

Quality teaching in physical
education: A New Zealand perspective.

D. George Salter

A number of researchers in recent years have posed the question, "Is physical education worth saving?" [for example, Lewis, 1969; Wilson, 1969; VanderSwaag, 1983; Dodds and Locke, 1984]. This question was prompted by a world-wide recognition that after students had left school, many demonstrated remarkably negative attitudes towards their previous school physical education experiences. Research by Jackson [1980] illustrated that a very prominent reason why adults avoid participation in sport stems from their previous school physical education programmes. Clearly, the teacher of physical education is an immediately available scapegoat for this situation, and many believed that the problem of student motivation could be solved by teachers teaching better [Locke, 1981; Siedentop, 1981]. There are clearly a number of other extremely complex conditions influencing the actual delivery of physical education in schools, and this paper focuses on the nature of quality teaching, and the nature of quality physical education, from a New Zealand perspective. There exists a great deal of literature which describes the characteristics of good teaching in physical education. Such literature tends to address the notions of teaching effectiveness, with particular attention paid to management strategies, instructional techniques, and teacher-student interaction [for example: Anderson and Barrette, 1978; Costello and Laubach, 1978; Cheffers and Mancini, 1978; Phillips and Carlisle, 1983; Darst, Mancini and Zakrajsek, 1983; Metzler, 1990]. While this literature has focused on the process of teaching, considerable debate has occurred also concerning the desirable content of the physical education lesson itself, and on the structuring of that content so that activities are developmentally appropriate [Bredenkamp, 1987]. This paper considers these notions, and reflects upon the congruence between what should ideally occur in physical education lessons, and what occurs in practice in many New Zealand schools.

Quality teaching

Teaching effectiveness.

The basic task of teaching physical education is to help students learn and grow in skill, fitness, understanding and attitude. Teachers are effective when students reach important learning goals, and do so in a way that enhances their development as human beings [Siedentop, 1991]. Siedentop regards an effective teacher as:

.....one who manages students well to decrease disruptions and increase time for learning. An effective teacher then organises that learning time with activities matched to student abilities so that an optimal amount of learning takes place. [p.3]

The characteristics of effective teaching outlined below are derived from

considerable research into the relationship between teacher intention and student achievement, and are summarised from the work of Siedentop [1991]. Those characteristics are:

* Teacher expectation of childrens' roles:

Teacher expectations are clearly communicated through high, but realistic, expectations for achievement, and strong, positive expectations for involvement in work. Teacher and student roles need to be defined, and practice time allowed for children to learn their roles.

* Class management for student engagement:

The purpose of good management is to create more time for active work in the lesson. In order to minimise management time, and to produce smooth and automatic transitions during the lesson, teachers should establish routines early in the school year. These routines and rules should be enforced primarily through positive strategies rather than punitive. The most consistent predictor of [less effective teachers is

their tendency to use punitive and negative coercion to correct behaviour.

* Content covered, and the opportunity to learn provided:

Effective teachers allocate maximum time for teaching the lesson content, and provide students with sufficient opportunity to learn. The time devoted to non-learning objectives is minimised. Evidence exists which shows that many teachers manage well to create time for teaching and learning to take place, but do not actually perform the teaching act well.

* Active teaching:

Effective teachers tend to communicate content directly, rather than through curricular materials. Short, effective demonstrations tend to be followed by guided student practice, during which the teacher frequently prompts, and provides feedback relative to the performance.

* Effective performance of major instructional functions:

1. Review or teach the prerequisite skill: Check for understanding, and be prepared to reteach if necessary.

2. Presentation of instruction, in well-prepared small steps which promote active involvement.

3. Guided practice: a] Whole group involved b] Frequent checks for understanding # c] Frequent prompts and feedback < d] Practise until students are able to work independently

4. Independent practice: a] Clearly understood tasks and accountability b] Non-predictable, whole group supervision c] High success rate and over-learning@l

* Meaningful learning tasks and high success rate:

Learning tasks relate to lesson objectives, and are presented in meaningful units. Tasks are matched to achievement levels within the class, are challenging and allow for a high success rate through participation.

* Pacing and momentum:

Effective teachers develop and maintain a strong forward momentum to the lesson, and prevent intrusive events from disrupting that pace. Tasks are broken down into small steps, and effective teachers pace students through those steps quickly and smoothly.

* Teachers hold students accountable for task completion :

This is accomplished through a variety of formal and informal mechanisms, the majority of which are positive. Task modifications and negotiations with students are dealt with quickly and effectively.

