other APE teachers had continuous interactions throughout the week and during their staff meetings despite her self-expressed communication problems. Meaningful relationships with parents were very rare without any collaboration. Pam felt that parents should demonstrate more affection toward their children by making the school an extension of the home. This would help since parents can continue what is done at school at home she asserted.

Professional Development

Pam also touched on the need for gaining more knowledge through professional development. She stated that professional development workshops approved by the school board did not benefit APE teachers very much. Pam noted that APE teachers should be permitted to attend workshops not necessarily funded by the school board that would be beneficial.
Equipment and Facilities

Pam believed that the equipment situation was much better because of the aforementioned school district’s physical education grant and the district’s APE teachers’ fund raising efforts. Moreover, they had a pool where all of them collected the equipment. The APE teachers draw up schedules so that they used equipment at different times. However, they were restricted to one time use because other APE teachers used the same equipment after each had done so. Moreover, the APE teachers could not revisit what had been taught because of this shortage of available equipment. In view of this, Pam argued that the District’s School Board should provide more funding by increasing the budget and parents could also donate equipment.

Inclusion Practices

During the first interview, Pam confirmed that she did not teach in inclusive settings. This was because within the school district it was not a policy for inclusive programming. During a post-lesson conference notes were taken based on the researcher’s interaction with Pam about the ability level of students and the need to socialize, she stated:

We are not given any instruction to teach both students with and without disability in an inclusive setting. Occasionally, I may organize some inclusive setting play but I think it will be a good thing to do if we are officially to teach in an inclusive setting. (Pam, Stimulated Recall Comments).

Pam believed inclusion would be beneficial to practice, and would enable students with disabilities to socialize with students without disability and vice verse.

Pam’s Level of Job Satisfaction

The level of job satisfaction in terms of accomplishments and/or successes for Pam and her students seemed high. Pam indicated that she feels satisfied now because she
taught APE in different systems where she worked one-on-one or one-on-two or may be three and it was hard to teach individual skills. For the most part, they may never catch a ball correctly and never play in a game because there was only one student, according to Pam. She taught a lot more students in her current schools in the same class and this was what she had to say:

So when I moved here I loved the work because I teach like regular P.E. class. I expect the same thing. It is at a slower pace, probably with different ball but the expectations are all the same, and I feel like I am useful, I am doing APE. I like my job (Pam, Interview 1)

She continued:

I think in all my classes the students like physical education. For many it is the best thing of the week. They look forward to it. It tends to be an equalizer for all students in the classes because not all of them are academic, so they are socially out there. When it comes to physical education they are all on the same playing field, there is fun and they learn things. The behavior issues don’t often come out, just once a while but not as in the classroom where it is a frustrating area. It is not frustrating with physical education. It is great. You walk in and you are best thing they’ve ever seen. They enjoy it so much. (Pam, Interview 1)

Pam did not give any direct suggestions on what might improve her job satisfaction except those relating to preparation and interactions with other teachers.

**A Summary of Pam’s Behaviors and Contexts**

Specific to Pam’s situation, the average number of students in the classes observed was 22 and the average number of teacher aides was 8 per class. All observations of Pam’s teaching occurred at the St. Anne’s High School. Pam did not make her lesson objectives readily available. Pam’s teaching demeanor was generally seriousness and energetic. She seemed organized and proactive but her seriousness overshadowed her enthusiasm and seemed not to make the lessons lively. She gave a lot of general feedback to the students, but rarely was specific feedback given.
To a large extent teacher flexibility was witnessed in almost all lessons observed and this manifested in Pam changing and adapting activities to meet the needs of the group or of individual students. For example, during the ‘top ball’ activity students were not getting the ball to roll from one end of the piece of fabric held along the lengths by all students who tried to direct the ball from one end to the other. Pam modified the rules of playing and added another piece of cloth to spread the students along the fabric. The activity became more challenging but more fun to be able to direct the ball to the opposite end without it falling off. Students had enough space to operate and the objective of teamwork was better achieved while students tried to be successful.

There were inconsistencies in the patterns of lesson sequencing of warm up, set induction, body of lesson (practice/game), and closure. Generally, warm ups were seen as routines. Set induction was given in 6 out of 10 lessons observed. In those lessons, where set inductions was not observed the teacher went straight to the body of the lesson with demonstrations and descriptions, and soon thereafter the students started performing.

In most cases, those lessons did not have distinct practice and game sections. Students worked more in game situations. Moreover, eight of the lessons did not have a routine for closing. Whenever class time was over and the bell rang the students activities were stopped by Pam and they left the gym. The teacher aides did not always assist in the learning environment. Out of eight aides that were present most of the time in the gym, two aides were constantly seen assisting students. This was especially the case where stations were involved or helping out with a large group that the teacher was working with. Two aides assisted fully in six lessons and partially assisted during four lessons. Two of the teacher aides would always wait and assist near the end of the class. The last
two aides would always talk mostly throughout the lesson. This situation often created managerial problems because the teacher aides did not consistently assist when there was the need for one-on-one attention with a particular student or students.

**Case II: Amy**

Findings from Amy’s case study are reported in this section. The purpose of this study was to determine and describe the job roles and responsibilities of APE teachers in this case Amy, an itinerant service provider (teaching/consulting) at urban public city schools. A second purpose was to determine whether or not these APE teachers including Amy had job-related concerns. If so, what were their or her concerns?

*Amy’s Professional Preparation*

Amy was a 48-year-old married White female APE teacher (Table 4.2). Amy had earned a BA degree in education majoring in physical education from a southern university in the1980s. Amy had no master’s degree but had earned some graduate credits and she held an APE certificate, LD behavior disorder certificate (K-12), a coaching certificate, and a health certificate (grades 7-12). Amy explained that she did not take the APENS test for the APE certification but was given it on merit and the fact that she took some courses in APE and taught in schools which had programs specifically designed for students who have severe behavior disorders (Table 4.2).

*Amy: Demographics of Experiences, Responsibilities, and School Contexts*

Amy had taught for 22 years, 7 to 8 years as an APE teacher and 14 years in GPE. Four out of the 8 years of APE teaching had been in itinerant positions and in the same schools. During this study, Amy taught in 5 different schools at various levels from preschool to high school. The total number of students with disabilities that Amy was
responsible for teaching in self-contained APE classes was between 200 and 225 (average of 40 students per school). She described the types and degrees of student disabilities:

I have students with very low to very functional disabilities. One of the schools is for very fragile students. I don’t think the other physical education teachers have such low levels [i.e., students with such severe disabilities]. In another high school they are allowed to stay in school until age 21 or 22 and some parents have their sons or daughters who is very low functioning stay in school just to get the atmosphere and stuff. (Amy, Interview 1).

Describing the socioeconomic status (SES) of students she taught, Amy stated that they were middle class or lower. Her proportion estimation was about 50/50. She taught about 50 students in group-homes who had foster parents and she said she could not give comment on them because she did not really know their home situations. The ethnic proportion of students was described as about 50% students of color (e.g., Africans, African Americans, Asians, Latinos and Latinas, and others) and 50% White students (Table 4.1).

Case II—Research Objective 1—To Determine and Describe Amy’s Roles and Responsibilities

Indirect Service

Amy said that consulting was a role that she played when teachers asked her if she had any games or things for them in the classroom. She also talked to teachers about bringing different students down to her class (gym) so they could combine classes. Lastly, she occasionally had PETE students from two universities in the area who came to her to observe and ask questions about teaching students with disabilities.
Direct Service

Amy described her roles and responsibilities as an itinerant APE teacher. This was her description:

I am a very strong believer that physical activity is the most important thing. They [students] enjoy moving their bodies. That’s my main concern. If they’re in a wheelchair, I want them out of their wheelchair moving as much as possible. So movement is my goal. This is for them to enjoy movement so they will continue this throughout their lives. I stress to my students how important it is for them to keep their body moving and strong. It is more important for APE students so they can help themselves as long as possible. Through game situations and sports that we play; if someone excels, I help them further explore that. At Juniors Park there’s wheelchair basketball. There’s archery. There’s all sorts of things that we have for special needs students. (Amy, Interview 1)

Amy stated that direct services as opposed to indirect services were most important in describing her roles and responsibilities.

Safety of Students

Amy talked about what she thought were the most important roles and responsibilities:

The first thing is safety to know all [students] different disabilities to know what to do or what not to do because not all students can safely perform certain activities. The other important thing is mobility, my goal is to make them move but the type of movement and range of movement are very important so that students do not get injuries from activities they perform. (Amy, Interview 2)

For Amy safety was an integral aspect of her teaching roles and responsibilities. She explained:

Yes it depends on whether they are in a wheelchair or out of it and obstacles in the gym or playground (ditch/slope) splinters, bees attack, chairs in gym, bicycles, etc. that pose a danger to the students. (Amy, Interview 2)

Individualized Education Program (IEP)

IEP development was considered an important responsibility as Amy explained,
It is a very important responsibility to write and to keep updating information of the students, use information from other professionals, and also give them information they might need or find useful (Amy, Interview 1).

Amy said “The problem with IEP goals is they (IEP) could not tell everything that one needs to know.” Commenting on attending IEP meetings Amy explained:

I attend IEP meetings as many as I can but because of the amount of meetings it would take too much time out. If there is a particular situation where I feel I am needed to be in there and make remarks, for instance, there might be a student that I feel really doesn’t need APE, I’m all for transition into regular physical education. Adaptation is only needed in certain areas and some kids need to be in the regular physical education classroom. (Amy, Interview 1)

Planning and Documenting

Amy described planning and documenting as part of her roles and responsibilities. Reflecting on the importance of planning (unit/lessons) to her service delivery and to whether she develops lesson plans, she stated “I don’t develop them on paper unless I am not familiar with the activities, I want to organize for the class…but I do have unit plans.” (Amy, Interview 2).

Continuing with her descriptions, Amy emphasized that some documents were important but not all. She believed that IEPs were important (and mandatory), unit plans not so important, and records on testing and assessing important for use later to help in preparing to teach students.

Skill Teaching and Learning

Amy also described her efforts at ensuring students’ skill acquisition, skill development, and movement proficiency as part of her responsibilities. She said “Skill acquisition is important to the students’ future success because some of them will use the skills in the community.” However, she insisted that the importance of skillfulness to the
daily enjoyment of her students depended on the level of severity of the child’s disabilities.

**Case II—Research Objective 2—To Determine and Describe How Amy Executed Her Roles and Responsibilities**

*Testing and Assessing*

Amy talked about executing her roles and responsibilities, and explained that one thing that she always did was test and assess her students’ motor skills and fitness (e.g., modified sit ups and push ups). Amy also did stretching exercises with her students, and the students were typically assessed at the start of the year or latter half of the school year. Amy stated that she kept assessment records to use the following year. Amy said she mostly used teacher made tests because the “tests in the books” do not match her students.

*Consulting*

Amy asserted that she did both teaching (direct) and consulting (indirect) and could not talk about differences because:

I want the students outside the school to participate as much as they can in recreational and physical activities, so during consulting I tell them about… [a sport group for individuals with disability] which organizes a lot of outdoor activities, and I have speakers come in and talk or demonstrate wheelchair basketball or have regular GPE and adapted students play together. I do the wheelchair basketball but I also tell students where to go, I write letters to the parents telling them who I am and give them my phone number and tell them to call if they need ideas for activities…I do get calls from parents and I also offer my services by taking several students to brush horses and ride them. (Amy, Interview 1)
Inclusion Practices

Amy did not teach students in inclusive classes except on one occasion where she had sought and planned for having students without disabilities from GPE classes come join her students with disabilities.

Rules and Routines

To make sure she executed her teaching in a controlled atmosphere, Amy stated that she established rules and routines. This enabled her to have lessons go on smoothly and orderly. She established rules and routines at the beginning of the school year and reiterate them during each class. She felt that her classes were organized and managed better by her emphasizing various rules and managerial routines.

Organization and Management

In organizing and managing her classes to achieve optional success, Amy asserted that she tries to pair less mobile students who need assistance with students who were more skilled to work on their own. Moreover, she would pair a student role model (i.e., high functioning student) with a student who is lower functioning. Amy emphasized that lack of availability of equipment was a hindrance in the organization of her classes but the APE teachers rotated the use of equipment.

Executing Her Roles and Responsibilities: What Amy Said and Did

The following field notes were taken from one lesson. During the pre-lesson conference Amy described the class as all students with orthopedic impairments. Her class objective for the lesson was described as “Get involved in basketball”. Amy said she did not have teacher aides even though they were in the school. But if the PT and OT were available they came in to assist. For this particular lesson, one parent volunteer was
available, two PTs and one OT were present. The researcher’s field notes provided the following descriptions:

The number of students in the class was twenty-four.

**Activity:** Basketball

**Start- Warm-up:** As students entered the gym they wheeled their chairs several times in the gym (seemed a routine).
In two groups, each group facing a ‘hanged’ basketball ring adapted to each student’s ability. Students were to make shots on their own (free play). Students changed to passing. Some could bounce pass others were throwing to pass (e.g., chest pass) while others passed from hand to hand. The teacher was very enthusiastic. Teacher put students into a circle formation waiting for another class to join. Students mentioned their names, then teacher spelled the name of the school and students shouted (called out) the name. Exercises were done with music. While music was playing the teacher led in exercises. The therapists assisted students who could not move arms during arms and shoulder circling and shrugging, and then arms stretching upwards.

**Set Induction and lesson content:** Teacher lined up all students along a line (two classes) standing side by side facing teacher. Teacher explained the activity and what they were expected to achieve, that was sportsmanship “meaning do not get angry at or insult or be upset when your teammate misses”. Teacher asked students what they had to do or say in such a circumstance. One student responded “nice try”. Teacher gave students chance to contribute to the class and learning that is, she counted off with students (when she was putting them into teams). Teacher put students into teams and designated baskets into blue and green indicating where those wearing blue should shoot and those wearing green. Teacher then explained the rules of the game by demonstrating for example, hitting somebody’s hand so that ball dropped was not permitted. Teacher put ball into play with a toss up. To defend the back player (defense) should raise their hands up. If the ball dropped the player who made the attempt to get the ball gains possession, ball being picked up for him/her by PT and OT. After two goals by green and two by blue the game ended. New set of students came in (two stand-by teams). Teacher used a lot of talking aimed at encouraging, prompting, and providing feedback. Teacher was alert about safety issues and would modify or give a new rule as was necessary. When each team scored twice teacher stopped the game and made new arrangements for the waiting teams to play. Changes were made replacing those who got tired. A new rule was introduced regarding passing and more of teamwork (i.e. two passes before shooting). Teacher talked to students when one student passed an unpleasant remark. For the next fun game one student chooses a favorite name from TV show bears that name. When the name is called the rest of the class ask what time it is then that student mentions a time (e.g. one or two or three o’clock etc). The rest of the students moved a number of steps relating to the
time called. When the rest of the students came closer he or she (leader) called 12 o’clock and the rest of them moved as fast as possible to the starting base while the leader chased them to catch some of them.

**Closing:** Class ended at 12 noon. Teacher organized students into their respective class groups and their teachers met them at the entrance of the gym. (Field notes, Lesson # 5).

Routinely, the researcher engaged the teachers in a pre-observation conference to find out the objective of the lesson. At her pre-observation conferences, Amy would for example, emphasize safety issues, rules, passing, teamwork (if the lesson included game activities) or fun. In most instances, Amy executed her roles and responsibilities of teaching with enthusiasm, flair, expressions of love, and was very much physically and actively involved herself in the lesson activities.

**IEP Writing and Evaluation**

Amy commented that in executing her duties she utilized IEP information. She said:

> A lot of times we find out medically what is the situation. If we don’t have that it can be dangerous to the students and liability to us. IEP is important. I go to the teachers mainly. I don’t look up every student’s IEP but I ask teachers if there is anyone I really need to know about and have a list. (Amy, Interview 1)

In view of the importance she attached to the IEP process, Amy made sure to write IEP objectives with as much detail as warranted. She claimed to review students’ IEPs four times each year.

**Case II—Research Objective 3—To Determine and Describe Amy’s Views on How Effective She did Her Job**

Reflecting on her strengths and weaknesses, Amy stated that she was relatively effective. She described the most effective way of doing her job as making the students enjoy the class, making them laugh, creating social interaction, and promoting fun, which
was high up in importance. Other variables that Amy thought facilitated her teaching and consulting effectiveness included:

The PTs that come in and help volunteer their time. PTs and aides that do come in and help are a tremendous thing, also materials and things that we can offer adaptive equipment and also being creative. My strengths are my enthusiasm and love for the students. I try to make gym classes fun. I incorporate music a lot, laughter, happiness, sportsmanship, and students have to do that too. My weaknesses are organization, not following lesson plans but I perceive these also as effective way of my job as itinerant APE teacher. (Amy, Interview 2).

Case II—Research Objective 4—To Determine and Describe How Knowledge Acquired During Professional Preparation (Preservice) and Development (Inservice) Influenced Amy in Doing Her Job

Amy’s Professional Preparation

Amy had earned a bachelor degree in education with a major in physical education and she also had coaching certificates. At time of this study, she was taking graduate courses and had accumulated 50 credit units toward her master’s degree. Her APE certification was obtained on merit. In considering her professional preparation, Amy reflected on her coursework but could not be specific at speaking to any particular courses she had taken. However she had this to say:

Well, I can’t remember coursework from way back. All of the courses helped create me. The best courses had me actively involved...Yes, practical courses. (Amy, Interview 1)

Inservice Workshops and Conferences

Amy further indicated that attending workshops, matriculating in graduate courses, and attending conferences had all been beneficial to her professional development. She said she attended workshops and conferences at least more than once each school year.
Describing the knowledge base from her PETE preparation and teaching experiences, Amy commented:

I’ve had so many experiences and training, different races and religions, poverty and wealth. That’s my teaching experiences. I’ve taught PE in different states and to different children. I’ve made mistakes along the way and learned a lot. I think I am well rounded now. The PETE training program has had an impact in some of my job areas. For example, one program was quite extensive, the school needed an aerobic instructor so I went to training and I incorporate music and rhythm in my classes. I believe my experiences have influenced me so much more. (Amy, Interview 1)

Case II—Research Objective 5—To Determine and Describe Amy’s Professional Interactions and Relationships with Parents, IEP Team Members, and Other Persons with Whom She Worked

Parents

Amy said that she had established good social interactions and relationships with some parents. Her comments were:

Well, not all parents I know. The parents I do know and have talked to over the phone I have a good rapport with them. There are some parents that are supportive of their child and we try to do what we can. At Juniors Park, I don’t have any gym space so I write a letter and permissions slip and I take them [students] in my van to go to the YMCA. With parents’ permission I can do that which is great but some [parents] would not respond. (Amy, Interview 1)

Co-Workers and other Teachers

Amy described her interactions and relationships with coworkers (team members) such as the chair of their unit or supervisors. She said:

The [APE] staff has meetings once a week. Our boss [APE supervisor] talks with us whenever there is a problem otherwise we don’t meet. When he meets there is not too much positive. That is unfortunate. It is a matter of the financial burdens of our school system and cuts and some teachers may be not where they are supposed to be. (Amy, Interview 1)
Amy continued:

My interactions and relationships with the APE staff are collaborative and we are supportive of each other. With other teachers in the schools I would say my relationships are good. I am an easygoing, flexible, well-liked person. I’ve been in a lot of schools and I love every school and the staff. I try to get along with everybody. There’s just a handful I stay away from. I have a collaborative relationship with a lot of the teachers. (Amy, Interview 1)

Regarding interactions and professional relationships with administrators, Amy said:

I have a fine relationship but mainly principals’ number one key is educational aspect not physical education. This is a concern. In one school I have a supportive administrator. Most of them are supportive to the extent that as long as it doesn’t interfere with regular education. Others would just ask you to share the gym with a regular class of 50 to 60 students. (Amy, Interview 1)

Other Professionals

Describing her interactions and professional relationships with other professionals such as OTs and PTs Amy commented:

I always get them a Christmas gift and thank you card because without them my job would be the hardest job in the world. All of them meet in the school so I know them. I am fun loving and laugh and joke a lot so we kind of have a collaborative relationship. (Amy, Interview 1).

Case II—Research Objective 6—To Determine and Describe any Job-Related Concerns, which Hindered Amy’s Consulting and/or Teaching Effectiveness

Concerns

Amy described some variables that hindered her effectiveness:

The variability in students’ disability types can be a concern to effective teaching. The level can be low to high in the same class. We don’t put them in groups. We would like to rely on assistants and that is a problem in our school system. We have aides that forget about students’ needs. (Amy, Interview 1).
Support

Amy discussed supports and said:

We have some very good aides and then we have some that sit down and do nothing. We’ve talked several times [to the teacher aides] and given up [due to lack of support from them. I have teacher aides that are supposed to be helping me and don’t even come in. In one school, my PTs are helpful but I have no aides. Most of them have been there for a long time so they don’t come into the gym. Some of them ignore instruction. So those would be my strongest concern, the aide’s problems and the variance in the students with one teacher. I can’t give everyone individual attention. Usually the lower students get the rap unless they have an aide helping them.

Amy expressed the following concerns as well:

One major concern is assistance for safety, then inclusion. Our physical education boss calls inclusion “double dipping’ meaning, you can’t have adapted physical education and regular physical education. This is a big concern, why we can’t have inclusion. (Amy, Interview 2)

Another concern identified was limited space and allocation of time for gym use. Amy explained that she had supportive administrators in some schools especially one school, but others were not supportive. As she indicated in one school she shared the gym with other classes and it was loud and the students were “off the wall”. Her comments were:

We are the lowest on the hierarchy in terms of space and time. The principal would say, “Oh, I forgot about APE. They can just share the gym.” (Amy, Interview 1)

Equipment

Amy had concerns about equipment. She was resolved in that if there was the need for equipment she bought what was needed with her personal money. She did not go through the school system for funding of equipment because she knew there was no reimbursement. She considered buying equipment as an investment because it enhanced
her APE program and also it was like giving money to charity. She nonetheless felt the lack of adequate equipment availability and procurement as big concerns.

**Transportation (Traveling)**

Amy was also concerned about loading and unloading equipment as she traveled from one school to the next schools. She said, “I seem to be getting use to this traveling and transporting equipment nevertheless, loading and off loading [equipment] could be a pain.”

**Amy’s Professional Interactions and Relationships**

As mentioned earlier Amy had a good professional relationship with some of the classroom teachers but she felt that others did not regard her with respect as an APE teacher.

**Case II—Research Objective 7—To Determine and Describe Amy’s Views on How Her Job could be Improved and Her Overall Job Satisfaction**

**Professional Preparation**

Commenting on what was lacking and what was needed to be improved in teacher preparation for APE teachers, Amy offered this opinion:

I think that the PETE curriculum is rigid on teaching and planning. ‘When you teach this lesson you have to do it this way’ and so many teachers think they have to go by the book and I think that is not the way it really is. Flexibility in teaching was lacking in college preparation so there is the need for flexibility for students to be more creative in their approach. Also, they don’t really talk that much about personality and rapport. If you don’t smile and show genuine care for your students it’s not going to happen, so I think the social aspect of teaching is very important to acquire in the preparation program. (Amy, Interview 2).
Support: Interactions in the Schools

Amy suggested that if the teacher aides got up from the seats to help and stopped talking, they could be of better help. This was particularly true as a lot of the students needed one-on-one assistance, especially those students who were frequently off-task.

Collaboration

Regarding interactions and professional relationships, she said:

The more we collaborate is good. Meeting as a group would be good so we organize. Maybe a once-a-month type of ordeal where the parents come in to talk about their kids to exchange ideas or request for ideas would be very much appreciated. (Amy, Interview 2)

Professional Development

Amy further pointed out that there was a need for more conferences or workshops with more activities relevant to APE programming. Conferences or workshops should be organized specifically for APE teachers instead of consistently grouping both GPE and APE teachers together.

Equipment and Facilities

Amy asserted that with obtaining equipment, the problem is an insufficient budget and difficulties in getting money to purchase equipment. Fundraising helps to get some of the equipment. I purchase my own equipment, Amy said if I have the need for equipment that the department does not have. However, she insisted that an increase in the budget to assist them in buying equipment would be beneficial to the students and program overall.

Inclusion Practices

While inclusion was not mandated, Amy nonetheless stated that she occasionally combined students with and without disabilities together in a class session by consulting
with the GPE teacher and it had worked. She felt that it would be a good idea if the local School Board of Education made inclusion a policy, then all involved would be ready for it. She believed that inclusion would have been a way of encouraging good relationships.

_Amy’s Level of Job Satisfaction_

Regarding her job satisfaction she said:

Well, I wouldn’t be here if I didn’t love it. I am very satisfied with my accomplishment because is just moving, having fun, and working on skill so that they (students) can do it, it is fine. There is always improvement as far as success is concerned. (Amy, Interview 1)

Amy however, worried that:

Some people (teachers) do not show affection, enthusiasm, they are not showing interest but I think they should put away their negative or apathetic feelings etc. and do the job better. (Amy, Interview 2)

_A Summary of Amy’s Behaviors and Contexts_

Based on field notes accrued from multiple nonparticipant observations it was clear that Amy was one participant whose practices were consistent with her beliefs of what students should achieve. That is, she believed that students should engage in lots of movement and have fun. Amy’s lessons typically followed the pattern of warm up, set induction, body of lesson (practice/game), and closure. Prominent in the 10 observations were warm up and closing routines that involved stopping activities, grouping students, and a routine for leaving the gym. Many of the activities followed routine group formations. This helped Amy in her class organization and management. In group activities, she mostly paired students who had functional abilities or physical strength with students who were less functional in their abilities or less physically strong. She allowed students to be cognitively active as well, for example, while talking about rules
involved in a game or activity she would not supply the answer but asked students to give the answers.

Daily, providing feedback, encouraging and motivating students, and emphasizing safety issues were a common part of her lessons. In eight lessons, Amy incorporated music, which seemed appealing and enjoyable to the students. Teacher explanations and demonstrations were everyday occurrences in her lessons. She was full of energy and exuberance.

Amy occasionally had problems with class management, particularly with those students who had severe disabilities. When behavior problems occurred she would immediately try to control the situation. She used teacher aides or the physical or occupational therapists to assist. In most cases, few of the teacher aides actually assisted. Because Amy’s enthusiasm, organization, and general teaching approach made the lessons lively and fun, serious behavior management issues were typically avoided.

It appeared that the starting positions of some skills taught needed a better or easier approach or explanation. For example, Amy’s teaching of jumping jacks could have been introduced with demonstrations when students stand with their feet together instead of feet apart. There were occasions when informal assessments were seen in the form of individuals performing and the teacher giving evaluative comments. More structured testing or formal skill assessments were not observed in the ten lessons witnessed. Amy seemed to be an example of an enthusiastic, diligent, loving, passionate teacher whose classes were always fun. She got deeply and actively involved and was often modeling and making sure she gave individual attention to students.
Case III: Natalie

This section reports finding from Natalie’s case study relative to the purpose of the study, which was to determine and describe the job roles and responsibilities of APE teachers in itinerant service delivery (teaching/consulting) at urban public city schools. The second purpose was to determine whether or not APE teachers, including Natalie had any job-related concerns.

Natalie’s Professional Preparation

Natalie was a single 42-year-old white female APE teacher who had a bachelor degree (BA) in K-12 physical education that she had earned in the early 1980s and master’s of art degree in APE earned in 2000 (Table 4.2). These degrees were obtained from different universities. Natalie explained that she had earned APE certification before obtaining her master’s degree but she did not take the APENS examination because in states, which have APE certification, one could get certified without taking the examination.

Natalie: Demographics of Experiences, Responsibilities, and School Contexts

Natalie had taught for 20 years, 3 years of these, she taught as a substitute teacher. In all, she had 17 years of full time teaching with 2 years in GPE and 15 years in APE programs. Natalie had previously taught APE in another county in both the main school building and a preschool facility before transferring to her current school district. She had taught for 4 years in her current school district. The past four years she had served as an itinerant teacher in the same schools. Natalie indicated that she had teaching and consulting responsibilities in 14 different schools (Table 4.1).

Natalie did not teach high school students at all but she taught students from preschool through middle school. Not counting students who did not have an IEP, she taught 90 to
100 students with disabilities who had IEPs. In all per week, she taught a total of 135 students including those students with disabilities who did not have IEPs available. Natalie explained that the students in the preschools were those without IEPs.

Describing students’ types and degrees of severity of disabilities, Natalie explained:

I have a lot of [students with] cognitive disabilities through physical disabilities, autistic students, Down syndrome, cerebral palsy (CP); the gauntlet. In fact, the whole range. They are usually in the county board program. I have some that are very difficult and they need one-on-one. I don’t have any wheelchair students that can’t do anything. They can push their own chairs. (Natalie, Interview 1)

The families of most students she taught socioeconomic status fell within low to middle income. Natalie also said that she had a high percentage of African American students about 45% in the preschool, nearly 10% Hispanic, 25 to 30% White students, and the rest of the students were described as immigrants.

**Case III—Research Objective 1—To Determine and Describe Natalie’s Roles and Responsibilities**

Natalie explained her understanding of her roles and responsibilities in terms of direct and indirect service provider as:

With direct services, you work with the kids, write IEPs, and make sure everything is going the way it is supposed to be going. You are the one helping guide them. A consult is more of indirect. You are giving the regular physical education teacher some advice where they can have peer models or the teacher can adapt a class. We are not there, we might meet once a month but we are not there hands on with the students so with direct you teach the students on your caseload and indirect you are not teaching, you are giving advice and helping out. (Natalie, Interview 1)

Natalie asserted that providing direct and indirect services were of similar importance.

