

5-2009

The Effects of Education and Experience on the Attitudes of Pre-service Physical Educators toward Teaching Children with Disabilities

Justin A. Haegele

The College at Brockport, Justin.A.Haegele@hotmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/pes_theses

 Part of the [Disability and Equity in Education Commons](#), and the [Kinesiology Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Haegele, Justin A., "The Effects of Education and Experience on the Attitudes of Pre-service Physical Educators toward Teaching Children with Disabilities" (2009). *Kinesiology, Sport Studies, and Physical Education Master's Theses*. 6.
http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/pes_theses/6

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Kinesiology, Sport Studies and Physical Education at Digital Commons @Brockport. It has been accepted for inclusion in Kinesiology, Sport Studies, and Physical Education Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @Brockport. For more information, please contact kmyers@brockport.edu.

The Effects of Education and Experience on the Attitudes of Pre-service Physical
Educators toward Teaching Children with Disabilities.

By

Justin A. Haegele

A thesis submitted to the Department of Physical Education of The College at
Brockport, State University of New York in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Masters of Adapted Physical Education

5/1/2009

The Effects of Education and Experience on the Attitudes of Pre-service Physical
Educators toward Teaching Children with Disabilities.

By: Justin A. Haegele

APPROVED BY:

Cathy Houston-Wilson

5-6-09

Thesis Chairperson: Dr Cathy Houston-Wilson

Date

Lauren Lieberman

5-6-09

Committee Member: Dr. Lauren Lieberman

Date

Christopher Williams

5-5-09

Committee Member: Dr. Christopher Williams

Date

Ferman Konukman

5-7-09

Committee Member: Dr. Ferman Konukman

Date

Susan C. Peterson

5/7/09

Chair, Department of Physical Education: Dr. Susan Peterson

Date

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	iii
Abstract.....	v
Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1
Problem Statement.....	3
Hypothesis.....	4
Operational Definitions.....	4
Definitions.....	4
Assumptions.....	5
Limitation.....	5
Delimitations.....	6
Significance of Study.....	6
Chapter 2. Review of Literature.....	7
Legislation.....	7
Attitudes of Physical Education Teachers.....	8
Attitudes of Pre-Service Physical Education Teachers.....	11
Chapter 3. Methods.....	17
Selection of Subjects.....	17
Instruments.....	18
Procedures.....	18
Data Analysis.....	19
Chapter 4. Results.....	21

Chapter 5 Discussion.....	24
Comparison of Results to Literature.....	25
Recommendations and Future Directions.....	26
Conclusions.....	29
References.....	30
Appendix A. PEATH Survey Modified Version.....	34
Appendix B. PEATH Survey Original Version.....	41
Appendix C. Statement of Informed Consent.....	49

Abstract

The education of children with disabilities has changed dramatically since 1970. Litigation and legislation have guaranteed students with disabilities a free and appropriate public education in an environment which would be least restrictive. This has placed some students with teachers who may not have a positive attitude toward teaching children with disabilities. Research has identified several variables which effect an educators' attitude toward teaching children with disabilities- the two most prominent being previous experience and education. The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of education and experience on the attitudes of pre-service physical education educators toward teaching children with disabilities. Pre-service physical educators from The College at Brockport, State University of New York, who were enrolled in an introduction to adapted physical education course, were asked to complete a modified version of the Physical Educators' Attitudes toward Teaching the Handicapped (PEATH) questionnaire before and after their experience in the course, which included field experience. Results indicated that there was no significant difference in the pre-service teachers' attitudes toward teaching children with disabilities before and after the course. Even though results were not significant, there was a trend toward pre-service attitudes becoming more favorable. The trend suggests that higher education institutions can create a positive and effective adapted physical education course in physical education teacher preparation courses that may increase positive attitudes. The lack of significance suggests that more can be done to continue to improve attitude.

Chapter 1

Introduction

During 1900s, the rights of children with disabilities in public school systems progressed dramatically due to several litigation cases and national legislation. Prior to these changes, students with disabilities had few rights, were discriminated against in school, and occasionally were denied education altogether. Litigation such as *Mills v. Board of Education* (1972; Martin, Martin, & Terman, 1996) and *PARC v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* (1972; Gilhool, 1973) laid the foundation for legislation, which would benefit children with disabilities by displaying the negative actions school districts were taking toward the education of children with disabilities (Winnick, 2005). Legislation such as *Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act* (1973; Cornell, 2007) and the *Public Law 94-142* (1975; Turnbull & Turnbull, 1998) followed shortly in an attempt to correct educational practices for children with disabilities.

These laws created mandates addressing the education of students with disabilities that school districts must abide in order to receive federal funding. Benefits of these mandates for students with disabilities included that each student be provided a free and appropriate public education regardless of ability level, the creation of the Individualized Education Program (IEP), and teaching students in a Least Restrictive Environment (LRE). The Least Restrictive Environment is defined as the education of a student with a disability with able-bodied peers to the maximum extent appropriate, which will allow the student to have maximum success levels (Winnick, 2005).

As students with disabilities began participating in least restrictive environments- including school-based special education classes, integrated classes, and inclusive classes-teachers were faced with teaching students for which they have had limited training and preparation. Deficiencies in training and preparation have an affect on a teacher's ability to teach children with and without disabilities, and may also affect an educator's attitude toward the students and teaching in general (Rizzo & Kirkendall, 1995). Research has indicated that there is a direct relationship between teacher attitudes toward teaching students with disabilities and the general acceptance level of a student with a disability in the classroom (Rizzo & Vispoel, 1991). As a result, a teacher's attitude can limit the educational possibilities of their students.

In order to further investigate what affects a teacher's attitude toward teaching children with disabilities, several variables have been studied. Two variables which demonstrated a strong correlation with educators' attitudes toward teaching children with disabilities were perceived competence (Block & Rizzo, 1995; Rizzo & Vispoel, 1991; Tripp & Rizzo, 2006) and prior coursework and preparedness in the field (Ammah & Hodge, 2006; Block & Rizzo, 1995). Furthermore, the quality of past teaching experiences has shown an effect on teachers' attitudes toward teaching children with disabilities (Block & Rizzo, 1995). Therefore, in a higher education environment, perceived competence, prior coursework, preparedness in the field, and quality of teaching experiences can be manipulated throughout teachers' undergraduate education and pre-service experience.

While discussing attitudes of pre-service physical education teachers toward teaching children with disabilities, research has identified variables which may positively affect their vision of teaching children with disabilities. Specifically, coursework in adapted physical education (Hodge, 1998; Hodge, Davis, Woodard, & Sherrill, 2002; Rizzo & Kirkendall, 1995; Rizzo & Vispoel, 1992) and hands-on field experience (Folsum-Meek, Nearing, Grotelushen, & Krampf, 1999; Hodge, Davis, Woodard, & Sherrill, 2002; Rowe & Stutts, 1987; Schoffstall & Ackerman, 2007) are the two strongest variables to demonstrate a correlation to undergraduate physical education teachers' attitudes toward teaching children with disabilities.