These characteristics describe effective strategies of teaching physical education. The "effective" teacher tends to predominantly use these strategies, whereas the less effective [teacher does not. It is clear that any reading of current literature on physical education research into teaching behaviour makes great use of academic learning time [ALT]. Much research was conducted in the the United States during the late 1970's and early 1980's which attempted to use ALT-PE [academic learning time in physical education] to describe the behaviour of teachers, and, by proxy, as a measure of student achievement in physical education [for example, Costello, 1977; Brophy, 1979; Metzler, 1979; Pieron, 1980; McLeish, Howe and Jackson, 1981; Siedentop, Tousignant and Parker, 1982; Godbout, Brunelle and Tousignant, 1983]. ALT-PE measures the length of time individual students actually work with physical education content at an appropriate level of difficulty. It is an important variable in determining effectiveness of instruction in physical education, but because it is possible to provide a highly active environment without quality instruction, ALT-PE cannot be regarded as the only variable in determining the extent to which students learn.

Methods of delivery.

Alongside the consideration of the characteristics of the effective teaching, a great deal of [literature particularly during the early 1970's explored the idea that there might be some [particular method of

teaching / instructing which was inherently superior to other styles. Hoffman [1971], for example, distinguished between the "traditional" methods of teaching and innovative, or "modern" methods, such as movement education, and Mosston [1972] described a continuum of teaching styles from "command" to "student self teaching". [However, in their examination of ten studies in which primary school children were used as subjects, Thaxton et.al. [1977: p. 100] concluded that:

.....a combination of methods should be used in teaching elementary school physical education activities, depending on the activities to be taught.

That teachers should employ strategies which embrace the notion of "child-centred teaching and learning", is a frequently-repeated message of the new New Zealand physical education syllabus [Department of Education,

1987]. According to Rink [1985], many physical educators have grasped the idea that direct instruction is the "best" way to teach, in so far as it provides a teaching-learning environment which maximises active learning time for children.

Direct instruction implies the following characteristics of the teaching-learning environment:

- * A task-oriented environment with a clear focus on goals.
- * The selection of clear instructional goals and highly active monitoring of student progress towards those goals.
- * Structured learning activities.
- * Immediate feedback on the effectiveness of the instruction.

The characteristics of a teacher-controlled environment which is tightly structured and narrow in its focus, and involves large group instruction, are closely associated with these ideas and Zare sometimes included in the concept of direct instruction [Rosenshine and Berak, 1979].

While many New Zealand physical educators have traditionally practised direct-instructional, [teacher-directed approaches in their teaching of physical education, recent reviews of the literature caution that the subject matter, broader goals, and the characteristics of individual students all play major roles in deciding whether to employ direct instruction or more open instructional procedures [Peterson, 1979]. A great deal of New Zealand physical education teaching over the last three decades has focused on achievement of basic skills, and research indicates that direct-instruction may well be the most appropriate strategy to accomplish this [Peterson, *ibid.*]. When creativity, abstract thinking and student independence are goals for the physical education lesson, however, more open instructional strategies have been shown to be more effective. Research conducted by Bennett et al. [1976] and by Solomon and Kendall [1976] shows that student characteristics are a critical variable which should be considered when choosing the [most appropriate instructional technique. Students of low ability, or who are unmotivated, unsociable and nonconforming, perform better in less structured environments. High ability, [motivated, sociable and conforming students perform better in more structured environments. Anderson and Scott [1978] also suggest the importance of the effect of the teaching method on students with different characteristics. Regardless of aptitude, students tend to demonstrate more task-relevant behaviour when two-way communications are involved. When the content is other than basic skills, there is some evidence that instruction which involves the learner is most effective [Brophy, 1979; Peterson, 1979]. These notions have [important implications for teachers of physical education, since they are required to make decisions regarding the appropriateness of different instructional techniques for the subject matter to be taught, and for the learning outcomes sought from any particular activity. These decisions are not based at the unit level, but at the point where teachers are designing more specific learning experiences [Rink, 1985; Rosenshine and Berak, 1979].

More open styles of teaching are likely to contribute more to affective

concerns if they are designed to achieve those ends [Goldberger and Gerney, 1982; Stewart, Cobb and Gufford, 1979]. Task orientation, active teaching, clear goals and student accountability for their own learning are probably characteristics of good teaching, regardless of the broadness or narrowness of the content [Rink, 1985]. It is clear that in physical education, there is a place for both direct and indirect instruction, for both teacher-directed and child-centred teaching and learning approaches. Recent descriptive research conducted by myself [Salter 1991b] with 52 teachers of physical education in New Zealand demonstrated that direct instructional approaches are used predominantly by many teachers. Teachers were asked to respond to a survey question which asked how frequently they used a variety of different methods in their teaching, on a scale from 0 [never] to 5 [most of the time]. The results are illustrated by chart 1, below.

Chart 1: Teachers' perceptions of their frequency of using different teaching methods in physical education.

Chart 1 illustrates that there tends to be more attention paid to using child-centred strategies earlier in children's school careers, and a progressive shift towards direct instructional, teacher-dominated strategies with older children. This shift is to some extent explained by teachers' attitudes towards controlling students, or managing the class for minimum disruption, rather than because of a belief in the superiority of one style of teaching over another to achieve particular learning outcomes. This observation was supported by a number of comments obtained from interviews with teachers, for example:

Early childhood.