**Indirect Service**

Natalie confirmed that she did some counseling.
We consult. We get phone calls and go test students and see if they need regular or APE. The regular PE teacher or nurse or OT/PT could call us in such situations or issues. (Natalie, Interview 1)

Direct service

Natalie further described what she thought were her most important roles and responsibilities:

To make sure you have your IEP completed to show that you do your job; safety, curriculum to meet the individual’s need, knowledgeable about their needs, testing, evaluating the students, attending conferences and seminars (we don’t get that much). (Natalie, Interview 2)

Individualized Education Program (IEP)

She continued in speaking to her job roles and responsibilities as:

For my roles and responsibilities as an itinerant APE teacher, well, my first responsibility is to the students and their safety. I make sure they are in their correct program, testing, evaluation, writing IEPs. I work with the teachers and meet some parents, so my main role is with the students but I do a lot of talking with the teachers and OT teachers. (Natalie, Interview 1)

Planning and Documenting

Apart from what Natalie had mentioned earlier in terms of IEP development, she considered planning of units and lessons, maintaining students’ school records, and recording progress in skill performances as all-important to her role and responsibilities.

Skill Teaching and Learning

Natalie believed her work at ensuring students’ skill acquisition, development, and proficiency were important to the daily enjoyment of students depending on individual differences and needs. She also regarded skill acquisition important to the future activities of the students (e.g. swimming in the community).
Case III—Research Objective 2—To Determine and Describe How Natalie Executed Her Roles and Responsibilities

Testing and Assessing

Natalie explained that assessment in her teaching was a responsibility she executed. She claimed to test and assess students in locomotor, gross motor, and social skills. She often tested them as a whole group and in smaller groups if need be. In doing so, she normally used TGMD (Ulrich, 2000) as the main instrument for testing and assessing motor development.

Consulting

As indicated earlier Natalie provided consultation when requested by a teacher or other professionals for information on placement or referral. She sometimes tested the students on various motor skills. In consulting she also gave pieces of advice on issues pertaining to exposure to recreation and other activities and where to get peer models.

Inclusion Practices

Natalie did not delve into inclusion as a part of her roles or responsibilities. She only had a chance to include students without disabilities in her APE classes if such students were around when she was teaching and if they wanted to take part in the planned activities. She indicated that all her classes were self-contained and therefore segregated (e.g., comprised only of students with disabilities).

Rules and Routines

Speaking to her practice, Natalie said she established rules and routines to make it easier for students to know what was expected of them in everything and to assist the students in transitions. She said she had five rules, which were established at the
beginning of the school year and then reiterated as needed. For example, class rules included: ‘Stand in your own space’, ‘Keep your arms to yourself’, and ‘Listen before you perform’.

Organization and Management

In discussing how she went about organizing and managing her classes to achieve optional success Natalie said:

I put all my equipment out, follow my routines (sitting to listen to instruction or starting to run), demonstrate, do particular activities, use of other teachers, and end with a sticker or review (Natalie, Interview 1).

In executing her teaching responsibilities, Natalie said she recognized the issue of safety as an integral aspect. Some safety issues she encountered regarded obstruction of the learning environment with tables, chairs, and other objects (sharp ones), doors, projecting concrete, playground equipment, improper use of bat by students, and improper use of scooters. To ensure safety Natalie said she moves around the setting showing the students the proper ways to do things and she would go to the principal or custodian in certain cases of misbehavior.

Executing Her Roles and Responsibilities: What Natalie Said and Did

Natalie had stated that unit and lesson planning was very important especially in middle schools. Furthermore, she explained that a first year teacher should be monitored to plan units and daily lessons but that she was not. She commented, however, that while teaching sometimes she wrote notes on what students did in class so that she could later talk to their teachers. Ten of her lessons were observed to actually take note of how her roles and responsibilities were executed. The following excerpts came from field notes taken during two of the nonparticipant observations.
There was no lesson plan made available for the researcher to review. However, the researcher was made aware that in this particular class the lesson objective was kicking accuracy. The following field notes were taken:

**Number of students was twenty and number of teacher aides was six.**

The lesson started with warm up involving stretching, walking, jogging, sit-ups, jumping jacks, and body twisting. After warm up followed set induction.

**Set Induction and lesson content:** Students sat in a horseshoe formation. Teacher asked questions about various positions and responsibilities, for example, goalkeeper, defense and offense. Teacher started giving positions and formed teams, one team in colored braids [pennies]. The rest were to sit and observe until their turn. Two teams started and teacher made changes (substitution). Substitutes for each team were arranged sitting one behind the other. Players who were substituted sat behind the other substitutes yet to have a turn that is joining the line from behind the last student. Goalkeepers were changed to become field players. Teacher immediately informed them that as field players they were not allowed to use their hands and those field players who became goalkeepers could use their hands. The teacher and the other teacher assisting were actively involved, one officiating and Natalie organizing substitutions. At a point in the lesson, one boy and girl who were weaker than the rest were given the chance to kick the ball [given individual attention].

**Closing:** Teacher stopped and called all students together sitting in a circle. Teacher talked about good performance and floor hockey for next class. (Natalie, Field Notes, Lesson # 2)

After the class there was a brief post-lesson conference and her comments were recorded. Natalie was asked to reflect on her organizational skill in the substitution of players. She was asked why the teacher aides did not assist in any way. She responded that the teacher aides assist if they want to, but they would often sit and talk while teaching was going on. “It had been a big problem we [APE teachers] always talked about but there seemed not to be any positive change”, stated Natalie.

Later, another lesson with preschool students was observed and this class involved a series of safety issues. The following field notes were taken:
The number of students was seven and one teacher aide. The lesson objective was to learn roller-skating for fun. Skating shoes were available for all students.

**Starting:** Students were assisted by the teacher and teacher aide to put on their skating shoes and they moved round the carpeted classroom to familiarize themselves with the shoes. There was a cluster of tables and chairs in the middle of the carpeted area and the students were moving (skating) round the pile. Some of the students were falling very often. Any time they moved and balanced towards the heel they fell. The teacher and aide assisted those who would fall to get back on their feet. Feedback was very rare yet the teacher encouraged the students to continue. (Natalie, Field Notes Lesson # 5).

From the post-lesson conference an important safety issue manifested. This regarded skating on the carpet. When asked why students were skating only on the area with the carpet surface Natalie responded, “The carpet slows down the speed of the skates reducing danger and building confidence.” She also commented that students liked skating because it was fun for them. However, her supervisor did not want them to teach skating as such they had to stop doing so. Despite this, Natalie had still taught skating in some schools to the preschoolers.

**IEP Writing and Evaluation**

Like her assessments that were also connected with IEP development, Natalie said she used students’ IEP objectives for guidance but she also observed students mostly to notice their behaviors because she wanted to assess the students early or prior to teaching them in her class. Apart from that Natalie emphasized that she utilized file information on students especially those with behavior problems to enable her to work more effectively. She reviewed IEPs for each student four times each year and rewrote and updated IEP information as needed.
Case III—Research Objective 3—To Determine and Describe Natalie’s Views on How Effective She did Her Job

Natalie believed in her own teaching effectiveness. In fact, she described teaching effectiveness partially by using herself as example, and talked about her strengths and weakness in teaching. Natalie declared that she was very effective. She said to be very effective one has to do a good job of making sure that the students were always first and you were doing your job. Among the many variables she mentioned that facilitated her job-related effectiveness was the willingness of the teacher aides to work, and teamwork especially with co-workers helping each other and coming up with ideas. To a lesser extend teamwork with other teachers which could be very effective if they were to collaborate was important to her teaching efficacy. Additionally, attending workshops, conferences, and seminars was nice to meet other APE teachers to give and get ideas. It is also important that APE teachers acquired information from other areas claimed Natalie. For example, gaining information about students’ behaviors was important to provide consistency in the management strategies used by all people who work with the student.

Considering her effectiveness in terms of strengths, Natalie remarked that good organization skills, being approachable, creativity in teaching activities, and the love for the job were necessary teacher dispositions. Natalie suggested that her weaknesses were that she always had a hard time seeing other people’s views but rather tending to always stick to her own, sometimes getting mad too quickly, and lack of developing units and lesson plans. She said getting over such tendencies would make her more effective than she had been, so she believed being accepting and opening up to suggestions and
different ideas, being friendly, and having good temperament makes one approachable, and keeping updated documents were all very important for effective pedagogy practice.

**Case III—Research Objective 4—To Determine and Describe How Knowledge Acquired During Professional Preparation (Preservice) and Development (Inservice) Influenced Natalie in Doing Her Job**

*Natalie’s Professional Preparation*

Natalie had earned a bachelor degree (BA) in education majoring in physical education and a master’s degree in APE. Recalling the coursework that has had the greatest influence on her job she said:

> The assessment class was great. We had to assess the students to give their IEPs to get to know the different assessments, to help each student and it helps to know what assessments are out there. When we have problems or difficulties we look them up now. To the other courses, I like the ones that were hands-on, where we could get out. Among all of the courses taken, assessment was the best one. (Natalie, Interview 1)

Natalie also commented that in terms of her teacher preparation more hands-on experiences would have been better, both to add more knowledge and gain practical learning. But she did not have hands-on experiences rather she gained her knowledge by years of inservice teaching.

*Inservice Workshops and Conferences*

Natalie recalled that there had been several workshops or conferences organized during professional development days for all physical education teachers in the district, but none specifically for APE teachers. She felt that she had benefited most from workshops and conferences that were geared towards APE. Natalie added that she had recently taken a computer course for teachers to get computers into the classroom.
Case III—Research Objective 5—To Determine and Describe Natalie’s Professional Interactions and Relationships with Parents, IEP Team Members, and Other Persons with Whom She Worked

Parents

Describing her interactions and relationship with parents, Natalie commented:

With parents we don’t really interact. I’ve met a few [parents] during conferences. That is basically been it. Most of our parents barely interact with teachers. Many don’t go to parent-teacher conferences; maybe three parents will go to the meetings. It’s sad. They might say they don’t have transportation. They have our phone numbers so any questions they could call us or relay a message through the classroom teacher. When they look at the IEP it is not their top concern, I wouldn’t say our relationship is collaborative because there is hardly any relationship. I know part of it is our problem because we don’t take the initiative. We have so many kids. I know that is a bad excuse but that’s the way it is. I’m open if parents need help but it’s hard because they are not interested. (Natalie, Interview 1)

Co-Workers and Other Teachers

Natalie described her interactions and relationships with team members. With coworkers Natalie said they were six APE staff and they have a supervisor. They met once a week and talked about concerns to help each other and come up with ideas. The supervisor (boss) may come in every other week but it depended on whether or not there was an issue to be discussed. Her interactions with the APE staff were very collaborative and supportive.

With regard to her relationships with other teachers in the schools, she commented:

It depends on the school. Of all the schools, I really actually know three of the regular physical education teachers. They are not in the building when we are. That’s how we use their gym. I am allowed to use her equipment at the most of the schools and they can use my equipment. That’s cooperative. I get along very well with two. There’s one I don’t get along with well. The other two we work very well together so our relationship is collaborative. The two are very cooperative and some of my kids see them for physical education. It is not just
that I work with them. They [students] get extra with them. They are very good. (Natalie, Interview 1)

Natalie described her interaction and relationship with administrators:

At the beginning of the year I introduce myself to the principals, and that’s basically all I see of them. A couple of them I see every time but I’m not friends with any of them. They are busy doing their job and out of the building. I say “Hi!” Sometimes but that’s basically how it goes. They don’t observe me. I’d describe it as hardly any relationship. Only one principal I talk to more than three times a year, she asks how it is going. (Natalie, Interview 1)

Other Professionals

Speaking to her interactions and relationships with other professionals, for example OTs and PTs, Natalie said:

The OT/PT at one school came in my class and we taught together. That was wonderful. The kids really needed it. We go on different days. I say “Hi!” and if there are any issues we talk and try to collaborate. We don’t all go to the same schools. Our relationship is collaborative. They collaborate with other APE teachers at other schools as well. We actually talk it is not just “Hi!” we talk about kids. Not all the time but we do talk if it’s not there, it’s here at the office. (Natalie, Interview 1).

Case III—Research Objective 6—To Determine and Describe any Job-Related Concerns, which Hindered Natalie’s Consulting and/or Teaching Effectiveness

Concerns

Considering concerns from her perspective, Natalie commented on variables that hindered her teaching/consulting:

What impedes me is the lack of ability to have a regular gym instead of having a cafeteria. That to me is a big impediment. Lack of time, for example, we have lunch from 11:15 am until 11:30 am, you can’t get in because they [students] are eating. To me constrains, sometimes administrators trying to run your class when they don’t know what is going on. Not getting the help you need. You have things planned and they [equipment] are not there, you have to change things. Sometimes we are in a classroom, instead of a gym. It is difficult to teach
[physical activities] in a classroom. Some schools cooperate. Some people don’t want to be a team player and some people are great at it. (Natalie, Interview 1)

**Support**

Natalie explained also that the behavior of most teacher aides was problematic. She pointed out that some of them were very helpful, but others not helpful at all. Natalie stated that even if you showed them what to do they would respond, “How can I do that?”

In one of Natalie’s classes that was observed the following field notes were taken:

- **Number of students** was twelve and two teacher aides.
- **Activity:** Baseball
- **Start:** Students sat on the turf [outside in the open] listening to the teacher
- **Set Induction:** Teacher explained the game asking a student to demonstrate running to first base, second base, third base, and home. Teacher asked students what happens to the player who bats the ball. Students responded that the player runs from base to base. Teacher asked what happens to the bat and a student responded the batsman drops the bat. Teacher asked how and why the bat is dropped but not thrown and a student responded it would hit somebody. Teacher dwelt on the risk factor and talked about the risks in the game and what students should and shouldn’t do. Teacher then called students by name and positioned them.
- **Activity:** Students started to bat the ball. One student hit the ball and dropped the bat running to first base; teacher called and explained why it was a foul. (1) ball went outside boundaries to the player’s left hand (2) bat was dropped far outside the home lines. Teacher explained that ball hit should be within the two boundaries and bat should be dropped at the home. Another student hit and ball went outside boundaries and backwards. The player had to hit again. Teacher changed teams after all students in the batting groups had a turn. The two aides were all along standing with folded arms and were talking. One aide only helped about five minutes towards the end of class.

- **Closing:** When all students had had the chance to bat in both teams teacher asked students to sit down and went through rules regarding the play to end the class.

During the post lesson discussion, Natalie made a comment about the teacher aides:
They only assist if they want to so what you noticed is not something new to me. I could have used their help to assist students running from base to base but they were just spectators. (Natalie; Field Notes, Lesson # 8).

Natalie discussed her concerns about lack of adequate support and a need for more workshops or conferences for professional development purposes. She mentioned that typically workshops were organized for GPE but not APE teachers. The few workshops that APE teachers attended were not organized by the local public school system. Natalie also expressed concerns about her inability to attend IEP meetings, lack of support, and rare communication with parents. On issue of not regularly attending IEP meetings, Natalie explained that she had too many students and too large of a caseload to do so because so she could not miss her classes. The perceived lack of support from most school principals was also a concern. Natalie indicated that there was hardly any relationship with the school principals. Moreover, the principals did not observe the APE teachers because they were not considered part of the schools by these principals.

**Equipment**

Lack of adequate equipment especially for her preschoolers seemed to be problematic. Natalie commented that she purchases equipment with her personal money to take to the schools. She explained that they have a budget so the APE teachers collaborate and figure out what they needed, yet still the budget was consistently less every year. She further indicated that some schools have a lot of equipment and others have the bare minimum. This was attributed to the socioeconomic status of the local surrounding community. At some schools, Parent-Teacher Associations (PTA) had raised money to buy equipment outside of what had been bought from the school’s budget. Some do more fundraising than others. To deal with inadequate equipment, Natalie explained:
I bring my own. If they don’t have it, we have to bring it. There’s nothing else we can do if they don’t have funds. We don’t have the funds to help them. They have to come up with ideas on their own to get some equipment; Ask for donations or whatever. Sometimes sports groups give them equipment. There are schools within the system that hardly have anything. It’s sad. (Natalie, Interview 1)

Transportation (Traveling)

Natalie did not talk much about the issue of transportation or traveling. Her general comment was that she did not think anything could be done about it so she would just accept the situation since she was being reimbursed for transportation costs.

Natalie’s Professional Interaction and Relationships

Natalie felt that she was not viewed by her colleagues or administrators as an integral part of the schools she taught at. In one of the schools for example, there were photographs of all teachers at that school displayed on a picture board, but there was no photo of Natalie. She commented that “We were not considered part of the school.” Natalie stated that “There is gross disrespect for our position and that is a big concern.” There was very little interaction between Natalie and any other teacher in the schools. The only classroom teachers that had some interaction with Natalie were the ones who had their students coming to her classes.

In summarizing her major concerns, Natalie said:

Being more team-oriented with other teachers [professionals, supervisor treating us with respect]; why do we have restrictions to attend seminars, conferences just because students would miss out? The disrespect and disregard to our position, office, and job. (Natalie, Interview 2).
Case III—Research Objective 7—To Determine and Describe Natalie’s Views on How Her Job could be Improved and Her Overall Job Satisfaction

Professional Preparation

Natalie explained that she had taught APE classes even before she got her master’s degree in APE. She said when she started teaching APE she was ‘scared to death’ because what ‘they (teacher preparation programs) teach in the books is not the same thing that practically occur’. Recalling her professional preparation and what was lacking Natalie believed that to improve the system:

We need more mobility, at least go into the gym and teach other classmates to get more hands on experience especially in summer classes when you can’t get out there in the schools to interact more with the students and teachers. Even teaching peers instead of listening to lectures and writing papers, well you need these but more hands on. (Natalie, Interview 2).

Support: Interactions in the Schools

Natalie felt that the limited interaction with teacher aides and the lack of required assistance as a problem. For improving this she suggested:

They could be more effective by helping those students who need help to be more successful. I need only a few of them to be more productive instead of more sitting. (Natalie, Interview 2).

Collaboration

Commenting on ways to improve interactions and professional relationships with other teachers, administrators, other professionals (OTs, PTs), and parents, Natalie said:

More meetings. More team meetings and collaboration. Our public school system is huge but somewhere people need to get together even if it is by phone, and same way with principals. They come in and look at your class for a few minutes and freak out because you’re playing games. You’re supposed to be playing games. With parents it would be great if they would come in to see what their kids could do not what they can’t do. Some of them feel they are in denial, especially with the young children. The older parents know but don’t think their kid can do a
lot. If they would come in and actually see, it would give them a clearer picture. In sum, having assistance from other professionals and respect for our position, office and job by other teachers, and principals treating us like other teachers in the schools are ways to collaborate. (Natalie, Interview 1).

**Professional Development**

We should also have a handbook for quick references, for example, to look up tools, behavior, etc, more in-service on specifics for example PE Central website has some specific activities but mainly for regular PE so we need what we can use for our kids; list of APE teachers in and around my working area or the whole state to brainstorm when we don’t attend in-service, seminars, and conferences. Also access to computers to enhance our work [e.g. IEPs] is important. (Natalie, Interview 1).

**Equipment and Facilities**

We need more access and time to use the gym and get basic equipment that we can keep. We can have a general pool as we already have but some equipment like small balls, rackets, and so on I think we should have our own. (Natalie, Interview 2).

**Inclusion Practices**

I think if we can have inclusion it will go a long way to improve the socialization of our students with and without disabilities. They will be more accepting of each other. I will suggest that if not full inclusion there should be at least once a while interaction that will bring the two groups of students together to have physical education. (Natalie, Interview 1).

**Natalie’s Level of Job Satisfaction**

Natalie described her level of job satisfaction as:

For me, basically other than this year, I love my job, coming to school, going out with the kids. That’s what runs me. Going in making kids smile, they make me smile. It makes my day. I enjoy going out and making new things. I like preschoolers and you whip out the ideas and everything is fun and new for them. I love my job. (Natalie, Interview 1).

**A Summary of Natalie’s Behaviors and Contexts**

Daily warm up routines were observed followed by set induction, body of lesson, and closure. All ten lessons observed followed this pattern. During set inductions, Natalie
normally introduced the activities, and then what should be done using demonstrations as needed especially during the first day of introducing a new activities, rules, and expectations. Teaching of particular skills, and giving students directions, or corrections as to specific starting positions and body movement were lacking in Natalie’s teaching behaviors. It seemed lessons were introduced and students were to have fun participating but with limited teaching of skills.

Moreover, specific feedback was rarely given but general feedback was prominent in her teaching. Students in some cases had assistance from teacher aides. Natalie seemed to have good organization skills in all games and activities observed (i.e. floor hockey, duck-duck-goose, and some creative fun games). For example, Natalie did an effective job of organizing during the floor hockey making student substitutions and changes orderly and effectively. Students sat in a line one behind the other and student substitutions were made with outgoing student joining at the back and incoming student from the front of the line. If students’ roles in the game changed, Natalie explained the rules for the new role (position) to each student. Natalie was consistent in showing enthusiasm and active involvement, giving individual attention, and being creative.

While Natalie showed an awareness of most safety issues, other safety issues were overlooked. For example, during one lesson on skating held in a classroom that had floor carpeting, the tables and chairs were arranged in the middle of the classroom and the students were skating around the cluster. Many of the students did not have good control and were falling near or on the tables and chairs every two to three steps. The danger element of a student falling onto the tables or chairs made the environment unsafe.
Another issue regarding the lesson was that students were falling too often but the skill of stopping or controlling the speed was not mentioned.

A question of pedagogy effectiveness at modifying activity, occurred in the volleyball lesson where large and lighter rubber ball were used, which created difficulty as the short students were not able to push the ball over the net unless after several trials and application of extra effort. Yet, Natalie neglected to emphasize the skill of volleying that would allow students to push the ball over the net more effectively.

Natalie’s lessons were mostly successful from the perspective of fun and students enjoyment because of her enthusiasm, involvement, demonstrations, and management skills, and the evidence of love for the job. However, her lessons did not emphasize skill acquisition, development, or proficiency. Her closure always involved some cognitive development questions and answers from the day’s activities.

Case IV: Mary

Finding from Mary’s case study is reported in this section. Again, the purpose of the study was to determine and describe the job roles and responsibilities of APE teachers in itinerant service delivery (teaching/consulting) at urban public city schools. A second purpose was to determine whether or not these APE teachers had any job-related concerns. If so, what were their or her concerns?

Mary’s Professional Preparation

Mary was a 30-year-old White female APE teacher who had earned a bachelor degree (BA) in therapeutic recreation, a master’s degree in physical education, and a master’s degree in APE. Mary explained that after graduating with a BA she worked for six months and enjoyed the clients in therapeutic recreational settings but it became hard
emotionally. After an epidemic that resulted in a lot of several clients passing away she decided to go back to college to train to become an APE teacher. She was asked to complete the PETE Master’s of Education (M.Ed) program for teacher licensure first before matriculation in the APE program. Next, she went straight to do the Master’s of Arts in APE without taking any time off. Mary completed her BA in the mid-1990s and earned two master’s degrees in 2000. After completing the APE degree program she did not take an exam including APENS for certification. But she did receive validation as an APE teacher. Her physical education certification is for K-12 level (Table 4.2).

Mary: Demographics of Experiences, Responsibilities, and School Contexts

Mary explained that she never taught GPE outside her student teaching experiences. But, she had taught four years as an APE teacher. All four years had been in an itinerant position and mostly in the same schools except the current year where she had switched middle schools. Similarly all the APE teachers in the district had switched preschools around. In all, Mary had responsibility for teaching at ten schools every week (including preschools), she could have consultation outside of teaching at those schools in such situations she would go to different schools to consult.

For her responsibilities, Mary taught preschool through high school seniors so she said she taught ‘across the whole spectrum’. She explained the system this way:

What they do for special education is in special needs preschool they combine kindergarten, first and second grade [that is considered primary mentally handicapped (MH)]. Then third, fourth, and fifth grades are in intermediate MH; then they group middle schoolers sixth, seventh, and eighth; and then high schoolers from ninth to twelfth graders together. Sometimes the seniors will stay an extra year or so because they are allowed to stay until they are twenty-one years of age. (Mary, Interview 1)
The total number of students per class ranged between 8 and 21 but with an average of ten. In terms of her caseload, Mary said she taught a total of 75 to 100 students but none in inclusive settings. The students had various disabilities and different levels of severity. She explained:

I have students who are very severe in terms of behavior [emotional-behavioral disorders] and understanding and with physical disabilities and I have students who are very high [functioning] and understand a lot and can participate in form of organized games. (Mary, Interview 1).

The socioeconomic status of her students was low to middle class, and 60% of them were African Americans and 40% were White students (Table 4.1).

**Case IV—Research Objective 1—To Determine and Describe Mary’s Roles and Responsibilities**

*Indirect Service*

Mary asserted that providing indirect services (consulting) was less important than direct services, because they are not asked to consult. She explained that she sometimes did some consulting work whenever a GPE teacher approached her department and had some concerns for a student who could not perform in the same way as another typically developing youngster. In such a case, Mary would typically complete an assessment. She explained that consulting was additional work but no additional income. It was part of her regular job but outside the ten schools she taught at.

*Direct Service*

In describing her job roles and responsibilities, Mary discussed her day-to-day activities. She said:

I have to travel from school to school so I use my own resources to do that. I get reimbursed but I am responsible for maintaining my car. I am responsible for
teaching students sports skills and motivating them to become physically active and teaching them about places in the community where they can be physically active. That’s what the textbook defines. Further, I have to be mother, comforter, nurse, sometimes. There are all kinds of different things that I don’t always think about. I just kind of do it. (Mary, Interview 1)

*Individualized Education Program (IEP)*

Writing IEPs for her students was a responsibility as described by Mary. She attended IEP meetings only a handful of times in a given year because of her workload. Mary said she could not attend IEP meetings regularly because it was inappropriate to leave her regularly scheduled classes. Further, she was discouraged from doing so because she felt that parents do not seem to view the meetings as important to attend.

*Safety of Students*

The issue of safety as Mary discussed was an integral aspect of her role and responsibilities. Some safety issues she mentioned regarded wearing of improper clothing, shoes, behaviors of putting things in the mouth or eating/chewing on equipment, and acts of hurting each other. Mary described important roles and responsibilities:

In my opinion, the most important roles and responsibilities are to provide safe, enjoyable activities; stepping outside normal PE to get movement; to collaborate with other teachers; to be a team player. (Mary, Interview 2)

*Planning and Documenting*

Considering the issue of documentation as a responsibility Mary explained:

It is important, it is not meant for accountability but we are expected to keep them and so we can track student’s progress, for example performance records. With planning (Lesson/unit, plans), I don’t need them because the more experience you have the less planning. We don’t rely on unit plans because the benchmarks set for us by our public school system are just like unit plans. In some cases unit plans or lesson plans are not applicable due to the students’ disability. (Mary, Interview 2)
**Skill Teaching and Learning**

Another responsibility described by Mary was teaching of skills. She described teaching skill acquisition, development, and proficiency as very important but before that students should be encouraged to like moving. She described the ultimate goal of APE pedagogy as to help the students develop skills for their daily enjoyment and future success, and also a way of preparing the students for life-long activity.

**Case IV—Research Objective 2—To Determine and Describe How Mary Executed Her Roles and Responsibilities**

**Testing and Assessing**

Mary stated that she executed her roles and responsibilities in different ways by using different approaches. She mentioned assessment as one way of executing her responsibility. For example with consulting she assesses the students. She explained:

> The process of doing that is we go out and observe the kid in the regular physical education environment first to determine if we need to do assessment. If we need assessment we do it and then we take it from there. Apart from such situations, I normally assess my students in gross motor skills and fitness. I use standardized test, TGMD or AAHERD test. I test six year olds through twelfth grade. (Mary, Interview 2).

**Consulting**

Mary did do consulting when she received referrals. As she discussed, it was a part of her responsibility if she had to do consulting. She said “Last year I had three or four consulting sessions that resulted in assessment but this year I’ve had only one.”

**Inclusion Practices**

Mary confirmed that she did not teach in inclusive GPE settings but taught only APE classes which served only students with disabilities.
Rules and Routines

In executing her teaching responsibilities she noted:

I establish rules and routines because if you don’t they walk all over you especially with autistic kids. At the beginning of the school year, I post the rules. I teach skills [motor and sport] so they can participate in games and sports for enjoyment and their future. (Mary, Interview 2).

Organization and Management

To achieve optimal success there was the need to organize and manage classes. This was also the reason for establishing rules and routines and the use of teacher aides. (Mary, Interview 2).

Mary continued:

The teaching goes with safety as a responsibility. There are several safety issues and to ensure safety I constantly supervise; take care of equipment setting so it is not dangerous, always do check before class and ensure safe floor environment. (Mary, Interview 2).

Executing Her Roles and Responsibilities: What Mary Said and Did

The following field notes were written while observing one of Mary’s classes:

Activity: Line Tag
Number of students: 18
Number of Teacher Aides: 1 (25 minutes late)
Objectives: Fitness, Fun.

Start: Warm up- playing around with basketball
Stretching- arm circling, waist twisting round, trunk bending to touch toes with fingers (leg opened shoulder with apart), crossing legs while standing and touching toes with fingers; sit and reach (knees bent), and soles of both feet touching (knees apart), crossing one leg over the thigh to touch floor at the side of thigh, in pairs one spotting holding feet on floor the other did sit-ups with knee bent (flexed), push-ups to end the series. Students jog three times round the gym to end the warm-ups.

