

The History of a Professional Organization:

NAPEHE/NAKPEHE/NAKHE

Perspective from a long standing members

**Ron Feingold, Professor Emeritus Adelphi University & Leah Fiorentino, Professor
University of North Carolina, Pembroke**

In 1978 the National College Physical Education Association for Men (NCPEAM) and the National Association for Physical Education College Women (NAPECW), two national professional physical education higher education associations merged to form the National Association for Physical Education in Higher Education (NAPEHE). In an effort to better understand the perspectives of the two national associations and their philosophical underpinnings, a short history of each is provided as described in the first volume of *Quest* in 1963, a perspective fifteen years prior to the merger.

History: NCPEAM

Following the historic meeting at Adelphi Academy in 1885 led by William G. Anderson where the American Association for the Advancement of Physical Education, better known as AAHPERD and now SHAPE America was founded, a subsequent meeting was conducted for college directors in New York City in 1897 (Rice, 1929). Anderson, then the director at Yale University, intended to provide for greater uniformity in programs and methods among teachers of physical education in higher education. Some of the twelve men that attended the 1897 meeting did not want to compete with the new association AAHPERD; however, they felt that an organization for male physical education directors was warranted. This group was called the *Society of Gymnasium Directors* until 1908, and it played a significant role in ensuring a place for physical education in the college curriculum. Most of the members were doctors of medicine

and by forming this group, physical education was given a widened acceptance as a subject in college curriculums (Miller, 1963).

In 1908, the organization changed its name to the *Society of Directors of Physical Education in Colleges*, reflecting the changing sentiment within the profession away from gymnastics and therapeutic activity to physical education. Note, it was in the 1920s that physical education became part of school programs under the leadership of Jesse Feiring Williams, when a case was made that physical education was part of education. In 1932, the organization changed its name again to *College Physical Education Association* to better reflect the continued changes within the profession. The Association also supported a publication of the *Annual Meeting Proceedings*. Thirty years later in 1962, the name was once again changed to the *National College Physical Education Association for Men* (NCPEAM). Thus, it began with twelve men in 1897 and in 1963 had over 800 members, and continued as the major association that connected the profession to the *Body of Knowledge*.

The NCPEAM structure was directed by individual members representing one of four divisions, *Body of Knowledge*, *Professional Preparation*, *Sport and Leisure*, and *Special Projects*. Professionals in the *Body of Knowledge*, included those interested in exercise science, sport psychology, sport sociology, sport philosophy and history. Note that sub-disciplinary focused associations did not exist, so those in higher education found NCPEAM as the professional association where collaborative scholarly connections were made. The division of *Professional Preparation* focused on teacher preparation, and the division of *Sport and Leisure* included the required basic instruction activity program found in college and universities. Since Anderson called meetings that were central to the birth of two important professional

organizations, he might be considered the founder of NCPEAM just as he was founder of AAHPERD (Miller, 1963).

History: NAPECW

Thirteen years after Anderson called the meeting that launched the men's professional organization, Amy Morris Homans invited a small group of directors of New England women's colleges to Wellesley College in 1910. Although no formal association was organized, the group met annually until 1915. In 1915, all directors were invited to Wellesley College for the purpose of forming the *Association of Directors of Physical Education for Women*. This group was comprised of directors from eastern colleges. Two years later the *Mid-West Society* was formed and in 1921 a *Western Society* was organized. Finally in 1923, representatives from the three regional societies met in Springfield, Massachusetts and drafted the resolution forming the *Association of Directors of Physical Education for Women in Colleges and Universities*. In 1935, more regional affiliates were identified when a *Southern Society* was added and the *Mid-West Society* was split into the *Mid-West* and *Central Societies*. Thus, the seeds of the regional associations began in 1910 growing into a national association with five district associations in 1936. Note that although this was a national association, its structure reflected regional district associations. In 1963 over 1,000 females were members. Much of its work over the years included public relations, professional preparation and research as well as joint projects with NCPEAM (Miller, 1963).