The children are such individuals, it would be unfair to try to "teach" them something as a whole group. Besides, we try to provide opportunities for them to learn physical competence through discovery, rather than by having them practise the "right" way to perform something dozens of times.

Kindergarten caregiver [female, aged 32]

Primary.

Over the last couple of years I've been experimenting with different strategies for teaching physical education, in the same sort of way that I do for other curriculum areas. One of my major aims in physical education this year has been to give children more responsibility for their own learning....but, I must admit that I resort quite a bit to the old teacher-directed ways when my lesson is not very well planned, or the kids are boisterous

Primary school teacher [female: aged 27]

Secondary.

I tend to stick to strategies where I'm in charge. I think kids like to know where they stand, and they have quite strong opinions on wanting to learn how to play the game - they can't see a lot of benefit in the process, they want immediate results like being able to shoot a goal. I encourage younger teachers in my department to try different approaches if they feel comfortable, but they all seem to end up doing it my way!

Secondary school Head of Department [male, aged 46]

Teaching physical education using a variety of strategies is a feature of lessons being much more carefully planned to achieve particular learning outcomes. A national teacher development programme for physical education conducted in New Zealand in 1990 / 1991 focused on developing teachers' understandings of the teaching process and of the role of the [teacher in that process [Salter, 1991a]. Research conducted into the effectiveness of that programme illustrated that teachers developed quite different constructs of teaching and learning between the beginning and end of the programme [Salter, 1991b]. In consequence,

they began to perceive their role as teachers quite differently, as can be seen from the following comments in response to a post-intervention survey question:

What changes in your own feelings, attitudes and / or behaviour have occurred due to your involvement, (concerning your role as a teacher?)

Early Childhood

How important it is to have full participation in child-centred activities. I really feel that I am now the motivator.

Early childhood caregiver [female, aged 25]

Primary

I am trying to become more of a facilitator than a dictator. I now stand back and observe - taking up teaching points when they are seen necessary.

Primary [junior] school teacher [female, aged 32]

I am an initiator not a controller, there to extend / help children when the need arises, to give the children the opportunity to take part. My teaching has become less dominating and regimented.

Primary [senior] school teacher [male, aged 38]

Secondary

I feel I am there more to facilitate learning than to be the focus of attention all the time. Now there is less of "me up the front", and more student involvement.

Co-ed high school teacher [male, aged 34]

Teachers' perceptions of their role changed throughout the programme. There were shifts away from teacher-dominated teaching strategies, and towards situations in which teachers perceived themselves as motivators, facilitators of learning, and guides. These conceptual changes were accompanied by changes to teachers' behaviour with their physical education classes, in particular with reference to the use of a range of teaching strategies to effect particular learning outcomes.

The physical education handbook, 'A guide for success' [Department of Education, 1987], reflects an understanding of these notions, and states that all children must be actively involved in learning. The teacher's role is to assist this active learning, by providing an environment which enables children to reach their full potential. This role is described in the document as: facilitator, promoter, provider, and enabler. The document goes on to state:
Physical education by its nature demands that a variety of teaching methods and strategies be employed....teachers should not limit themselves to one approach. [p. 9]

The role of the teacher when teaching and learning are viewed from a constructivist perspective may be described as facilitator, motivator, diagnostician, challenger, guide, innovator, experimenter and researcher. These descriptions are drawn from statements made by many teachers who participated in the programme, and are supported by the writings of Osborne and Freyberg (1985), and the findings of research into learning in science conducted in New Zealand by Bell, Kirkwood and Pearson (1990). Teachers became increasingly aware that they need to use a variety of strategies to encourage children to construct new conceptions.

Quality teaching¹ Intended outcomes from physical education. The New Zealand Physical Education Syllabus [Department of Education, 1987], is directed towards the developmental needs of all young people, and advocates that teachers plan programmes to provide regular and frequent opportunities for children to experience activities which promote the following:

- * Reaching their potential in physical growth and development.
- * Developing a wide range of motor skills.
- * Participating in physical activities which aid personal and social development.
- * Acquiring knowledge and understanding about movement, about themselves and others, and about the contribution of physical activity towards a healthy lifestyle.
- * Developing positive attitudes towards physical activity.

Basic skills learned in physical education are seen to provide a starting

point for extension into organised sport, recreation and leisure pursuits. Physical education activities are not the same as sport or recreation activities, but have as one of their objectives the provision of movement education experiences which form a base for future skill development. The two publications 'Physical Education Syllabus and A Guide for Success' [both Department of Education, 1987] provide teachers with both philosophical and practical guidance in delivering quality physical education programmes in schools. Some particularly important principles which are incorporated in this guidance are as follows:

- * Developing effective programmes.
- * Evaluation.
- * Cultural considerations.
- * Gender-inclusive activities in physical education.
- * Links between physical education and sport.
- * Links with other subjects.