Skill Work (Activity): One student with ball in hand chased rest of students who were walking on lines drawn on the floor of the gym. Student with ball tried to throw ball at those walking aiming below their waist. If any of them was touched
he or she sat down. While walking a student couldn’t jump lines but walked along by connecting to another joining line (intersecting or meeting another). Teacher gave time out to students who did not obey instructions and misbehaved.

**Closing:** Teacher assembled all students to the center of the gym to sit down. Teacher talked to students asking questions about what they did for the day and informed them about following week’s activity to be kickball.

During the post lesson conference, Mary talked about the lesson:

> The beginning of the class seemed messy because of the organization and management. Without any aide it took a long time to organize them. Secondly, some had problems understanding the movement and the rule of not jumping to connect lines. I was happy towards the end they understood it and had fun. (Mary, Post-Lesson Conference Lesson # 4)

**IEP Writing and Evaluation**

Students’ IEPs seemed very important to Mary, so she utilized IEP information from other professionals and she also provided information to teachers and other professionals. This way she tried to be consistent with the teachers about what she expected from a student. As a responsibility therefore, she reviewed each student’s IEP about three to four times each year. Explaining how often she utilized IEP information Mary said:

> You want to say everyday, but honestly there are things that come up during the lesson or the week that you might not be able to address. Generally in high school it is trying to get them to understand more complex abstract rules and boundaries, and they do. They learn where a foul line is and 3-point line. They can deal with offenses and defenses. That’s what my goal is. I want them to be able to participate at a recreation center or with a group of friends. I want them to be a fan. I want them to be able to watch a basketball game and say ‘Oh they made 3 points’ or offense was looking good but defense wasn’t’. (Mary, Interview 1).

**Case IV—Research Objective 3—To Determine and Describe Mary’s Views on How Effective She did Her Job**

The most effective way Mary does her job was viewed from comments about her effectiveness and about strengths and weaknesses. Mary mentioned that one effective
way to do her job was to attend conferences or workshops that gave her activities to use in her classes. Refresher courses also gave Mary the opportunity to learn new things and served as reminders for things that need to be done. Mary asserted that she was fairly effective and viewed it from the sense that she did different things:

I try to include all kinds of activities. Not only group activities, I try to do cooperative activities. I’ve done aerobics, weight lifting, and pedometers. So I try to include a good balance of activities and try to get them to like activity and encourage them to do their best. They do real well. (Mary, Interview 1)

She continued discussing her effectiveness in terms of strengths and weaknesses:

I am open to ideas, I am an advocate to get kids moving more outside school period; I am good at developing positive relationship with kids. On the contrary, a lot of times I am not structured like others. I could be more diligent in planning and I think those are good qualities for being effective. (Mary, Interview 2).

Mary also noted that one of the most effective ways of doing her job was through communication. She said communication with co-workers, other IEP team members, and the APE supervisor was necessary to solve problems and share ideas. Notwithstanding this, an example of a need for better communication to solve a problem was given by Mary regarding no access to computers. In this example, student IEP objectives could have been more easily developed on computers-based programs but no one had communicated with or informed the APE teachers of the computer-based IEP programs and as such they did not until recently learn of or how to use these programs. Moreover, it was hard to get in contact with the supervisor to communicate such problems.
Case IV—Research Objective 4—To Determine and Describe how Knowledge Acquired During Professional Preparation (Preservice) and Development (Inservice) Influenced Mary in Doing Her Job

Mary's Professional Preparation

Mary noted that she had a bachelor degree in therapeutic recreation, master’s degree in education (M.Ed), and a master’s degree in APE. Talking about her knowledge base that had influenced her role and responsibilities, she explained:

I would say definitely my assessment class that was part of my master’s in APE coursework. Learning about different types of assessment that might be used in assessing motor skills was good. We currently use Test of Gross Motor Development (TGMD). I would say that was probably the most helpful class. I got a feel for the different types of assessment out there and I knew what to do when I got my current position within this school district. I knew what I needed to do with TGMD. (Mary, Interview 2).

Mary continued:

I also gained from my practicum experiences. I did two for my MA and three for the M. Ed. While I feel like I gained some experience, I felt a lot better being out on my own without a supervisor directly over me. I felt more confident that way and I gained much more out of the experience being on my own my first year and with my peer assistance review (PAR) person. (Mary, Interview 2).

In continuing her comment, she referenced in a generic way the PETE preparation program. Mary stated that her university was one of the best to attend for physical education and therefore her overall preparation had helped her do a better job. However, she complained that there was a lot of emphasis on research and theory that could have been given to more time in teaching settings. Further, she explained that she had benefited from learning to develop lesson plans and unit plans. In terms of the experience comparatively, Mary explained that she had a better experience in the APE program
because it allowed her more flexibility. In light of this, she said her cooperating teachers in the APE program were more flexible and guided her and had assisted in skill building.

*Inservice Workshops and Conferences*

Mary added that workshops as well as refresher courses had been beneficial. She noted that her school district gave about three to four professional development days. Also if they were given the opportunity, she attended in-service workshops that would be helpful where she would receive a lot of ideas. She also commented that she had recently taken some graduate courses, as refresher courses, for her re-certification and that those courses too had increased or enhanced her knowledge base.

*Case IV—Research Objective 5—To Determine and Describe Mary’s Professional Interactions and Relationships with Parents, IEP Team Members, and Other Persons with Whom She Worked*

*Parents*

Mary described her professional interactions and relationships with parents as limited. She noted that except for some few IEP meetings that she attended where she might meet some parents, Mary hardly had any interactions with parents. She felt that there was a limited amount of time for such meetings. She attended only a handful of IEP meetings in the school year. Mary felt that she could not cancel classes to go to these meetings and many parents also worked at night and would not attend meetings held in the evenings. So while the day was not conducive for the APE teachers to IEP meetings, evenings would not be possible for many parents to do so. Therefore, she relied on classroom teachers who attended IEP meetings for information on IEPs and communication of students’ issues.
Co-Workers and Other Teachers

Professional interactions and relationships with coworkers, other teachers, administrators, and other professionals were described as mostly collaborative. Mary stated that there was a scheduled meeting time once a week for her department. During that time all the coworkers discussed what was coming up, for example, for Special Olympics. They discussed what the concerns and how they could address them. They had collaborative and supportive relationships. Interactions and relationships with other teachers such as the GPE teachers in the schools as well as classroom teachers were described as collaborative. Mary put it this way:

Basically, I try to touch base with the general physical education teachers to make the connections so I’ll be able to use their equipment. That’s the main thing. The other teachers come in and assist and I have teaching assistants that help me out in the classroom. We try to help each other out and they recognize the importance of APE. (Mary, Interview 1).

To some extent Mary felt that there were collaborative relationships with administrators. This was how she described it:

At the beginning of each year I try to make a phone call to the principals to let them know when I’m coming to clear up any miscommunication. When I first go to the school I introduce myself, shake hands to let them know my face and what I’m doing in there. I rarely have principals come in and observe my class. They are supposed to walk in occasionally but I rarely have that happen. They think my supervisors will take care of that. I try to cooperate as much as I can and they try to be considerate of me and let me know if there is something going on. So for the most part I will say there is collaboration but there are sometimes I get pushed out of the gym and I have to hold my class in a classroom. That is frustrating because I don’t get a schedule ahead of time but the teachers in the school might. (Mary, Interview 1).
Other Professionals

Although, mostly positive with other teachers and school administrators, Mary insisted that her interactions and relationships with other professionals including the OTs and PTs were much more collaborative. Mary commented:

At one of my schools the PTs come in during APE time to help out and that’s really nice. I’ll occasionally, if there is an orthopedic issue consult with the PT and come to a conclusion as to how I can help that kid or what I need to keep in mind in terms of adapting. I work with OTs too in terms of fine motor skills like holding a paddle, etc. They have good ideas and I try to consult with them. They also come to me so I would definitely say we kind of bounce ideas off each other. I try to be consistent with the teachers about my expectations of a student. (Mary, Interview 1).

Case IV—Research Objective 6—To Determine and Describe any Job-Related Concerns, which Hindered Mary’s Consulting and/or Teaching Effectiveness

Concerns

Considering what variables hindered Mary’s effectiveness, she made the following observations:

A lot of it is technology. We don’t have access to IEPs on the computer yet. Every other area has been taught to do that. We are still handwriting ours out. This is 2004. That is kind of frustrating. We don’t even have a formalized consulting sequence in place. We try to sit down with the special education department head to go over this with her. It has been approved with the PE head but she [special education department head] won’t sit down with us and tell us what is good and bad and why. We don’t have a form to give GPE teachers. We have to rely on them to call us and tell us if there is something going on. That’s frustrating too. There are all kinds of things. The weather makes it hard to get to my classes sometimes. (Mary, Interview 2).

Support

Talking about support, Mary discussed how and when teacher aides did assist but it depended on the school. In some schools they assisted effectively but in others they did not. She also mentioned a lack of support from parents some of whom did not show
concern and love for their children, as they should and even to support the efforts of the APE teachers. Moreover, Mary felt that budget limitations do not permit them (i.e., district’s APE teachers) to have support by way of attending in-service workshops or conferences. So the limited opportunity to attend conferences or in-service workshops made it difficult to be more effective and current in their practices.

**Caseloads and Class Sizes**

Other concerns regarded the number of schools and the caseload or relatively large number of students APE teachers taught at a time in some schools. This also created the problem of the teacher’s restricted ability to attend IEP meetings. Mary also mentioned some problems faced in the schools. For example, she commented on the disrespect shown her whenever her classes were kicked out of the gym.

**Equipment**

A concern about equipment was described. Mary reiterated that they (APE teachers) had some equipment at least to work with in some areas for example basketballs. They decide at the beginning of the year to figure out who was going to teach what and when. For instance, the equipment changed hands every three weeks but she commented:

> What is frustrating sometimes is that I might teach basketball in the fall and I want to revisit it in the winter but basketballs aren’t available so I have to rely on the regular PE teachers. A lot of times they don’t have the same equipment we do. It’s about revisiting a unit, you want to go into it deeper or they really want to do it or there are Special Olympics games and you want them to prepare. That is kind of irritating. We do have a budget every year to buy new equipment but then it comes down to can we really agree on what we need? I might say one thing and someone else will say another. That’s kind of frustrating. I don’t teach roller-skating again because there are no fitting skating shoes for my students. (Mary, Interview 2).
Transportation (Traveling)

Other concerns expressed by Mary involved traveling from school to school and carrying, and loading and unloading equipment using her car to transport needed equipment. As she expressed, it is difficult to get groceries when your car is loaded with equipment from school. Also of concern was that these APE teachers received no extra pay for consulting because it was part of the job. “As a weakness a lot of times I am too content, not so much structured like others, pretty relaxed,” admitted Mary.

Mary’s Professional Interactions and Relationships

Mary seemed to have some level of collaboration with GPE teachers in some of the schools because they allowed her to use their equipment. With the other classroom teachers she pointed out that some did not even know her. It was either a matter of greetings in a way or just walking around without talking to anybody. “It was not healthy but they do not regard APE as important”, insisted Mary. Summing this up, Mary said:

My major concern is about equipment [some are not in good condition]. We are forced to use equipment for regular PE. I don’t feel much supported. I don’t think our program is valued. Our director of special education has for two years not met with us. (Mary, Interview 2).

Case IV—Research Objective 7—To Determine and Describe Mary’s Views on How Her Job might be Improved and Her Overall Job Satisfaction

Professional Preparation

Mary commented that teacher preparation had certain things that needed clarifying. She said:

I think there was a lot of emphasis on lesson plans and unit plans. I understand they are important and I rely on them today. But I think there was so much emphasis on doing it one way. Allowing me to have more freedom with that and design one for what I was teaching would have been a lot easier and less
frustrating. In my PE experience there was always someone hovering over me and that frustrated me a lot. I think having more freedom would make a better experience. Also it seems rigid, but more flexibility would lead to creativity. (Mary, Interview 2).

Mary gave some suggestions for preservice training that would alleviate some of the concerns and in turn improve her service delivery:

I think knowing about urban kids is good to know and to work with them [to know about issues and what to do], I would like to see that during pre-service preparation. Sign language is important to our job; more experiences in IEP writing and comparing IEP from other places. (Mary, Interview 2).

Support: Interactions in the Schools

Interactions and relationships could also be improved through meetings so teachers in the schools would know us and work with us respectfully. Principals could also have regular visits to us and encourage the students because they need that motivation and recognition. I believe the principals should be mandated to check the aides who do not work hard or attend APE so that warnings and recommendations could be given about them to terminate their job if they would not work. (Mary, Interview 1).

Collaboration

Mary gave some idea about how she thought they could collaborate.

It would also be easier if we could sit down as a group and discuss ideas or goals and objectives for the students. With the aides it would be great if they participated in the activities with the kids. I use them mostly for behavior control issues. If they really help, students would have more time on task. (Mary, Interview 2).

Professional Development

The acquisition of new knowledge was something dear to the heart of Mary as she valued knowledge gained about varied activities from the few conferences she did attend. Her suggestion was:

I believe something should be done about the budget so that we can have workshops or conferences for only APE instead of having workshops for all physical education teachers. It will be very important if at least we have one
conference to attend outside our district or even state. We will learn more to enhance our work this way. (Mary, Interview 1).

Mary’s Level of Job Satisfaction

Describing her job satisfaction, Mary commented:

I have the best job in the world. I get to basically have a good time all day long. I move all day. I need that. I wouldn’t want to sit at one place all the day. I like to walk around and move and I like them to have a good time. I try to participate in what I’m teaching as much as the kids do because it gets them motivated. I’d say my job satisfaction is really high. I love what I do. I can’t see myself doing anything different. I have a passion for it. (Mary, Interview 1).

A Summary of Mary’s Behaviors and Contexts

Mary’s lessons were always characterized by warm ups that combined both jogging and stretching, followed by set induction, body of lesson, and closure. Warm up activities were mostly routine. Different skills and activities were observed during the ten lesson observations. These activities included line tag, kickball, and team handball. The researcher made nonparticipant observations at two schools. At Ridgeview High School, eight teacher aides were always present in the APE setting and in most cases three or four of them would assist. Mary’s organization and management efficiency tended to be better with the assistance of the teacher aides. Observations at Ridgeview High School revealed that without teacher aides, Mary had problems organizing students into formations, and motivating their participation in activities. It was obvious that it took her a longer time to organize students into formations and encourage their participation in activities without the help of teacher aides. Mary seemed laidback, at times had difficulty in explaining task statements to the understanding of the students, and she was also not well structured.
Mary was always enthusiastic about her teaching, gave general feedback and encouragement, especially to students with severe disabilities. Group activities featured prominently in her teaching episodes but individual attention was not overlooked. Mary had positive relationships with the students. Nonetheless, she had to deal with misbehaviors and often did so using time outs that lasted long enough to correct and to control such misbehaviors. Her teaching of skills lacked an emphasis on how well students performed the skills so teaching points or holding students accountable for their learning were not characteristic of her practice. An emphasis on fun was part of Mary’s daily objectives and that seemed to influence her teaching behaviors. She explained and demonstrated skills during her lessons. Mary’s closures most often ended with questions in checking for understanding and for students to reflect on what was done for the day. She prepared them by informing students on the activities for the next lesson.

**Case V: Beth**

This section reports findings of the fifth case study. To reiterate the purpose of the study was to determine and describe the roles and responsibilities of APE teachers in itinerant service delivery (direct/consulting) at urban public city schools. A second purpose was to determine whether or not APE teachers had job-related concerns. If so, what were their concerns?

*Beth’s Professional Preparation*

Beth was a 48-year-old White female APE teacher who had earned a BA degree in education with physical education K-12 teacher certification and a Master’s of Art degree (MA) in APE. Beth’s undergraduate major was physical education and health. She completed her undergraduate program in the 1980s and the APE master’s degree program
in the 1990s. Her certification in APE was resultant of her master’s degree but she had not taken the APENS examination. Her other certificates were for elementary GPE, secondary, and health (Tables 4.2).

Beth: Demographics of Experiences, Responsibilities, and School Contexts

Beth had taught APE for 14 years and all those years she had been in an itinerant capacity. Over the years as an itinerant teacher she had changed schools on several occasions. For example, she taught in different schools for 2, 3 and 5 years before she moved on to another school or the schools were changed on an as needed basis. She explained that she could be in some schools longer than others because the change may not affect all the schools at the same time. At the time of this study, she taught at 10 different schools and these included pre-school, elementary, and secondary schools.

Beth taught more than 100 students who had orthopedic disabilities or multiple disabilities. She reiterated that she taught in the city and that the socioeconomic level of these families was mostly low income. But she did coach in one school that was suburban so there were all levels of socioeconomic ranges. Considering ethnic proportions, Beth stated that she taught mostly African Americans (80%) and less so White (10%) and other ethnic groups (10%) (Table 4.1).

Case V—Research Objective 1—To Determine and Describe Beth’s Roles and Responsibilities

Beth discussed that she traveled to different schools dealing mostly with students who had orthopedic disabilities and those with multiple disabilities.
Indirect Services

Beth noted that she did not have ongoing consulting responsibilities. Occasionally, the GPE teachers called on her to evaluate or assess some students and she would give the teachers ideas, but no parent had consulted with her. To her providing either indirect services (consulting) or direct services were both equally important. As Beth explained, she valued both because both direct and indirect services helped the students.

Direct Services

Again, Beth explained that she primarily provided direct teaching services to her students.

Safety of Students

She stated that safety issues were an integral aspect of her teaching. For example, she had to be sure the gym was clear of any dangerous obstacles or furniture, and that students did not collide or crash into each other.

Planning and Documenting

The issue of documentation was also described as very important. Beth said it was very important to write unit and lesson plans and document her plans. She also explained that the IEP is a document that was mandated by Public Law 105-17, IDEA of 1997 so it had to be written.

Skill Teaching and Learning

The teaching of skill development and proficiency was mentioned as her primary responsibility. Beth explained that fun was important to the daily enjoyment of the students because they enjoyed the sportspersonship and leadership roles such as team
captain. She added that students’ skill acquisition, development, and proficiency contributed to future lifetime skills and leisure activities.

In general terms, Beth concluded that she provided both indirect and direct service delivery but indirect service was dependent upon whether or not she was contacted for consultation. However, to her the most important roles and responsibilities were direct service delivery as to get all the kids involved in activities and for them to have fun.

**Case V—Research Objective 2—To Determine and Describe how Beth Executed Her Roles and Responsibilities**

Beth expressed that she provided both direct and indirect services and did so in different ways.

*Testing and Assessing*

Beth stated that she tested and assessed her students on motor skills, fitness, cognitive abilities, and social behavior variables. To do this she used various assessment strategies. For example, to evaluate fitness she would observe and count how many push-ups individual students performed.

*Consulting*

Beth said occasionally if some teachers asked her about how to deal with a behavior issue she would recommend allowing the student to have some activity to do for some time. This worked for some of them because the student would use a lot of energy and thus the student would become calm probably due to exhaustion. Generally, no parent consulted with Beth but some of the other teachers did and her suggestions would depend on what they consulted her about.
Inclusion Practices

Inclusion was not a policy in the district so Beth did not teach in inclusive settings. Still, she had established one basketball inclusive game where she combined students with and without disabilities to play. As she explained “This special game pays off well because it is well patronized by almost all the students in the school as well as teachers.”

Rules and Routines

In executing her teaching responsibilities, Beth disclosed that she establishes rules and routines early on in the school year. More specifically, she would plan her units at the beginning of the year. The rules and routines were established in her teaching settings, for example, warm up and exercise routines. Plus, she established and taught behavior rules to keep students from hitting or kicking each other. She established these at the beginning of the year and enforced them as needed.

Organization and Management

Beth added that to organize and manage the classes to achieve optimal success she used routines. She also ensured safety by talking to students about the need to follow directions and not to be out of control. In some of the classes there was team teaching and the presence of the two teachers helped in organizing and managing the class.

Executing Her Roles and Responsibilities: What Beth Said and Did

Nonparticipant observations were made to capture direct teaching behaviors of Beth. Field notes of one unique lesson are presented below:

The number of students in the class was 20 and 5 teacher aides were present.

Objectives: Cooperative skills/Team Work/Listening skills.

Activity: Wheelchair basketball (Objective given by Beth).
**Equipment:** Two adapted basketball rings, a smaller size basketball.

**Start:** Students were put into two teams of five each. The teams consisted of both students with and without disability. Students played by throwing ball to teammates and moving to make baskets by either getting close to dunk or shooting a field goal. The students without disability on the teams all had to use wheelchair. The majority of students without disability and some teachers were spectators. The setting and class seemed to be a special session, an organized educative session that promoted social inclusion. There were two classes in all for this session for both students with and without disability. Two students were peer helpers pushing around two students who could not move fast by themselves to move up and down the court to the direction of the ball. Occasionally these two students were given the ball to touch and handle and would hand pass to teammate or came very close to the basketball ring to make a personal basket by either pushing the ball in or dropping it. The teams were changed every seven to ten minutes.

**Closing:** The class ended when the bell rung for change of classes. (Field Notes, Lesson # 6).

Since this was the only lesson of its kind observed, Beth explained and discussed it in the post-lesson conference. Beth explained that this lesson was the only time once in a while that the students had the chance to play with their peers without disability. The game brought a whole lot of people to watch and they all loved it (both players and spectators). They always looked forward to having it. Beth emphasized that since they [APE teachers] did not teach in inclusive settings she devised and promoted this session and it had always been a success.

**IEP Writing and Evaluation**

Beth explained the use of IEP information. She indicated use of IEP information was recommended but using information from other professionals regarding IEP goals did not help much. In view of this, she did not give any information unless it was very necessary.
However, as part of her responsibilities she reviewed the IEP document about four times a year, about twice every nine weeks she checked their progress and completed grades.

**Case V—Research Objective 3—To Determine and Describe Beth’s Views on How Effective She did Her Job**

Beth commented that she always did a good job because her students were able to gain confidence. She expressed that confidence building was very important and the effective way to achieve this was to pace the lesson and reduce difficulty of activities to the functional level of students. According to Beth, other variables that facilitate her effectiveness include team teaching because it normally breaks monotony and allowed team-members to confer immediately on issues, variety in lesson presentation (that was good for the students), and the opportunity for team members to learn from each other as well as support and help from OTs, PTs and teacher aides.

Beth stated that attending in-service workshops, conferences, or seminars to get new ideas to use with the students is one of the most beneficial ways to improve her effectiveness in doing her job. But unfortunately her school district did not give them enough professional development opportunities to do so. Most of the workshops may be for GPE teachers but not APE. Occasionally, they got workshop type opportunities rather from one of the local universities that extended an invitation to them for APE focused training. Beth further regarded meetings with coworkers and supervisors as another way of gaining information that would allow her to move effectively to do her job. She elaborated that certain pertinent issues could be discussed, being it behavior or how to introduce or teach a topic. She indicated that they did not get to meet frequently with their APE supervisor to discuss issues pertaining to their work without looking for him.
Case V—Research Objective 4—To Determine and Describe How Knowledge Acquired During Professional Preparation (Preservice) and Development (Inservice) Influenced Beth in Doing Her Job

Beth’s Professional Preparation

Commenting on the knowledge base that has had the greatest influence on her job, Beth stated that probably her physical education field experiences had the most impact. But, she felt also that several courses such as elementary education, core courses, and secondary methods courses all gave her good background knowledge for her job.

Inservice Workshops and Conferences

In addition to the courses mentioned, Beth noted that workshops that were directed towards APE had been very beneficial. She recalled that she got a lot of knowledge talking to professionals in APE on new types of games or skills or other things to try. In any case she did not get the opportunity to attend many such workshops or conferences. She commented that they were not allowed to get professional days every year.

Case V—Research Objective 5—To Determine and Describe Beth’s Professional Interactions and Relationships with Parents, IEP Team Members, and Other Persons with Whom She Worked

Parents

Beth explained that she had interactions and relationships with some parents of students she taught. She stated:

The parents that I get to know are good. They come to my orthopedically handicapped basketball game so I get to know a lot of them otherwise you wouldn’t know the parents. Occasionally too, some of them come to our track meet. (Beth, Interview 1)


**Co-Workers and Other Teachers**

Her interactions and relationships with APE coworkers according to Beth were very friendly, supportive, and collaborative. She stated that the six APE teachers in this school district met once a week to have discussions and interactions. She added that they had a lot of special events so they had to meet to do a lot of planning to organize. She asserted that their supervisor might just peep in while the meeting was going on. While Beth described interactions and relationships with coworkers as mostly friendly, supportive, and collaborative, contrastingly some of the GPE teachers were rather not friendly, supportive, nor collaborative. She noted:

> Most of them [GPE teachers] I get along with but a lot of them don’t like us being in the gym or taking up their time. I have a lot of kids who are developmentally handicapped [DH] and a few of the teachers don’t want the kids in there. Most of them are great and they let us share the gym and sometimes we do activities together collaboratively. A couple of them don’t like us and don’t want us to mess around. (Beth, Interview 1)

Beth continued to describe interactions and relationships with administrators:

> I think it is Ok. They don’t really know that much as we do in the schools. They are not out there every day to see what we are doing. They might come to observe us teach two or three times in a year. They might know the big picture but not what happens every day. They are overwhelmed. Yeah it is ok. Some of them are pretty much supportive of our program. (Beth, Interview 1).

**Other Professionals**

Professional interactions and relationships with other professionals for example OTs and PTs as described by Beth seemed quite good. She commented:

> I think we all have a good relationship. They like what we do and we like what they do. We help each other a lot so I would say the relationship is collaborative. (Beth, Interview 1).
Case V—Research Objective 6—To Determine and Describe any Job-related Concerns, which Hindered Beth’s Consulting and/or Teaching Effectiveness

Concerns

Speaking to variables that hindered her teaching effectiveness, Beth replied:

Scheduling, sometimes we can’t get the gym because they [administrators] forget about us so a lot of time we can’t serve the pre-schoolers. The scheduling and other problems are the same in all the schools. (Beth, Interview 2).

Support

Beth described other issues of concern. She claimed that she gained a lot by attending workshops or conferences but professional development days were infrequent. The APE teachers were not given professional development days each year typically every other year and she had a problem with those limited opportunities. She also cited large class sizes and caseloads as situations that adversely affected her because she said “One cannot be all that effective when there is so much to do.” The itinerant position has “…related problems of traveling from school to school carrying equipment and loading and off loading, and if there are no teacher aides who work hard to assist in organizing and managing behavior the problems become more difficult.” Her comment about the teacher aides was that:

When they [teacher aides] want to participate they do a good job. Some are so good I use those but those who don’t want to work I think have to leave the gym so they don’t adversely influence others. (Beth, Interview 2).

Equipment

The lack of adequate equipment was another area that Beth described as being a constraint affecting her effectiveness. This is what she had to say about equipment:
We have to share so that can be a problem for the six of us [school district APE teachers]. So we try to schedule well but you might get some schedule for special events so sometimes it is not enough. Some of the regular teachers might allow us to borrow their equipment but not all of them. If you want to have an activity and no equipment is available and you can’t borrow then you have to change the activity. We do occasionally have fundraising to buy some equipment but we still need more. (Beth Interview 1).

Transportation (Traveling)

During the interviews Beth did not talk much about issues of transportation or traveling. However, it was clear from the interviews that the constant traveling to and from the many schools she taught at everyday was a problem. She pointed out that there were risk factors because under pressure of making the time to get to the next school anything could happen. She further complained that it was also very tiring.

Beth’s Professional Interactions and Relationships

Beth had stated that some of the teachers in the schools where she taught were great to work with because they were friendly. But she also felt that less than positive professional relationships with other teachers at these schools could adversely affect her job performance. She expressed that some teachers “…just do not like the APE teachers” and as such would make it difficult for them sometimes to use the gym at the appropriate time. Reiterating her major concerns, Beth identified concerns of getting the gym when she needed it, and overcrowded classes. She also mentioned lack of access to adequate equipment to teach such activities as roller-skating or golf.
Case V—Research Objective 7—To Determine and Describe Beth’s Views on How Her Job could be Improve and Her Overall Job Satisfaction

Professional Preparation

Beth mentioned field experiences and some coursework as having a good impact on her job. However, she emphasized that preservice PETE training did not give her enough variety. By explicating her point in terms of what was lacking in her PETE preparation she noted that the standardized lesson plans and formats required of the program faculty could have been less *standardized*, allowing for different types of plans and formats. She suggested that it would be better for PETE teacher candidates to be exposed to different types of unit and lesson plan formats or templates during the field experiences. To some extent there was that rigidity of always using the same types of lesson plans and formats but less flexibility in allowing PETE teacher candidates to come up with their own lesson plans and formats.

Support: Interactions in the Schools

To improve interactions, Beth commented:

> I think it would be nice if parents come to our special events. Teachers support our programs and I think the special events help with that. Administrators and supervisor would come to our special events but administrators in the school building don’t really know what we do so they can come to the special event to say Hi! To them [students] and to us [APE staff] that is pretty much it. (Beth, Interview 1).

Equipment and Facilities

Beth suggested parents should support the district’s APE teachers’ fundraising efforts to get equipment and/or parents could donate equipment to their APE programs. In
addition to such efforts the budget allocation could be increased. There should be equal access to physical activity facilities for APE just as for GPE programs.