Problem Statement

In order for a higher education physical education professional preparation program to have a positive influence on the ability of their pre-service teachers to teach children with disabilities, it must create a positive field experience and provide sufficient coursework in adapted physical education. To date, only a limited number of studies have investigated this area. The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of education and experience on the attitudes of pre-service physical educators' teachers toward teaching children with disabilities while enrolled in PEP 445 during the course of one semester.

The Physical Education Department at The College at Brockport, State University of New York is designed to prepare academically competent students to teach physical education in public schools. The physical education program offers one adapted physical education course (PEP 445) to prepare students to teach children with disabilities. In addition to either supporting or contradicting the previous

conclusions, the current study can be used to evaluate the physical education professional preparation program at The College at Brockport, State University of New York on its ability to affect the attitudes of pre-service physical education teachers toward teaching children with disabilities.

Hypothesis

Based on previous research, it was hypothesized that the attitudes of pre-service physical education teachers will become more favorable after completion of adapted physical education coursework and hands-on field experiences.

Operational Definitions

Adapted experience. The adapted experience is defined as the PEP 445 courses offered in the Department of Physical Education at College at Brockport, State University of New York to physical education, teacher preparation majors.

Attitudes. Attitudes are defined as ones mental state involving either favorable or not favorable beliefs or feelings measured by the PEATH survey score.

Definitions

Student with disabilities. A student with disabilities is defined as a child having intellectual disabilities, deafness or other hearing impairment, speech or language impairment, blindness or other visual impairments, serious emotional disturbance, orthopedic impairment, autism, traumatic brain injury, a learning disability, deafblindness, or multiple disabilities or other health impairments that require special education and related serviced (U.S. Department of Education, 2009).

Pre-service teachers. Pre-service teachers are defined as undergraduate physical education majors enrolled in the teacher preparation track in the Department of Physical Education at the College at Brockport, State University of New York.

Assumptions

1. Participants answered the survey truthfully.
2. Participants were representative of other physical education, teacher education students.
3. The Introduction to Adapted Physical Education class (PEP 445) was representative of introductory adapted physical education content.
4. The Introduction to Teaching Physical Education class (PEP 441) was representative of introductory physical education content.
5. Children were representative of other children with disabilities.

Limitations

1. Participants in the study may have had previous experiences working with children with disabilities.
2. The Introduction to Adapted Physical Education (PEP 445) may have taught different types and levels of disabilities in their courses.
3. The field experiences used in the study offered disabilities including intellectual disabilities, autism, behavioral disabilities, and cerebral palsy.
4. Participants in the control group may have pre-existing interests in adapted physical education.
5. Participants in the control group may have experienced interactions with children with disabilities during their fifteen hour off campus field experience.

Delimitations

1. Participants were all pre-service physical education, teacher education majors in a Northeastern State College (n=118).
2. Participants in the experimental group were enrolled in the PEP 445 Introduction to Adapted Physical Education class in Department of Physical Education at College at Brockport, State University of New York.
3. Participants participated in a college based field experience which consisted of 8 sessions for duration of 2 hours each and included both a gym and aquatics component.
4. Participants in the control group were enrolled in the Introduction to Teaching Physical Education course in Department of Physical Education at College at Brockport, State University of New York.

Significance of the Study

The education of children with disabilities has changed dramatically since 1970. Students with disabilities are now being taught by general physical education teachers, many of whom may have limited experience teaching children with disabilities. At the College at Brockport, State University of New York, physical education majors must complete (only) one course in adapted physical education in order to graduate. The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of education and experience on the attitudes of pre-service physical educators' toward teaching children with disabilities. Influencing pre-service physical education teachers to have more favorable attitudes toward teaching children with disabilities would create a more positive learning experience for students with disabilities in their classrooms.

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

The purpose of this chapter is to present a review of the significant literature pertaining to legislation and attitudinal research, which affect in-service and pre-service physical education teacher's attitudes toward teaching children with disabilities.

Litigation

Today, students with disabilities are provided a free public education equivalent to their able bodied peers, but this was not always the case. Through struggle, litigation, and advocacy of new laws, children with disabilities and their families have had to advance their educational rights for over forty years. In the 1970s, litigation cases such as *Pennsylvania Association of Retarded Children v. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* (Gilhool, 1973) and *Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia* (Martin, Martin, & Terman, 1996) provided national awareness of negative actions taken against children with disabilities in education and initiated future legislation to benefit the education of these students. Beginning with the *Rehabilitation Act of 1973* (Cornell, 2007) and progressing to *Public Law 94-142* (Turnbull & Turnbull, 1998) and *Public Law 101-476*, commonly known as the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA; Arnhold & Auxter, 2003), education for children with disabilities progressed from poor curriculum and low expectations to a structured and legally mandated education. The Least Restrictive Environment is defined as the education of a student with a disability with able-

bodied peers to the maximum extent appropriate, which will allow the student to have maximum success levels (Winnick, 2005).

As education for children with disabilities became integrated in schools, general physical education teachers began interacting with students with disabilities on a more regular basis. However, in order to produce quality education for children with disabilities, it is necessary to have quality educators; and the first step to being a quality educator is to have a positive attitude toward students.

Attitudes of Physical Education Teachers

With new legislation, the implementation of inclusion, and teaching in a least restrictive environment, general physical education teachers have been presented with new challenges of teaching children with disabilities. Unfortunately, general physical education teachers may not have a significant amount of education or experience teaching children with disabilities. Throughout their educational experiences, research has indicated education and experience along with other variables including labeling and perceived competence affect general physical education teacher's attitudes toward teaching children with disabilities.

Rizzo (1984) assessed 194 general physical education teachers' attitudes toward teaching children with disabilities using the Physical Educators Attitude toward Teaching the Handicapped (PEATH) instrument. The original instrument was designed to assess teacher attitudes according to type of disability and grade level. The author reported that general physical education teachers demonstrated a more favorable attitude toward teaching students with learning disabilities than teaching

those with physical disabilities. Additionally, teachers' attitudes become progressively less favorable as students advance in grade level.

To investigate in-service physical education teachers attitudes further, Rizzo and Vispoel (1991) studied the relationship between several attributes of physical education teachers and their attitudes toward teaching students with disabilities. The study assessed ninety-four in-service physical educators' attitudes using a modified PEATH-II instrument. The attributes included age, years teaching, coursework in adapted physical education, highest degree earned, coursework in special education, gender, years teaching students with handicaps, and perceived competence. The results indicated that the physical educators' perceived competence in teaching students with disabilities was the best predictor of positive attitude. Additionally, the study demonstrated that students with learning disabilities were viewed more favorably than students with mental retardation or behavioral disorders.

In a similar study, Block and Rizzo (1995) studied the relationship between attitudes and teaching attributes of public school physical educators. The attributes included teaching assignment, teaching level, adapted physical education coursework, special education coursework, years teaching students with disabilities, quality of teaching experience, and perceived competence in teaching students with disabilities. One hundred fifty in-service teachers from suburban school districts were given the modified PEATID-III instrument. Results indicated that as quality of in-service teaching experiences improved and pre-service adapted physical education coursework increased, attitudes toward teaching children with disabilities became

more favorable. Additionally, attitudes became more favorable with the addition of pre-service coursework in special education and perceived teacher competence.