The underpinning themes of the new syllabus and its supporting resources are:

- a] Teachers should explore child-centred teaching and learning strategies.
- b] Teaching activities should be directed towards ensuring that learning takes place.
- c] All participating children are to be provided with opportunities for success.

Few of these notions are either unique or new to the teaching of physical education in New Zealand. Sadly however, from a physical educator's viewpoint, the practices of a great many teachers do not always involve application of the philosophical messages which are contained in the new syllabus, and described above. Many early childhood physical education programmes consist solely of unguided exploratory play, and many programmes in both primary and secondary schools have a strong sports skills and game-playing orientation, which seems to best fit the "busy, happy and good" notion of Placek [1982]. Among reasons cited by myself [Salter, 1991b] for New Zealand teachers to continue to run poor quality physical education programmes in their schools, the following were quite common:

- * I hadn't really thought about children's learning outcomes.
- * I haven't got the background knowledge for teaching some topics.
- * I've always done it this way. It must be successful, because we're recognised as the best sporting school in the region.
- * It's difficult to fit physical education in, with so many other pressures during the day.
- * I know I could be better prepared for physical education classes, but it's the only time in the day when I can take a time-out. The children always enjoy themselves, and it's easy to organise a game at short notice.

While many physical education teachers throughout the country are running excellent, thoughtfully planned programmes which are based upon the

developmental needs of children, it is also true that many teachers are offering less than adequate programmes [i.e., irregular, unplanned, non-sequential and / or developmentally inappropriate]. There exists a mis-match between what the new syllabus says should be happening in schools, and the daily practices which actually occur. I recently conducted qualitative research with students in a variety of New

Zealand primary, [intermediate and secondary schools, using student questionnaires and interviews. While ALT-PE research has been extensively used in recent years to give clear indications of learner involvement in physical education in terms of time-on-task averages, it does not necessarily reflect the degree to which learning takes place. Teachers often state the aims they hope to achieve in their teaching of physical education, and this investigation set out to establish the congruence between these aims, and students' perceptions of their learning in physical education. The questionnaire, based on a model described by Underwood [1988], posed 40 questions asking students to rank on a scale from 0 [not at all] to 5 [very much] the degree to which physical education lessons in school had contributed to their learning. A factor analysis based on the inter-correlations of these items revealed that the perceptions of teachers [and students were quite different concerning the stated outcomes of physical education, as prescribed by the 1987 physical education syllabus. This factor analysis is illustrated by chart 2, below.

Chart 2: Students' perceptions of their learning in physical education

A number of issues are clear from the results of the research, most importantly perhaps the indication that the physical education lesson is not fulfilling teachers' perceptions of what the teaching process is intended to provide. Girls perceive that physical education has contributed to their development even less than boys in each of the four areas, with motor skill development - the most important aim for teachers - being rated lowest. It should be recognised also that the results illustrated by chart 2 are skewed to some extent by the very positive responses of most primary school children, many of whom indicated in interview that just getting outside the classroom and running around was enjoyable, and made them feel good! The importance teachers attach to different intended outcomes of the physical education programme is illustrated by chart 3, below, and it is immediately observable that there is some disparity between teachers' intentions as to what students were to learn, and students' perceptions as to what was actually learned.

Chart 3: Teachers' perceptions of their students' learning in physical education

An important axiom of professional preparation programmes for teaching is that teachers should choose particular objectives for their students,

and then select activities and management / instructional strategies which will best ensure the attainment of those objectives. In reality however, research has shown that teachers typically begin their planning with the activities to be taught, and then construct objectives which appear to validate the activities [for example: Clark and Yinger, 1979; McCutcheon, 1980; Placek, 1984; Tinning, 1987; Salter, 1991a]. Further, there is good reason to believe that many teachers of physical education do not define the success of a lesson in terms of whether their students learn [for example, Harootunian and Yarger, 1981; Placek, 1982]. These notions are further explored in the following section.

Teaching content.