Beth’s Level of Job Satisfaction

Beth asserted that her job satisfaction was good. This was her comment:

I like my job. I like organizing orthopedic handicapped [OH] basketball program. My students like it and it gives them opportunity occasionally to play and socialize with their counterparts without disabilities. I like my school district because we have the highest number of special education kids. The suburb may have only one kid and I don’t like that, it is more challenging to have more than one to work with (Beth: Interview 1).

A Summary of Beth’s Behaviors and Contexts

Beth was observed 10 times mainly in two different schools. Her objectives included fun, cooperative skills/teamwork, and listening skills. During the study, Beth had routines for warm up that always preceded her lessons. She normally gave explanations during set induction and demonstrated when there was the need for skill demonstration. Beth taught kickball, badminton, baseball, ball relay, and organized wheelchair basketball games that involved students with and without disabilities.

The badminton lesson revealed that Beth knew her students needs, interests, and abilities. She was well-prepared to meet their individual needs. She put students into ability groups and coordination groups and this grouping of students influenced the use of equipment (some students used rackets and shuttlecocks while others used foam bats and balloons). That part of the lesson was a success because some teacher aides assisted. Regrettably, when Beth changed the activity to shooting basketball the teacher aides sat down to talk and she had a problem organizing and supervising the students. Safety was
compromised at that time because as Beth was working individually with four students while all the other students were throwing balls at and hitting some of their classmates.

Throughout her teaching in all lessons, Beth actively participated, encouraged students, and give general feedback with occasional corrective feedback. Beth instructed one activity which was wheelchair basketball she had organized for both students with and without disabilities to participate in together. That was the only inclusive activity she had instituted specifically for enhancing social inclusion. The wheelchair basketball game was well attended and both players and a large group of spectators enjoyed it.

Teaching of the ball relay was void of corrective feedback as students had problems passing the ball and receiving. Beth was active and energetic and duty conscious making her a very responsible teacher. On the other hand, her seriousness and lack of a facial smile overshadowed her enthusiasm and the flair that an observer might expect to see.

Case VI: Sue

Findings of the sixth case study are reported in this section. The section concludes individual case reports. Once more, the purpose of this study was to determine and describe the job roles and responsibilities of APE teachers in itinerant service delivery at urban public city schools. A second purpose was to determine whether or not APE teachers had any job-related concerns. If so, what were their concerns?

Sue’s Professional Preparation

Sue was a single White female APE teacher in her mid forties (Table 4.2). She had a bachelor degree (BA) in education with a major in physical education from a local university, but had no additional degrees. Although Sue had received APE certification,
she had not taken the APENS exam. She had taken some courses to receive APE validation. Her other certification was pre K-12 physical education (Table 4.2).

**Sue: Demographics of Experiences, Responsibilities, and School Contexts**

Sue had taught for four years. All four years of teaching were of APE with no GPE programming. The four years of APE teaching had been in an itinerant position all in her current schools. She taught APE in nine different schools but had done no consulting the current year. The grade levels she taught were from preschool through high school.

The total number of students with disabilities she taught (caseload) ranged between 90 and 110. She noted that the number of students she taught in each school differed, but at each school there were at least 10 or more students with disabilities she taught.

Describing the students’ types and severity of disability, Sue stated:

I have students who have cerebral palsy (CP), Down syndrome, mental retardation, language communication deficits, and I have worked with students with visual impairment and hearing impairments. But I don’t have either this year. For severity, except probably few with very severe cases I have some students that are totally non-communicative, I have a youngster who just comes to my preschool who learned how to walk within last year so we have to really watch him, then I have autistic students. (Sue, Interview 1)

Sue described the socioeconomic level range of her students as very poor to middle class. The ethnic proportions of the students estimated by her in percentages were 65% African Americans, about 5 to 10% Hispanic and same percentage for Native Americans and Asians, and 20% White students. She added that those percentages depended on the location of the school (Table 4.1).
Case VI—Research Objective 1—To Determine and Describe Sue’s Roles and Responsibilities

Describing her roles and responsibilities, Sue noted:

My job is to provide services for multiple handicapped, developmentally handicapped, transitional developmentally handicapped, to write IEP goals that are appropriate for each student for APE, to keep appropriate records of each student’s IEP goals and to document their progress. (Sue, Interview 1)

Indirect Service

Explaining her roles and responsibilities in terms of providing direct versus indirect services (teaching versus consulting), Sue said she was not involved so much with consulting except may be a little with other teachers or assisting in the classroom. However, she did explain that to her direct services and indirect services were equally important but she did not have many opportunities for indirect roles.

Direct Service

Individualized Education Program. Sue explained that she rarely attended IEP meetings and that the classroom teachers wrote the major parts of the IEP. She believed that it was a responsibility of APE teachers including her to write the APE portion of the IEP objectives.

Safety of Students. Sue noted the difficulty of maintaining proper safety as an integral aspect of her roles and responsibilities. She expressed that there were safety issues regarding use of equipment and the danger involved (proper vs. improper use) as well as suitability of equipment for the activity. She also expressed concerns about aggressive behaviors from some students to other students or staff and of students running out of the
gym or playground without any warning and with sudden speed, and running into each other. (Sue, Interview 2)

Planning and Documenting

According to Sue, documentation for example, planning (unit and daily lessons) was very important because the more planning accomplished the better the preparation to teach. Despite this, she did not write daily lesson plans. Other documents such as IEPs, students’ school records, and assessment records were all very important, Sue suggested. Interestingly, however, Sue claimed that there was no standard way for them to document the progress of the students. Nonetheless, she emphasized that progress reports and skill assessments were important types of documents to do this. In sum, Sue said she believed that planning and organizing activities to benefit her students, and writing appropriate goals for each student to help them grow and develop were the most important roles and responsibilities of an itinerant APE teacher (Sue, Interview 2). However, she neglected to create or use written unit or lesson plans.

Skill Teaching and Learning

Sue discussed how important her roles and responsibilities were relative to students’ skill acquisition, development, and proficiency. She stressed that skill acquisition, development, and proficiency was important to the daily enjoyment of some of the students but not all. This also contributed to the future success of the students because they could keep building on what they learned in her classes.
Case VI—Research Objective 2—To Determine and Describe How Sue Executed Her Roles and Responsibilities

Testing and Assessing

As indicative of her roles and responsibilities, Sue stated that she does complete assessments on students at the start of the school year, using TGMD on a one-on-one basis. She also reviewed students IEP documents about four times a year and assessed those students who needed to have new IEP goals written.

Consulting

Specific to consulting as an indirect role, Sue claimed that she did not have many opportunities to consult. The previous year she had opportunities to do so because she was supposed to have consultation for some schools or assist in the classroom. Currently, she only consulted if some teachers approached her for clarification or to get some information about a particular student or group of students with disabilities.

Inclusion Practices

Sue confirmed that she did not teach in inclusive settings because none of the schools in the district were permitted to have inclusive programming. All her teaching occurred in self-contained APE classes designed for only students with disabilities.

Rules and Routines

Sue noted that she established rules and routines in the teaching setting at the start of the school year and reminded the students on various occasions of the class rules and routines. There were rules that she established for safety and she enforced them especially when a student did not do the right thing. She also taught rules and routines when she taught new activities or unfamiliar games or activities. In establishing the rules
and routines initially she talked in a general sense, asked questions, and requested answers and/or had students demonstrate their understanding.

Organization and Management

Because she believed that teaching environments need organizing and managing, Sue commented that to achieve optimal success:

I organize using stations and aides if they are available. I try to have students active and a lot of practice time for the skills I teach. (Sue, Interview 2)

Executing Her Roles and Responsibilities: What Sue Said and Did

Field notes from the fourth lesson observed of Sue’s teaching are presented below.

**Number of students:** Eight

**Number of Teacher Aides:** Two

**Activity:** Basketball Skills

**Start:** The teacher started the class leading the students in warm up by first walking round and swinging arms, then continued with running round the perimeter of the gym. On command from the teacher, students went to their spots on the floor to do modified sit-ups with knees bent (folded). The aides physically assisted some students. Students on command changed to pushups (also modified) with knees in contact with floor. The next activity was jumping jacks. There seemed to be some problem with students’ coordination with this activity, yet only general feedback was given instead of specific.

**Skill Work:** Teacher explained skill activity to aides and another teacher who was present. Teacher demonstrated emphasizing throwing and catching after ball hits the floor. Students then went to their stations to practice with aides assisting and encouraging students. Teacher kept checking on aides in groups about students’ performance if her attention was on one group. Students changed stations after ten 10 to 15 minutes. Skill performance was corrected through feedback (mostly general) and some demonstrations. One aide at basketball shooting station allowed those waiting for their turns to sit against the wall directly fixed with the basketball ring. Unsuccessful attempts at the basket were dangerous as these frequently almost hit those students sitting nearby several times.

On command stations were changed again.
**Closing:** At the end of class students helped put away equipment. Teacher announced to students to be in their lines to organize leaving the gym. Students stood on the spots to do this and they filed out of the gym. (Sue, Field Notes Lesson # 4)

During the post-lesson conference, Sue expressed satisfaction with the students’ performance and the, albeit inconsistent, assistance and support of the teacher aides. She complained that the teacher aides did not always show a willingness to assist or enthusiasm to support class activities or students. Sue further explained:

I felt satisfied with their [students] performance because they were more active and moving and having fun. I believe it is partly due to the assistance the aides gave because we had fewer students to control, and assist. At times when the aides are many they all end up not doing anything or few would assist while the rest do nothing. Today was a good class. (Sue, Notes of Post-Conference Comments)

When Sue’s attention was drawn to what happened at the basketball court with some students sitting under the ring while others were shooting the ball, she realized this created a safety concern. Initially, however, she had not observed the situation occurring as it did, but did take prompt action at avoiding injuries after realizing the safety issue.

**IEP Writing and Evaluation**

Sue reviewed IEP documentations four times in a year. She would write the main IEP objectives at the beginning of the school year. She commented that the interest of the student was not part of the IEP so throughout the school year she would take notes of a student’s interests during her teaching episodes so that she would be able to include that information when writing the IEP goals. For example, she had incorporated music in her teaching to meet the interest of many students. She further emphasized that she discuss IEP issues with her department chair making sure that she took care of appropriate documentation and evaluation as far as progress was concerned on a particular student’s
behavior. Sue also asserted that in order to execute her job successfully when she had a student with a specific behavior problem she would contact a parent on the phone if they could meet to see how best to solve the problem.

Case VI—Research Objective 3—To Determine and Describe Sue’s Views on How Effectively She did Her Job

According to Sue, she was an effective teacher. She commented that she partially determines her effectiveness by assessing how she had improved as a teacher and what she did to improve. She expressed herself in the following statement:

I think I am getting better and better each year. I think I am pretty effective. I understand I can always be better looking for ways to improve. If I see that there is a particular student that I am not reaching for whatever reason then I try to allow more time to maybe work one-on-one with that student and also consult with the teacher to see what we can do for that student.

Sue continued describing effectiveness in terms of her strengths:

I really enjoy the kids and my interaction reflects that. I think I can relate well with children. I give positive feedback to encourage them. I am very interested in the children. I like physical activity so I become a role model for my students.

Sue further commented that to be effective she establishes rules and routines for safety and to better organize and manage the teaching environments for activities. She emphasized that the rules are established at the beginning of the school year and reinforced periodically throughout the year.

Commenting on other variables that facilitate teaching and consulting effectiveness, Sue mentioned communication and time. She stated:

I think one example is having good communication with the aides and others and having a lot of cooperation from them makes it a lot better because I think kids get a lot from them since they have role models. Also I think having to be effective we need a lot more time that really helps us to be able to provide much one-on-one.
Case VI—Research Objective 4—To Determine and Describe How Knowledge Acquired During Professional Preparation (Preservice) and Development (Inservice) Influenced Sue in Doing Her Job

Sue’s Professional Preparation

Although Sue only had a bachelor degree in physical education, she has taken courses that allowed for her APE certification. Explaining and describing the knowledge base that has had the greatest influence on her job, she said:

I can’t say any particular coursework, but probably assessment. It is important because at the beginning of the school year we assess our students and the knowledge in assessment has been very helpful.

Sue continued describing the knowledge base by recounting and reflecting on her PETE program in terms of preparing her for her job:

Human development, assessment (that was hands on experience), field experience, and some undergrad courses like method courses were good.

Inservice Workshops and Conferences

In addition, Sue commented on in-service workshops and conferences.

Yes, definitely we come up with very good ideas in terms of how to modify some of the activities that we do. It kind of depends on whether or not we have what the workshop addresses. I have only been to one conference, but I got a lot of knowledge that still helps me do my job.
Case VI—Research Objective 5—To Determine and Describe Sue’s Professional Interactions and Relationships with Parents, IEP Team Members and Other Persons with Whom She Worked

Parents

Sue explained her interactions and relationship with parents of the students she taught:

I really very rarely talk to parents. I would say parents don’t avail themselves. But, occasionally, I would meet with a parent if we have a specific behavior problem and occasionally the contact is on the phone. Most of them have understanding and want to collaborate.

Co-Workers and Other Teachers

Describing her interactions and relationships with coworkers and the supervisor (chair), Sue said:

We meet once a week to talk about issues and our supervisor comes around occasionally, not always. We discuss issues of IEP, making sure that we have the appropriate documentation as far as progress is concerned. We might discuss a particular student’s behavior or something else. We help each other out so we have a collaborative relationship. We also have a professional development day or early release day when we are supposed to meet at the Education Center with regular PE teachers and the coordinator.

Sue viewed professional interactions and relationships with other teachers including regular education teachers and GPE teachers as determined by personalities because as she insisted “People can work on relationships”. In her case, Sue explained that she has good and collaborative relationships with the classroom teachers helping out and making suggestions. Typically, she did not have anything to do with GPE teachers, but would interact occasionally but this depended on whether there was an issue or not to be resolved. Sue described professional interactions and relationships with administrators as:

I don’t see the administrators a lot. It is pretty much going into the building and doing my thing and leave unless we have a major behavior issue or I get kicked in
the eye. We kind of have a collaborative relationship. For the most part I come across them a couple times when we had issues relating to scheduling and so forth.

*Other Professionals*

Sue also described her interactions and relationships with other professionals such as the OTs and PTs. She explained that:

It depends on the student and if I want to know how other professionals deal with the students, seeking advisement to learn about a student’s behavior. In terms of their (students) learning I can provide information about what students do and how they do in the gym socially, cognitively, and emotionally. In such relationships could be good for team approach, but I do not really see OT personnel often at all. I only see one PT who does come in to work with students during APE and so I do work with him and he is really helpful. We will definitely work together on anything so with him we work collaboratively.

**Case VI—Research Objective 6—To Determine and Describe any Job-related Concerns, which Hindered Sue’s Consulting and/or Teaching Effectiveness**

*Concerns*

Sue identified some concern variables that hindered her teaching or consulting effectiveness as follows:

I would say time constraints. I think the amount of time and having 24 or 30 (class size) students we do not really have a whole lot to do different things. We have to cover throughout the year, I have one school we can’t provide services twice a week because of scheduling so we have only 30 minutes.

Then availability of equipment, we have to share the little equipment. At times I borrow from other schools but there are some teachers who don’t want us to use their equipment and I try to tell them the equipment is for all students. Sometimes we have to go to the principal to have the issue straightened up a little bit.

Another problem that I have with the preschool and other elementary school is that days that I am in a particular elementary school the regular PE teacher may have a class in another school so they take the equipment with them, so sometimes I borrow from other schools. Fortunately, last year I attended a funded program and I had the chance to have some equipment but they are still inadequate for all six of us.
Support

Sue discussed other concerns. She complained that there were no specific inservice workshops or seminars organized specifically for APE teachers unless a local university funded an APE workshop and extended invitations to them. The inservice workshop that might be organized by the district would be for GPE, or special education, or behavior management specialists. She had a concern that the APE teachers in the district were allotted only two positions for attending the previous year’s workshop and she was one of two who attended. But the other position was given to a teacher who no longer taught APE in the district so eventually Sue was the only APE teacher exposed to the workshop in the district. She commented that if two active or current APE teachers had attended the workshop they would have benefited more. She felt this was because later they could have discussed issues with their APE colleagues and could have filled in where one or the other may have forgotten some information.

Sue also expressed concern about the number of cases assigned to the six APE teachers in the district. She noted that she did not attend IEP meetings and none of the other APE teachers regularly attended IEP meetings because of the demanding caseloads and the demands on their time that would be involved.

Another concern regarded the inconsistency of the teacher aides at assisting her, but Sue commented that it depended on the schools. In some schools, the situation was better than at other schools because some teacher aides were more hands on and they were willing to be in APE settings. Other teacher aides were clearly not interested themselves in physical activity so they did not help.
Sue cited a lack of support relating to formatting and documenting in APE in the school district as a concern. She emphasized the inconsistency in how they document what each APE teacher is to present on the same topics or issues instead of having a standard format.

*Equipment*

Reiterating a major concern, Sue mentioned lack of adequate availability of equipment. She believed that at least each of the six of them [APE teachers] should have some basic equipment that they could keep with them so that they would not need to come to the Special Education office all the time to retrieve equipment.

*Transportation (Traveling)*

Sue was questioned about traveling while off loading equipment in a school parking lot, and she responded to the problem of transporting equipment and going from school to school as part of the job. To this, she was resolved that she had to deal with it and live with it. Sue explained that she did not see how to do the work without problem around traveling in-so-far-as she did itinerant work instead of having one or two permanent school locations.

*Sue’s Professional Interaction and Relationship*

Sue felt that professional interactions and relationships depend on individual personalities. In most instances, she was fine with interactions that occurred between her and the classroom teachers of her students. In contrast, she did not typically interact with the GPE teacher except for some occasional contacts. With school administrators, she only had contact with them when there was an issue of scheduling or dealing with behavioral problems. The main issue was Sue did not feel valued, or respected, or
considered a part of the school family this evident as very few teachers interacted with her in meaningful ways.

**Case VI—Research Objective 7—To Determine and Describe Sue’s Views on How Her Job could be Improved and Her Overall Job Satisfaction**

*Professional Preparation*

Sue’s reflections on what was lacked or was inadequate about her teacher preparation program influenced her responses. She pointed out that more exposure to different types of settings (e.g., urban schools) that PETE teacher candidates could possibly do observations and internships at would have been beneficial. This would also create more real-world opportunities for planning and teaching lessons during professional preparation at the preservice level and more training on preparing of IEP documents.

*Support: Interactions in the Schools*

Sue believed that professional interactions and relationships would be improved if the district’s APE teachers could regularly attend IEP meetings. She felt this way because those meetings are where all other people working with the student met. Opportunities for APE teachers to discuss issues, which were of professional regard of students, would also improve the respect that they deserved from other teachers, parents and so on. In such a situation APE teachers’ knowledge and expertise would then be acknowledged.

*Collaboration*

Teacher aides were an important source of assistance to the degree they were willing to work, but some would work while others did not. “There is the need for collaboration because teacher aides work directly with us in the gym.” Sue suggested that for the teacher aides to be more effective their roles and responsibilities should be emphasized
before they are hired. There should be more emphasis on the importance of assisting students with disabilities while they are in the physical education settings. Moreover, teacher aides need to be advised that they have to change their often apathetic attitudes for the benefit of the students or they may lose their jobs.

Another suggestion regarded IEP development, and that was that students’ interests should be included in the IEP goals. She thought that it would be beneficial to know what the student is interested in, what sports, and so on. She suggested while teaching, teachers should write comments and progress notes so that at the beginning of the school year they could also write on student interests to help plan lessons. In addition, Sue suggested that since she has a problem with documenting, as well as organizing and planning, there should be a consistent planning format that they all would adhere to ensure that they were all on the same page and doing same kinds of things to avoid inconsistencies.

*Equipment and Facilities*

On equipment, Sue suggested a need exists for increasing the budget. Also of making available the equipment GPE teachers already have in the schools for APE teachers’ usage in their classes. Plus, parents and the community members could do more in terms of donating equipment. Because each APE teacher should have access to basic equipment so that they do not necessarily come to their office equipment room everyday to collect such equipment.

*Sue’s Level of Job Satisfaction*

Sue expressed that she was very much satisfied with her job and that she could not have done anything better.
A Summary of Sue’s Behaviors and Contexts

Sue was one of the most enthusiastic teachers observed, as she was full of energy and ideas. Her lesson sequences were typically warm up, set induction, body of lesson, and closure. Warm up activities were well organized and normally aroused students to be active and ready throughout the lesson. Her active participation in activities enabled students to follow her actions and model movement after her.

Demonstrations were embedded in her lessons and she normally had stations as part of her environmental arrangement. During station work especially in the school where she was observed the most, the teacher aides that assisted were given instructions and their roles clearly defined for the station they supervised. Sue’s active supervision typically kept the aides working in most cases. Sue had a comprehensive eye while supervising so even with her group at her station she would steal a glance at each student and could give feedback and encouragement to a student at a different station. She gave general feedback to ensure participation and fun.

In most cases she did a good job of creating space for safety while students worked on poly or hot spots. The school’s gym space was too small for the class sizes but Sue’s organization and management skills did nicely help maintain order and class control. Sue was one teacher who incorporated music in most of her lessons especially for warm up. She was very creative in introducing and teaching activities. Sue had instituted a fitness walk routine, which was done at least once in the term. She took students for a neighborhood walk with the assistance of the teacher aides.

Even though Sue was careful about safety issues, she seemed to be carried away while activities were in progress and tended not to realize some potential safety issues. For
example, in a tag activity in the multipurpose gym (also used as cafeteria, place for meetings, etc) Sue should have set boundaries and rules for safety. This was especially needed because the gym was small with the dining tables and stage around students were running either too close to the chairs and tables or bumping into the side of the platform. In teaching the skill of target throw, Sue did not give challenging situations to students according to their ability level or severity of their disabilities. For example, in the target throw no distances were marked so all students irrespective of ability or severity level were going close to the target and instead of throwing were dropping the beanbags through the hoops. In one particular lesson that had station work it was obvious that one activity was more interesting to the students than the other two activity stations, so Sue had a problem of managing the students to stay at their respective stations until time to rotate. All the students stopped their activities and joined the string game stations.

**Collective Findings Based on Cross Case Analysis of All Six Teachers**

This section thematically addresses the overall description for all six APE teachers under each research objective. That is, the descriptions, responses and observations for each APE teacher were grouped, regrouped and reanalyzed, and recurring themes emerged across cases associated with the research objectives. Table 4.3 presents the major themes and supporting sub themes that emerged from the data. These themes were: (a) teachers’ roles and responsibilities as indirect and direct service providers; (b) teachers’ effectiveness in executing their roles and responsibilities; (c) professional preparation strengths and weaknesses; (d) professional interactions and relationships collaborative, but not always; (e) similarities in teachers’ concerns; and (f) despite concerns teachers, teachers had high levels of job satisfaction.
**Teachers’ Roles and Responsibilities as Indirect and Direct Service Providers**
- Teachers did not Distinguish between Roles versus Responsibilities
- Teachers Infrequently Provided Indirect Services via Consultations
- Teachers Regularly Provided Direct Services as Their Primary Role
- Teachers Committed to Special Olympics Programs
- Teachers Acknowledged Unit and Lesson Planning Important, But Rarely Done
- Teachers Acknowledged IEP Meetings Important, but Rarely Attended
- Teachers Considered Safety Important
- Teachers Felt Teaching Movement Skills Important to Current and Future Environments
- Teachers Advocated Inclusion Practice, but Inclusion not a District Practice

**Teachers Effectiveness in Executing Their Roles and Responsibilities**
- Similarities in How Teachers Executed Their Roles and Responsibilities
- Teachers Believed in Their Own Effectiveness

**Professional Preparation Strengths and Weaknesses**
- Field Experiences and Coursework as Influencing Knowledge Base
- Hands on Experiences Had the Greatest Impact on Teaching Efficacy
- Rigid Aspects of PETE Program—More Flexibility in Training Advocated
- Need for Additional Field Experiences
- Need for Additional Information and Training

**Professional Interactions and Relationships were Collaborative, but Not Always**
- Periodic Interactions and Relationships with Parents— Mostly Positive
- Periodic Interactions and Relationships with Teachers/Principals— Not Always Positive
- Regular Interactions and Relationships among APE Teachers— Typically Collaborative
- Periodic Interactions and Relationships with Supervisor— Not Always Encouraging
- Teachers’ Interactions and Relationships with OT and PT mostly Collaborative

**Similarities in Teachers’ Concerns**
- Concerns about Gymnasium Use, Time Allocation, and Size
- Concerns about Limited Equipment Availability, Adequacy, and Use
- Concerns about Caseloads and Class Sizes
- Concerns about Apathetic Attitudes and Behaviors of Some Teacher Aides
- Concerns about Professional Development Opportunities
- Concerns about Transportation/Traveling
- Concerns about APE Teachers Feeling Disrespected and Disregarded by Others

**Despite Concerns, Teachers had High Levels of Job Satisfaction**
- Job could be Improved, but Teachers Expressed High Levels of Job Satisfaction

---

**Table 4.3. Recurring Themes Reflective of Teachers’ Roles and Responsibilities**

---
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Research Objective 1—This Collective Case Study sought to Determine and Describe the Roles and Responsibilities of Itinerant APE Teachers in Urban Schools

The first major recurring theme was that these APE teachers identified their roles and responsibilities as that of indirect and direct service providers for students with disabilities in physical activity contexts. All six of the APE teachers mentioned roles and responsibilities in terms of either providing indirect (consulting) or direct (teaching) services. They however did not differentiate between roles and responsibilities because they viewed these as very much intertwined. That is, these APE teachers did not distinguish between roles versus responsibilities as separate aspects of their jobs, but they did distinguish between direct and indirect service delivery.

Teachers Infrequently Provided Indirect Services via Consultations

All six teachers claimed to have provided some consultation to professional colleagues. But they stated that consultation was not an ongoing or every day occurrence as part of their roles or responsibilities. They therefore considered indirect services via consultation a part of their roles and responsibilities but only provided this service periodically. This was a role they played to mainly assist GPE or classroom teachers who taught students with disabilities when those teachers needed the services of an APE teacher. Generally, responses from the teachers showed that consulting was not a continuous occurrence but they all confirmed that they did consulting when a general education teacher asked for information for example regarding behavioral issues or ideas on recreational activities. Pam and Mary added that they did consulting when there was the need for referral.
Teachers Regularly Provided Direct Services—Teaching

These six APE teachers all felt that their primary role and responsibility was to teach students with disabilities, who were assigned to them in their various schools. At the time of this study, Pam’s primary responsibilities included teaching students with mental retardation (MR), emotional behavior disorders (EBD), visual impairments, and hearing impairments. Amy mostly taught students with mental retardation (MR) and students with orthopedic disabilities. However, Natalie taught students with a whole range and severity of disability types including cognitive disability, physical disabilities, autism, Down’s syndrome, and cerebral palsy (CP). Mary primarily taught students with MR and EBD, and some students with physical disabilities. Beth taught mostly students who had orthopedic disabilities. Sue also taught students with a board range of disability types including CP, Down’s syndrome, MR, language communication deficits, visual impairment, and hearing impairment.

Teachers Committed to Special Olympics Programs

It was ascertained from the teachers’ interviews that all six of them regarded their direct teaching as a primary responsibility but services outside their teaching as additional yet important roles. For example, all of these APE teachers were involved in Special Olympics. They all trained their students to compete in Special Olympics and made selections for the various athletic events. Importantly, all of these APE teachers organized and officiated in Special Olympics. One of them, Pam had part of her teaching schedule assigned to assisting in the Office for Special Olympics. For this, Pam had fewer schools assigned to her compared to her five APE colleagues, who had on average twice as many
schools assigned to them. Speaking of teaching responsibilities, all six teachers noted that IEP writing, safety of students, and skill development and learning were very important.

*Teachers Acknowledged Unit and Lesson Planning Important, but Rarely Done.*

Although, all of these APE teachers affirmed that planning of units and lessons and other forms of documentation were important responsibilities, they rarely developed such plans. This was mainly because they believed that they were experienced (Kartz, 1972; Stroot & Whipple, 2003) and thus knew what and how to teach void of planning lessons on paper. Amy was the only teacher who mentioned that she occasionally wrote a lesson plan on paper when she had to teach something unfamiliar. Sue periodically kept notes while she taught to help her later in writing IEP objectives to get at the needs, interests, and abilities of students she taught.

*Teachers Acknowledged IEP Meetings Important, but Rarely Attended*

Attending IEP meetings was considered as an important part of their responsibilities, but all six of these APE teachers explained that it was difficult to do so because of their large caseloads. They noted that it would be time consuming to attend IEP meetings for each student they taught. Furthermore, to do so would have an adverse impact on all the other students. In view of this, these APE teachers rarely attended IEP meetings. They wrote their section of the IEP but normally they contacted the other teachers who attended the IEP meetings either for gathering information or for presenting information through them to the IEP team.

*Teachers Considered Safety Important*

On the issue of safety these six APE teachers were in agreement in that they believed ensuring students and others safety was an extremely important responsibility in teaching.
To avoid injuries and liability they felt they must attempt to ensure safety of the environment, surfaces of playing ground, protruding objects, use of equipment, and safety from collision of students as they played or participated in class activities.

**Teachers Felt Teaching Movement Skills Important to Current and Future Environments**

Essentially all six of these APE teachers noted that teaching and the students’ learning of movement skills was important to the enjoyment and future success of students in the community including recreation. However, they pointed out that to a large extent how much students enjoyed and utilized skills learned would depend on the severity of the student’s disability. Similarly, future performance associated with movement skill acquisition, development, and proficiency depended on the individual student and level of severity of his or her disability.