Further research has shown more variables that affect in-service teachers' attitudes toward teaching children with disabilities. Ammah and Hodge (2005) completed a qualitative analysis of secondary, general physical education teachers' beliefs and practices on inclusion and teaching students with severe disabilities. The study used two, in-service, general physical education teachers from different suburban high schools. Using observations and interviews, data was collected from eighteen lessons from each participant. The results indicated that variables needed to successfully teach children with disabilities include feeling that the teacher is adequately prepared, well equipped, and supported. Preparedness may be related to either educational or experience related variables.

In an effort to determine the effect of other variables, Tripp and Rizzo (2006) explored questions dealing with teachers working with children with disabilities to determine whether or not labeling students would affect a teacher's attitude. In addition, the authors investigated attributes of physical education teachers which are associated with favorable intentions. The study demonstrated that there is a definite labeling effect when it comes to teachers attitudes, such that teachers tend to be less favorable of teaching children who have been labeled as disabled regardless of ability level of students. The labeling effect also lowered teacher's self competence in regards to teaching children with disabilities. The study showed that perceived teaching competence is an important attribute, which is associated with teachers

having favorable intentions toward teaching children with disabilities. These results support findings by previous studies.

Studies of attitudes of in-service, general physical education teachers' attitudes toward teaching children with disabilities have indicated several variables that have an effect. Perceived competence of the teacher (Block & Rizzo, 1995; Rizzo & Vispoel, 1991; Tripp & Rizzo, 2006), type of disability of the student (Rizzo, 1984; Rizzo & Vispoel, 1991), and prior coursework and preparedness in the field (Ammah & Hodge, 2005; Block & Rizzo, 1995) are each recurring variables in research that show a strong relationship with attitudes of teachers. In addition, the quality of past teaching experiences (Block & Rizzo, 1995) and labeling of students with disabilities (Tripp & Rizzo, 2006) have shown significant changes in teachers' attitudes toward teaching children with disabilities. Idealistically, each of these variables can be addressed before teachers enter the field of teaching and while they are enrolled in undergraduate pedagogy programs.

Attitudes of Pre-Service Physical Education Teachers

In order to produce teachers who have positive attitudes toward teaching children with disabilities, it is important to enhance their attitudes while enrolled in university programs. Early research (Rowe & Stutts, 1987) set forth to determine variables that would make attitudes of pre-service teachers more favorable toward teaching children with disabilities. The study included 175 undergraduate physical education majors, which were assigned to practicum sites and included one of four different groups of individuals with disabilities - preschool disabled, adult CP disabled, elementary school disabled, and adolescent MR disabled. The participants

were administered the Attitudes toward Disabled Persons Scale (Yuker, Block, & Campbell, 1960) before and after a twelve-week program. The results indicated that both prior experience and the site of the field experience demonstrated significant differences in attitudes; whereas, gender of the undergraduate student did not demonstrate a significant difference.

Further research of pre-service physical education teachers' attitudes toward teaching children with disabilities has investigated coursework, which may or may not include practicum time. Rizzo and Vispoel (1992) conducted a study to determine the influence of physical education courses on undergraduate physical educators' attitudes toward teaching students with several disability classifications. The study used two different courses- one designed specifically as an Adapted Physical Education course and the other designed as a physical education for children course- to determine if the courses would affect students' attitudes differently. Subjects were given the Physical Educators' Attitudes toward Teaching the Handicapped Questionnaire (PEATH-II) at the beginning and end of the courses. The results of the study indicated that attitudes of pre-service teachers in the adapted physical education course became significantly more favorable toward teaching children with disabilities than those in the physical education for children course. The results suggested that coursework may assist in positively influencing undergraduate physical education majors' attitudes.

Research has also discussed the association between demographic characteristics of pre-service teachers and their attitudes toward teaching students with disabilities. Demographic variables have included gender, age, year in school,

past experience, perceived competence, and academic preparation. Rizzo and Kirkendall (1995) investigated 174 undergraduate physical education majors in a pretest-posttest design, using the original Physical Educators Attitudes toward Teaching Handicapped Questionnaire (PEATH). The results from the study demonstrated that two variables, perceived competence and academic preparation, were the best indicators for pre-service teachers having a favorable attitude toward teaching children with either an intellectual disability or learning disability. These results support that younger teachers nearing the completion of their coursework had more positive attitudes toward children with behavior disabilities.

Additional research determining whether or not coursework in adapted physical education affects attitudes has been conducted. Hodge (1998) implemented the Physical Educators' Attitude toward Teaching Individuals with Disabilities-III (PEATID-III) survey to 103 students from five states before and after enrollment in a ten-week adapted physical education course. Results supported earlier work indicating that prospective general physical education teacher's attitudes may be positively impacted by such a course. Further results indicated that attitudes became more favorable with or without a practicum experience and that teacher attitudes became more favorable as experiences teaching students with disabilities increased.

A qualitative approach has also warranted valuable information about pre-service physical educator's attitudes toward teaching children with disabilities. Parker (2002) used interviews, observations, and personal journals to study four participants before, during, and after their student teaching experience. The study indicated that participants struggled with concepts of safety concerns when teaching children with

emotional/ behavioral disorders, which faded with grade level. Another interesting trend demonstrated was how unqualified the teachers felt during their experience and how they felt this experience would prepare them for future encounters.

Research has also explored the differences in academic major and attitudes toward working with children with disabilities. Folsom-Meek, Nearing, Groteluschen, and Krampf (1999) investigated the effect of academic major, gender, and hands-on experience on attitudes toward teaching individuals with disabilities. In this study, 2,943 undergraduates enrolled in adapted physical education courses at 192 universities across the country took the Physical Educators' Attitude toward Individuals with Disabilities-III Pre-service Version (PEATID-III PS) during the final two weeks of an adapted physical education course. Results included that people in majors other than physical education had more favorable attitudes toward working with children with disabilities; females had a more favorable attitude than males, and pre-service teachers with more hands-on experiences had more favorable attitudes than their inexperienced counterparts. These results may suggest implementing a practicum experience in introductory adapted physical education courses.

However, the type of practicum may affect pre-service teachers' attitudes toward children with disabilities. Studies by Hodge, Davis, Woodard, and Sherril (2002) and Hodge and Jansma (1999) have compared attitudinal changes in undergraduate students, which were enrolled in both on-campus and off-campus field experiences. Both studies implemented the Physical Educators' Attitude toward Teaching Individuals with Disabilities III (PEATID-III) instrument, which was given to students at different points during the experience. Hodge and Jansma (1999)

reported that both on-campus and off-campus experiences offered a more favorable attitude at the end of the experience, with the on-campus practicum experience improving attitudes significantly more than off-campus ones. Contrastingly, Hodge, et al., (2002) reported no significant differences between on-campus and off-campus field experiences. However, Hodge, et al., (2002) did report that perceived competence improved significantly in both groups from pretest to posttest.