As previously noted, NCPEAM tended to represent higher education professional development and included an academic and scholarly mission. When NCPEAM was formed there were no sub-disciplines, and as a result NCPEAM tended to focus on research and scholarly pursuit on the aforementioned four divisions responsible for conference program

preparation. Many areas within the *Body of Knowledge* division included specialties that would eventually move into sub-disciplinary organizations. But at its inception, the NCPEAM brought together the leading scholars in the profession as collaborative, and scholarly pursuits and networking were very much part of the annual NCPEAM conference. In addition to the scholars, most of the college administrators were also members and attended the annual NCPEAM convention. The convention was the *place to be* in higher education, not only to gain greater insight and knowledge within the academy, but also to meet with former colleagues and develop new professional networks. Although a men's organization, some women were members and it was not unusual to have female speakers present their research. On the other hand the women's association which also had an academic foundation, tended to place greater emphasis on teaching methodology and philosophic foundations.

Today it appears strange to have separate associations based on gender. However, prior to the 1970's many colleges and universities had separate units, a men's physical education department and a women's physical education department. It was not surprising that male physical education majors and female physical education majors never interacted, were never in the same class, and even had different curricular requirements.

Early Collaborative Efforts

Although the associations differed in structure (women included regional associations and national conference every two years, while the men had an annual conference), both had similar missions to enhance the profession which led the leaders of both associations to collaborate on joint projects.

Joint projects. One of the joint projects was the development of the *Quest* publication. In 1963, Donna Mae Miller, a physical education philosopher at the University of Arizona assumed

the role as the first editor, followed in successive terms by Pearl Berlin, Marvin Eyler, Margaret Mordy and Lawrence Locke in 1972. The first publication (Miller, 1963), included articles by Van Dalen, “*Philosophy: An Initial Consideration in Quest*”, Lynn “*A Living Legacy*”, Brackenbury, “*Physical Education: An Intellectual Emphasis?*”, Davis, “*The Power of Beliefs*”, Holbrook, “*A Teleological Concept of the Physical Qualities of Man*”, Oberteuffer “*On Learning Values through Sport*”, Lunn, “*Sport and Politics*”, Pullias, “*The Education of the Whole Man*”, and Hellebrandt, “*Living Anatomy*.” The political challenges encountered during WWII erased preliminary plans to prepare a publication somewhat similar to *Quest*; however after 1945 the idea once again emerged and within a decade the number of supporters “swelled to a veritable command” (Miller, 1963, p.iv). Miller (1963) in the editor’s explanation of why they were starting *Quest*, noted that the support from highly-respected professionals demanded such a publication, one where manuscripts challenged the profession, raised acute issues, and questioned assumptions that underlie classical standards, programs and methods.

Another joint project was initiated in 1974, as a monograph series called *Briefings*. This series was to be different from *Quest* with the intention of addressing issues in physical education through invited submissions. Members of this committee charged with oversight of this effort were Neil Dougherty (Rutgers), Ginny Studer (Brockport), Kate Barrette (North Carolina, Greensboro), Ed Turner (Appalachian State), and Ron Feingold (Adelphi). The titles of the five monographs (1974-77) included, (1) “*Title IX: Moving Toward Implementation*,” (2) “*Competency-Based Teacher Education*”, (3) “*Careers in Physical Education*”, (4) “*Mainstreaming Physical Education*”, and (5) “*Continuing (In-Service) Education, Professional Direction or Dilemma*”.

In 1974, the third joint project between NCPEAM and NAPECW included the creation of the Scholarly Directions Committee (SDC), a committee charged with the distribution of scholarly grants up to \$700. The intent was to support small groups of scholars to meet for the purpose of developing scholarly projects. The founding SDC members were George Sage, Joanne Safrit, and Wynn Updyke. The SDC grants supported the design of such enterprises as 1) research projects, 2) simultaneous attack of a single problem from multiple perspectives, 3) large scale field projects, 4) cross-disciplinary research, 5) review of knowledge in a discrete area of scholarly interest, and 6) design publications to serve scholarship (Sage, 1974).

Gaining academic credibility. The late 1960s and early 1970s were a time where it was imperative for physical education disciplines to gain academic credibility in higher education. At that time there were two professional associations, and in most cases separate physical education departments (men's and women's) at colleges and universities. Although NCPEAM and NAPECW were considered professional associations that met quality standards, had a high quality professional journal (*Quest*) and a series of monographs (*Briefings*) addressing critical issues in higher education, still physical education departments were perceived to be lacking in academic rigor and standards as compared to other majors.