In most schools in western societies there is likely to be some agreement about the goals of physical education, and the sorts of activities which should form the basis of the programme in schools. The daily physical education programme of Australia, for example, is more similar than different to that of New Zealand. This is hardly surprising in view of the fact that values held by people in society, including curriculum developers, are socially, culturally and historically constructed. The traditional or "activity" approach to curriculum focuses on units of activity taught for certain units of time throughout the year, and the traditional approaches of Dauer and Pangrazi [1983], Kirchner [1985] and Vannier and Gallahue [1978] construct activity sequences for

different age-groups of children [in, for example, games, dance and gymnastics]. Content for primary levels is predominantly individual, self-directed, exploratory and creative, with the intention that students learn basic skills and concepts which are subsequently built upon. Ward and Werner [1982] identified "movement analysis" as a curricular model distinct from the "developmental" model, and both approaches share the notion that activities taught serve as a vehicle for achieving the broader aims of the physical education lesson, rather than as an end in itself. Regardless of the specific theme content, there is agreement that perceptual and motor tasks should be applied according to the appropriate developmental motor stage of each individual. According to Tinning [1987], the type of curriculum model applied to physical education in both countries would best fit the eclectic approach described by Siedentop, [Herkowitz and Rink [1984]. An important feature of this model is that it provides teachers with the opportunity to modify particular elements of the programme for either pragmatic or educational reasons, as they see fit. The New Zealand physical education curriculum consists of eight themes or elements, each of which are supposedly to receive equal attention in schools.

These themes are:

- * Aquatics
- * Athletics
- * Ball activities
- * Gymnastics

- * Fitness
- * Movement & dance
- * Te reo kori [Maori cultural dimension]
- * Education outside the classroom

Research into the national teacher development programme mentioned earlier [Salter, 1991a], disclosed the fact that New Zealand teachers teach fitness, ball activities and athletics with much greater confidence than they do movement and dance, education outside the classroom or te reo kori. Teachers' perceptions of their teaching competence, background knowledge of the topic to be taught, and their interest in the particular topic were shown to be closely connected. While teachers perceived that their knowledge, competence and interest increased substantially as a result of the programme activities, it is important to recognise that these and many other teachers of physical education focus on topics which interest them, and which [they feel comfortable teaching. Further, teacher interviews demonstrated that an important hindrance to teaching some content stemmed from teachers' uneasiness with topics which required student-centred methods of teaching.

In consequence, many teachers continue to teach the same sorts of "traditional" topics [running, jumping, throwing, fitness and games] as has been the case for a very long time. This is illustrated by chart 4, below, which portrays primary and secondary school teachers' [responses to the question of what importance they attached to planning for the teaching of Weach theme throughout the year. It is not surprising that many primary school teachers [expressed a view that they had little background knowledge for teaching particular content Xthemes - in New Zealand, primary teachers are required to be generalists, and only high schools require specialists to teach physical education. It may be argued that the specific content to be taught is of relatively little importance, if the teacher does not have clearly defined learning goals for the lesson or unit of work. According to Mosston and Ashworth [1986: p.1], successful teaching occurs as a result of the congruence between what was intended and what actually occurs in the lesson. While Siedentop, Mand and Taggart [1986: p.374] claim that effective teaching can only be judged in terms of the goals of the teacher, this does not answer the question as to the real worth of a particular activity. Although many of the teachers who provided the data for chart 4 [below] claimed that they placed this importance or that importance on a particular content theme, it became clear in interview that, for some at least, ball activities in reality meant minor games, Mand a number of

teachers favour relays as an easily managed fitness activity.

Chart 4: Importance attached to content themes in long-term planning for physical education

Some teachers selected activities which they believed had some educational

value in themselves, rather than using the activities as part of a process in the pursuit of more meaningful aims. This notion is to some extent a function of the lack of understanding teachers have of the need for adequate planning for the individual lesson. While the New Zealand syllabus contains detailed goals for physical education at different levels of the school, teachers find relatively little guidance as to specific outcomes of any particular lesson. According to Williams [1992]:

.....several of the most popular and widely used activities and games at the heart of our curricula have many features and traits which are contrary to the accepted practices of good physical education. [p.57]

Not only do many of these activities provide minimal participation for the majority of students [Klesius, 1988], but they involve limited physical activity, require little pedagogical skill to teach, and serve little purpose in the achievement of any major goal of physical education [Faucette, McKenzie and Patterson, 1990]. Such concern has been expressed over this issue in the United States that Williams [1992] reports the establishment of a 'Physical Education Hall of Shame', to which activities such as dodgeball, musical chairs and relay races should belong.

Developmentally appropriate physical education.

The notion of developmentally appropriate physical education activities is not new. According to Grineski [1992], developmental programmes are based on three important principles of motor skill acquisition:

Motor skill development is sequential and age-related.

Many researchers of motor skill acquisition [for example, Cratty, 1979; Haubenstricker and Seefeldt, 1986; Zaichkowsky, Zaichkowsky and Martinek, 1980], suggest that children within a given age range benefit from instruction with age-appropriate tasks. A number of researchers have suggested frameworks for prescribing age-stages for motor skill development [for example, Gallahue, Werner and Leudke, 1975; Seefeldt, 1979], and these are fairly consistent with those proposed in the New Zealand physical education syllabus. Grineski [1992] suggests the following age periods and stages:

5-8 years - movement awareness concepts and basic motor skills.

9-11 years - specialised game, gymnastics, dance and aquatic skills.