**Teachers Advocated Inclusion Practice, but Inclusion not a District Practice**

All six teachers indicated they did not teach in inclusive settings. They pointed out that inclusion was not an educational programming policy in their school district. However they all advocated inclusion practices. In fact as mentioned earlier, Beth had instituted an inclusive basketball game that was organized each school term.

**Research Objective 2—To Determine and Describe how these APE Teachers Executed Their Roles and Responsibilities**

These APE teachers described how their roles and responsibilities were executed. To this, a second major theme emerged from the data on teachers’ effectiveness in executing their roles and responsibilities. In brief, they were similar in how they executed their roles and responsibilities and they all believed in their effectiveness as itinerant APE teachers.
Similarities in How Teachers Executed Their Roles and Responsibilities

Testing and Assessing. These six APE teachers all claimed to test and assess their students. Testing and assessing of students’ motor skills, fitness levels, and cognitive abilities were used for identification, placement, and IEP development purposes according to these teachers. More specifically, four of the teachers—that is Pam, Natalie, Mary, and Sue claimed that they tested and assessed students’ gross motor skills (object control and locomotor skills) and they all used the TGMD to do so. Natalie added that she tested social skills but did not explain how she did so. Amy explained that she tested in class using teacher made test because in her view the standardized tests did not allow her to best assess the needs of her students. She mostly did fitness testing. Beth also used observations to assess fitness by observing how students performed, for example, the number of times they did push ups and level of improvement. She also did cognitive ability assessments. These teachers appropriately used the TGMD for identification, referral or placement, and IEP development purposes.

Rules and Routines. There was a consensus by all six teachers that they established rules and routines at the beginning of the school year to help them execute their teaching responsibilities. Pam and Natalie affirmed that the rules and routines established enabled the students to know the expectations of what to do, what not to do, and when to do or not do something. Natalie was more specific and pointed out that she had five rules and generally the rules helped in class organization, behavior management, and transition as well. Mary’s explanation depicted further that the rules and routines helped in behavior management. Sue however, did not go by only what she established at the start of the school year but added new rules and routines when she taught new or unfamiliar
activities. Pam and Mary pointed out that they wrote and posted rules on the gym walls. Sue said she talked to students about rules and routines, asked questions, and requested answers from them to demonstrate their understanding of the rules and routines.

Organization and Management. Class organization and management were integral aspects of teaching their students, according to these APE teachers. Their interview responses suggested that the rules and routines established helped in organization and management of their classes. Four of the teachers explained the problem of using and sharing of the limited available equipment among all six APE teachers in this large school district. These teachers also felt that setting up of equipment before class started was an important organizational strategy that either benefited or hindered their teaching effectiveness. Managing and safety issues regarding equipment use and environmental variables were also taken care of by supervising student behaviors, reminding students of the rules and routines, and enforcing the rules and routines as deemed warranted. Beth stressed that those teachers who did team teaching had an advantage to organizing and managing their classes because of two teachers in the same class.

APE Teachers’ Regular Meetings Beneficial. Pam mentioned the once-a-week APE teachers meetings they had as helpful to their efficacy at executing their teaching roles and responsibilities. This was because these weekly meetings provided them regular opportunities to discuss issues regarding organization and management, to discuss sharing and using of the limited equipment, to discuss instructional matters (e.g., pacing, using different formations, pairing/grouping students, and using station work) or to present ideas and strategies for solving behavioral issues.
Research Objective 3—This Collective Case Study sought to Determine and Describe Itinerant APE Teachers’ Views on How Effective they did their Jobs

Teachers Believed in Their Own Effectiveness

In this study, responses from all six APE teachers on their teaching effectiveness revealed that they all viewed themselves as effective teachers. They described characteristics of their teaching practices that enhanced their perceived effectiveness. Table 4.4 gives a summary of variables they felt allowed them to be effective teachers.

- **Student-Centered**: Teachers Described a Need to Focus Teaching on Students
- **Class Management**: Teachers Able to Control Student Behaviors for Learning to Occur
- **Feedback**: Use of Appropriate Feedback to Motivate Students to Learn
- **Pacing of Lesson**: Ability to Pace Lesson and Present Learning Activities Timely
- **Flexibility**: Refrain from Rigid Routines/Activities that do not Meet Students’ Needs
- **Proactive Teaching, Planning and Preparing in Advance**
- **Adaptability and Creativity**: Ability to Adapt Lessons, Modify Equipment and Setting
- **Enthusiasm and Passion**: Exhibiting the Love and Zeal for Teaching
- **Make Learning Fun**: Ensure Students Enjoy the Lesson and have Fun
- **Establish Rapport with Students**: Open up and Be Approachable
- **Establish and Maintain Communication and Cooperation** with Co-workers, Other Professionals, and Teacher Aides
- **Professional Development**: Upgrade Knowledge via Courses, Workshops, Conferences

Table 4.4 Variables Allowing for Teacher Effectiveness
Teacher Effectiveness. To teach effectively these APE teachers described the need to focus teaching on individual student’s needs, interests, and abilities. To which, the teachers felt they were able to effectively individualize teaching to individual students. For example, Pam said that she was an effective teacher and among her qualities was the ability to individualize her teaching. The ability to control student behavior was also an important issue described by these teachers as one of the criteria for effectiveness. Based on multiple nonparticipant observations it was judged that by and large these teachers were effective at managing students’ behaviors.

These six APE teachers described their effectiveness in various ways that largely reflected their teaching approaches. Providing feedback was described as important for effective teaching and encouraging the students to participate as another important variable. All six of these APE teachers gave mostly general feedback and praise much more so than any other type of feedback or social reinforcement. Moreover, they rarely emphasized skill improvement. Beth did emphasize that pacing of the lesson was essential for the students to learn and enjoy their experiences. Amy gave a similar description of making students enjoy the class by using a slow approach that allowed all students to participate. Pam, Amy, and Mary described the flexibility (e.g., teachers allowed to use their own lesson formats instead of using some specific formats) in teaching as an effective way to help to meet the needs of their students.

All the teachers described proactive teaching, which would include planning in advance their classes and anticipating various behavioral problems, and planning ahead with solutions to such problems as very important to becoming effective. These APE teachers talked positively about planning as an effective way of teaching. Regarding
general planning to distribute and share equipment, the teachers demonstrated that they were duty conscious. The researcher’s observations allowed him to conclude that the teachers planned (*in their minds*) what equipment to use ahead of time and transported their equipment to the teaching sites as needed. However, their inability or unwillingness to show evidence of lesson or unit plans left much to be desired. They attributed the absence of lesson notes or written lesson plans to their experience. That is, because they were experienced (Kartz, 1972; Stroot & Whipple, 2003) teachers they know what to teach and what to do in the class so there was no need in writing lesson plans. All six teachers further described their ability to adapt teaching and to be creative as characteristics of effective teaching. They stressed the need to adapt equipment as essential in teaching students with disabilities.

Sue, Amy, and Natalie were very apt at using toys that they bought from general toyshops. And they were creative in using toys for different activities even if they had to repeatedly use the same toys. Making sure learning was fun as an effective way of teaching was a quality that was exhibited by all of these teachers. These APE teachers insisted that being enthusiastic and showing passion for teaching students with disabilities were variables characteristic of their teaching effectiveness. As Amy described, “My strengths are my enthusiasm and love for the students. I try to make gym classes fun”. The lesson objectives that they gave were mostly focused on making ensure students enjoyed the lesson and had fun. This goal of fun for the students permeated many of the lessons and affected skill teaching. But, no accountability measures were observed in any of these teachers’ practices on students’ skill acquisition and development.
These teachers asserted that establishing good rapport with students by opening up to them and being approachable was a quality that made their teaching behaviors effective. From observations made, this quality was seen more in Amy compared to Pam for example. While Amy often showed laughter and had a commanding but reassuring voice, Pam was seen most often as very serious and rarely smiled. Pam did not talk much during lessons to attract students to her or even teacher aides. Nonetheless, all of the teachers described good communication and cooperation as essential variables to effective teaching. This would only occur if teacher aides were to help or cooperate and for other professionals (OT, PT) willingness to assist. Pam pointed out that she had communication problems. This was evidenced as she was often seen very serious at teaching without smiling much or talking to the teacher aides.

Keeping records and documenting students’ misbehaviors, for example, were viewed as necessary for monitoring issues that impacted individual students. Consistency in keeping notes by these teachers and documenting students’ progress was described as a way to know more about students and to ensure individualized teaching. For example, Sue stated that from the notes she always kept, she was able to know the interests of her students so that when writing IEP goals she could include such information to better meet the needs, interests, and abilities of the students.

According to these APE teachers, increasing or upgrading their knowledge and getting new ideas through courses, workshops, conferences and/or seminars would make them more effective if they really utilized the information received and the knowledge acquired. For instance, Sue described a workshop she attended that had much influence on her teaching effectiveness. Sue described numerous activities she experienced while at
the workshop and the equipment she retained at the end of the workshop that had been a tremendous help. However, to benefit from attending workshops, conferences and so on, these teachers desired that some of the workshops and conferences would be more pertinent to APE pedagogy. Topical areas of concerns are listed in Table 4.5.

**Research Objective 4—This Collective Case Study sought to Determine and Describe how Knowledge Acquired during Professional Preparation (preservice) and Development (inservice) Influenced these APE Teachers in Doing their Jobs**

A third major theme emerged from the data regarding teachers’ professional preparation strengths and weaknesses. These APE teachers felt that their professional preparation by and large prepared them well for teaching students with disabilities. But, there were some areas in need of improvement.

*Field Experiences and Coursework as Influencing Knowledge Base*

During their professional preparation these APE teachers benefited from engaging in field experiences. As a whole, they all confirmed that field experiences gave them an important knowledge base for their jobs. In fact, they felt that *hands-on experiences had the greatest impact on their teaching efficacy*. Pam, however, noted that she did not have as much of such experiences as expected. In the same line of thinking, Mary explained that more of such experiences were needed rather than more theory and research for APE and PETE trainees who intended teaching as a career. She added, however, that she believed there should be more flexibility for teachers to operate and learn during PETE field experiences but with less supervision from the university supervisors. In fact, she claimed to have had a better field experience in the APE program than what she had encountered during her PETE graduate training.
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Three of the teachers, Natalie, Mary, and Sue mentioned that their assessment course
taken during their professional preparation gave them a good knowledge base. These
teachers emphasized that as part of their responsibilities they conduct testing and
assessing both for grading and IEP development. For IEP purposes they were required to
use the TGMD and the knowledge acquired from their APE coursework in the use of
different assessment tools including TGMD had been invaluable.

Additionally, Pam had acquired knowledge on students’ varied disability types and
how to make use of adaptations and modifications. Beth added that content knowledge
she acquired from elementary and secondary education methods courses was beneficial.
Further Sue expressed the importance of knowledge she had obtained from human
development and physical education method courses. Invariably, other sources of
professional knowledge for all six teachers had been through professional development
such as workshops, conferences, or seminars. They all stressed, however, that they
benefited most from workshops, conferences, or seminars that were specifically geared
toward APE programming. Thus, they expressed a concern about a lack of such
professional development opportunities for APE programming and practice in their
current school district.

_Rigid Aspects of PETE Program—More Flexibility in Training Advocated_

The opinions of these APE teachers reflected their views on what they thought could
be done to improve their professional preparation. Four of the teachers, Amy, Natalie,
Mary, and Beth asserted that some aspects of their PETE teacher preparation, for
example, format or design for unit and lesson plans were too rigid. They recognized that
rigidity in planning lessons as a problem and they felt PETE faculty needed to allow for
more flexibility. That is, PETE faculty ought to allow teacher candidates to be more
creative in designing their unit and lesson plans. These suggestions may be interpreted as
these APE teachers wanted to have greater creativity in their approaches to planning for
meeting group as well as individual student’s needs, interests, and abilities.

A Need for Additional Field Experiences

PETE and APE professional preparation field experiences were mentioned as very
important but the general consensus was that there should have been more hands on
experience in many different settings including urban contexts. In that case PETE teacher
candidates are more likely to be hired, for example, to teach in an urban setting or
suburban setting without many problems. Relatedly, more hands-on teaching experience
would be better because what is derived from books is not always what is experienced in
actual schools, suggested these APE teachers. It is assumed that teaching tasks may differ
according to different settings. To deal with teaching tasks and to impact student learning,
these teachers understood that experiencing teaching in different settings while in their
professional preparation programs would have significant benefit. This does not
necessarily mean all experiences in teaching could be derived from field experiences at
teacher training level but that more exposure to different settings would make for more
complete preparation.

A Need for Additional Information and Training

Mary and Sue emphasized that there is the need for more experience in writing
students’ IEPs and possibly if there were different types of IEP formats from other states,
physical education trainees should be exposed to such IEP development. Mary also
asserted that a need exist for course work and practice in using sign language for teaching
individuals with hearing impairments and other disabilities such as autism would greatly enhance APE teachers teaching effectiveness.

**Research Objective 5—To Determine and Describe Itinerant APE Teachers’ Professional Interactions and Relationships with Parents, IEP Team Members, and Other Persons with whom they Worked**

A fourth major recurring theme emerged from the data on teachers’ professional interactions and relationships with parents, other teachers, school building principals, APE supervisor, APE colleagues, and other professionals such as OT and PT. In short, these APE teachers’ *professional interactions and relationships were mostly positive and collaborative but not always.*

These teachers had *mostly positive, but only periodic interactions and relationships with parents.* More specifically, the predominant response by all teachers was that there was hardly any interaction or relationship building between them and the parents of the students they taught. Amy and Pam said that they interacted with a few parents and even then some interactions occurred only briefly over the phone. Amy further explained that she sometime wrote letters to some parents for permission to take their child out for recreation, whereas, Pam’s limited interactions focused on addressing behavioral issues. The lack of regular interaction between APE teachers and parents was also partially attributed to the fact that most parents did not attend IEP meetings, just as the teachers often did not attend these meetings. Thus, any opportunity to interact at IEP meetings was lost. Mary, however, confirmed that the few parents she had interacted with she did so during IEP meetings she attended.
Periodic Interactions and Relationships with Other Teachers and Principals—Not Always Positive

These APE teachers’ interactions and relationships with other teachers within the various school buildings depended on the school and individual teachers. Four of the six teachers, Pam, Natalie, Mary, and Beth seemed not to have any relationships with the classroom teachers at the schools they served. But two of the APE teachers, Amy and Sue interacted with the classroom teachers of the students they taught and the interactions were typically positive and collaborative. Pam explained that interactions with the GPE teachers were mostly during the general meeting for all APE and GPE teachers. Beyond this, Mary only could identify one GPE teacher, Joshua at Logan High School, who had been very collaborative.

The consensus was that these APE teachers had collaborative relationship with some teachers they encountered. However, many of them had not established positive relationships for various reasons. A point of contention was that of basic misunderstandings revolving around some of the GPE teachers not fully appreciating what was required to teach students with various disabilities. According to these APE teachers, for example, some of the GPE teachers even thought that to teach an individual with MR meant that the teacher her or himself had “something special” or “behaved similar” to the youngster with MR. In actuality, such teachers rarely interacted with the APE teachers plausibly because of fear and misconceptions about students with disabilities.

As far as the school building principals and APE teachers were concerned, their interactions mainly occurred at the beginning of the school year. Most such interactions
occurred when there was a need to work on APE program scheduling. Often scheduling
difficulties regarded APE programming needs were neglected or if there were student
behavioral issues that had to be addressed in the presence of the principal. In most cases
all the teachers explained that they did not typically see or meet with the principals.

Regular Interactions and Relationships among APE Teachers—Typically Collaborative

Consistently, all six APE teachers mentioned and confirmed a once-a-week scheduled
APE meeting that they all attended. According to explanations given by these APE
teachers, they met to discuss various issues such as equipment sharing and time of use by
each teacher, behavior management issues, lessons, Special Olympics programming, and
other issues pertaining to their work. Their interactions and relationships among
themselves were described as friendly, cordial, supportive, and collaborative.

They always had periodic interactions and relationships with the APE supervisor,
which were mostly positive although not always encouraging. These APE teachers had
mostly positive views about their interactions and relationships with their APE supervisor.
But, they stressed that they only interacted with their supervisor occasionally. This
mostly occurred whenever he had an issue to discuss with them, on those occasions he
would attend the APE teachers meeting. Such occasions were not always encouraging for
the APE teachers. Otherwise, the APE supervisor would only randomly peep in his head
during their meetings once in a while.

Teachers’ Interactions and Relationships with OT and PT—Mostly Collaborative

Some of the APE teachers worked in schools where an OT and/or PT also worked. In
contrast Pam and Natalie, for instance, had no interaction with an OT or PT because of
scheduling or not being in the same schools at the same times. However Natalie
explained that those occupational therapists and physical therapists that she interacted with were typically professional in their behaviors and collaborative in their working relationships. Of the six APE teachers, Sue met only one OT, but their interaction was collaborative. Amy and Beth interacted with OT and PT professionals most often because they worked with students with orthopedic impairments. Their interactions and relationships were very collaborative. The consensus was that at one point or another all six teachers had interacted and established collaborative relationships with OT and PT professionals.

**Research Objective 6—To Determine and Describe any Job-related Concerns, which Hinder Itinerant APE Teachers’ Consulting and/or Teaching Effectiveness**

These APE teachers did have job-related concerns, which emerged from the data as a fifth major recurring theme with several sub themes. Interesting was the degree of similarities in these APE teachers concerns on issues of (a) gymnasium use, time allocation, and size; (b) limited equipment availability, adequacy, and use; (c) large caseloads and class sizes; (d) apathetic attitudes and behaviors of some teacher aides: (e) need for better support to improve their jobs; (f) aspects of professional development; (g) issues of transportation and traveling; and (h) teachers feeling disrespected and disregarded by other colleagues.

*Concerns about Gymnasium Use, Time Allocation, and Size*

All six APE teachers had similar concerns (Table 4.5). The lack of gym space or unexpected removal of them and their students from the gym while lessons were in progress was of concern. In agreement these APE teachers pointed out that school building principals developed teacher schedules but would at times neglect to identify a
scheduled time for the APE teachers use of the gym. Therefore, it could happen that there
would be no gym time allocated for APE programming until this oversight was called to
the attention of the school administration. It also happened that APE teachers would lose
access to the gym for any particular scheduled function (e.g., talent show), which the
APE teacher may not have even been aware of because she was not informed. This
happened occasionally due to the time allocation for APE, which at times preceded lunch
or immediately followed lunch. This was a big concern of these teachers, especially in
schools where the same venue was used for gym activities and dining hall activities.

Concerns about Limited Equipment Availability, Adequacy, and Use

All six teachers also expressed concerns about equipment. These teachers claimed
they lacked enough adequate equipment to properly carry out their roles and
responsibilities in teaching students with disabilities. This common concern adversely
affected their teaching effectiveness. The teachers planned their units and lessons with
the scheduling they made regarding sharing of equipment. For example, they would plan
to teach basketball units one APE teacher for a prescribed time period and then one after
the other would do so such that each teacher could use the few basketballs available.
Mary’s concern was that of revisiting a unit thus becomes difficult because other teachers
may be using the same equipment. To get extra or needed equipment, these teachers
organized fundraising activities and some were compelled to buy their own equipment to
support their teaching. They claimed the equipment budget was too insufficient to
support their needs. It is plausible that the lack of sufficient equipment and limited gym
space were characteristic both of these teachers’ role as itinerant APE teachers but more
so due to contextual factors in that they taught in an urban school district. In that context,
today’s urban schools are often characterized as having limited resources for teaching purposes (Argon, 1998). The fact is urban public city schools are often characterized with devastating budget deficits, teacher shortages, poor facilities, and inadequate equipment and supplies this includes physical education programs (Burden, Hodge, & Harrison, 2004). In contrast, Hodge et al. (2004) reported GPE teachers from suburban school districts had ample equipment, modern facilities, and multiple resources for teaching students with disabilities. However, they had no adaptive equipment available to do so.

Concerns about Caseload and Class Sizes

These APE teachers felt that their caseloads and class sizes were too large. The case loads for these teachers ranged from 75 to 200 students with varied disability types and severity levels (average caseload 113 students per teacher) across multiple grade levels (typically preschool to high school) and school locations (range 4 to 14, average of 9.6 different schools per teacher). To which, all six teachers asserted that their caseloads and large class sizes were areas of concern (Table 4.5). The least number of schools that an APE teacher (i.e., Pam) taught at was four and the least number of students taught in a school was more than eight per class. Again, Pam had part of her teaching schedule assigned to assisting in the Office for Special Olympics. For this, Pam had fewer schools assigned to her compared to her five APE colleagues, who had on average twice as many schools assigned to them. In some schools, the class size and the gym space made it difficult for teachers to organize and manage their classes.

Concerns about Apathetic Attitudes and Behaviors of Some Teacher Aides

Apathetic attitudes and behaviors of some teacher aides was one of the major concerns expressed by these APE teachers. The general concern of the teachers was that some of
the teacher aides in many cases did not work effectively with them. Some teacher aides did not even do the work, while at the same time the APE teachers had little influence on changing their apathy. That is, they had talked at length about the apathetic attitudes and behaviors of some teacher aides with the principals and their APE supervisor and the situation did not improve. Paradoxically, while most of the teacher aides exhibited such apathy towards work, those who did do their jobs did so really well and consistently worked hard. For example, where Mary and Pam taught, the teacher aides got involved, worked throughout each class session, and consistently assisted during class sessions. They were very supportive while in contrast some other teacher aides typically just sat and talked. In general, teacher aides were considered valuable supports—if and when they were willing to assist. The APE teachers felt that if and when teacher aides were present and willing to actively help with organization and management, and behavioral issues the learning context became easier for all, particularly for the APE teachers in executing their teaching responsibilities.

Concerns about Professional Development Opportunities

One other major concern expressed by five of the six teachers regarded professional development in terms of workshops, conferences, or seminars. The teachers explained the lack of available professional development days, particularly where training was exclusive to APE programming. They viewed this as a lack of professional support on behalf of the school district. They noted for instance that the school district had only one professional development day for physical education so both APE and GPE teachers attended, but such workshops typically focused on GPE programming. Thus, these
workshops had not been as beneficial to them in comparison to APE focused workshop training, which would be more relevant to their needs.

**Concerns about Transportation and Traveling**

The role of itinerant APE teachers involves traveling, which all teachers seemed to attest to but still they expressed concerns about using their cars, transporting equipment, loading and off loading equipment as tiring and cumbersome. This was a recurring concern for all of these APE teachers. Mary summarized her concern on this issue when she explained that itinerant APE teachers got paid for or reimbursed for using their own vehicles, but the pain in doing that, and not even having space in their vehicles for their personal belongings was a concern to consider.

**Concerns about APE Teachers Feeling Disrespect and Disregard by Others**

The professional interactions with other teachers in their respective school buildings were of concern. Four of the APE teachers were vehement about feelings of disrespect or disregard of their position in the various schools by teachers in those school buildings. One instance of that was when Natalie expressed that she could lose use of the gym without prior notice. Clearly, the APE teacher should have been informed if the gym was to be used for other purposes. The other issue described concerned scheduling. Principals would neglect to allocate time for the APE program on the schools’ schedules (Table 4.5).
Teaching-Related

- Caseload and Class Size
- Traveling from School to School
- Student Variability (Disability Types/Severity/Behaviors)
- Safety of Students and Others
- Time Allocation (Scheduling)
- Preparedness for IEP Development
- Lack of Support for Professional Development

Equipment/Facilities

- Limited Gym Space/Time Allocation
- Limited and Inadequate Equipment
- Loading and Off Loading Equipment

Table 4.5. Listing of Concerns Described by Teachers

Research Objective 7—To Determine and Describe ways by which their Jobs could be Improved and their Overall Job Satisfaction

In interviewing these APE teachers it was clear that despite their expressed concerns, they had high levels of job satisfaction. A sixth and final major recurring theme was that these APE teachers felt their jobs could be improved yet they all expressed high levels of job satisfaction. They felt that if actions were taken to address their concerns than their jobs might be improved. For example, these APE teachers suggested that support in
various ways if well addressed would improve their jobs. Of particular concern was a need for supports resulting from positive interactions in the schools where teacher aides would be ready to work and assist would be a tremendous help. The APE teachers argued that teacher aides should be alerted prior to their hire of the possibility for dismissal due to apathetic attitudes and behaviors. Most importantly, these APE teachers felt that the teacher aides were valuable supports particularly when they were willing to assist them in dealing with behavioral issues. Otherwise, the APE teachers had to find alternative ways to deal with students’ misbehaviors. For example, Pam and Mary mentioned the use of time out as a behavior management strategy. Natalie and Sue indicated that in certain cases they went to the school principal with behavior issues or as Sue added she contacted parents when deemed necessary. By and large these APE teachers had high levels of job satisfaction even in the face of such concerns.

Most important, despite their concerns all six of the APE teachers expressed high levels of job satisfaction. They seemed to enjoy what they were doing with the students in teaching and contributing to the students’ happiness and fun.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION, SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine and describe the job roles and responsibilities of APE teachers in itinerant service delivery (direct/consulting) at urban public schools. A second purpose was to determine whether or not the itinerant APE teachers had job-related concerns. If so, what were their concerns? This chapter presents a discussion, summary and conclusions, implications and recommendations as they relate to the purpose and objectives of the study. There are also recommendations provided for future research consideration.

Discussion

A Discussion of APE Teachers’ Roles and Responsibilities

The roles and responsibilities of the six APE teachers in this study were described from their own perspectives as primarily that of providing direct service via teaching of students with disabilities, but with occasional indirect service via consultations. All of the findings are important to our understanding of the roles, responsibilities, and concerns of itinerant APE teachers in urban city schools. Currently, there are no studies focused specifically on roles, responsibilities, and concerns of itinerant APE teachers in urban city schools. Consistent with this finding, scholars have talked about the roles and
responsibilities of APE specialists from similar perspectives (Hazekamp & Huebner, 1989; Jansma & French, 1994; Sherrill, 2004). Sherrill (2004) described the work of APE specialist in school systems as resource teacher, itinerant teacher, or consulting teacher. Sherrill described these roles as follows.

1. A resource teacher is one, who serves a single school, team-teaches with GPE teachers and provides instruction for individuals not in GPE.

2. An itinerant teacher is one who works in several schools, but performs essentially the same job functions as resource teachers.

3. A consulting teacher is one who travels from school to school and does some direct service delivery, but mostly provides support services to GPE teachers and helps them learn how to adapt instruction.

The APE teachers in the current study, best match the description given by Sherrill as itinerant teachers. In that regard, Jansma and French (1994) emphasized the roles of APE teachers as that of itinerant teachers who travel to and from different schools to provide direct instruction and consultant services. Descriptions of direct service by Jansma and French and recently Sherrill (2004) indicate that APE specialists engage in roles that include: (a) providing direct service (i.e., teaching responsibilities), (b) consulting and resource room functions, (c) training via inservice workshops, (d) carrying out administrative duties, and (e) conducting research.

Chandler and Green (1981) identified curricula areas that APE teachers use. These include sensory motor, lifetime leisure, health related fitness, movement education, traditional games and sport skills. APE teachers like their counterparts in GPE in discharging their roles and responsibilities use such curricula in various ways to the
benefit of their students. Services regarding the use of these curricula may be direct or indirect. Miller (1981) articulated that direct service for APE included but was not limited to physical fitness (including muscular strength and endurance, cardiovascular and respiratory, and so on), motor fitness, fundamental motor skills, play, posture, rhythms and dance, individual games and sports, and group games and sport.

The teachers in this current study described their roles and responsibilities as itinerant APE teachers. They did not have on-going consulting roles except in a few cases when other teachers, both GPE teachers and classroom teachers may seek their expertise via consultations with them. They described their job roles and responsibilities in terms of direct (specifically teaching) and indirect (consulting) services. These APE teachers generally described their job roles and responsibilities mainly in the area of direct service delivery. In fact, only one of the APE teachers described that both direct and indirect services were equally important. The rest of these teachers described direct service as more important than indirect service.

Hazekamp and Huebner (1989) defined roles and responsibilities of APE teachers by recognizing the importance of both the knowledge and practical experiences of such specialists. Hazekamp and Huebner suggested that APE teachers ought to (a) be knowledgeable about unique educational needs of students with disabilities, (b) work closely with other teachers of the student and other professionals like occupational and physical therapists, (c) become familiar with proper use of specialized and adapted equipment, and (d) involve students with disabilities in appropriate physical education activities that can be applied in daily life. APE teachers have unique job roles and responsibilities. For example, Rabbette (1996) identified instructional roles of
occupational and physical therapists in comparison to those of APE teachers. She stated that there were differences and similarities between the roles of these professionals.

Most relevant to the current study, Rabbette (1996) reported that APE teachers were perceived as having a strong role in teaching students with disabilities about fitness and basic movement skills and games, play, and motor skills. In agreement with this, APE teachers in the current study described their responsibilities as primarily that of providing direct services via teaching of students with disabilities in physical activity contexts. They felt that their teaching responsibilities included acts of testing and assessing students, developing IEP objectives, planning lessons, providing appropriate instruction, organizing and managing their classes, ensuring safety for all, and collaborating with other professionals and IEP team members. It is obvious that these APE teachers were in agreement with other APE professionals in identifying roles and responsibilities (Hazekamp & Huebner, 1989; Jansma & French, 1994; Kelly & Gansneder, 1998; Sherrill, 2004). Again, this finding is consistent with what Sherrill (2004) suggested were the responsibilities of direct service specialists: planning, assessment, preparation, coordination, consulting, and advocacy. Moreover, the APE teachers in the present study were all in itinerant roles with teaching related acts as their primary responsibilities. Importantly, these six APE teachers felt that they were effective in executing their roles and responsibilities whether or not they were providing indirect or direct services.

