DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 984 SP 026 486

AUTHOR Lumpkin, Angela
TITLE The History of Elementary School Physical Education (1950-1985).
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 23p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Elementary Education; *Movement Education; Perceptual Motor Learning; *Physical Education; Physical Education Teachers; *Program Development

ABSTRACT

Elementary school physical education in the 1950s espoused the aims of complete education through programs which emphasized mastery of skills in games, sports, dance, and similar activities. Since the middle of the 1960s, movement education has gained in popularity as both a methodology and as a program focusing on learning through efficient movement. Several conferences have been conducted to develop conceptual frameworks for both the professional preparation of teachers of elementary physical education and the optimal implementation of the values of human movement as a medium of learning within the curriculum. "Essentials of a Quality Elementary Physical Education Program," initially formulated by members of the profession in 1970, states guidelines for the integration of elementary physical education as an integral part of the total educational program. Brief annotations of significant writings on the topic are included in this review. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED261984

THE HISTORY OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PHYSICAL EDUCATION (1950-1985)

Angela Lumpkin
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Lumpkin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy

SP026486

Growing out of the new physical education of the preceding decades, elementary school physical education in the 1950s espoused the aims of complete education yet sought to achieve them through traditional programs. In the 1980s another new physical education focused more on meeting the needs of children than on educating them to live in a democratic society as Jesse Williams advocated. What curricula and methodology in elementary school physical education brought about these changes? How have these factors influenced today's programs and future developments? This historical overview will analyze and synthesize selected writings, curricular trends, program objectives, and conference and convention presentations in elementary school physical education. Through this examination of the past third of a century, hopefully, those involved in elementary physical education may gain insights into how to provide the best quality experiences for children plus how to innovatively lead into the twenty-first century.

Before embarking on an examination of the curricula and methodology in physical education in the elementary schools, what has been and is the status of these programs in terms of number and preparation of teachers, numbers of students, facilities, length of program, etc? During the 1955-56 school year Elsa Schneider from the U.S. Office of Education conducted the first comprehensive study to determine the policies, practices, and procedures used in physical education for children of elementary school age in city school systems. In this study it was found that classroom teachers provided the overwhelming majority of physical education instruction in all grades, as shown in Figure 1, but with help from physical education specialists over half of the time. In-service education was provided to classroom teachers 35% more often when a specialist directed the program. Of the 5,225 persons employed as specialists, 72% actually taught children on a daily basis. In grades 1-3 only 23% and in grades 4-6 only 28% of the children received daily instruction in physical education of at least 30 minutes.[1]

In a comparison between elementary school physical education in 1968 and

1979, Sheila Caskey reported that in the interim years between the two surveys requirements had increased, while elementary programs continued to be taught by classroom teachers, the number of specialists increased, and the average minutes per week fell below the usual recommendation of 150 minutes.[2] The survey results are summarized in Figure 2.

The National Children and Youth Fitness Study reported that about 97% of the children in grades 5-6 were enrolled in physical education. More students in these two grades took physical education twice a week than any other paradigm as shown in Figure 3. On a weekly basis, 54.6% of the students in grades 5-6 received an hour and a half or less of physical education. These and other data verified that elementary school age children at the time of the study failed to meet the five objectives established in Promoting Health/Preventing Disease: Objectives for the Nation in 1980. Focusing on 10-17 year olds, the study stated the three goals sought by 1990--60% will attend physical education classes daily, 70% will periodically have their fitness levels tested, and 90% will participate in physical activities that help maintain an effective cardiorespiratory system.[3] Have these always been the goals for children in elementary physical education programs?

In the 1950s and 1960s when education was criticized for being too soft, for stressing literacy rather than learning, and for failing to emphasize math and science, the essentiality of physical education in the elementary schools was also questioned. During these two decades as physical education sought to prove its worth in the development of the whole child, results of a comparative fitness study on European and American children threatened the field's credibility. Beginning in the mid-1950s a renewal of interest in physical fitness spread nationally as curricula broadened in scope of activities and fitness goals and objectives became paramount.

The participants in the 1959 AAHPER National Conference on Fitness of

Children of Elementary School Age expressed concern for the health, physical education, and recreation of children when they agreed to several basic assumptions. Specific to physical education, they recommended that the schools provide daily instructional periods which fostered creativity and vigorous physical activity and included movement exploration, rhythm and dance, games, practice in sports skills, sports activities, stunts, tumbling, and apparatus, and when possible, swimming.[4] This conference along with the AAHPER's "Operation Fitness" in 1958, the development and initial implementation of the AAHPER Youth Fitness Test in 1958, and the promotional activities of the President's Council on Physical Fitness helped to promote youth fitness nationally. In the early 1960s tremendous progress was reported in the fitness levels of school children. For example, between 1961 and 1963 there was a 21% increase in the proportion of children (grades 4-12) who exceeded the minimum established standards for physical fitness. By 1963 eight states required every student to participate every day in a regular physical education period, while in 10 other states more than 75% of the students engaged in physical education daily.[5] Unfortunately, following this major emphasis on youth fitness and the successes measured in the 1965 administration of the AAHPER Youth Fitness Test, a slowdown and even reversal occurred in the importance placed on this component of children's programs. Not until the 1980s did physical fitness become a major program thrust, partly resulting from government reports, independent surveys, and the National Children and Youth Fitness Study which measured fitness and established goals for improvement.

Since fitness was not consistently stressed, what comprised elementary school phsyical education programs? Most schools and teachers offered a potpourri of activities which focused on traditional sports and games. Classroom teachers, who usually were responsible for these programs, often received their only exposure to physical education through one elementary methods course in college.