Miller and Cordova (2002) compared changes in attitudes across a spectrum of undergraduate courses. This study implemented the Interactions with Disabled Persons (IDP; Gething & Wheeler, 1992) scale before and after enrollment in three courses, which included an introductory adapted physical education course without a field experience, an introductory adapted physical education course with a field experience, and a sport psychology course. The results indicated a significant difference in positive attitudinal change in the students enrolled in the both adapted physical education courses, but not in the sport psychology course. There was no significant difference in attitude between the courses that did and did not offer a field experience.

In addition to courses, the university setting may also have an affect on the attitudinal changes. Schoffstal and Ackerman (2007) studied the effects of an undergraduate adapted physical education course on the attitudes on pre-service educators toward children with disabilities at a faith-based university. Similar to prior studies, they implemented the Physical Educators Attitude toward Teaching Individuals with Disabilities III to 108 students. And similar to studies in non faith-based universities, positive significant differences in attitudes between the pretest and

posttest were reported. Additionally, the participants indicated that the course had prepared them to teach children with disabilities and had positively impacted their view on teaching children with disabilities.

There are multiple variables which affect the attitudes of pre-service physical education teachers toward teaching children with disabilities including academic preparation and practicum experience. Early research (Rizzo & Vispoel, 1992) showed that course work in adapted physical education positively affects the attitudes of pre-service educators' attitudes toward teaching children with disabilities, and these results have been supported by subsequent research (Hodge, 1998; Hodge, et al., 2002; Rizzo & Kirkendall, 1995). Furthermore, research has indicated that another important variable affecting undergraduates' attitudes toward teaching children with disabilities is hands-on experience, whether it is on-campus or off-campus (Folsom-Meek, et al., 1999; Hodge, et al., 2002; Hodge & Jansma, 1999; Rowe & Stutts, 1987; Schoffstal & Ackerman, 2007). Other factors which showed relevance toward attitudes include past experiences and gender (Folsom-Meek, et al., 1999).

As the past research has shown, both academic preparation and practicum experience have the ability to improve a pre-service teachers' attitude toward teaching children with disabilities. The purpose of the present study will be to reinforce prior research with additional information and to strengthen knowledge of the importance of maintaining quality adapted physical education coursework and practicum experiences in university physical education programs.

Chapter 3

Methods

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of education and experience on the attitudes of pre-service physical educators' teachers toward teaching children with disabilities.

Selection of Subjects

Participants who were selected for the experimental group were undergraduate physical education majors in the Department of Physical Education at the College at Brockport, State University of New York, who were enrolled in an Adapted Physical Education course (PEP 445). Three sections of the course were selected by the researcher to be used in the study. The experimental participant pool included 56 males and 25 females ($n=81$). For the lecture portion of the class, the class met for one hour twice a week. For the field experience, the class met for 2.5 hours once a week. The field experience included facilitating physical activities for a child with a disability in both an aquatic and gymnasium setting.

Participants who were selected for the control group were undergraduate physical education majors in the Department of Physical Education at the College at Brockport, State University of New York who were enrolled in a Introduction to Teaching Physical Education (PEP 441). Two sections of this course were included in the study. The control pool included 29 males and 7 females ($n=36$). The class met for ninety minutes twice a week and included 15 hours of off-campus observation at a local school. Basic information pertaining to teaching children physical education was reviewed in this course.

Approval was granted from the Institutional Review Board at the College at Brockport, State University of New York, in order to conduct this study (Appendix A). Additionally, permission was obtained from each participant prior to the initiation of the study (Appendix B).

Instrument

A modification of the PEATH survey was used to measure the attitudinal changes in the pre-service physical education majors (Appendix C). Subjects answered attitudinal questions toward teaching children with disabilities on a seven-point Likert scale. The survey was used at the beginning and end of each course, and pretest-post test comparisons were used to indicate attitudinal change.

The PEATH survey was evaluated for content relevance by six nationally prominent researchers with expertise in educational programs for teaching students with handicaps (Rizzo & Vispoel, 1991). Folsom-Meek and Rizzo (2002) reported construct validity through previous studies. The PEATH survey used in this study was modified by the primary investigator and Dr. Cathy Houston-Wilson, and was reviewed by two experts in the field of adapted physical education. The alpha coefficient for the present study for all instrument items was .847.

Procedures

The participants in the experimental group were enrolled in a sixteen-week course, which included both a lecture and a field experience component. The field experience included an aquatics and a gymnasium component. The course included eight, 2.5 hour field experience components throughout the course. Participants in the

control group were enrolled in a fourteen-week course, which included lecture and fifteen hours of off-campus observation. The course included twenty-eight meetings, each of which was ninety minutes in duration.

Participants from both groups were given the PEATH survey at the beginning of the second day of class and prior to any field experience. Each survey was exactly the same, and there was no time limit for completion. All participants in the experimental group went through the same experience during lecture. The field experience was impacted by the variety of disabilities with which each participant was involved.

Posttest data collection took place during the last week of lecture in the course, and the same procedures were taken as during the pretest data collection.

Data Analysis

Means and standard deviations of each treatment group were calculated, and four independent *t*-tests were used for comparisons. *T*-tests compared (1) the pre-test experimental group and the pre-test control group to determine whether or not the two groups were statistically different prior to the adapted experience; (2) the pre-test control group and the post-test control group to determine whether or not there were any significant changes in the group which did not receive the adapted experiences; (3) the pre-test experimental and post-test experimental group to determine whether or not the adapted experience affected the attitudes of the experimental group; (4) the post-test experimental group and the post-test control group to determine whether there was a difference between the group which received the adapted experience and the one that did not. It was hypothesized that (1) the control group and experimental

group would not be significantly different before the adapted experience, that (2) there would not be a significant positive change for students in the control group, that (3) there would be a significant difference between the pre-test experimental and post-test experimental indicating a positive change in attitude after the adapted experience, and that (4) there would be a significant difference between posttest control and experimental groups indicating a more positive experience for participants receiving the adapted experience.

Chapter 4

Results

The purpose of this study was to determine if experience and education in adapted physical education would affect the attitudes of pre-service physical education teachers toward teaching children with disabilities. To address this problem, a survey instrument was given to pre-service physical education teachers in both introductory adapted physical education courses (experimental group) and introduction to teaching physical education courses (control group). The experimental group consisted of eighty-one participants from three sections of the introductory adapted physical education course. The control group consisted of thirty-seven participants from two sections of the introduction to teaching physical education course. The participants were each given the survey instrument on the first day of the semester before any instruction had begun and on the final day of classes.

First, an independent sample *t*-test was administered to compare the pre-test experimental and control group. The mean score of the experimental group was 3.2368 with a standard deviation of .51986. The mean score of the control group was 3.1474 with a standard deviation of .62802. No significant difference was found between the two groups ($t = .811, p < .05$), indicating that the experimental and control groups did not differ at the onset of the study. Since groups were unequal, a Levene's test was used to determine homogeneity of variance across groups, and equal variance was assumed ($F = 2.156$).