Formation of an academic discipline. In 1964, Franklin Henry called for increased academic standards through specialization at the sub-disciplinary level. Henry defined an academic discipline as an “organized body of knowledge collectively embraced in a formal course of learning” (Henry, 1964, p 32). The components of these sub-disciplines were to include 1) a body of knowledge, 2) a conceptual framework, 3) scholarly procedures and include 1) a body of knowledge, 2) a conceptual framework, 3) scholarly procedures and methods of inquiry, and 4) both the process of discovery and the end result. Franklin wrote one of the more

important articles in the history of the profession and provided the motive and enthusiasm for the development of sub-disciplines. As a result many members splintered off and formed their own professional associations and specialties; American College of Sport Medicine (ACSM) was the first, followed by sport sociology, sport history, and sport philosophy. At this time (1960s), many universities and colleges were trying to maintain their programs, as well as gain respect and pursue scholarly pursuits. In order to gain this respect, many chose to sharpen the focus on more specific research model designs specific to the sub-disciplines.

While many universities and colleges were trying to maintain a scholarly perspective on campus, and as many issues in sport, fitness, teacher preparation and areas related to the profession were being addressed by others, it appeared the timing for the creation of a joint association which could speak on issues for the profession was appropriate; and a merger was planned by the two associations. Many of the younger members of the separate associations found it embarrassing to be part of a professional association that was separated for men or for women. Certainly, there was not a math men's association or an English women's association. In addition, there was increasing pressure to address equality and equity issues for both men and women. As a result of Title IX (1972) many of the universities across the nation merged the men's and women's physical education departments/programs. The leadership in both NCPEAM and NAPECW felt it was time to respond to the national climate and merge the two associations into one national association. At the time Fred Roby (University of Arizona) and Mary Ann Trekelle (University of Illinois), as presidents of their respective associations formed a committee with representatives from both associations for the purpose of merger.

History: NAPEHE

In 1978, after two years of meetings and revision of implementation strategies, the committee brought forth the recommendations to both leadership groups at a joint national conference. The membership present at the meeting voted to approve the recommendation to merge the two associations and form a new association called the *National Association for Physical Education in Higher Education* (NAPEHE).

In order to accommodate both associations, the board structure was established to be totally inclusive – but that approach became somewhat cumbersome. Besides the president, VP for Research, and the Secretary, each affiliated professional association president (*Eastern Women, Southern Women, Midwest Women, Central Women, Western Women, and Western Men*) were placed on the board and in order to provide equality (men and women) on the board, four at-large members (men) were elected to the board. The four male at-large members and the six affiliated presidents had no specific responsibilities devoted to NAPEHE yet were on the board. In addition to the lack of specific responsibilities of board members, NCPEAM met in January and NACPEW met every two years in June, and in order to accommodate both, NAPEHE met one year in January and the following year in June. .After ten years it became obvious that there was a need for a change in structure, specifically, one annual conference and specified responsibilities for each board member. It appeared that continuation of affiliate regional presidents and member-at-large representatives on the board was not in the best interest of NAPEHE.

Thus after a significant loss of membership (1,800 to 900) over a decade since merger, the four male at-large members complained that they had no responsibilities and as a result of the merger, it appeared that NAPEHE was losing members and political ground to the new sub-

disciplinary associations. In 1988, Beverly Becker (president) and David Clarke (president-elect) established a committee comprised of the four at-large members plus additional appointments (Ron Feingold, Don Hellison, Jim Ewers, Jim Bryant, Linda Bain and Dean Pease) and charged the committee to examine the current organization and return with a plan for reorganization, with specific mission and vision statements. These committed members established the plan for NAPEHE's current focus and currently there exists a committee, Future Directions Committee, (FDC) that is charged with the same task. Dean Pease (chair of the original committee) so strongly believed in the importance of future planning that he placed a condition in his will that provided a substantial financial contribution to ensure that NAPEHE would continue to support this type of work.

The original committee recommended that all board members have specific responsibilities and suggested that appropriate committee chairs be board members, in order to enhance communication and the business of the association, such as Membership, Bylaws, Elections, Public Affairs, Publications, and Awards. They also recommended a new committee, the Future Directions Committee to serve as a *think tank* addressing issues related to the future of the profession. In addition, the committee recommended a Foundations Committee that oversaw the finances of the association. In addition there was a recommendation to start a newsletter, *The Chronicle of Physical Education in Higher Education* with a public affairs column, and also a job placement publication, *Opportunities for Physical Education and Related Areas (OPERA)*. Besides the reorganization of the board membership to enhance communication and productivity, it holds true that the original committee established a vision and direction for the association – a most significant contribution.