10-12 years - application of movement awareness concepts / basic motor skills / specialised skills in physical education activity.

2. Motor skill progression is similar for all children

.. With the exception of children exhibiting abnormal motor development, progression through the sequentially ordered stages of development is consistent. Gallahue [1982], Robertson [1984] and Wickstrom [1983] described developmental sequences for various skills, and concluded that the majority of children not only follow similar

sequences of motor skill development, but arrive at developmental points at approximately the same age.

3. The rate of motor development varies. ✓

The rate at which children progress through ✓✓✓sequences varies, with the result that there are individual differences among children of ✓✓✓the same age. Haubenstricker and Seefeldt [1986] offer reasons for this, such as: physical ✓✓✓size, learning potential, emotional maturation, practice opportunities, cultural support, ✓✓>innate motor ability, environmental influences and motivation.

Given these principles of motor skill development, Grineski [1992] offers four guidelines for ✓✓✓judging the developmental appropriateness of physical activities, which are in line with ✓✓✓COPEC's position paper [American Council On Physical Education for Children]. These ✓✓✓guidelines are intended to assist teachers in planning physical education curricula in schools, ✓✓_in such a way as to ensure that students are taught with the intention of achieving meaningful ✓✓@goals in physical education. The guidelines are:

1. Provide orderly sequences of motor skill learning. ✓
2. Allow for individual differences.
3. Set appropriate goal structures. ✓✓
4. Provide ample learning time.

The principles of developmentally appropriate physical education outlined above are stated in ✓✓✓similar form in the New Zealand physical education syllabus [Department of Education, ✓✓✓1987], and are reflected in the work of Siedentop [1991]. If more teachers used them as a ✓✓✓guide to curriculum planning, then the daily practices of physical education in schools would ✓✓Xbe more likely to diverge significantly from Placek's [1982] notion of "busy, happy and ✓✓good".

Conclusion.

The above discussion has considered the notion of quality teaching in physical education to ✓✓Xbe a function of two elements: quality teaching, and quality physical education. I have ✓✓Xexamined these two elements, both from the point of view of what international research ✓✓Zinforms us constitutes teaching effectiveness and good physical education, and from a New ✓✓WZealand perspective in the light of my own observations and research with teachers and ✓✓astudents in schools. There are a number of issues that I have not explored in this brief paper, ✓✓]which also have a direct bearing on what actually happens in schools - such as, for example, issues pertaining to the hidden curriculum in physical education, gender-inclusion and ✓✓cultural sensitivity, the scientisation of physical education, the effectiveness of current pre-✓✓[service preparation and in-service support for physical education teachers, and models for ✓✓Pcurriculum planning for the physical education programme. My comments have been ✓✓]confined to describing what I believe is widely

practised in New Zealand schools in the name of physical education, and indicating principles which should be focused on it teachers are to improve their daily practices. This is not to claim that Placek's [1982] notion of "busy, happy and good" is universally evident in our school physical education lessons. Indeed, there are a very large number of highly competent, reflective practitioners throughout the country, who are teaching outstandingly successful physical education programmes which largely achieve the broader aims of physical education as prescribed in the 1987 syllabus - namely, enhancing the individual student's potential in physical growth and development, motor skill development, personal and social development, and in knowledge and understanding about physical education. My concern is that very many teachers of physical education in New Zealand schools would like to teach better, but lack the knowledge base informed by research, lack a deep understanding of the process of teaching and learning, and find themselves constrained by the resistance of work colleagues, the pressures of teaching and planning in an increasingly demanding educational system, and by society's negative attitudes towards physical education as a function of the leisure / work dichotomy.

I have focused on teaching effectiveness, methods of delivery, the intended outcomes of the physical education programme, teaching content and developmentally appropriate activities, because I believe each of these elements is capable of being improved for any particular teacher, with the result that students in schools would benefit from a better physical education programme. My own research [Salter, 1991b] demonstrated that improving teachers' proficiency was related to changes in their conceptualisation, in regard to the ways they made sense of the nature,

content and purposes of physical education. As a consequence of these conceptual changes, teachers planned physical education much more thoughtfully than they had previously, attempting to provide opportunities for children to achieve pre-determined learning outcomes. My belief is also echoed by others, among them Tinning [1987: p.61], who makes an extremely valid point in proclaiming:

.....teaching better is not an end point to be reached, but a process. It should include the search for ways to make your lessons more meaningful, just and enjoyable. It should involve you in the conscious search for contradictions in your practice and should be largely reflective with respect to the question, "What are the implications of what I teach and the way that I teach"?

References

Anderson, L. and Scott, C. [1978]. The relationship among teaching methods, student characteristics and student involvement in learning. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 29 (3), 23-25.

Anderson, W.G. and Barrette, G.T. [1978]. Teacher Behavior. In W.G.

Anderson and G.T.Barrette [Eds.], `Monograph 1: What's going on in the gym: Descriptive studies of physical education classes.