An independent sample *t*-test was then used to compare the control group's pretest and posttest scores. The pretest mean was 3.1474 with a standard deviation of

.62802. The posttest mean was 3.0581 with a standard deviation of .65312. The statistical test indicated no significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores for the control group ($t = .596, p > .05$). Since there was no significant difference in this test, the results indicated that the participants in the control group did not display a change in attitude throughout the course of the study, which was hypothesized.

The first two statistical comparisons indicated that the two groups (control & experimental) were not significantly different before the intervention and that the control group did not change throughout the course of the study. Since both groups did not differ initially, any change in the attitude of the experimental group can be attributed to the adapted experience.

An independent sample *t*-test was conducted to compare the posttest scores of the experimental group and the control group. The experimental group demonstrated a mean of 3.0829 with a standard deviation of .51922. The control group indicated a mean of 3.0581 with a standard deviation of .65312. This statistical computation indicated no significant difference between the control group and the experimental group ($t = .828, p < .05$).

In addition, an independent sample *t*-test was conducted to compare the pretest experimental group to the posttest experimental group. The results indicated a pretest mean of 3.2368 with a standard deviation of .51986. The posttest mean indicated by the test was 3.0829 with a standard deviation of .51922. The results indicated that the pretest experimental group scores and posttest experimental group scores were not significantly different ($t = .066, p < .05$).

In summary, it was hypothesized that the experimental group would have a significantly more favorable attitude toward teaching children with disabilities after being exposed to education and experience in adapted physical education, which would indicate the effectiveness of the adapted experience. Statistical findings did not support this hypothesis, as no significant differences were found (1) between the post-experimental group and the post-control group (2) between the pre-experimental group and the post-experimental group. However, it was noted that a trend was found toward a positive change in attitudes from the pre-experimental to the post-experimental groups.

Chapter 5

Discussion

The literature indicates several variables which have an effect of the attitudes of pre-service physical education teachers toward teaching children with disabilities. The two variables which displayed the strongest effect on pre-service physical education teacher's attitudes toward teaching children with disabilities were courses in adapted physical education (Hodge, 1998; Hodge, Davis, Woodard, & Sherrill, 2002; Rizzo & Kirkendall, 1995; Rizzo & Vispoel, 1992) and hands-on field experiences (Folsum-Meek, Nearing, Grotelushen, & Krampf, 1999; Hodge, Davis, Woodard, & Sherrill, 2002; Rowe & Stutts, 1987; Schoffstall & Ackerman, 2007). Evidence indicates that adapted physical education courses that include hands-on field experience opportunities a vital component of a university-level physical education program when preparing pre-service physical educators.

In the current study, the combination of adapted physical education course and hands-on field experience was included in a fourteen-week semester where students met in a classroom for three hours per week and had 2.5 hours of field experience. During the field experience pre-service physical education teachers enrolled in this program were assigned a child with a disability. The children's ages range from eight to seventeen, and children's disabilities ranged from mild to very involved. The control group was included in a fourteen-week course where students met in a classroom for three hours per week and had 15 hours of off campus field experience.

Posttest comparisons of attitudes of the experimental group and the control group indicated no significant differences. Since there was no significant difference,

it may be reasonable to suggest that the implementation of education and experience did not have an effect on the attitudes of pre-service teachers toward teaching children with disabilities in the current study. Furthermore, comparisons of attitude between the pretest experimental group and the posttest experimental group indicated no significant difference. Although not significantly different, the change from the pretest to posttest did suggest a trend toward a positive change in attitude over the course of the current study.

Comparison of Results to the Literature

Rizzo & Vispoel (1992) investigated the influence of physical education courses on undergraduate physical educators' attitudes toward teaching students with several disability classifications. The authors reported a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test of students enrolled in an adapted physical education course with a field experience; whereas, the current study did not. However, one difference exists between Rizzo and Vispoel's study and the current one. The difference was that the previous study used a five-point Likert scale, and the current study used a seven-point Likert scale. Although both studies reported pre-test scores which were considered neutral, the expanded Likert scale may have allowed for a more accurate representation of attitude in the current study. A more accurate representation of attitude may have led to both a more accurate depiction of pre-service physical education teachers' attitudes, which resulted in a trend toward positive change as opposed to statistically significant differences.

In a similar study, reported that on-campus field experiences significantly and positively changed the attitudes of pre-service physical education teachers toward

teaching children with disabilities. The study used 474 participants in twenty-two different institutions of higher education. The current study only used 81 experimental participants in a single institution. With an increase in sample size, significant differences are also more likely to be detected (Hodge and Jansma, 1999). As a result, a non-significant trend was reported.

Another difference between past research and the current study is the content of the PEATH survey used. In the original PEATH survey (titled PEATID; Appendix B), attitudinal questions were prefaced by a narrative involving a female student named Heather who had attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). For this project, the instrument was altered such that attitudinal questions were prefaced by a narrative involving a male student named Peter who had Autism (titled PEATID Modified; Appendix A). Although past research has reported significant results using the original PEATH survey (Hodge, 1998; Hodge, et al, 2002; Rizzo & Kirkendall, 1995; Rizzo & Vispoel, 1992), a change in the narrative description on a student with a different disability may have altered the results of the current study.

Recommendations and Future Direction

Several limitations may have contributed to the lack of significant differences found in this study. The participants in the control group may have had pre-existing interests in adapted physical education, which may have affected the favorability of their attitudes toward teaching children with disabilities. In addition, throughout the course of the semester, participants in the control group may have had experiences interacting with children with disabilities while on campus or at their field experience. Uncontrolled experiences may have introduced similarities to the

adapted experience that the experimental group received. Another limitation which could be considered would be finally, the types or levels of disabilities which were included in the field experience for the experimental group may have affected the intensity of the adapted experience and therefore the effect of the experience on attitude.

In order to illicit a stronger effect, and to potentially detect significant differences in this study, the following considerations may have been implemented. Delimiting the participants in the control group to those who did not have any pre-existing interests in adapted physical education would enable more accurate descriptions of attitude for those without any exposure to teaching children with disabilities. This may include creating a control group from participants who are not participating in field experiences, and perhaps are not students in physical education.

Future research can change the population of the control group. The control group used in this study included students enrolled in an introduction to teaching physical education course. Students enrolled in an introduction to teaching physical education course may have already taken courses in the physical education major and may even be enrolled in the adapted physical education concentration. An alternative may be to use a group of first-year college students in an attempt to detect the largest differences between the control and experimental groups.

Delimiting the type and severity of disability with whom experimental participants interacted in the field experience may have a greater affect on attitude. Future research may consider categorizing the intensity of disabilities in the students in the field experience. Investigators may categorize their experimental group

according to the type or intensity of disabilities of the children with whom they are working. Attitudes of these experimental groups can then be determined using the PEATH survey in a pretest-posttest design to determine whether the intensity of disabilities affects attitude.

Future research may also consider using several versions of the PEATH survey, which might include narratives of students with different disabilities. A study such as this may be used to investigate whether an educational program provides a well-rounded experience when preparing pre-service physical education teachers to teach children with varying disabilities. If it is possible to determine trends of favorable attitudes toward teaching children with specific disabilities, courses could then be modified appropriately.