A Discussion of APE Teachers Providing Indirect Services—Consultations

The APE teachers in this current study agreed that to some extent they did do consultations when GPE teachers contact them or classroom teachers need some information. This is consistent with findings from previous research (Kelly & Gansneder,
1998). More specifically, Kelly and Gansneder (1998) suggested that indirect services could be labeled as itinerant or consultative, and that some APE teachers indirectly provide services other than being the primary physical education teacher providing instruction. Such services may include providing information, assessment, and so on. However, one of the teachers in the current study noted that she in consultation with GPE teachers would advise them to treat the student with disability no differently from other students without disabilities. This statement presupposes that students with and without disabilities will equally benefit from use of the same materials, equipment, and rules. This is contradictory to the literature on effective teaching of students with disabilities whether in APE or GPE settings (Block & Vogler, 1994; Vogler et al., 2000; Vogler et al., 1989; Vogler et al., 1992; Webster, 1993).

In fact, scholars insist that for teaching students with disabilities there is a need for a heightened emphasis on adaptations, modifications, and supports (e.g., APE specialist, peer tutors, teacher aides) (Hodge et al., 2004; Houston-Wilson et al., 1997; Vogler et al., 2000). The seriousness of the misinformation offered by the aforementioned APE teacher on treating students with and without disabilities the same in terms of instruction indicates that future teacher candidates need to be alerted to the importance of consulting effectively with accurate information. This is still necessary even though these APE teachers stated that consultation was an additional role and not their primary role. In their responses, it was evident that the six APE teachers under study in these cases were not required to consult. It was also evident that a general lack of communication and limited interactions with the GPE and classroom teachers contributed to the reasons why these APE teachers did not consult or collaborate as often as they would have otherwise.
Again all six of the APE teachers felt that providing direct service was their primary responsibility and that this included acts of testing and assessing students, developing IEP objectives, planning lessons, providing appropriate instruction, organizing and managing their classes, ensuring safety for all, and collaborating with other professionals including IEP team members. What's more, they claimed to be effective at these responsibilities.

For example, the claims of these APE teachers points out that they did conduct assessments for specific purposes. Their general descriptions of assessments seem to relate mostly to IEP development. Four of the teachers mentioned the use of the TGMD (Ulrich, 2000) as the standard instrument of choice. All six teachers talked about the importance of IEP development and the fact that they all reviewed each student’s IEP four times each school year. One teacher commented on IEP development that ‘she does not even know why the teachers write IEPs. This statement exposes that she neglected to use students’ IEP objectives in her daily practice and also shows how frustrated the APE teachers were at not having realistic opportunities to regularly attend IEP meetings. Their explanation was they teach many students and thus cannot attend IEP meetings for each student. Further, some of the APE teachers seemed to think that it was a waste of time to write IEP goals and objectives and yet not have opportunities to attend IEP meetings where IEP development is supposed to be discussed.

None of the APE teachers talked about conducting regular or on-going assessments for planning and instructional purposes. With one exception, which involved the broad jump where the teacher aides seemed to be checking by simply observing distances jumped, none of the lessons observed confirms the use of any other kind of assessment.
strategies by these teachers. Plausibly, the teachers may not have tested and assessed the movement skills of students with disabilities for planning and daily instructional purposes because there were no accountability measures in the district that required them to do so. Nonetheless, two teachers mentioned the use of the TGMD in connection with assessing students for referral or placement purposes, but more often for IEP development. It therefore seems that assessment is mostly done to fulfill IEP requirements. One teacher explained that she used teacher-made tests and another teacher claimed to test fitness using a standardized assessment instrument. This suggests that these teachers conducted assessments at certain times that were not observed. This is reasonable as three teachers claimed they wrote progress reports for their students using assessment data. In brief, they typically assessed their students at the end of a unit or term, but not necessarily to inform their planning or daily instruction.

These APE teachers described teaching as their primary responsibility of which they felt effective at doing. To which, multiple lessons were observed as the researcher sought to ascertain how they executed their teaching roles and responsibilities. The teachers all had established rules and routines in their teaching-learning environments. This confirmed what they claimed in their responses during the interviews on the need to establish rules and routines to ensure clarity of expectations and to help in class organization and management.

The teachers also described the safety of their students as a major responsibility within their teaching role. For example, they made use of rules to ensure safety of the environment as students participated in various planned activities. Nonetheless on a few occasions it was observed by the researcher that some lessons had notable safety risks.
For example, during a lesson on skating there was potential for injury to the students from falling against or onto tables and chairs in the environment. More typical, however, the APE teachers seemed to be aware of potential liability issues resulting from negligence and they were conscious about the importance of safety for students and others. They also tried with varying degrees of success to use the help of teacher aides in managing students’ behaviors. This was helpful in those cases where the teacher aides were available and willing to do so. Otherwise, some teachers were observed using time out as a means to control and manage student behavior, but others of them stated that if more serious inappropriate behaviors were encountered, they typically informed the principal.

As part of their teaching responsibilities, the teachers described teaching of movement skills as important. However, they had divergent notions concerning the role skill acquisition played in students’ enjoyment and their future participation. The two important notions from these teachers’ descriptions relate to the level of severity of disability and the individual student. Considering this issue and relating it to the lessons observed, consistently all six of these teachers emphasized students having fun as a daily lesson objective. To create fun for students, the teachers tried to encourage them to move as much as possible within the lesson. In all, most often the APE teachers emphasized movement of body parts during the various activities, but they did not emphasize skill acquisition, development, or proficiency.

In addition to finding ways to create fun activities for the students, the teachers described cooperation (teamwork) and proper socialization (good sports behaviors) as important lesson objectives. These were mentioned by the teachers as objectives of some
lessons observed, and moreover reflected in the organization of activities, especially with station activities and team games. During their class sessions, it was observed that these teachers mostly provided general feedback. General feedback was used as a means to motivate and encourage the students to participate. Specific or corrective feedback was rare. It was not determined whether or not these teachers were unaware of this tendency of them to predominantly provide general feedback or if they were simply inadequate at providing specific feedback.

During all lessons observed, the students were most often having fun and cooperating with each other appropriately and the teachers described these lessons as successful. Across the APE teachers’ lessons there was a resemblance of ‘Busy, Happy, and Good’ classes as described by Placek (1983). That is to suggest that students were often observed as busy while engaged in class activities, they were typically happy at doing so, and they were good at not misbehaving, and for the APE teachers studied it appeared that they considered such classes as ‘good’ classes. However it did not appear that the students were held accountable for learning in such learning contexts. This was mostly the case of the classes observed in the current case studies. Yet responses extracted from interviews with all six teachers studied, indicate that they all felt effective in executing their roles and responsibilities including the primary responsibility of teaching. According to McLeish (1981), effective teaching means structuring the lesson to maximize the amount of time in direct practice by each individual at a level that ensures a continuing development of the skill compatible with minimal number of mistakes. In terms of these descriptions, the APE teachers in the current cases were not typically as effective as they could have been in that time spent in most lessons observed was not
directed at skill acquisition, nor were there clear accountability measures on student learning outcomes.

In their synthesis of the extant literature, Siedentop and Tannehill (2000) identified several characteristics of effective teachers. These characteristics were: (a) belief in their own efficacy; (b) allocates enough time and opportunity to learn, and covers appropriate content; (c) communicates high, reasonable expectations and students receive adequate instruction and practice time to learn their roles; (d) establishes positive approaches to class management and student engagement; (e) designs meaningful, success-oriented tasks; (f) creates and sustains a brisk pace and sustains momentum; (g) communicates content with clear, brief demonstrations and explanations, followed with ample guided practice, and provides feedback and checks for understanding; (h) actively supervises students progress and practice; (i) holds students accountable for apt participation; (j) communicates with clarity and enthusiasm, and exhibits equitable support of all students; and (k) use student input and ongoing assessment to inform their practice (Siedentop & Tannehill, 2000). Scholars also suggest that teachers should reflect to inform their teaching (Hodge, Tannehill et al., 2003; Tsangaridou & O’Sullivan, 1997).

In the current collection of cases, the APE teachers teaching behaviors were typified by several of the aforesaid indicators of effectiveness. For example, these APE teachers wanted students to actively participate in fun movements so they typically gave them opportunities to be motor engaged as much as possible. This is to suggest that ensuring that students were having fun while moving was the teachers’ main focus not necessarily holding them accountable for correct forms of movement in relation to skill acquisition, development, or proficiency. Giving credit to their effectiveness, these teachers had
minimal classroom management issues with the exception of at times working with students who had severe emotional-behavioral disorders (EBD). Also there was notable variability in transition times. For example, there was typically less transition time consumed when at least some of the teacher aides assisted during lessons. To the contrary, increased transition times and management issues were more evident whenever the teacher aides did not assist with the class activities and/or when there were students with severe EBD acting out in the classes.

Of concern to these APE teachers was a limited amount of time allocated to them for providing instruction, which was largely due to constraints in scheduling that fixed classes either preceding lunchtime or immediately afterwards thereby reducing the time allocated for classes. Such scheduling reduced the amount of time for the lessons among other class disruptions. In addition, the students received less frequent opportunities for practice because of variables that hindered this such as limited gym space and inadequate equipment available confounded with the apathetic attitudes and behaviors of some teacher aides. By and large, such variables appeared to have had an adverse impact on these APE teachers’ teaching effectiveness.

The aforementioned findings would seem to suggest that teaching effectiveness is relative. That is, the general census of the six APE teachers studied here was that they were effective given the diverse groups of students they were responsible for teaching (e.g., varying grade levels, disability types, severity of disabilities) and the constraints of their contexts (limitations on equipment, gym space, time allocation, support from teacher aides). The beliefs of the APE teachers in the current collective of case studies is consistent with Siedentop’s (1991) claim that teachers tend to believe in their own
efficacy. Even though evidence is thin some evidence does suggest that teachers judge their efficacy by self-evaluation of their own teaching skills (how they demonstrate, give feedback, and the like) rather than by the progress of their students. In the present case studies, the APE teachers all taught in self-contained settings and were responsible for teaching students with a broad range of disability types and levels of severity at differing grade levels. Plausibly, these variables coupled with the teachers’ overarching goals of students having fun and being actively engaged in movement activities made them consider their pedagogies as effective whenever students were ‘busy, happy, and good’ (Placek, 1983). Thus, they felt effective even as students did not appear to be held accountable for skill acquisition, development, or proficiency. Placek described a physical education class as ‘busy, happy, and good’ in the sense that the physical education teacher desires the students to enjoy participating, stay actively engaged in activities, and not misbehave. Clearly there is a basic lack of accountability for learning in this approach to teaching. Again, the teachers in this current collective of cases typified this approach. They were seen holding students accountable for their behaviors, but not accountable for learning outcomes.

In the current collective case studies, the APE teachers mentioned planning and documenting student progress as important responsibilities. Despite this, these teachers produced no unit or lesson plans. That is, when the researcher requested unit and lesson plans from them they claimed to have used plans in the past that were similar to what GPE teachers typically use. But they no longer did so. In fact, the APE teachers argued that they were experienced and thus used this to justify why they did not now need lesson plans. Only one teacher insisted that she wrote and used lesson plans but only when she
was required to teach unfamiliar activities. The consensus of these APE teachers was that
novice teachers ought to write and use lesson plans but not veterans such as themselves.
Similar to this, Kruger et al. (2000) reported that of 155 APE specialists studied only 33
(21%) of them had written leisure transition plans (LTPs) in accordance with PL 105-17.

During professional preparation most PETE teachers are taught to use Tyler’s (1950)
linear planning model for planning instruction. Despite this, research suggests that most
teachers in practice do not adhere to this prescriptive approach in planning (Byra &
Coulon, 1994). Teachers in the current collection of cases—did not adhere to any
particular planning approach as they did not develop written lesson plans. In contrast,
Stroot and Morton (1989) reported GPE teachers’ planning behaviors and decisions
center around instructional objectives and that some teachers use Tyler’s (1950) planning
model. Later, Byra and Coulon (1994) compared the instructional behaviors of a group of
preservice GPE teachers across planning and no planning conditions. They found that
planning had a positive effect on some preservice teachers’ instructional behaviors.

Again, collectively APE teachers in the current study neglected to develop written
lesson plans, to which they justified not doing so by arguing that as experienced teachers
they “knew what they were doing” without a need for written plans. It is unclear as to
whether or not developing written plans would have had a significant impact on these
APE teachers’ efficacy at carrying out their primary responsibility of teaching (Byra &
Coulon, 1994; Stroot & Morton, 1989). According to Sherrill (2004), however, planning
is one of the basic responsibilities of a direct service specialist. Siedentop and Tannehill
(2000) asserted that “One of the saddest situations in physical education is to see a well-
managed class, led by a teacher with good teaching skills, working on content that is
boring, insignificant, or developmentally inappropriate for the particular group of students” (p. 129). Further, they suggested that designing a meaningful, challenging curriculum is a key element in building a successful physical education program. On this point, Siedentop and Tannehill posited that interpreting “the intent of that curriculum into units of instruction, then a series of lessons, each of which has an appropriate progression of well-designed learning tasks, is the basic stuff of good planning” (p. 129). The importance of planning is explicit in that statement.

Shulman (1987) noted that planning serves to facilitate the transfer of content knowledge and general pedagogical knowledge into pedagogical content knowledge. It is also argued that planning is necessary if we are to develop the best program for physical education. He explained that planning is important because of: (a) limited amount of teaching time, (b) variables that influence lessons (e.g., class size, equipment, facilities, and climate), and (c) students’ diverse backgrounds (e.g., varying skill levels) and curricula choices. Consistently, scholars have argued that planning is essential to effective pedagogy. In that vein, Clark (1983) stated that well-developed unit and lesson plans are likely to lead to student achievement of the intended learning goals.

A Discussion on APE Teachers’ Knowledge Base

In the current collection of case studies, the six APE teachers stated that during their professional preparation field experiences and coursework had influenced their knowledge base, which enhanced their teaching competency. They felt that hands-on practicum or field experiences had had the greatest impact on their teaching efficacy.

The different advocated competencies by teacher educators and researchers before 1995 seemed to have created inconsistencies across APE training programs for preparing
teachers. However, the development of APE competencies and national standards has helped to resolve some of the inconsistencies across various APE professional preparation programs (Jansma & Surburg, 1995; Kelly, 1995). For instance, Luke E. Kelly was project director of a nationwide survey leading to the development and publication of the APE National Standards (or APENS) manual (1995). The outcome of this work resulted in 15 broad standards. Since the development of APENS (Kelly, 1995), APE professional preparation programs have mostly followed these standard guidelines. The teachers in the current case studies had taken coursework from APE programs that were guided by standardized competencies listed in the APENS manual irrespective of their college of training. These APE teachers stated that they had mostly benefited from meaningful field experiences as well as four of these APE teachers mentioned the importance of knowledge gained while enrolled in an assessment course taken at a nearby university. Other courses including human development, method courses, disability specific courses, adaptations, and elementary and secondary education courses had influenced their knowledge base. In addition to knowledge acquired through coursework these teachers indicated that attending conferences, in-service workshops, and seminars have also influenced their teaching and were beneficial especially whenever such conferences and workshops were directed specifically toward APE programming.

This finding that APE teachers benefited from coursework and hands-on teaching experiences during their professional preparation supports an advocacy for providing physical education teacher candidates including future and current APE teachers with multiple hands-on practicum and/or field based teaching experiences in a diversity of physical activity contexts (Burden, Hodge, O’Bryant et al., 2004; Hodge, Tannehill et al.,
To a large extent teacher candidates’ academic preparation is impacted by the decisions and actions of others. For instance, APE and PETE faculty more often than not make decisions on curriculum content and learning experiences that directly impact future teachers’ extent of preparedness to teach students with disabilities (Hodge, Tannehill et al., 2003). Findings in the current collection of case studies indicate that the APE teachers’ self-efficacy was favorably influenced by coursework and experiences during their professional preparation. This is an important finding as scholars insist that teachers must believe they are adequately prepared to teach students with various disabilities and have a belief in their own efficacy (Hodge et al., 2002; Siedentop & Tannehill, 2000). Furthermore, empirical evidence also confirms a teacher’s skill at adapting and modifying instruction, equipment, and activities (Sherrill et al., 1994) as well as efficiently using supports (e.g., peer tutors, teacher aides) are particularly crucial to teaching students with disabilities (Houston-Wilson et al., 1997). Again, to acquire skillfulness at teaching students with disabilities requires proper professional preparation and experience teaching such students (Hodge et al., 2002; Hodge, Tannehill et al., 2003).

Hodge, Tannehill et al. (2003) asserted that APE coursework coupled with practicum experiences and self-reflective journaling provides a medium for PETE students to identify issues, address problems, and think critically about best practices. It is commonly accepted that APE teacher candidates as well as practicing APE teachers would benefit similarly from such academic preparation. Therefore both APE and PETE teacher educators should implement such training approaches (i.e., APE coursework plus a diversity of practicum and school based teaching experiences, self-reflective journaling,
and an infused-based curriculum) to better prepare APE as well as GPE teachers to teach students with disabilities in urban contexts (Burden, Hodge, & O’Bryant et al., 2004; Hodge, Tannehill et al., 2003; Stroot & Whipple, 2003).

A Discussion on Professional Interactions and Relationships

A troubling finding in the present case studies was that the APE teachers had limited interactions with parents, general education classroom teachers, principals, and even GPE teachers. On the other hand, they regularly met and had established collaborative relationships among their own APE cohorts within the school district. These APE teachers also had mostly collaborative albeit periodic interactions and relationships with OT and PT personnel at the various schools.

More specifically, all six of the APE teachers confirmed that they had limited interactions with the parents of the students they taught. According to the APE teachers, parents do not show very much interest in the performance or behaviors of their children nor do they attend parent-teacher conferences or IEP meetings. These circumstances reduced the chances of meaningful interactions between the APE teachers and students’ parents. The APE teachers themselves did not regularly attend IEP meetings and justified their absence from such meeting as due to their heavy caseloads. Two of the six APE teachers claimed to have interacted by phone occasionally with a few parents who were supportive of their kids. In such cases, these APE teachers felt that at least to a minimal extent those parents worked collaboratively with them in terms of helping to resolve student related issues. Although no such interaction was observed by the researcher, the APE teachers described their telephone interactions as representing collaboration between them and parents. One teacher also noted that her only interaction with a parent
would be those parents who attended her inclusive basketball game. Beyond such few instances all of the teachers suggested that they rarely interacted with parents.

Scholars suggest that establishing positive relationships with parents is an important responsibility of physical education teachers (Block, 2000; Hodge, Murata et al., 2003). For instance, establishing positive relationships with parents is important in order to ensure regular and effective communication and to gain their support. Block (2000) stated that “Parents should be kept abreast of their child’s progress or lack of progress in all school environments, including physical education” (p. 333). So as to establishing positive relationships and communicating regularly with parents as essential, Block asserts that this “is particularly true for students who have a history of displaying inappropriate behaviors” (p. 333). Establishing positive home–school relationships is also important to make sure that there is joint responsibility for learning through cooperation and community building among teachers, students, and parents (Block, 2000).

In the current collective case study, overall the APE teachers felt that they only had periodic interactions that were not always positive with other teachers including GPE teachers. In fact, there seemed to be a bone of contention between the APE teachers and GPE teachers in some schools regarding the use of the gym and equipment. These issues did not make for a good working relationship between these teachers. However, the APE teachers spoke of isolated cases where there could be collaborative interactions between them and the GPE teachers at their school buildings. In those situations where the GPE teachers permitted the APE teachers to use their equipment more positive interactions occurred that were more rewarding and meaningful.
Only two of the six APE teachers talked about positive interactions with classroom teachers at the schools they taught at. These two APE teachers interpreted their interactions with the classroom teachers as collaborative. They talked about getting along well with some of the general education teachers and that they had had some collaborative interactions. The other four APE teachers gave less positive descriptions of their interactions and relationships with classroom teachers.

Moreover, all six APE teachers discussed their rather infrequent interactions and relationships with school building principals. They all suggested that their interactions with principals mostly had to do with scheduling issues (e.g., scheduling of gym use and time allocation), but beyond that they might only once in a while come across the school principals. These APE teachers’ main contention was that periodically principals forget or overlooked them as part of their schools and even often neglected scheduling APE classes as part of the school programs.

Importantly, however, this cohort of six APE teachers had regular mostly collaborative, supportive, and friendly interactions with one another. More specifically, this cohort of APE teachers held weekly meetings among themselves that provided them regular opportunities to discuss issues regarding organization and management; to discuss sharing and using of the limited equipment that was available; to discuss instructional matters (e.g., pacing, using different formations, pairing/grouping students, and using station work); or to present ideas and strategies for solving behavioral issues.

In a similar spirit of collaboration, the APE teachers stated that their interactions with occupational and physical therapists were described as mostly collaborative. They felt that periodically where opposite the occupational and physical therapists would support
their classes by physically assisting students with orthopedic disabilities, for example. They also shared ideas on behavioral issues and possible solutions. However, not all of the APE teachers had regular opportunities to meet with the occupational or physical therapists at the schools they worked. Nonetheless, all of these APE teachers reported that they had had collaborative, supportive, and friendly interactions with occupational and physical therapists during their careers. Such professional interactions benefit students in the spirit and intent of collaborative teamwork. This is particularly important as Rabbette (1996) identified similarities in the roles and responsibilities of these three groups of specialists in the areas of sensory—perceptual skills, gross motor development, and the development of the whole child. Research also indicates that there are differences as well in service delivery models, levels of collaborative teaming, and professional interactions (Rabbett, 1996). This is consistent with findings in the current case studies as there were various levels and opportunities to engage in collaborative teamwork and interactions between these APE teachers, occupational therapists, and physical therapists.

To the contrary, another troubling finding in this collective case study was that the school district’s APE supervisor seldom interacted with the APE teachers and rarely attended the teacher’s weekly meetings. He only did so if there was something of particular interest he wanted to share with them. Moreover, the APE teachers did not have opportunity to establish much of a relationship with the district’s APE coordinator who they might not even see or meet for a whole year. One of the APE teachers gave a more serious description suggesting that they had had no real interactions or meetings with the district’s director of special education (coordinator) for some two years. The APE teachers explained that the director of special education in the school district heads
their department. Yet, they felt that the apathetic attitude of the director was not very supportive of them. The APE teachers were disappointed that the director of special education who had oversight of their jobs did not show much interest in them. They expressed a need to meet at least periodically with the director.

It appears from the aforementioned findings that these APE teachers were at times marginalized by other professionals including some classroom teachers, GPE teachers, school principals, and even their own APE supervisor. Interestingly scholars have described the marginalization of physical education as a matter of concern (Stroot, Bell, & Jones, 2000; Stroot & Whipple, 2003). This concern is also directly related to the issue of the legitimacy of physical education as a subject area not only for beginning teachers but also for many members in the physical education profession (Stroot & Whipple, 2003). In the current set of case studies, the APE teachers appeared to be marginalized professionals within an often marginalized profession. One can conveniently admit that the disrespect or disregard of these APE teachers may be a direct offspring of the legitimacy of APE as a subject area. Some of the interactions and relationships noted by the APE teachers create a contradictory view from what Sherrill (2004) discussed. That is, specialists typically working as partners with generalists or members of multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, or cross-disciplinary teams in performing PAPTE-CA services (i.e., planning, assessing, preparation, placement, teaching, counseling, coaching, evaluation, coordination, consulting, and advocacy). By and large, the APE teachers studied did not appear to have that type of partnership approach with generalists. Clearly there is a need to work more positively with other professionals and a need to demand that they are respected and regarded as professionals as well rather than harboring negative feelings of
others. According to Case-Smith, Allen, and Pratt (1996), good team relationships have been found to resolve and prevent overlapping problems of roles among professionals.

Of note, Kelly and Gansneder (1998) addressed the issue of interactions and relationships on the consultancy role of the APE teacher. In sum, the literature indicates that APE consultations occur on a continuum from proximal to distal dependent on the degree of interaction between the APE specialist, the general education teacher, and the students. Moreover, the effectiveness of consultations depends upon the general education teachers’ attitudes and the APE specialist’s communication skills and competencies. The descriptions of interactions by the APE teachers in the current cases with parents, general education teachers, GPE teachers, and others seem to follow what the literature indicates. And that is, interactions vary greatly contingent upon the dynamics of interpersonal relationships, communication skills and competencies, and contextual variables (Kelly & Gansneder, 1994).

**Description of APE Teachers’ Concerns Using Fuller’s Stages of Concern**

A second, yet important purpose of this collective case study was to determine whether or not itinerant APE teachers had job-related concerns. And if so, what were their concerns? Findings in this study reveal that these APE teachers did have concerns. The stages of concern theoretical model, which include the self, task, and impact stages (Fuller, 1969; McBride, 1993), was used to better understand the findings of this study as associated with these APE teachers’ concerns. The teachers expressed concerns on several variables, which were: (a) gymnasium use, time allocation, and size; (b) limited equipment availability, adequacy, and use; (c) large caseloads and class sizes; (d) apathetic attitudes and behaviors of some teacher aides; (e) need for better support to
improve their jobs; (f) aspects of professional development need improvement; (g) issues of transportation and traveling; and (h) teachers feeling disrespected and disregarded by some of their colleagues.

Overall, the APE teachers in this study held concerns in the task and impact stages of Fuller’s (1969) model of teacher concerns (i.e. concerns about dealing with teaching tasks and student learning as related to equipment needs, large caseloads and class sizes, inadequacy and inconsistency of assistance from teacher aides). They also expressed concerns reflective of the self stage. For example, they had concerns about self-protection associated with feelings of disrespect and disregard derived from the attitudes and actions of some colleagues as well as concerns about adequacy of some aspects of their professional preparation. Essentially, the APE teachers had concerns related to teaching tasks and how to meaningfully impact student learning within their given restraints. These concerns reflect concerns of teachers in the task and impact stages of the concerns model. Again, the teachers all had concerns of self-protection and adequacy that were reflective of the concern’s model self stage.

_A Discussion of Teachers’ Self Stage Concerns_

According to Fuller (1969), teachers in the self stage are concerned about survival or their inadequacy. This reflects the idea of what concerns the self or personal issues rather than the task or student. In the current study, the APE teachers’ felt a degree of marginalization and even disrespect and disregard by some. A concern of all six teachers was a lack of respect by other teachers and administrators in school buildings. Fuller’s (1969) model explains among other points that teachers in the self stage have a primary concern about self-protection and adequacy. This concern includes the notion of finding a
place in the power structure of the school and understanding expectations of supervisors, principals, and parents, and in this study also of GPE, classroom teachers, and others.

Most troubling, again these APE teachers felt that they were disrespected or disregarded by some teachers and principals at the various schools where they taught. A result of this was that these APE teachers seem to question their place of importance in the educational system especially in those schools. The questions that may allude to this concern are exactly what Fuller (1969) identified of teachers who question: (a) Where do I stand (where is my place in the school)? (b) How do others think I am doing (how do other teachers and/or principals think of my job and of me)? This might not be a primary concern for experienced teachers to the extent of being traumatized or intimidated. As experienced teachers, it was obvious that the APE teachers in the present study had passed from the novice stage of survival or inadequacy to maturity stage of development (Katz, 1972). At this stage “teachers begin to ask questions of themselves and their teaching that focus on their insights, perspectives, and beliefs regarding teaching and children” (Stroot, 1996, p. 342). Nevertheless, the APE teachers in the current cases expressed a concern for self. McBride (1993) reported similar concerns of teachers and stated that the physical location of the gym relates directly to this issue. APE teachers can begin to work at creating respect and regard for themselves by getting more involved in programs and activities of the schools with which they work (Rabbette, 1996).

A Discussion of Teachers’ Task Stage Concerns

Teachers in the task stage are concerned about their own teaching, issues that are associated with teaching and how they can teach effectively. In this study, all six APE teachers expressed similar common issues or concerns regarding gym allocation, space
and time, as well as concerns around scheduling, and being kicked out of the gym; large caseloads and class sizes; lack of or inadequate equipment; the apathetic attitudes and behaviors of some teacher aides; lack of support by administrators and parents; lack of support through professional development opportunities exclusive to APE; and issues related to transportation and traveling. These were recurring concerns expressed by all six of the APE teachers that they felt adversely affected their teaching.

The similarity of the concerns expressed by the APE teachers in this study to what Fuller described as representing the task stage points to concerns within the parameters of their jobs such as dealing with contextual variables (e.g., space, equipment, time allocation, class size), managing students behaviors, as well as dealing with or ignoring the apathy shown by some teacher aides.

