

Introduction

The Intrinsic Logic of Academic Activities

Academic activities are all about the creation, accumulation, and verification of knowledge. For the purpose of acquiring and facilitating advanced, in-depth knowledge of any discipline or field of inquiry, scholars inevitably have to collect, analyze and synthesize present research results of the issues or topics which they are interested in so that they can understand more about what have been known and what might be essential to know. Only after the time when scholars bring up a critical argument or important but omitted questions deserving to study with strong and reasonable supports derived from previous research literature, they start to open a new promising space untouched and unknown for understanding and explaining specific phenomena belonging to specific discipline or field and the retrospective process is broadly recognized as “literature review” by scholars in different academic communities.

The intrinsic logic of literature review is to base knowledge development and breakthrough on the preceding efforts and experiences and on the idea of continually systematic procedure. For example, since pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) as one of the most crucial conceptions in education field was first declared to educational researchers by Shulman (1986b), it kept being worthy and highly potential topic in teaching and teacher education. What needs to be highlighted is that it should be attributed to an extensive review process of past research on teaching (Shulman, 1986a) through which Shulman could find out subject matter content was “a missing program” in understanding teachers’ ability and teaching quality. In addition, if any scholars who sought to investigate issues about teacher knowledge, especially pertaining to their content knowledge, after 1986 (e.g., Blömeke, Suhl, & Kaiser, 2011; Gess-Newsome, 1999; Grossman & Richert, 1988), they would not be allowed to skip over the original as well as the follow-up intelligent outcomes made by Shulman. Furthermore, one study which intended to dealing with the relationships between teachers’ knowledge and practice should take the relationship represented by PCK and its implicit practice into consideration as well (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999). Apparently, this process of literature review for strengthening scholarship of certain discipline or field is constantly operated and faithfully valued by researchers up to the present.

Indeed, another two inspiring studies in sport pedagogy can sustain the important role literature review plays and be the proof of its functions on knowing the development and restrictions of research in physical education. The first one is Locke’s (1984) thoughtful review study of physical

educators' teaching and learning. In order to introduce a yet unaware field of inquiry, keep sight of its boundary, and comment on its origins, present composition and future prospects, Locke conducted a long-term, comprehensive review of research on teacher education in physical education (RTE-PE) from 1960 to 1984. He found that the accumulating knowledge base about RTE-PE at the time was asymmetrical because "we know vastly more about *what* physical education teacher need to learn, than we do about *how* to help them learn" (Locke, 1984, p. 6). More seriously, he found out educational professionals were unable to distinguish the differences between research on teacher education (RTE) and research on teaching (RT), not to mention illustrating the specific research interests and issues in each them. What result in this confusion were that first RTE was not been regarded as a particular field which was different from RT, and second the territory of questions which characterize RTE also was not anchored by scholars. Thus, those reasons were the constraints on further improvement of RTE-PE which was part of RTE, and on raising as yet unapproachable "good questions" into the continuing dialogue of scholars in the academic field.

The second study is provided by Metzler's (1991) reflective article which also represented the importance of looking back on the past. Metzler used Locke's (1977) inclusive/exclusive criteria for research on teaching to investigate the data-based reports published in *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education (JTPE)* and also abstracts accepted for a major symposium from 1981 to 1989. The result showed that the researchers in sport pedagogy changed their interests of research, and there seemed to be little smooth declination of attention given to research on teaching. With the spirit of "returning the teaching act to the main focus of sport pedagogy" (Metzler, 1991, p. 159) in mind, Metzler not only requested scholars in sport pedagogy community to work hard on "teaching when dependent and independent variables have a clear relationship to how and what teachers instruct and how and what students learn" (Metzler, 1991, p. 151) but also continued to think of our academic enterprise so as to "ask reflective questions about our field, retrace where we have been, appraise where we are now, and project where we might be going" (Metzler, 1991, p. 150).

Applying Content Analysis to Understanding Research Trends in Physical Education Pedagogy

Obviously, no matter what kinds of methods were used, it is the reflective process of reviewing previous knowledge base and trends, and pointing out what questions have been solved and what have not and how research methodologies have been utilized over times that should actually enlighten us researchers on future directions of inquiry. There were still many studies in sport pedagogy that explored the development of any discipline or research trends in the certain field of