Future research may also consider comparing field experience structures. In the current study, two different instructors interacted exclusively with different members of the experimental group. Although the instructors shared similar teaching techniques throughout the course, they utilized different structures when creating field experiences. For example, one participant group was required to create weekly lesson plans for their experience while teaching a child with a disability in a one-on-one setting; whereas, the other participant group was required to create a lesson plan to instruct larger groups of students with disabilities. Each field experience was created to simulate a teaching atmosphere. However, the former simulates a one-on-one teaching setting, and the latter simulates a group teaching setting. Comparing different field experience structures may indicate which type of field experience type

can have a greater effect on attitudes of pre-service physical education teachers toward teaching children with disabilities.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of education and experience on the attitudes of pre-service physical educators' teachers toward teaching children with disabilities. It was hypothesized that pre-service physical educators' attitudes would become more favorable toward teaching children with disabilities after the completion of the adapted physical education course and the hands-on field experience. Contradictory to past research, the results did not indicate a statistically significant difference between the attitudes of the experimental groups at the beginning and at the end of the adapted experience. Although statistically significant differences were not detected, a trend toward a positive change in attitudes of the experimental group toward teaching children with disabilities was observed, which may indicate that with either a longer duration of the study or a larger participant pool may yield significant differences.

The trend toward a more favorable attitude toward teaching children with disabilities supports the implementation of adapted physical education courses with hands-on field experiences in the university level. As educational environments have changed, so have the demographic population of students. General physical education teachers are much more likely to interact with children with disabilities on a more regular basis. In order to provide the best education possible to all students, educators must have a positive attitude toward those populations that they will be teaching.

References

- Ammah, J.O.A. & Hodge, S.R. (2006). Secondary physical education teachers' beliefs and practices in teaching students with severe disabilities: A descriptive analysis. *High School Journal*, 89. Retrieved December 10, 2008, from Academic Search Premier, <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdf?vid=15&hid=4&sid=f1291ba0-5af8-42b6-97bc-1e7e84ddb10f%40sessionmgr3>
- Antonak, R. F. (1980). A hierarchy of attitudes toward exceptionality. *Journal of Special Education*, 14, 231-241.
- Arnold, R. & Auxter, D. (2003). IDEA reauthorization: A historical perspective. *Palaestra*, 19(3), 6-7.
- Block, M.E. & Rizzo, T.L. (1995). Attitudes and attributes of physical educators associated with teaching individuals with severe and profound disabilities. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 20(1), 80-87.
- Cornell Law School. (2007). *U.S. Code collection*. Retrieved Dec. 1, 2008, from <http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/html/uscode29/usc sec 29 00000794----000-.html>
- Folsum-Meek, S.L., Nearing, R.J., Groteluschen, W., & Krampf, H. (1999). Effects of academic major, gender, and hands-on experience on attitudes of preservice professionals. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 16, 389-402.
- Folsum-Meek, S.L. & Rizzo, T.L. (2002). Validating the Physical Educators' Attitude Toward Teaching Individuals with Disabilities III (PEATID III) Survey for Future Professionals. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 19, 141-154.

- Gething, L., & Wheeler, B. (1992). The interaction with disabled persons scale: A new Australian instrument to measure attitudes towards people with disabilities. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 44(2), 75-82.
- Gilhool, T. (1973). The uses of litigation: The right of retarded children to a free public education. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 50(2), 120-127.
- Hodge, S.R. (1998). Prospective physical education teachers' attitudes toward teaching students with disabilities. *Physical Educator*, 55(2), 68-77.
- Hodge, S.R., Davis, R., Woodard, R., & Sherrill, C. (2002). Comparison of practicum types in changing preservice teachers' attitudes and perceived competence. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 19, 155-171.
- Hodge, S.R., & Jansma, P. (1999). Effects of contact time and location of practicum experiences on attitudes of physical education majors. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 16, 48-63.
- Martin, E., Martin, R., & Termin, D. (1996) The legislation and litigation history of special education. *Special education for students with disabilities*, 6 (1), 25-39.
- Miller, J., & Cordova, J. (2002). Changing attitudes toward people with disabilities. *Palaestra*, 18(3), 16-22.
- Parker, S. (2002). Preservice physical education teachers' perceptions toward teaching students with emotional/behavioral disorders in a general education setting. *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation*.

- Rizzo, T.L. (1984). Attitudes of physical educators toward teaching handicapped pupils. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 1, 267-274.
- Rizzo, T.L., & Kirkendall, D.R. (1995). Teaching students with mild disabilities: What affects attitudes of future physical educators? *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 12, 205-216.
- Rizzo, T.L., & Vispoel, W.P. (1991). Physical educators' attributes and attitudes toward teaching students with handicaps. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 8, 4-11.
- Rizzo, T.L., & Vispoel, W.P. (1992). Changing attitudes about teaching students with handicaps. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 9, 54-63.
- Rowe, J., & Stutts, R.M. (1987). Effects of practica type, experience, and gender on attitudes of undergraduate physical education majors toward disabled persons. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 4, 268-277.
- Schoffstall, J., & Ackerman, B. (2007). Attitudes of pre-service physical educators at a faith-based university toward individuals with disabilities. *Journal of Beliefs & Values*, 28(2), 183-193.
- Tripp, A., & Rizzo, T.L. (2006). Disability labels affect physical educators. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 23, 310-326.
- Turnbull, H.R.III, & Turnbull, A.P. (1998). *Free and appropriate public education: The law and children with disabilities* (5th ed.). Denver, CO: Love Publishing Company.

United States Department of Education. (2009) *Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services*. Retrieved May 1, 2009, from <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/osers/index.htm>.

Winnick, J.P. (2005). *Adapted Physical Education And Sport, Fourth Edition*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers.

Yuker, H.E., Block, J.R., & Campbell, W.J. (1960). *A scale to measure attitudes toward disabled persons; Human resources student number 5*. Albertson, NY: Human Resources Foundation.

Appendix A
PEATH Survey
Modified Version

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research project.

Please read the following description of a student named Peter. After you read the information you will be provided a questionnaire. Please respond to the following questions according to the directions and the rating scale that are explained on the first page of the questionnaire.

Assume you have just accepted a teaching position at Susan B. Anthony Elementary School as a physical education teacher. During the start of the school year, you are told that you will be teaching a student named Peter who has autism. Autism is a developmental disability that typically effects communication and behavior. Peter and his family recently moved into the district. Peter is 12 years old. Based on information provided by his former district, you learn that Peter has some motor delays but has no physical disabilities. However, he does not use language to communicate and he has mild behavior disorders that interfere with his motor performance. Based on this scenario, please answer the questions below as honestly as possible.