It is obvious that if teachers have concerns as these APE teachers clearly did their teaching effectiveness might be compromised. Teachers must find solutions to these concerns or adapt to their situations whenever possible. For example, the APE teachers in this study organized fundraising to get money for purchasing equipment. This helped to reduce the problem of a lack of equipment available so that the teachers could teach better. However this was not a permanent solution. This urban school district not unlike other urban school districts nationwide (Argon, 1998; Noguera, 2003) must find ways to better provide necessary equipment for its workers including APE teachers. For APE teachers, some of these concerns need to be tackled by the district’s APE supervisor. In the meantime, itinerant APE teachers should open up and maintain dialogue with their colleagues at the different schools they serve so that improvements will occur in their interactions and collaborations (e.g., share equipment between APE and GPE teachers).
Additionally, there should be incentives and rewards established for those teacher aides who do support the APE classes. On the other hand, teacher aides who show apathy toward getting involved in assisting APE teachers and their students should be held accountable. What APE teachers desire are environments typified by an atmosphere conducive to teaching and learning, and reliable support from teacher aides could help significantly in that regard.

The APE teachers in this collection of cases exhibited some demeanors or characteristics that were reflective of the task stage of development. From day-to-day, they were concerned about dealing with teaching tasks. Experienced as they were these teachers were not concerned about their inadequacy, which is a characteristic of self-stage (Fuller, 1969) instead each of these APE teachers believed she was an effective teacher. Their concerns focused on issues that impacted how to deal with teaching tasks to make students engage in movement fun.

A Discussion on Impact Stage Concerns

The impact stage reflects teachers’ concern for students’ learning and success, as well as meeting individual needs. According to Fuller (1969), the questions asked by teachers in this stage include: (a) Are students learning? (b) How does what I do affect their gain? While all six APE teachers in this collection of case studies explained their concerns it was evident that the concerns expressed culminated in their ultimate objectives of ensuring that students enjoyed and engaged in movement activities as much as they could. These objectives identified and exposed their concerns in the task stage as a means to an end. In other words, the APE teachers had concerns but they still wanted their students to have fun, which was a primary objective. Even though the teachers did not
Teach skills per se in all lessons at the impact stage their objective of fun was achieved in
the midst of all the concerns at the task stage. This means that they dealt with teaching
tasks to ensure that their students gained as a group and as individuals. They employed a
lot of motivational techniques to encourage students to participate individually.

These APE teachers were concerned about how to impact student learning and did so
with limited or inadequate equipment, for example. To this, these teachers organized
fundraising activities to purchase equipment, which would reduce the problem. Not
surprisingly, fundraising activities did not eliminate the equipment problem, so the
teachers tried to meet individual students’ needs with the limited equipment that was
available. They also complained about being asked to leave the gym while in the middle
of a lesson (or even having their classes cancelled altogether). While this was an issue the
teachers managed to utilize whatever time they did have to organize a class for the
students. The teachers were also perplexed with concerns of how best to encourage some
of the teacher aides to make an attempt at supporting their teaching as well as lack of
support from parents and administrators. However, the teachers taught lessons within
times scheduled or whatever time they had to do so such that students would have fun in
movement activities. The teachers’ concerns were consistent with Fuller’s description of
the impact stage. In this stage teachers ask questions such as: “What do I do to meet the
needs of individual students and the whole group of students?” The six APE teachers in
this study understood the importance of hands-on experiences and knowledge acquired
from workshops and/or conferences as necessary for answering such questions as they
went about doing their jobs.
They noted that they gained most by attending workshops that were explicitly pertinent to their job roles and responsibilities. This implies that the APE teachers were ready and willing to learn more about APE programming and teaching students with disabilities, which would enable them to better meet the needs of individual students as well as groups of students. Despite their concerns that were reflective of the impact stage (Fuller, 1969; McBride, 1993), these teachers’ lessons were mostly successful at keeping students busy, happy, and good (Placek, 1983), and they demonstrated skills at providing students with individualized attention as well as group attention.

**Concerns of Teachers Regarding their Roles and Responsibilities**

In all, the concerns expressed by these APE teachers had to do with limitations in gym use, time allocation, and space; limitations in equipment; large caseloads and classes; apathetic attitudes and behaviors of some teacher aides; perceived lack of support from some colleagues and administrators; issues related to transportation or traveling; and at times feelings of disrespect and disregard for them by others. These concerns were reflective of self, task, and impact stages of teacher concerns (Fuller, 1969; Lienert et al., 2001; McBride, 1993). This is consistent with previous research on teaching physical education for students with disabilities in schools within major metropolitan areas (Lienert et al., 2001). Specifically, a comparison of findings from the current collection of case studies and the findings reported by Lienert et al. exemplify several noteworthy similarities. Both studies revealed teachers had: (a) personal concerns, but their personal concerns may differ; (b) management concerns, for example, with large class sizes and heavy caseloads; (c) inadequate budgets and resources; (d) inadequate facilities and equipment; (e) concerns on issues of collaboration with others.
Similar to findings in this collective case study, Kelly and Gansneder (1998) reported concerns of APE specialist about caseloads and class sizes. In both instances, APE teachers admitted that they rarely attended IEP meetings due to heavy caseloads. On average, APE specialists surveyed by Kelly and Gansneder reported caseloads of 104 students. In this present study, the APE teachers who worked in the same large urban school district had even larger caseloads with an average of 113 students with a range of 75 to 200 students with disabilities. It is quite difficult for APE teachers to regularly attend scheduled IEP meetings. To do so would in some instances require them to take time out from their already limited time designated for teaching classes. To still honor their obligation as required by law regarding IEP meetings, these APE teachers completed their portion of the IEP and presented it to the team meeting through another teacher who would be attending. They only attended themselves if it was absolutely necessary.

Teachers in the current study also felt that class size (i.e., an average of 15 students with varied mild to severe disabilities) made it more difficult for them to be effective. This was particularly true given their concerns about limited or inadequate equipment and a need to provide students with individualized instruction and attention especially those students who exhibited behavioral problems. These APE teachers’ concerns were heightened by the variability of students’ disability types and severity. It is reasonable to suggest that teachers may be less effective at their work under such circumstances particularly when they have a professional responsibility to be mindful of the needs, interests, and abilities of students with a broad range of disability types and severities (Hazekamp & Huebner, 1989).
On the issue of inclusion, Lieberman et al. (2002) reported that physical education teachers had concerns regarding their professional preparation, lack of equipment, issues around time in their schedules, apathy shown by some teachers, and communication issues. Again, although the APE teachers in the current study taught exclusively in self-contained classes they had very similar concerns (i.e., large caseloads and class sizes, apathy of some teacher aides, disrespect shown to them by some, inadequate equipment and facilities, scheduling difficulties, and variability in students’ disability types and severities). There exists transferability of findings from the current study to what others have reported in the literature (Hodge et al., 2004; Kelly & Gansneder, 1998; Lieberman et al., 2002; Lienert et al., 2001; McBride et al., 1986), which confirms that such issues persist in physical education contexts and thus require appropriate measures to be taken toward resolutions.

Consistent with previous research (McBride et al., 1986), the APE teachers in this current investigation reported concerns with their status as that of feeling disrespected and disregarded by some colleagues. McBride et al. (1986) attributed these sorts of concerns to the physical location of the gymnasium that is often removed from the school main complexes. Issues around physical educators feeling disrespected and disregarded or marginalized by others is most troubling. In the current collection of case studies, the APE teachers under study were marginalized by some colleagues who themselves taught within an often marginalized profession that of physical education (Stroot et al., 2000; Stroot & Whipple, 2003). There is the need for APE and GPE teachers to forge positive and collaborative relationships between and among themselves to the benefit of their students. Rather than APE teachers waiting for other teachers to come to them, they
should take the initiative to seek out their colleagues to establish positive and collaborative interactions and relationships. APE teachers must also realize that there is a need to help foster respect for themselves as individuals and respect for the APE profession. This can began to occur as APE teachers demonstrate effectiveness in their daily teaching behaviors, seek out collaborative relationships with colleagues, and make it a point to attend faculty meetings, for example, such that they can contribute to faculty discussions and decision-making in meaningful ways.

In line with the APE teachers feeling disrespected and disregarded, they described their itinerant status to multiple schools as being viewed by others as that of *visitors*, rather than as valued members of the schools’ faculties. This lack of recognition of full membership on the schools’ faculties was symbolized as these APE teachers did not have their names and/or photographs on the display boards in the schools where they taught. Yet, all other teachers in these schools had their names and/or photos displayed on the boards. The *visitor* issue needs to be resolved by the schools’ administrators, faculties, and APE teachers. School administrators and faculties have a professional obligation to make sure all faculty members feel welcomed and accepted; and no less should be afforded APE teachers including those with itinerant status. Moreover, APE teachers should immerse themselves into the school environments; for example, by asking questions about what is going on in their various schools and getting involved. If proactive steps are not taken to change the perceptions of APE teachers as *visitors* to the schools they serve they will continue to encounter a marginalized status. To the contrary, APE teachers can take initiative to ask questions and get involved in school functions and
activities. This will break the kind of ‘cold’ relationships too often characteristic of itinerant APE teachers and some of their colleagues at the various schools they serve.

Another concern of the APE teachers in this investigation was with aspects of their professional preparation. There was some concern that the nearby PETE program lacked flexibility in terms of not allowing them to use alternative lesson plan templates, they used a linear planning model (Tyler, 1950), which they believed would have allowed them more room for creativity; and what they considered as rigidity of the PETE curriculum that “makes teaching going by the book difficult”. Typically, during professional preparation PETE teachers are taught to use Tyler’s (1950) linear planning model for planning instruction. Despite this, research indicates that most teachers do not adhere to this prescriptive approach in their planning practices (Byra & Coulon, 1994). Teachers in the current collection of cases—resisted using a linear approach during their professional preparation and did not adhere to any particular planning approach as experienced teachers. In all, however, these APE teachers felt adequately prepared to teach students with disabilities. They credited their favorable perceived competency to their PETE undergraduate and APE graduate training that included hands-on practicum and/or field experiences and coursework as influencing their knowledge base. In addition, the teachers felt that they had benefited from workshops and conferences, particularly those that were focused specifically on APE programming and teaching of students with disabilities.

Still another concern was scheduling difficulties related mostly to availability of the gymnasium. These teachers indicated that they were sometimes forgotten about so they had to contact the various school principals before scheduling adjustments could be made.
It was also evident in some cases that the GPE classes were scheduled at the neglect of APE classes (Hazekamp & Huebner, 1998). This normally made APE classes either placed just before lunch or immediately after lunch. Classes scheduled in this way lost some of the allocated class time because the classes either had to end early for the gym to be re-organized (i.e., arranging of tables and chairs and bringing out the food trays before lunch) or cleaning up after lunch often delayed the start of classes. This concern is a problem which typifies most schools where the gymnasium is also used as a dining hall, which was the case for the urban school district in this study.

Similar to findings in previous research (Krueger et al., 2000) on concerns about transportation, social isolation, and budget restrictions, the APE teachers in this current study were also concerned about daily traveling and transporting of equipment, less than positive interactions with some colleagues in the school buildings where they taught, and budget constraints. As one teacher explained “…transporting equipment makes it difficult to go grocery shopping because the vehicle is loaded with equipment and it does not make sense to offload in the evening for grocery and load again the following morning’. Added to this problem was the concern about increment weather that made driving risky and dangerous, particularly so in this Midwestern city where snow fall is a common occurrence during winter months.

Other areas of concern that were mentioned by these APE teachers included communication and technological issues (e.g., their lack of an awareness of various computer programs that would have enhanced their work such as a software program designed for IEP development); inconsistencies in documenting student progress; and lack of guidance or a formalized consulting process. These APE teachers had a concern
that they had not been made aware that IEP documents were being developed using a particular computer software program, which other teachers had been taught to use. This software program apparently allowed other teachers to have a simpler way of completing IEP documents. These APE teachers had not been introduced to that particular software program and they did not even have easy access to computers to do their work. Related to this, there was also no standard format for documentation of student progress. Thus, each teacher completed their progress records and often did so in different ways, which they thought, did not allow for consistency in doing their work.

A final concern expressed by these APE teachers had to do with consulting. They believed that if they were requested to consult there was no identified protocol as to how they should go about the consultation process. On those few occasions when some of the APE teachers had consulted in the past they just discussed issues with their colleagues (e.g. GPE teacher), but did not have a means to know whether or not they were doing it appropriately or effectively. In short, they had little awareness about how consultation needed to be done. The process of effective consultation should be addressed during APE teachers’ professional preparation (Block & Conaster, 1999).

In describing their concerns, the APE teachers in this study described issues that either directly or indirectly impacted the teaching-learning process. It has been argued that teaching-learning is a reciprocal process (Kiphard, 1983; Sherrill, 2004). In view of this acts of the teacher and acts of the student(s) affect both (i.e. student and teacher) reciprocally within the context of the environment. Teachers’ concerns (e.g., large caseloads and class sizes, apathy of some teacher aides, disrespect shown to them by some, inadequate equipment and facilities, scheduling difficulties, and variability in
students’ disability types and severities) are therefore critical to the degree of success experienced in the teaching-learning environment. The interconnectedness of such variables inevitably affect the achievement outcomes, interests, and opportunities of the students. Even though teacher concerns may differ from person to person and from setting to setting the basics remain the same that concerns are interconnected to all involved in the teaching-learning process and have influence on both teacher and student. Below Figure 1 presents a graphic representation of the interconnected variables of equipment, professional development, teacher consistency, collaboration, and technology, which have an impact on and are impacted by the reciprocal interactions of the teacher and student(s) in any given teaching-learning context.

Equipment. APE teachers need equipment to teach their students. The best situation is for them to have access to ample equipment for sport and movement activities including adapted equipment, supplies, and other resources (e.g., use and access to computers). But in the absence of their own needed equipment APE teachers should at least have access to equipment typically used in GPE classes. Equipment for sport and movement activities are in essence the tools that APE teachers need to carry out their primary responsibility of teaching. In those circumstances where such “tools” are limited and/or inadequate it becomes much more difficult for teachers to do their work effectively. Lack of adequate equipment, supplies, and other resources was a common concern of teachers in the current study, which is also characteristic of the conditions in many urban public city schools (Argon, 1998; Noguera, 2003).
Figure 1. Interconnectedness of Teachers’ Concerns in the Teaching-Learning Process

Again even today, many schools and school districts are culturally, ethnically, economically, and racially segregated and unequal (Toppo, 2004). This is evident as students who attend urban public city schools often do so in dilapidated school buildings and detrimental school conditions. In fact, it was estimated that nationally urban school districts need billions of dollars to refurbish their depleted schools (Argon, 1998). To the degree that APE teachers have requisite equipment of quantity, variety, appropriateness, and suitability, their teaching is enhanced or hindered (Block, 1994; Sherrill, 2004).
Students are likely to learn more when there is ample equipment, supplies, and other resources that would give them more opportunities to respond to practice and more active participation is possible. The less equipment available the less the opportunity for the students to practice and less learning would take place. So equipment is very important if teachers are to teach well and achieve their objectives and at the same time it is important if students are to learn, achieve, and have fun. Equipment therefore is reciprocally connected to the teacher and her students.

*Professional Preparation and Development.* The APE teachers in this current study expressed some concerns about their professional preparation (e.g., need for more training on IEP development, lesson planning issues) but mostly they had concerns about limited opportunities for attending workshops, conferences and seminars that would support their professional development. This concern was emphasized as a need to attend workshops, conferences, or seminars that were most pertinent to their work. It may be inferred that these APE teachers were concerned about acquiring more information in their field of expertise that would enhance their teaching. Through such professional development opportunities, APE teachers may be exposed to for example the use of new equipment or how to adapt equipment used in GPE settings. In short, new knowledge of teaching (methods or approaches) may be acquired by attending workshops, conferences, or seminars. These APE teachers explained that they would readily use any knowledge and/or hands-on experiences acquired through professional development opportunities. Obviously, students would benefit from teachers who continue to improve their teaching efficacy. The teacher, students, equipment, and the teachers’ professional development are interconnected in a reciprocal process between the teacher and student, and context.
Consistency of Practices. The need for APE teachers to be consistent in teaching and managing students with disabilities cannot be overemphasized. The establishment of rules and routines, for example, is a means by which teachers can demonstrate consistency in their physical education practices (Block, 2000; Rink, 1993; Sherrill, 2004). Some of the teachers in this current study also expressed concern about inconsistency in the kinds of records they keep on student progress. It was observed that these APE teachers were not consistent in how they went about writing and maintaining documents (assessment records, IEP documents, progress records).

Furthermore, students with disabilities exhibit varied tendencies both in general behaviors and specific to differing disability types and severity levels (individual differences even concerning disability types). Teachers who teach students with varying disabilities need to develop consistency in their organization (e.g., routines, environmental arrangement, use of equipment) and management of classes. During professional preparation as well as at professional development workshops, conferences, and seminars APE teachers can acquire practical knowledge on how best to be consistent in their class organizational and management behaviors. Moreover, APE teachers ought to maintain open lines of communication with one another and other colleagues to exchange ideas and ensure consistency in how they go about teaching, organizing, and managing classes particularly as associated with teaching students with various disability types and severity levels.

The availability and use of equipment, teachers’ knowledge and experiences gained through professional preparation and development, and teachers’ degree of consistency in exhibiting effective teaching behaviors are interconnected as part of the teaching-learning
process. This interplay of variables impacts and is impacted by the reciprocal relationship between the teacher and student(s), and contexts (Kiphard, 1983; Sherrill, 2004). All of which may affect the student’s achievement outcomes, interests, levels of fun and participation as well as affect the teacher’s use of various teaching methods or approaches or even impact them psychologically (e.g., perceived self-efficacy) or emotionally (e.g., feeling good or bad about their teaching effectiveness) given the feedback derived from the student(s) or the teaching-learning process.

**Professional Collaborations.** Consistently the need for collaboration between and among professionals who work with individuals with disabilities has been documented in the literature (Block, 1994; Case-Smith et al., 1996; Cowden & Eason, 1991; Rabbette, 1996; Sherrill, 2004). For example, Block (1994) noted that while administrators did not necessarily make allowances for team collaboration, they typically expect it to occur as a commitment by all. Similarly, Case-Smith et al. (1996) maintained that good team relationships resolve and prevent overlapping problems of roles among professionals. In agreement, Sherrill (2004) expressed the need and importance of collaboration by way of teamwork among coworkers or members of crossdisciplinary (transdisciplinary), interdisciplinary, and multidisciplinary teams.

The call for good teamwork is an important issue because the goals of all professionals working with students with disabilities seem to be that of improvement in students’ lives. Among other overlapping roles and responsibilities is the obvious area of psychomotor domain and the whole child (Rabbette, 1996). It has been emphasized that overlapping problems can be counterproductive therefore professionals should work together as one functioning unit to provide the best educational program for the student and to ensure
respect for the student as a whole person rather than a collection of parts (Case-Smith et al., 1996). With the view to realizing the collaborative outcome scholars have advocated that (a) professionals should resolve the power and prestige struggle, (b) be aware of the potential contributions of each professional to the well-being of the student, (c) professionals must be able to adapt to the changing team members, (d) informed professionals are aware of overlapping roles among the professions and build cooperative relationships, (e) good team relationships can allow practitioners to work at their advanced skill levels for longer periods than can the practitioner who doesn’t have access to team support and consultation, (f) each professional should interpret his or her role to others, and (g) professionals should keep open lines of communication recognizing the skills overlapping or specific of other professions, and using those skills to complement one’s own are hallmarks of professional competence (Case-Smith et al., 1996).

In the current collective case study, the APE teachers expressed a concern about feeling disrespected and disregarded by some of their GPE colleagues and other teachers in the school buildings where they taught. These teachers also had concerns about a failure to develop any meaningful relationships with principals, their APE supervisor, or even their director. On the other hand, they had much better relationships with one another and with occupational and physical therapists. Given that the child or student should be the center of attention for all these professionals—they must come to realize that they all have an invested interest in learning to collaborate in respectful and meaningful ways to the benefit of the child or student. When this type of realization is achieved, for example, GPE teachers would realize that whatever sport and movement activity equipment is in their respective schools should be made available for all students.
to use irrespective of which program serves (APE or GPE programs) any particular student(s) with or without disabilities. Ideally, professional knowledge, skills, and ideas acquired during professional preparation and development would be shared by all professionals between and among one another and would lead to the greater consistency in providing services to students and do so more holistically. Curricular changes need to be made that would ensure there were opportunities for various future professionals (APE teachers, GPE teachers, OTs, PTs, classroom teachers, etc.) to engage in collaborative activities with one another while working with youngsters during their professional preparation. Similarly, these types of opportunities should be provided for inservice or practicing professionals to collaborate with one another during professional development workshops, conferences, or seminars. It is reasonable to suggest that equipment availability, professional preparation and development opportunities, consistency of practices, and professional collaborations are interconnected and thus to a large extent impact teacher effectiveness and student achievement outcomes.

Communication and Technology. Today, we often travel on the communication highway in a technologically advanced era. The need for technology in this modern world is seen in everyday activities. For example, computers have opened or exposed a whole new world to most people. A major concern noted by the APE teachers in this current study, which was symptomatic of poor communication between colleagues, was on the occasion for example where other teachers had access and training to use a computer software program to more efficiently prepare their IEPs, while the APE teachers had not been notified nor received such training to do so. Even though the computer can be used in different ways to teach individuals with disabilities the concern of these teachers on a
general lack of communication with colleagues whether it is about IEP development, computer use, or other matters needs close attention.

Simply stated professional colleagues need to communicate with one another on a regular basis. Through professional preparation and development APE teachers can learn about how to use any particular software program on the computer to write IEPs for their students. They can learn to create documents that are consistent for sharing with colleagues related to IEP development, lesson planning, assessments, and student progress reports, for examples. This would enable APE teachers, GPE teachers, and other professionals to better communicate, interact, and collaborate with one another. There are countless ways to use today’s technologies. For instance, people frequently do business over the Internet. So for example, APE teachers could purchase adaptive equipment over the Internet, or APE and GPE teachers could exchange website addresses that are relevant to teaching students with and without disabilities in physical education settings (e.g., www.pecentral.com). The point is that any and all professionals can work collaboratively with one another to share information and ideas by staying in regular contact with each other—for example—via email messages. Not to mention that students can be exposed to different forms of technology to learn.

Observing and recording student games or other activities using technology (e.g., videotaping activities) or even the teacher in charge of technology assisting and leading other professionals in the use of technology to aid their teaching and enhance student learning outcomes are examples of how professionals can communicate and take advantage of technology in today’s schools. These issues are interconnected. To the degree that teachers are conversant in the use of various technologies in their teaching
practices impacts the teaching-learning process, can make teaching easier, and appeal to students, which would in-turn enhance students’ achievement outcomes (Hodge, Murata et al., 2003).

In summarizing the interconnectedness of the aforementioned components, it is clear that these components are impacted by and impact the teaching-learning process. Each individual (APE teacher, GPE teacher, OT, PT, student) plays an important role or has a unique place in terms of use of equipment, preparedness, consistency of practices, teamwork, as well as communication and technologies all of which impact student achievement outcomes. These are reciprocal variables in the teaching-learning process.

Another interesting finding was that some of the concerns cut across boundaries (overlapped), that means some concerns fit into more than one stage, a similar finding to existing literature (Lienert et al., 2001; McBride, 1993). For example, students’ individual differences (variability) could be in task stage because the teacher deals with how to teach all the students. On the other hand, the teacher makes use of the individual difference to motivate that individual to learn or succeed an impact stage concern. McBride (1993) stated that it is not always possible to have the three distinct categories of concerns but expect an overlap because human characteristics are variable and attempt to classify them into separate and distinct constructs may not always be successful.

Suitability of Fuller’s Concerns Model to Concerns of Itinerant APE Teachers

The analysis of the concerns of these APE teachers have revealed several concerns some of which relate to Fuller’s three stages of concerns of self, task and impact. However, there were some concerns, for example, transportation (on and offloading of equipment) and traveling in increment weather that were not accounted for by Fuller’s
(1969) model. This clearly indicates that the concerns model as described by Fuller (1969) is not an exact fit or very suitable to capture all concerns that APE teachers encounter in executing their roles and responsibilities.

The interconnectedness of these APE teachers’ concerns to each other and their reciprocal effect on both students and teacher is therefore similar to the dynamic systems model posited by Lienert et al., (2001) regarding the interrelationships among concern variables, contextual variables and personal variables. The dynamical systems model indicates interrelationships of concerns with innovations or adoption processes as originally posited by Hall et al., (1973). When studying concerns not directly related to innovations or adoption processes but general in nature that are related to either the student or the teacher they have an obvious two-way relationship that may either be direct or indirect.

In view of the relationships that exist between the teacher and the student concerns in the teaching-learning process become inextricably interwoven. The researcher therefore proposes the interconnectedness of concerns model to capture general concerns of teachers while they execute their roles and responsibilities. Worthy of note is the fact that the arrows connect all concerns, the student and the teacher indicating that even though the concerns may be distinct or unique from each they are still connected because they all together affect the teacher and the student. Secondly, since concerns differ from person to person as well as contextually, the model has flexibility such that other concerns could be added as branches to the existing model.
Summary and Conclusions

In the current collection of cases, the APE teachers studied were a cohort of six women who taught students with disabilities in urban schools. The students they taught represented varied age groups, grade levels, disability types and severity levels, and these students came from varied ethnic, cultural, and linguistic ancestries. These teachers acquired experiential knowledge as they interacted with students in their efforts to meet both group and individual needs. Through such interactions they were able to come to understand the nature of their roles and responsibilities as itinerant APE teachers in an urban school district. They used teaching techniques and methods based on past experiences coupled with their individual knowledge bases, which they had acquired through personal and educational experiences (i.e., professional preparation and development) to carry out their roles and responsibilities. These teachers understood that student variability (e.g., cognitive, physical, behavior, experiences) becomes more pronounced when teaching students with disabilities. The emphasis to acquire efficacy in teaching such students requires special professional preparation and experiences teaching a diversity of students with disabilities in varied contexts including urban public schools (Hodge et al., 2002; Hodge, Tannehill et al., 2003). Experience is crucial when working with individuals with disabilities. Vogler et al. (1992) reported that experience is important in order to become competent in dealing with the unique problems associated with students with disabilities. Also the literature supports the need for better preparation of teachers who teach students with disabilities in physical education settings. Rizzo and Vispoel (1991) reported that academic preparation (coursework) in APE and years of
experience teaching students with disabilities had significant positive correlations with physical education teachers’ perceived competence.

The descriptions of the teachers in the current collective case study on their roles and responsibilities fall within the scope of direct (teaching) and indirect (consulting) services (Hazekemp & Huebner, 1989; Kelly & Gansneder, 1998; Sherrill, 1998). However, these teachers described their roles and responsibilities more in terms of teaching (direct service) responsibilities and they did little consulting. Within the parameters of their teaching these APE teachers focused mainly on movement activities and creating fun for their students. The long-term goal of teaching students to acquire skills seemed not to be a focused aspect of their teaching. This leads to a conclusion that for these APE teachers their teaching was not geared towards acquisition, development, or proficiency of movement skills, but rather a focus on taking part in the lessons, cooperating with others, and having fun. To a large extent the approach of these teachers is similar to what Placek (1983) described about some physical education classes as busy, happy, and good. The APE teachers studied in this case generally described skill acquisition, development, and proficiency as mostly dependent on the individual student and the student disability type and severity. Despite no apparent accountability measures for student achievement outcomes, the APE teachers felt that active student participation is in and of itself motivating and self-fulfilling and can lead to life-long physical activity and recreational participation. These APE teachers claimed to have had expectations of student learning yet few if any accountability measures were in place to help realize student outcomes.

The APE teachers also claimed that planning and documenting were part of their responsibilities. But there was no evidence that these teachers used written unit or lesson
plans. Solomon and Lee (1991) reported contrasting planning behaviors between expert
and novice APE teachers. That report presupposed that experience is an indicator of
better preparation towards daily planning for lessons and a sign of teachers’ efficacy. The
descriptions of their own efficacy void of written unit or lesson plans by the APE
teachers in this study is not consistent with this presumption. It cannot be determined
from the findings of this study whether or not these APE teachers’ teaching was more or
less effective void of written unit or lesson plans (Byra & Coulon, 1994; Stroot & Morton,
1989). Nonetheless, APE and PETE professional preparation programs should continue
to emphasize the importance of planning as a means to document the unit or lesson focus,
instructional objectives, and hold students accountable for learning outcomes. If
experienced teachers rely on their experiential knowledge only, but do not take time to
plan they might take student learning for granted and be less effective than they would be
otherwise. There is a need to combine experience with good planning and execute what
has been planned to possibly yield a better result in the teaching-learning process. During
the researcher’s observations in this study it was difficult to ascertain the level of
preparation of the teachers. Still, it was apparent that they neglected to plan well. This is
difficult to explain given that these APE teachers all had received training in standardized
competencies including unit and lesson planning and all mentioned a number of qualities
of effective teachers to include planning paradoxically however they did not exhibit
several qualities expected of effective teachers.

In this case study, the teachers had had training in APE (i.e., four of them had earned
master’s degrees in APE and two had taken advanced courses in APE). Their descriptions
indicate that hands-on experiences and courses they had taken contributed to their
knowledge base. In addition, they derived knowledge from attending workshops and conferences. The teachers in this study described some experiences as too “bookish” (i.e., use of one size fits all lesson plans—linear approach; Tyler, 1950) and rigid so there should be some flexibility to allow teachers to be more creative. For example, unit and lesson plan formats should be more flexible. Their descriptions about a need for more field experiences was that there should be greater emphasis on preparation directed toward teaching students with varied mild to severe disabilities and at different settings including rural, suburb, and urban schools (Burden, Hodge, O’Bryant et al., 2004; Hodge, Tannehill et al., 2003).