Newtown, CT: Motor Skills: Theory into Practice. @``Bell, B., Kirkwood, V. and Pearson, J. (1990).`

Learning in science project (teacher development): The framework.` Working Paper 406. Hamilton: Science and Mathematics Education Research Centre, University of Waikato. Bennett, N. et al. [1976].`

Teaching styles and pupil progress.` Cambridge, Mass: Harvard`University Press. Bredekamp, S.[Ed.] [1987]`

Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs serving children birth through age 8. Expanded edition. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Brophy, J. [1979]. Teacher behavior and its effects. `Journal of Educational Psychology,`71 (6), 733-750.`

Cheffers, J.T.F. and Mincini, V.H. [1978]. Teacher-student interaction. In W.G. Anderson and G.T. Barrette [Eds.], `Monograph 1: What's going on in the gym: Descriptive studies of physical education classes.

Newtown, CT: Motor Skills: Theory into Practice.

Clark, C. and Yinger, R. [1979]. `Three studies of teacher planning [Research series no, 55], Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching, East Lansing.

Costello, J.A. [1977]. `A descriptive analysis of student behavior in elementary school physical education classes.``Unpublished doctoral thesis: Columbia University.``

Costello, J.A. and Laubach, S.A. [1978]. Student behavior. In W.G. Anderson and G.T.Barrette [Eds.], `Monograph 1: What's going on in the gym: Descriptive studies of physical education classes.

Newtown, CT: Motor Skills: Theory into Practice. Cratty, B. [1979]. Perceptual and motor development in infants and children [2nd. ed.]. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.`

Darst, P.W., Zakrajsek. D.B. and Mancini, V.H. [1983]. Interaction analysis: A system of coding direct and indirect teaching behaviors. In P.W.Darst. D.B. Zakrajsek and V.H. Mancini [Eds.]. `Analyzing physical education and sport instruction.`Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Dauer, V.P. and Pangrazi, R.P. [1983]. `Dynamic physical education for

elementary school children. Minneapolis: Burgess.

Department of Education [1987]. 'Curriculum review.' Wellington: New Zealand Government Printing Office.

Department of Education [1987]. 'Physical education: Syllabus for junior classes to form 7.' Wellington: New Zealand Government Printing Office.

Department of Education [1987]. Physical education : A guide for success.' Wellington: New Zealand Government Printing Office.

Dodds, P. and Locke, L. [1984]. Is physical education in American schools worth saving? Evidence, alternatives, judgement. 'NAPAHE Annual Conference Proceedings,' Vol. V, 76-90. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.'

Faucette, N., McKenzie, T. and Patterson, P. [1990]. Descriptive analysis of non-specialist physical education teachers' curricular choices and class organization. 'Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 9[4], 284-294. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Gallahue, D.L. [1982]. 'Developmental movement experiences for children. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Gallahue, D.L., Werner, P. and Luedke, C. [1975]. 'A conceptual approach to moving and learning. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Godbout, P., Brunelle, J. and Tousignant, M. [1983]. Academic learning time in elementary and secondary physical education. 'Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport,' 54 [1], 11-19.

Goldberger, M. and Gerney, P. [1982]. 'The impact of Mosston's teaching styles on motor skill acquisition. 'Paper presented at the National Convention: American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance.'

Grineski, S. [1992]. What is a truly developmentally appropriate physical education program for children? 'Journal Of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 63[6], 33-35.

Haubenstricker, J. and Seefeldt, V. [1986]. Acquisition of motor skills. In V. Seefeldt [Ed.], 'Physical activity and well-being. Reston, VA: AAHPERD.

Hoffman, S. [1971]. Traditional methodology: Prospects for change. Quest. 15 [Winter].

Jackson, J. [1980]. Sport rejection: An in-depth inquiry. University of Victoria, British Columbia.

Kirchner, G. [1985]. 'Physical education for elementary school children.

IA: Wm. C. Brown.

Klesius, S. [1988]. Are games like duck duck goose and pin guard inherently bad? *Florida Journal of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 26 [1], 29-32.

Lewis, G. [1969]. Adoption of the sports program. 1906-39: The role of accommodation in the transformation of physical education. *Quest*, 12, 34-36.

Locke, L. [1981]. Prognosis: What can be predicted for the profession? Paper presented at the American Academy of Physical Education annual meeting, Boston.

McCutcheon, G. [1980]. How do elementary teachers plan? The nature of planning and influences on it. *Elementary School Journal*. 81[1], 4-23.

McLeish, J., Howe, B. and Jackson, J. [1981]. *Effective teaching in physical education: Report to the Educational Research Institute of British Columbia*. Unpublished manuscript.

Metzler, M. [1979]. *The measurement of academic learning time in physical education*. Doctoral dissertation. The Ohio State University.