Physical Educators' Intention Toward Teaching Individuals with Disabilities (PEITID) (Modified)

In the questionnaire you are about to complete we ask questions that make use of rating scales with seven places; you are to make a mark (X) in the place that best describes your thoughts. For example, if you were asked about "The weather in Southern California" on such a scale, the seven places would appear as follows:

The Weather in Southern California is good
Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

If you strongly agree that the "Weather in Southern California is good" then you would place your mark as follows:

The Weather in Southern California is good
Strongly Agree **X** : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

In making your ratings please remember the following points:

1. Place your marks in the *middle of spaces*, not on the boundaries:

Strongly Agree **X** : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree
Like this ↗
↖ Not this

2. Answer all items - please do not omit any.
3. Mark the response that best describes your opinion about each statement.
4. Your responses are strictly confidential. This survey is numbered for data processing; your responses will remain confidential.

Please answer the following questions in reference to the student named Peter who has *Autism*. Mark a response that best describes your **opinions** about teaching a student like Peter in your general physical education (PE) class.

First, we would like to know about your intention to teach a student like Peter in your general PE class during your first year of teaching.

1. If a student like *Peter* was in my general PE class I would teach her.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

2. I would be willing to teach a student like *Peter* in my general PE class.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

Tell us your opinion about teaching a student like Peter in your regular PE class during your first year of teaching.

3. For me, to teach a student like *Peter* in my general PE class in would not be a good idea.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

4. Teaching a student like *Peter* in my general PE class would be a waste of time.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

5. It would be professionally rewarding for me to teach a student like *Peter* in my general PE class.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

Tell us what you think significant people in your life would expect of you when it comes to teaching a student like Peter in your general PE class during your first year of teaching.

6. Most people who are important to me think that I should teach *Peter* in my general PE class.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

7. People who are important to me would want me to teach a student like *Peter* in my general PE class.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

How much control do you believe you would have in teaching a student like Peter in your general PE class during your first year of teaching.

8. If I wanted to, I am confident I could teach a student like *Peter* in my general PE class.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

9. It would not be easy for me to teach a student like *Peter* in my general PE class.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

10. Whether or not I could teach a student like *Peter* in my general PE class would be entirely up to me.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

11. It would be mostly up to me whether or not I could teach a student like *Peter* in my general PE class.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

Tell us what you believe will occur if you were to teach a student like Peter in your general P.E. class during your first year of teaching.

12. Teaching a student like *Peter* in my general PE class would not require much of my time.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

13. I would need more training before I could teach a student like *Peter* in my general PE class.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

14. I have enough teaching experience to teach a student like *Peter* in my general PE class.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

What, if any, value would there be in teaching a student like Peter in your general PE class during your first year of teaching.

15. It would not be worth my effort to teach a student like *Peter* in my general PE class.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

16. One advantage of teaching a student like *Peter* in my general PE class would be that special academic training is not necessary.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

17. Because of my lack of teaching experience, I would not feel comfortable teaching a student like *Peter* in my general PE class.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

Tell us what you think the following people would say about you teaching a student like Peter in your PE class during your first year of teaching.

18. *Parents* of students with disabilities would think that I should teach a student like *Peter* in my general PE class.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

19. *General classroom teachers* would think that I should teach a student like *Peter* in my PE general class.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

20. *Special educators* would think that I should teach a student like *Peter* in my general PE class.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

21. *My non-disabled students* would think that I should teach a student like *Peter* in my general PE class.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

22. My Physical Education professors would think that I should teach a student like *Peter* in my general PE class.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

Tell us the extent you agree with doing what these people think you should do.

23. Generally speaking, I would do what parents of students with disabilities thought I should do.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

24. Generally speaking, I would do what general classroom teachers thought I should do.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

25. Generally speaking, I would do what special educators thought I should do.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

26. Generally speaking, I would do what non-disabled students thought I should do.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

27. Generally speaking, I would do what Physical Education professors thought I should do.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

Now we want to know about your ability to teach a student like Peter in your general PE class during your first year of teaching.

28. A lack of special equipment for *Peter* would make it impossible for me to teach a student like *Peter* in my general PE class.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

29. I would prefer a teachers assistant to assist in teaching a student like *Peter* in my general PE class.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

30. The behavior of other students would not prevent me from teaching a student like *Peter* in my general PE class.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

Will these conditions affect your ability to teach a student like Peter in your general PE class during your first year of teaching?

31. A lack of access to special equipment to teach a student like *Peter* would affect my ability to teach her in my general PE class.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

32. Having teaching assistants to help me teach a student like *Peter* would make no difference in my ability to teach her in my general PE class.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

33. The behavior of other students would not have any effect on my ability to teach a student like *Peter* in my general PE class.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

Tell us how often you teach a student like Peter in your class.

34. If a student like *Peter* was in your physical education class, would you modify your class activities or make an accommodation to enable her to participate. _____ Yes _____ No

If so, what general accommodations would you employ? (Please describe)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Finally, would you please answer a few general questions about yourself?

35. Identify your gender. _____ Female _____ Male
36. What is your age? _____ Age in
Years
37. Have you taken any Adapted PE courses? IP _____ Yes _____ No
38. How many courses? _____ # of courses _____
None
39. Have you taken any Special Education courses? _____ Yes _____ No
40. How many courses? _____ # of courses _____
None
41. Have you had any experience teaching individuals with disabilities? _____ Yes _____ No
42. How many years have you taught individuals with disabilities? _____ # of years _____
None
43. Do you have any family members with a disability? _____ Yes _____ No
44. Do you have any close personal friends with a disability? _____ Yes _____ No
45. Do you have a disability? _____ Yes _____ No
46. Rate the quality of most of your typical experiences teaching students with disabilities. _____ No
experience
_____ Not good
_____ Satisfactory
_____ Very good
47. How competent do you feel teaching a student with disabilities? _____ Not at all
_____ A little
_____ Somewhat competent
_____ Very competent
_____ Extremely competent

Thank you!

Appendix B
PEATH Survey
Original Version

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research project.

Please read the following description of a student named Hannah. After you read the information you will be provided a questionnaire. Please respond to the following questions according to the directions and the rating scale that are explained on the first page of the questionnaire.

Assume for a moment that you have just been told that a student named Hannah who has *Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder* (ADHD) has just transferred from another school into yours and will be attending your general physical education class starting next week. Last year your school system began a countywide physical education testing program based on the state standards. Hannah is physically fit and she is an active participant. Her gross motor skills are in the above average range. Her eye-hand coordination is adequate for a 9 year old. Hannah is beginning to develop the decision making ability to execute skills in game situations.

Physical Educators' Intention Toward Teaching Individuals with Disabilities (PEITID)

In the questionnaire you are about to complete we ask questions that make use of rating scales with seven places; you are to make a mark (X) in the place that best describes your thoughts. For example, if you were asked about "The weather in Southern California" on such a scale, the seven places would appear as follows:

The Weather in Southern California is good
Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

If you strongly agree that the "Weather in Southern California is good" then you would place your mark as follows:

The Weather in Southern California is good
Strongly Agree X _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

In making your ratings please remember the following points:

1. Place your marks in the *middle of spaces*, not on the boundaries:

Strongly Agree X _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree
Like this Not this

2. Answer all items - please do not omit any.
3. Mark the response that best describes your opinion about each statement.
4. Your responses are strictly confidential. This survey is numbered for data processing; your responses will remain confidential.