Individuals work best when they have support, a congenial atmosphere, and collaborative input from colleagues. This is no less true for APE teachers who work in multiple urban public city schools as itinerant teachers. Consistent calls have been made by scholars regarding the importance of PETE programs to provide curricula content and professional socialization experiences that would enhance intercultural sensitivity (Burden, Hodge, O’Bryant et al., 2004; Burden, Hodge, & Harrison, 2004; DeSensi, 1995). This should occur in APE programs as well. The goal is to better prepare APE and GPE teachers to work effectively in diverse contexts with students who represent ethnic, cultural, linguistic, and other diversities in urban environments (Burden, Hodge, O’Bryant et al., 2004; Hodge, Tannehill et al., 2003; Knop et al., 2001; Stroot & Whipple, 2003). The traditional failure to expose APE and PETE teacher candidates to teaching in diverse contexts is a serious concern. Importantly, teaching in urban public city schools can be a rewarding experience (Noguera, 2003). This was evident as all six of the APE teachers under study in this investigation taught in the same urban school district and
each stated that she was highly satisfied with her job, despite a number of concerns often associated with such schools.

Findings from this study also led to the conclusion that these teachers love working with students with disabilities. Their love was exhibited in how they taught even though they had concerns. The teachers felt that they were effective despite inadequate budgets, lack of or little support from some teacher aides, or disinterest shown by some administrators, or even disrespect by some teachers. It seems their standard for effectiveness was the degree to which they created fun opportunities for their students despite their concerns. They felt as if they were often viewed by others as *visitors* at the school buildings where they taught. Some of them, however, indicated that respect and professional interactions depend on individual personalities and the personnel at particular schools. Undoubtedly, however, the APE teachers were marginalized in their professional roles (Stroot & Whipple, 2003).

Several conclusions were reached based on findings from the current collective case study and the extant literature. These conclusions are enumerated below.

1. **The APE teachers were consistent in how they described their roles and responsibilities as itinerant service providers.** The APE teachers described teaching as a primary direct service and thus their main responsibility and to a lesser degree they viewed consulting as an indirect role they played periodically. This is consistent with the literature in this area. For example, Eason (1991) asserted that APE teachers are experts in motor development and are specifically trained to teach individuals with special needs using adaptations and skill sequences. The APE teachers in this study did do some fitness activities, but mostly taught basic movements and games
for fun (Rabbette, 1996). They used adaptations and supports such as those teacher aides who were willing to help (Hodge et al., 2004; Houston-Wilson et al., 1997; Vogler et al., 2000). But teaching using skill sequences was not evident (Chandler & Green, 1995; Eason, 1991; Kelly & Gansneder, 1998; Miller, 1981; Rabbette, 1996; Sherrill, 2004). Teachers in training (preservice) and those in the field (inservice) should be alerted to the importance of holding students accountable for learning outcomes in physical education contexts. Individuals with disabilities also have a life to lead beyond school environments and learning movement skills, fitness behaviors, games and sports as examples would do much to their satisfaction and encourage them to participate in current and future leisure and recreational activities (Block, 2000).

2. Relationship building is individually contrived and contextually driven. Rabbette (1996) found that levels of interactions with APE teachers, OT, and PT varied. The APE teachers in this collective case study had positive and collaborative but infrequent interactions with physical and occupational therapists. Similarly, the teachers had periodic yet mostly positive interactions and relationships with parents. Further, the APE teachers had frequent meetings and collaborative interactions with one another. In contrast, they encountered less than positive, sometimes marginalized, and even disrespected interactions with some colleagues. One of the teachers felt that she did have good interactions and relationships with most colleagues. While it cannot be concluded here that APE teachers do not interact much or well with other colleagues there is literature that confirms the concern that these particular APE teachers felt in terms of disrespect and disregard (McBride, 1993). McBride (1993)
explained that the interactive concern of some APE teachers is partially due to the physical location of the gym. Given that the level of communication, interactions, and kinds of relationships differed from teacher to teacher and school to school it is reasonable to suggest that communication, interactions, and relationship building depends on each individual and the context each person operates within. However, it should not be overlooked that there was a general marginalization of these APE teachers’ professional contributions to the schools where they taught. But because the child or student should be the center of attention for all the aforementioned professionals—they must come to realize that they all have an invested interest in learning to collaborate in respectful and meaningful ways to the benefit of the student.

3. **Concerns are individually determined and contextually driven.** In this collective case study, the APE teachers described various concerns they had from their own individual perspectives. Yet their concerns were consistently similar and defined in terms of the urban school contexts with which they carried out their roles and responsibilities. They did differ on which concerns were emphasized by individual teachers. For example, they all expressed concerns about inadequate equipment and facilities, but four out of the six APE teachers were more concerned about less than favorable relationships they had with some classroom teachers. Still there was even greater concern about perceived disrespectful attitudes of some GPE teachers toward them. On the other hand, two of the APE teachers did not show much concern about such relationships. In fact, one of the APE teachers talked about having positive interactions and good relationships with all the professional colleagues she interacted with at one particular school, but much less positive interactions and relationships at
another school. Interestingly, all six APE teachers described having mostly positive collaborative interactions and relationships with occupational and physical therapists at these schools. In sum, the APE teachers were similar in their overall concerns, differed in the degrees to which they emphasized any particular concern, and their concerns were defined within the contexts of the multiple schools where they taught in this large urban school district.

4. *Itinerant APE teachers assumed visitor status in the schools where they taught.* In carrying out their itinerant roles, which required traveling from one school to another, these APE teachers were often viewed by others as *visitors* to the schools. This statement fits the definition that a visitor is one who is at a place for a short time just for a stopover with or without a particular purpose in mind and leaves shortly thereafter. A visitor is not considered an integral member of full standing at that place. These APE teachers were not viewed as integral members of full standing at these schools. For example, at one particular school all of the teachers and staff of that school building had their pictures and names on a picture board, yet no one had displayed the APE teacher’s picture or name on the board. Itinerant APE teachers go to multiple schools to teach and do not stay for long periods of time. Arguably, they still should be considered a member of full standing at those schools because they return regularly to provide services to those schools. There is a need and responsibility for APE teachers to become more active in the schools where they teach classes. A start is for APE teachers to ask questions about what goes on in those schools and also to become actively involved in various school activities or programs once they become aware of such activities or programs.
Implications

Implications of findings from this collective case study are presented in this section.

Findings in this study indicate that these APE teachers did not clearly delineate between their roles and responsibilities. More important, however, they understood their various roles and responsibilities as itinerant teachers. To this, they considered teaching as direct service and consulting as indirect service, which is consistent with the extant literature (Hazekamp & Huebner, 1989; Jansma & French, 1994; Kelly & Gansneder, 1998; Sherrill, 2004). Though, teaching such that students acquired, developed, and showed proficiency in movement skills was not emphasized nor were students held accountable for learning outcomes in these APE teachers’ practices. Most lessons were about fun and movement. Fun is important for students with disabilities to enjoy their time engaging in physical activities. What’s more, teaching should also be about acquiring, developing, and showing proficiency in movement activities to benefit youth in their immediate capacity as students and for their future leisure and recreational pursuits (Block, 2000). Implications are that APE and PETE professional preparation program must ensure that teacher candidates are trained well and come to appreciate the importance of teaching movements skills (e.g., object control and locomotor skills) as well as fitness behaviors, games, and sports; and the importance of holding both students with and without disabilities accountable for achievement outcomes.

Teaching and assessing ought to go together (Block, 2000; Hodge & Tannehill, 1998; Rink, 1998; Sherrill, 2004), but findings from the current study indicate that this does not always happen in every situation. There is pressure for assessment and accountability of education that is increasing nationwide (Senne & Housner, 2002). In those states where
there are no state physical education standards it is difficult to enforce assessment as a component of teaching. However, APENS (Kelly, 1995) and IDEA (1997) clearly identifies the importance of testing and assessing students with disabilities in physical education settings. Implications are that APE teachers should conduct testing and assessing of individual students as needed for referral, placement, and IEP development, but they should also conduct continuous assessments to identify the instructional needs of individual students and programming for groups of students in order to better plan to meet such needs (Hodge & Tannehill, 1998; Sherrill, 2004).

Criticisms of inservice training programs often pertain to their short duration (Ackland, 1991) and their abstract nature (Zimpher & Howey, 1992). In the physical education profession, inservice or professional development workshops and conferences are often geared toward GPE programming and not necessarily directed towards the contexts or needs of APE teachers. Plus findings from the current study indicate that professional development days were limited for these APE teachers. Thus it is evident that APE teachers need more professional development workshops and conferences that are relevant to teaching of students with disabilities and context specific (e.g., urban, rural, suburban schools, and communities) aiming at what they need and would recognize as valuable to them. Moreover, APE teachers need more information on teaching in urban public city schools. The implications are that professional development opportunities should be made relevant to APE programming and teaching of students with disabilities in various settings including urban public city schools. As much should be done during APE and PETE preservice professional preparation as well (Burden, Hodge, O’Bryant et al., 2004; Hodge, Tannehill et al., 2003; Knop et al., 2001; Stroot & Whipple, 2003).
Budget constraints and restrictions create difficulties in the teaching-learning process. Such difficulties are often characteristic of urban school districts (Argon, 1998; Noguera, 2003). Findings from the current study indicate that these APE teachers tried to find ways to deal with limited and inadequate equipment, they shared the limited and often poor conditioned equipment, and the teachers purchased some equipment with their own resources. Implications are that state and local district’s Boards of Education need to make available budgets that can alleviate some of the constraints encountered by APE teachers—as federal law requires a free and appropriate public education for all children with disabilities this includes physical education programming (IDEA, 1997). It is difficult to provide appropriate education to meet student needs when teachers are in a constant struggle to be effective at teaching students in urban public schools using inadequate equipment, supplies, and resources in limited gym spaces and with overcrowded classes, and apathetic attitudes and little support from some teacher aides and professional colleagues.

These APE teachers felt that they had little flexibility in writing IEPs and they felt that during preservice training they had to follow a rigid unit and lesson plan format. The IEP is a legal document that needs to be written to include specific components to ensure appropriate and adequate educational services are provided to the student with disability (Sherrill, 2004). Policy regarding this should be clear and teachers should be made aware that in developing IEP documents they must adhere to the requirements of their state and local school district. This may not allow for overt individual creativity, but will help ensure that the legal requirements of IEP development are adhered to more consistently by all. It is reasonable however to allow for greater individual flexibility of teachers in
developing unit and lesson plans, again provided the necessary components of such plans are represented.

Consulting is an important role that APE teachers play as a service to help inform and collaborate with professional colleagues who also work with individuals with various disability types and severity levels. The APE teachers in this study did not consult often. However, whenever APE teachers do consult the information they provide must be accurate. Information that is inaccurate may be even more detrimental and dangerous than no such information. Implications are that during their preservice professional preparation and continued throughout their careers via professional development workshops and inservice opportunities APE teachers must receive guidance and information on how best to engage in the consultation process (Block & Conaster, 1999).

Different professionals have a part to play in the development of the whole child. For this reason professionals work in interdisciplinary teams, crossdisciplinary or transdisciplinary teams, and multidisciplinary teams to plan and implement their ideas to assist the individual with disability (Sherrill, 2004). Educational settings provide opportunities for professionals to communicate, interact, and collaborate. The need for professional interactions that are collaborative, supportive, and respectful should be seen as a shared responsibility that enables all parties to work together to the benefit of student (Bruder, 1993; Case-Smith et al., 1996; Rabbette, 1996; Rainforth, York, & Macdonald, 1994). Block (1994) noted that administrators did not make allowances for team collaboration but expected it as a commitment by all. Implications are that APE and PETE professional preparation programs need to emphasize the importance of
communication, collaboration, and mutual respect of professional colleagues in the training of future and practicing teachers.

Teachers in itinerant positions whose work involves a lot of traveling encounter problems and difficulties (Hodge, Murata et al., 2003; Stroot et al., 2000). This was so in the current collective case study as the teachers expressed various concerns and some of their concerns were related to their roles and responsibilities as itinerant teachers. Implications are that more school districts need to hire additional APE teachers to reduce the traveling placed upon each individual teacher. Those APE teachers already providing services need additional incentives and recognition for their devoted efforts in carrying out their roles and responsibilities. In this study, the teachers worked hard at doing their jobs well, but whether they did so as effectively as they might is still an open question.

Recommendations

Findings in this study provide a number of issues derived from individual cases and cross case analysis on the roles, responsibilities, and concerns of APE teachers working in itinerant positions at urban schools. The following section presents recommendations relevant to policies and practices, and future research.

Policies and Practices

1. Both in policy and practice, school district wide professional development opportunities should be made available on a regular basis for APE teachers to engage in inservice workshops and conferences that are pertinent, beneficial, and rewarding. APE teachers can benefit most significantly from participating in workshops and attending conferences that are designed for them to acquire new knowledge, ideas, and strategies that are directly relevant to APE programming and teaching of students.
with disabilities. Such policy and practice would enhance APE teachers’ overall teaching effectiveness. Permitting APE teachers to regularly participate in professional development workshops and attend conferences, which are cost effective ways to help maintain a well-prepared teaching workforce.

2. School districts should hold APE teachers accountable for participating in professional development workshops and attending conferences. For example, participating in workshops and attending conferences that are relevant to APE programming could be built into annual teacher evaluations to help ensure that teachers understand the importance of participating in professional development workshops, attending conferences, and engaging in continued learning opportunities (e.g., coursework at a nearby college of university) on a regular basis.

3. APE teachers should have discretion in selecting at least one or more professional development workshops and/or conferences per year to attend. Choice may be a criterion that would permit teachers to participate in workshops and attend conferences that they perceive to best meet their individual and contextual needs. This choice option would be in addition to general workshops and conferences organized by the school district specifically for all APE teachers to attend.

4. Teachers should be expected to give brief reports and present information to colleagues after participating in professional development workshops or attending conferences at a predetermined regularly scheduled meeting of coworkers, administrative staff, and/or other professionals. This would help ensure teacher accountability linked to participating in professional development workshops and attending conferences. Plus, it would be a direct way of disseminating information,
ideas, and strategies gleaned from such workshops or conferences to other colleagues and coworkers. Furthermore this would provide opportunities for promoting communication, interaction, and relationship building with colleagues across disciplines and professions.

5. The school district should require APE supervisors or coordinators to conduct needs assessments at periodic intervals to determine and describe what are APE teachers’ needs with the intent of supporting and enhancing their work. Some APE teachers may need equipment, supplies, and resources. While, others may have a greater need for reduced caseloads or additional support from teacher aides as examples. Moreover, assessing what individual teacher’s needs are would also serve to prompt these teachers to reflect on becoming even more aware of areas of their teaching that need improvement. For example, class organization, transitioning students into formations, and behavior management problems are possible areas that some teachers may lack efficiency or effectiveness and they may therefore benefit from mentoring provided to them by veteran APE teachers for support and guidance.

6. Experience is a necessary condition for expertise but not a sufficient condition (Siedentop, 1991). Experience therefore might not always be indicative of effectiveness. Annually, APE teachers should be expected to show proof via documentation (e.g., unit and lesson plans, IEP documents, student progress records, assessment data and interpretations) of their teaching practices. This could regularly occur at the end of each school year. Moreover, records of students’ progress and teacher’s unit and lesson plans should be readily available for principals, parents, or
APE supervisors to examine. Students should also be tested and assessed to inform planning of instruction and as a means to monitor student-learning outcomes.

7. In both policy and practice, school district APE coordinators or supervisors should establish and maintain regular contacts with APE teachers and be held accountable for carrying out their supervisory roles. This would further ensure that APE teachers meet the expectations of their job roles and responsibilities. It is incumbent upon district supervisors and coordinators to do their jobs well to help ensure that APE teachers are meeting at least minimal criteria for employment within the district.

8. During their professional preparation, APE teachers should receive training in supervision to acquire the necessary supervisory skills to enable them to better supervise teacher aides.

9. Teacher aides must be supervised more effectively and given encouragement and reward to more consistently do their jobs or face dismissal for apathetic attitudes and/or behaviors towards their work. The problem of teacher aides neglecting their duties has been reported previously in the literature and was further confirmed in this current study as reported earlier. Among other incentives, an award of recognition for example “Best Teacher Aide” award could be established within school districts to recognize, reward, and help motivate teacher aides to better carry out their job-related responsibilities, which in-turn would likely enhance APE teachers’ overall teaching effectiveness. On the other hand, those teacher aides who refuse to work including providing regular assistance in APE classes or who do not meet minimal job-related expectations should be dismissed.
10. Periodic meetings involving all teachers within school buildings including APE teachers should be organized. In that context, APE teachers need to attend meetings that involve their colleagues and other professionals and they must put forward conscious effort to contribute intelligently to discussions and decision-making processes. They need to expose themselves as knowledgeable and contributing members of the schools they serve. For example, APE teachers could present information on topics of interest and share their expertise and knowledge about teaching of students with disabilities.

11. Periodically, school building principals, APE supervisors, and/or APE coordinators should request briefings from APE teachers on their job-related activities so that they can interact and share information as well as show an appreciation and respect to these teachers by taking an interest in their work.

12. Literature indicates that education specialists and the public rarely perceive physical education as a legitimate subject area as such physical education is at times marginalized. To address this issue preservice training across professions should provide context for trainees to better understand one another’s professional roles (all subject areas) and promote interpersonal relationships and teamwork.

**Future Research**

1. Findings of this collective case study are based on data provided by only six APE teachers within the same district; therefore, it is recommended that this study be replicated in different schools in different urban school districts and across various geographical regions. Collective case study and/or other qualitative approaches could be used so that findings and data interpretations could be compared and contrasted.
Transferability of findings from several studies would strengthen confirmation of what we know about APE teachers’ roles and responsibilities, and job-related concerns. It would also be informative to replicate this study as various school districts might differ in their employment policies with regard to job roles and responsibilities of itinerant APE teachers. Comparatively there may be similarities and dissimilarities in urban public schools and schools located in rural or suburban, which should be investigated.

2. In this collective case study, all of the participants were experienced teachers ([Renewal and Maturity Stages of development] described as three to four years for renewal and four and above as maturity stage, Kartz, 1972; Stroot & Whipple, 2003). They all were White women APE teachers employed in the same school district, thus future related research should investigate both men and women from diverse ethnic, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds with varying levels of experience to determine and describe APE teachers’ roles and responsibilities, and job-related concerns from the perspectives of a diversity of both men and women experienced and inexperienced APE teachers. For example, African American men may express different concerns from what White American women APE teachers articulate and vice verse.

3. Findings in this collective case study indicate that these APE teachers neglected to develop written unit and lesson plans. These teachers claimed that they had unit plans but admitted not writing lesson plans. An explanation given was that as experienced teachers they did not need to write lesson plans because of the “planning in their minds”; yet they all admitted that written plans were important. Additional research
needs to be conducted to determine whether or not APE teachers (e.g., experience and inexperience) are more or less effective if they write and use unit and lesson plans on a regular basis (Byra & Coulon, 1994; Stroot & Morton, 1989).

4. In view of what is known about teacher effectiveness (Siedentop & Tannehill, 2000; Vogler et al., 2000) and what itinerant APE teachers in the current study described as effectiveness, yet at times did not exhibit qualities of effectiveness, there is the need for more research into effectiveness of APE teachers.

5. APE teachers in this collective case asserted that they benefited from participating in professional development workshops and/or attending conferences that were relevant to their teaching practices. Research should be conducted to determine to what degree and how teachers utilize information and knowledge acquired from such professional development workshops and/or conferences. Such a study would help to reveal the extent to which teachers implement or utilize information from professional development workshops and attending conferences. The outcome of such a study would also help inform school districts on whether or not various types of professional development workshops or conferences in fact meet the needs of APE teachers in their district.

6. Using a naturalistic inquiry or another qualitative approach (e.g., phenomenology; Moustakas, 1994), a study should be conducted to determine and describe the behaviors and beliefs of APE teachers relative to teaching a diversity of students with varied mild to severe disabilities. In such a study, for example, participants might be novice and experienced high school APE teachers and their students with disabilities from suburban and urban school districts across various geographical regions.
7. Research using quantitative methods such as a longitudinal study (Thomas & Nelson, 2001) or qualitative methods should be conducted to examine the extent and permanency of knowledge acquired during APE teachers’ professional preparation and/or through their career development over a period of years to determine how they go about using knowledge acquired and experiential learning to do their jobs.

8. Using a phenomenological (Moustakas, 1994) approach research should be conducted to explore the meaning APE teachers versus GPE teachers derive from their experiences teaching students with disabilities in self-contained versus inclusive GPE classes. Data collection might include interviews with these teachers. APE and PETE faculty must provide high quality training for teachers to more competently teach students with disabilities and better ensure that they have meaningful experiences doing so.

9. Typically, recent graduates from APE and PETE professional preparation programs are thought to have developed skills and competencies that reflect best practices. Moreover, experienced APE and GPE teachers are expected to continue their professional development. However, neither novice nor experienced APE teachers typically receive training at the preservice or inservice levels on how to go about establishing collaborative working relationships with their professional colleagues and earning the respect of others with whom they work. There is the need to conduct research in this area. Collaboration should connote meaningful teamwork and team effort at assisting each other for a common goal or set of objectives; that is, for APE teachers to the benefit of student with disabilities. Yet, this was not always the case in the current investigation.
10. The APE teachers in the current collective case study described their sense of teaching effectiveness—however observational findings within this study were not always consistent with their descriptions. Teaching effectiveness has been studied and described extensively for GPE settings (McLeish, 1981; Siedentop, 1989; Siedentop & Tannehill, 2000), but more studies on teaching effectiveness need to be conducted in APE settings particularly self-contained classes in urban public city schools.
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I voluntarily consent to participate in the research entitled:

A Descriptive Analysis of the Roles, Responsibilities, and Concerns of Adicted Physical Education Teachers in an Urban School District
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Print the name of the participant:
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PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

Teacher’s Name [pseudonym] _________________________________________

Teaching Experience

1. How many years have you taught regular physical education (PE) in K-12 schools?
2. How many years have you taught adapted physical education (APE) in K-12 schools?
3. How many years have you taught and/or consulted as an itinerant APE teacher?
4. How many years have you taught APE and/or consulted at your current schools?
5. How many schools do you currently provide service as an itinerant APE teacher?
6. How many students with disabilities do you currently teach (caseload)?
7. What range of disability types and levels of severity do you have in your classes?
8. How would you describe your current schools (e.g., urban/suburban/rural, students’ socioeconomic status, ethnicity/race, and so on)?

Educational Background

9. Where (college/university) and when (year) did you receive your bachelor’s degree?
10. What certificates and/or licenses do you have linked to your bachelor’s degree?
11. Have you earned a master’s degree? If yes, where and when?
12. What certificates and/or licenses do you have linked to your master’s degree?
13. What other certificates and/or licenses do you have—and in what area of expertise?
14. How many courses, inservice workshops, and conferences have you attended for professional development purposes as a practicing APE teacher?

*Personal Information*

15. What is your gender; what is your age; and what is your ethnic/racial background?

16. What is your marital status?
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TEACHER INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

INITIAL INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
Initial Interview Questionnaire

Professional Preparation

1. Is your baccalaureate degree in education—specifically in physical education? If not, please explain.

2. Do you have other graduate degrees, certificates, or licenses in regular PE, APE and/or other areas of expertise? If so, please identify each type and area.

3. Where and when did you receive the aforementioned degrees?

4. Do you have APE certification, licensure, and/or validation?

5. Do you hold other teaching certificates and/or licenses (e.g., K-12 regular PE)?

6. What coursework do you think has had the most significant impact on your efficacy to meet the demands of your roles and responsibilities as an itinerant APE teacher?

7. Have you benefited from taking graduate courses, participating in professional development workshops, and/or attending local/state/national conferences? If yes, describe in what ways you find doing so beneficial to your work as an APE teacher.

8. How many graduate course hours have you taken for professional development purposes; how often (per year) do you participate in workshops and/or attend conferences?

9. Describe your physical education teacher education (PETE) and APE programs at preparing you for what you actually do as an itinerant APE teacher.

10. What areas were lacking or needed improvement in your PETE and/or APE training that would have better prepared you to meet your current roles and responsibilities?
Teaching Demographics

11. How many total years have you taught APE and/or regular physical education?
12. How many years have you taught as an itinerant (i.e., traveling) APE teacher?
13. How many years have you taught APE at your current school(s)?
14. How many schools do you currently have teaching and/or consulting responsibilities?
15. How many grade levels do you currently have responsibility for providing APE services (i.e., teaching/consulting) for students with disabilities?
16. What is the total number of students with disabilities you provide with APE services?
17. Of the students with disabilities you provide with APE services (teaching/consulting) what are the disability types and degrees of severity of those students?
18. How many students do you currently provide with APE services for at each school?
19. What is socioeconomic status range of the students you provide with APE services?
20. What is the ethnic/race (e.g., African American, Hispanic, Native American, White, non-Hispanic) composition (percentages) of students you provide with APE services?

Roles and Responsibilities
21. Describe your job roles and responsibilities as an itinerant APE teacher?

22. In what ways are your roles and responsibilities distinctive in terms of providing direct (teaching) versus indirect (consulting) services?

23. Do you have regular or periodic meetings with colleagues (e.g., APE or regular PE) or administrators (e.g., APE supervisor, principals) on matters related to your job roles and responsibilities? If yes, describe such meetings and how often these occur?

24. Do you attend individualized educational program (IEP) team meetings? If so, how often do you attend and for how many students are such meetings held?

25. How often do you use information from a student’s IEP document to inform your teaching/consulting to meet the student’s needs, interests, and abilities?

26. How effective do you think you are as an itinerant APE teacher in meeting the needs, interests, and abilities of your students?

27. What things help you to more effectively teach and/or consult as an itinerant APE teacher?

28. What things tend to hinder effectiveness in teaching and/or consulting as an itinerant APE teacher?

29. Describe your professional interactions and relationships with education colleagues (e.g., PE teachers) in the schools where you provide APE services. Do you consider these interactions and relationships as collaborative/supportive? Why or why not?

30. Describe your professional interactions and relationships with administrators (e.g., principals) in the schools where you provide APE services. Do you consider these interactions and relationships as collaborative/supportive? Why or why not?
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31. Describe your professional interactions and relationships with other professionals (e.g., occupational therapist [OT], physical therapist [PT]; teacher aides) whom come in contact with at the schools where you provide APE services. Do you consider these interactions and relationships as collaborative/supportive? Why or why not?

32. Describe your professional interactions and relationships with parents of the students with disabilities for whom you provide APE services. Do you consider these interactions and relationships as collaborative/supportive? Why or why not?

33. Do you think your professional interactions and relationships with education colleagues such as regular PE teachers, APE cohorts, and classroom teachers; administrators, other professionals (e.g., OT, PT, teacher aides), and parents need improvement? If so, why and in what ways?

34. Describe the availability and your access to physical education and sports equipment, supplies, or other resources for your use. Is the equipment, supplies, or other resources readily available and adequate for you to properly carry out your APE job-related roles and responsibilities? If not, how do you handle limited access or inadequate equipment at your various school sites?

35. Describe your level of job satisfaction—associated with carrying out your roles and responsibilities as an itinerant APE teacher/consultant.
APPENDIX G

TEACHER INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

REVISED FOR SECOND INTERVIEW
SECOND INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Describe what you think are the most important roles and responsibilities of an itinerant APE teacher?

2. What degree of importance do you place on your role in providing consultant services?

3. What degree of importance do you place on your role in teaching students with disabilities?

4. How involved is the district’s APE supervisor in supporting/evaluating the work of you and your APE cohorts? How frequently does he/she attend your weekly meetings?

5. Do you think attending IEP meetings is important to you more effectively carrying out your roles and responsibilities? If you answered no—explain why IEP meetings are not so important? If you answered yes—explain what can be done such that you can more regularly attend and/or contribute to the IEP meetings?

6. How important is information from IEP documents to you effectively carrying out your roles and responsibilities as an itinerant APE teacher?

7. How often do you review or call for a review of students’ IEP records?

8. Do you see the issue of safety as an integral aspect of your roles and responsibilities? If yes, why and in what ways? How do you go about ensuring students’ safety?

9. What degree of importance do you place on developing unit/lesson plans for instructional purposes?

10. What approach, if any do you use for unit and/or lesson planning?
11. What degree of importance do you place on documenting student outcomes (recording test and assessment data, developing progress reports, identifying IEP goals and objectives)?

12. What degree of importance do you place on teaching students movement skills for acquisition, development, and proficiency?

13. How might students acquiring, developing, and demonstrating proficiency in movement skills contribute to current and future successes they experience in physical activities, sport, leisure, and/or recreational pursuits?

14. Do you establish rules and routines for your classes? If yes, why? If not, why?

15. Are you effective at organizing and managing your classes? If yes, how do you go about organizing and managing your classes to achieve optimal success?

16. Are teacher aides reliable and useful at assisting you in achieving class goals and lesson objectives? If not, describe in what ways they could be more helpful.

17. What strengths contribute to your effectiveness at carrying out your roles and responsibilities as an itinerant APE Teacher?

18. What areas need to be improved or changed in your teaching that would allow you to be more effective at carrying out your roles and responsibilities as itinerant APE teacher?

19. What major concerns—if any—do you have or see in performing your roles and responsibilities as an itinerant APE teacher?

20. What suggestions can you give as necessary to alleviate some of the concerns—you may have—to enhance your job-related roles and responsibilities such as improving your teaching effectiveness?