Metzler, M.W. [1990]. *Instructional supervision for physical education*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Mosston, M. [1972]. *Teaching: From command to discovery*. Wadsworth.

Mosston, M. and Ashworth, S. [1986]. *Teaching physical education* [3rd. Ed.]. New York: Merrill / Macmillan Publishing.

Osborne, R.J. and Freyberg, P. (1985). *Learning in Science: The implications of children's science*. Auckland: Heinemann.

Peterson, P. [1979]. Direct instruction reconsidered. In P. Peterson and H. Wallberg [Eds.], *Research on teaching: Concepts, findings and implications*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corp.

Phillips, A. and Carlisle, C. [1983]. A comparison of physical education teachers categorized as most and least effective. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*. 2 [3], 62-76.

Pieron, M. [1980]. Pupils' activities, time on task and behaviors in high school physical education teaching. *Federation International d'Education Physique Bulletin*, 50 [3/4], 62-68.

Placek, J. [1982]. Conceptions of success in teaching: Busy, happy and

good? In T. Templin and J. Olson [Eds.], *Teaching in physical education*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Books.

Rink, J.E. [1985]. *Teaching physical education for learning*. St. Louis: Times Mirror-Moseby.

Robertson, M. [1984]. Changing motor patterns during childhood. In J. Thomas [Ed.], *Motor development during childhood and adolescence*. Minneapolis: Burgess.

Rosenshine, B. [1971]. Research in teacher performance criteria. In B. Smith [Ed.], *Research in teacher education*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Rosenshine, B. and Berak, V. [1979]. Content, time and direct instruction. In P. Peterson and H. Wallberg [Eds.], *Research on teaching: Concepts, findings and implications*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corp.

Salter, D.G. [1991a]. *Physical education teacher development contract 90 / 6: Programme final report*. Unpublished report to the Ministry of Education Curriculum Functions. Unit: New Zealand: Wellington.

Salter, D.G. [1991b]. Collaborative research and professional development in physical education: Preliminary findings of investigation into a teacher development program in New Zealand. Published in the conference proceedings of the AISEP / NAPAHE World Congress, *Collaboration between researchers and practitioners in physical education: An international dialogue*. 121-126. Atlanta, GA.

Seefeldt, V. [1979]. Developmental motor patterns: Implications for elementary school physical education. In C. Nadeau, W. Holliwell, K. Newell and G. Roberts [Eds.], *Psychology of motor behavior and sport*. Champaign,

IL: Human Kinetics.

Siedentop, D. [1981]. *Secondary physical education: An endangered species*. Paper presented at the meeting of the AAHPERD, Boston.

Siedentop, D. [1991]. *Developing teaching skills in physical education* [3rd. Ed.]. Mountainview, CA: Mayfield Publishing.

Siedentop, D., Mand, C. and Taggart, A. [1986]. *Physical education: Teaching and curriculum strategies for grades 5-12*. Mountainview, CA: Mayfield.

Siedentop, D., Tousignant, M. and Parker, M. [1982]. *Academic learning time-physical education: 1982 revision coding manual*. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, College of Education. School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation.

Siedentop, D., Herkowicz, J. and Rink, J. [1984]. *Elementary physical education methods.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall

Solomon, D. and Kendall, A. [1976]. Individual characteristics and children's performance in "open" and "traditional" classroom settings. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 68, 613-625.

Stewart, C., Cobb, P. and Gufford, J. [1979]. *A comparison of discovery and guided teaching strategies of initial motor task learning and related motor task learning.* Unpublished manuscript. Georgia Southern College.

Thaxton, A. et al. [1977]. Comparative effectiveness of two methods of teaching physical education to elementary school girls. *Research Quarterly*. 48 [May], 420-427.

Tinning, R. [1987]. *Improving teaching in physical education.* Australia: Deakin University Press.

Underwood, G.L. [1988]. *Teaching and learning in physical education: A social psychological perspective.* Lewes, England: Falmer Press.

Vanderswaag, H. [1983]. Coming out of the maze: Sport management, dance management and exercise science - programs with a future. *Quest*, 35[1], 66-73.

Vannier, M. and Gallahue, D.L. [1978]. *Teaching physical education in elementary schools.* Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders.

Ward, D.S. and Werner, P. [1981]. Two curricular approaches: An analysis. *Journal of Physical Education and Recreation*, 52, 60-63. Wickstrom, R. [1983]. *Fundamental movement patterns* [3rd. ed.]. Philadelphia: Lea and Febiger.

Williams, N.F. [1992]. The physical education hall of shame. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*. 63[6], 57-59.

Wilson, C. [1969]. Diversities in meanings of physical education. *Research Quarterly*, 40[1], 211-214.

Zaichowsky, L., Zaichowsky, L. and Martinek, T. [1980]. *Growth and development: The child and physical activity.* St. Louis: C.V. Mosby Company.