Please answer the following questions in reference to the student named Hannah who has *Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder* (ADHD). Mark a response that best describes your opinions about teaching a student like Hannah in your general physical education (PE) class.

First, we would like to know about your intention to teach a student like Hannah in your general PE class in the next month.

1. If a student like *Hannah* was in my general PE class in the next month I would teach her.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

2. I would be willing to teach a student like *Hannah* in my general PE class in the next month.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

Tell us your opinion about teaching a student like Hannah in your regular PE class.

3. For me, to teach a student like *Hannah* in my general PE class in the next month would not be a good idea.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

4. Teaching a student like *Hannah* in my general PE class in the next month would be a waste of time.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

5. It would be professionally rewarding for me to teach a student like *Hannah* in my general PE class in the next Month.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

Tell us what you think significant people in your life would expect of you when it comes to teaching a student like Hannah in your general PE class next month.

6. Most people who are important to me think that I should teach *Hannah* in my general PE class in the next month.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

7. People who are important to me would want me to teach a student like *Hannah* in my general PE class in the next month.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

How much control do you believe you would have in teaching a student like Hannah in your general PE class in the next month?

8. If I wanted to, I am confident I could teach a student like *Hannah* in my general PE class in the next month.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

9. It would not be easy for me to teach a student like *Hannah* in my general PE class in the next month.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

10. Whether or not I could teach a student like *Hannah* in my general PE class in the next month is entirely up to me.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

11. It is mostly up to me whether or not I could teach a student like *Hannah* in my general PE class in the next month.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

Tell us what you believe will occur if you were to teach a student like Hannah in your general P.E. class in the next month.

12. Teaching a student like *Hannah* in my general PE class in the next month would not require much of my time.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

13. I would need more training before I could teach a student like *Hannah* in my general PE class in the next month.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

14. I have enough teaching experience to teach a student like *Hannah* in my general PE class in the next month.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

What, if any, value would there be in teaching a student like Hannah in your general PE class in the next month?

15. It would not be worth my effort to teach a student like *Hannah* in my general PE class in the next month.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

16. One advantage of teaching a student like *Hannah* in my general PE class in the next month would be that special academic training is not necessary.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

17. Because of my lack of teaching experience, I would not feel comfortable teaching a student like *Hannah* in my general PE class in the next month.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

Tell us what you think the following people would say about you teaching a student like Hannah in your PE class in the next month.

18. My school *principal* would think that I should teach a student like *Hannah* in my PE class in the next month.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

19. *Parents* of students with disabilities would think that I should teach a student like *Hannah* in my general PE class in the next month.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

20. *General classroom teachers* would think that I should teach a student like *Hannah* in my PE general class in the next month.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

21. *Special educators* would think that I should teach a student like *Hannah* in my general PE class in the next month.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

22. My *non-disabled students* would think that I should teach a student like *Hannah* in my general PE class month.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

23. My Kinesiology professors would think that I should teach a student like *Hannah* in my general PE class in the next month.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

Tell us the extent you agree with doing what these people think you should do.

24. Generally speaking, I would do what my principal thought I should do.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

25. Generally speaking, I would do what parents of students with disabilities thought I should do.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

26. Generally speaking, I would do what general classroom teachers thought I should do.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

27. Generally speaking, I would do what special educators thought I should do.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

28. Generally speaking, I would do what non-disabled students thought I should do.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

29. Generally speaking, I would do what Kinesiology professors thought I should do.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

Now we want to know about your ability to teach a student like Hannah in your general PE class in the next month.

30. A lack of special equipment for Hannah would make it impossible for me to teach a student like *Hannah* in my general PE class in the next month.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

31. Without teacher assistants it would be impossible for me to teach a student like *Hannah* in my general PE class in the next month.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

32. The behavior of other students would not prevent me from teaching a student like *Hannah* in my general PE class in the next month.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

Will these conditions affect your ability to teach a student like Hannah in your general PE class?

33. A lack of access to special equipment to teach a student like *Hannah* would affect my ability to teach her in my general PE class in the next month.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

34. Having teaching assistants to help me teach a student like *Hannah* would make no difference in my ability to teach her in my general PE class in the next month.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

35. The behavior of other students would not have any effect on my ability to teach a student like *Hannah* in my general PE class in the next month.

Strongly Agree _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Strongly Disagree

Tell us how often you teach a student like Hannah in your class.

36. If a student like *Hannah* was in your physical education class, would you modify your class activities or make an accommodation to enable her to participate. _____ Yes _____ No

If so, what general accommodations would you employ? (Please describe)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Finally, would you please answer a few general questions about yourself?

37. Identify your gender. _____ Female _____ Male
38. What is your age? _____ Age in Years
39. Have you taken any Adapted PE courses? _____ Yes _____ No
40. How many courses? _____ # of courses _____ None
41. Have you taken any Special Education courses? _____ Yes _____ No
42. How many courses? _____ # of courses _____ None

43. Have you had any experience teaching individuals with disabilities? _____ Yes _____ No
44. How many years have you taught individuals with disabilities? _____ # of years _____
None
45. Do you have any family members with a disability? _____ Yes _____ No
46. Do you have any close personal friends with a disability? _____ Yes _____ No
47. Do you have a disability? _____ Yes _____ No
48. Rate the quality of most of your typical experiences teaching students with disabilities.
_____ No
experience
_____ Not good
_____ Satisfactory
_____ Very good
49. How competent do you feel teaching a student with disabilities?
_____ Not at all
_____ A little
_____ Somewhat competent
_____ Very competent
_____ Extremely competent

Thank you!

Appendix C

Statement of Informed Consent

STATEMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT

The purpose of this research project is to examine the attitudinal changes in physical education teaching majors toward working with children with disabilities. This research project is also being conducted in order for me to complete my graduate thesis for the department of physical education at the State University of New York College at Brockport.

In order to participate in this study, your informed consent is required. You are being asked to make a decision whether or not to participate in the project. If you want to participate in the project, and agree with the statements below, "please sign your name in the space provided at the end". You may change your mind at any time and leave the study without penalty, even after the study has begun.

I understand that:

1. My participation is voluntary and I have the right to refuse to answer any questions.
2. My confidentiality is guaranteed. My name will not be written on the survey. There will be no way to connect me to my written survey. If any publication results from this research, I would not be identified by name.
3. There will be no anticipated personal risks or benefits because of my participation in this project.
4. My participation involves reading a written survey of 47 questions and answering those questions in writing. It is estimated that it will take 10 minutes to complete the survey.
5. 100 students will take part in this study. The results will be used for the completion of a graduate thesis by the primary researcher.
6. Data will be kept in a locked filing cabinet by the investigator. Data and consent forms will be destroyed by shredding when the research has been accepted and approved.

I am 18 years of age or older. I have read and understand the above statements. All my questions about my participation in this study have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in the study realizing I may withdraw without penalty at any time during the survey process.

If you have any questions you may contact:

Primary researcher
Justin Haegele
(516) 312 8361
5352

Jhae0802@brockport.edu

Faculty Advisor
Dr. Houston-Wilson
Department of Physical education ex.

Chouston@brockport.edu

Signature _____

Date _____