Over time, NAPEHE attempted to compete with the sub-disciplinary associations for young faculty members, but found that attempt fruitless, so instead the new vision focused more on *multi-disciplinary collaborative perspectives on scholarship and research*. Instead of focusing only on the young scholar, the thought was to place a greater emphasis on the seasoned and experienced scholar and leader who was able to cross disciplinary lines. These seasoned scholars were thought to be better able to see the big picture and the more complex nature of the human being in sport and activity. At the time, no other professional association focused on gathering faculty from multiple disciplines and perspectives, who valued collaboration and were open to differing perspectives, i.e., obesity in children (connect exercise science, psychology, and pedagogy); youth sport (social foundations, pedagogy, and sport management); development of social skills through sport (social foundations, pedagogy, psychology, philosophy, and sport management). Scholars such as Chuck Corbin, Don Hellison, George Sage, Larry Locke, and Scott Kretchmar were the professional role models for applied collaborative scholarship. The committee felt that the administrator and administrative issues in higher education were also paramount, since the administrator was important in the hiring process and in position to promote and support the multi-disciplinary and applied research perspective.

The original committee took the position of systemic change and that if one were to connect his/her goals to collaboration and applied/multi-disciplinary research then the association award system should reflect the vision. Therefore the NAPEHE awards recognized scholarship (applied and collaborative with a multi-disciplinary focus), service to the profession (not just NAPEHE), and administrative leadership within their university and community. Those awards now exist as the Distinguished Administrator, Distinguished Scholar, and Distinguished Service awards.

In summary, although there were numerous sub-disciplinary professional associations, there was an important need to have an association where individuals with different perspectives could come together and appreciate multi-disciplinary and collaborative scholarship and understand the complexity of issues impacting higher education. In other words, at least one professional association that saw the big picture, both in the study of human movement and sport, and also in the complexities of higher education administration. These values and directions were needed in the 1980s and perhaps are even more relevant and important today.

Recent Name Changes and Directions

NAPEHE over the years lost membership from a high in 1978 (1,800) when the two associations were merged into the current national association to a low in 2010 (250). In hopes of changing the perspective to be more scholarly and as the term physical education was being replaced by Kinesiology in many colleges and universities, NAPEHE membership voted to change the association's name to *National Association for Kinesiology and Physical Education in Higher Education* (NAKPEHE) to better reflect the changing culture in the university settings. Later in 2012, the term *Physical Education* was totally eliminated and the association adopted the name of *National Association for Kinesiology in Higher Education* (NAKHE). The perception was that Kinesiology was an academic discipline, just like biology or psychology. In addition, many departments not only changed their name but also dropped their teacher preparation program. The *National Academy* dropped physical education, and the *American Kinesiology Association* was formed.

Although many in the profession have tended to divorce themselves from physical education and teacher preparation, NAKHE has held to its founding principles and values by focusing on multi-disciplinary research as well as the mentoring of future leaders and department

chairs. In addition, NAKHE has changed the publisher of *Quest* from Human Kinetics to Taylor-Francis, and is in the process of publishing the *International Journal of Kinesiology in Higher Education* in place of the *Chronicle*. The change in oversight of NAKHE publications has been the single largest positive factor to impact the association in recent years; and the financial success of NAKHE publications combined with increasing membership forecasts a bright future for the Association. Continued Association efforts are directed at the establishment of a Leadership Institute and reestablishment of a grant program to support multi-disciplinary research projects. Finally, NAKHE leadership maintains the focus on mentoring new leaders and has sponsored a series of summer workshops designed to support the development of future leaders for the past 5 years.

References

- Henry, F. (1964). Physical Education: An academic discipline. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance* 35, 32-33
- Miller, D.M. (1963), Monograph I, *Quest* 1(1)
- Rice, E. A. (1929). *A Brief History of Physical Education*, A.S. Barnes, New York.
- Sage, George (1974). NCPEAM Newsletter, Minneapolis, MN