Textbooks of the 1950s offered minimal information about teaching methodology and program planning while maximally emphasizing a diversity of activities. Three have been selected to illustrate this trend.

Elizabeth Sehon in Physical Education Methods for Elementary Schools devoted 75% of this text to an explanation of how to execute games, sports, creative rhythms, folk singing games and folk dances, social and tap dancing, subject-integrated activities, and classroom activities.[6] Dorothy LaSalle discussed meeting children's needs, emotional development, class management, and evaluation yet focused on specific curriculum materials by grades in Guidance of Children through Physical Education, an elementary methods textbook first published in 1946.[7] Although Elizabeth Halsey and Lorena Porter in Physical Education for Children - A Developmental Program stressed the child progressing through movement experiences, still the majority of the book described games, dance, and self-testing activities. They did briefly discuss movement exploration.[8]

Physical Education for Today's Boys and Girls by Gladys Andrews, Jeannette Saurborn, and Elsa Schneider published in 1960 approached its subject quite differently than earlier texts through its advocacy of movement as the basis for physical education. In seeking to understand children and how they moved, they stated that movement was activity, movement was response, movement was purposeful, and movement was growth. The authors' comprehensive program of games, sports, stunts, tumbling, rhythms, dance, and other movement experiences focused on meeting the developmental needs and interests of children. Outcomes of their movement education program included enhancing learning, helping children understand their own ideas and feelings as well as understand others, providing a way of communication, self-expression, and creativity, and developing social and physical skills.[9]

Other textbooks in the 1960s usually included a chapter or brief references about movement exploration. Illustrative of these was Hollis Fait's Physical

Education for the Elementary School Child in which about one quarter of the writing set forth the foundations along with program planning, organizing, and implementing. Single chapters explained motor exploration, fundamental skills, basic skill games, physical fitness, lead-up and team games, rhythms and dance, stunts and tumbling, aquatics, classroom games, and games for playground and self-directed play.[10]

In the 1970s textbooks reflected the emerging curricular changes in elementary school programs. Developing Motor Behavior in Children - A Balanced Approach to Elementary Physical Education by Daniel Arnheim and Robert Pestolesi discussed the stages of motor development and concepts of perceptual motor development, thus signalling an emphasis on the importance of these factors in program design and implementation. The authors also differentiated between movement education as an instructional approach and movement exploration activities.[11] Evelyn Schurr in Movement Experiences for Children: A Humanistic Approach to Elementary School Physical Education[12] and Elsie Burton in The New Physical Education for Elementary School Children[13] focused on fulfilling the needs of children, in contrast to most earlier books which were activity-centered. While both included descriptions of varied movement experiences, Schurr emphasized the teaching-learning process while Burton told the importance of assessing children's educational needs and evaluating learning outcomes.

Hubert Hoffman, Jane Young, and Stephen Klesius weaved learning experiences throughout their book, Meaningful Movement for Children - A Developmental Theme Approach to Physical Education. They advocated that the study of movement must be integrated into the entire developmental process to be meaningful and that movement activities should be learned in conjunction with knowledge about children and teaching in order to focus on the whole child. This changing image of elementary physical education, they said, encouraged children to become aware and independent, to accept and to express feelings and ideas, to accept responsibilities, and to act cooperatively.[14]

Betty Logsdon, et al. provided examples of other curricular trends in Physical Education for Children: A Focus on the Teaching Process. The authors discussed children's movement developmentally, using mechanical principles, the teacher as observer, interpreter, and decision maker, and evaluation. Processes and products were both essential outcomes of their movement-focused content.[15]

Dynamic Physical Education for Elementary School Children by Victor Dauer and Robert Pangrazi, traditionally a popular college methods book, in its latest edition included six topics which reflected developments or areas of emphasis within the field. These included curriculum development, legal liability, class management, methodology and teaching styles, the special child, and evaluation. Still, approximately 75% of their textbook was devoted to activities and sports, as it provided users with structured content and lessons. Dauer and Pangrazi's objectives reflected the traditional outcomes, such as developing and maintaining fitness, acquiring physical skills, learning desirable social standards and ethical concepts, seeking to participate in non-class recreational activities, and acquiring personal values and attitudes about the role of physical activities in each person's life.[16] Rather than setting innovative trends, these selected textbooks explained what was happening at the time of their publication.

The Elementary School Physical Education Commission, an outgrowth of the 1964 Physical Education Division Implementation Committee of the AAHPER, ~~Physical Education Division~~ initially formulated "Essentials of a Quality Elementary School Physical Education Program" in 1970.[17] Based upon the point of view that physical education was an integral part of the total educational program and that movement provided the foundation for nearly everyone's accomplishments, children in the elementary grades needed optimal learning experiences. In 1981 the Council on Physical Education for Children (COPEC), formally the Elementary School Physical Education Commission, in its revision of the earlier statement, advocated that the degree of success in work and play enjoyed by children was strongly influenced by effective and efficient movement.[18] A

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

comparison between the two showed the evolution in the roles of the children and the teacher, expectations in teacher preparation, instructional criteria, organizational matters, and facilities and equipment.

Concerning the child, both statements listed the development of the whole individual and physical outcomes from carefully planned movement experiences, while in 1981 the needs of children with differing abilities and aptitudes were addressed as was the importance of gaining a positive attitude toward physical activity. Teachers of elementary school physical education must understand and integrate knowledges of human movement, growth and development, and learning theories, must work effectively with children as they move, keep current in the literature, and work closely with classroom teachers in order to provide appropriate programs. The 1981 statement added that skills were needed in assessing children's movements, competency in working with children with special needs, and personal skills and teaching skills.

Both writings stressed that the instructional program's goal was to help children become more self-directed, self-reliant, and fully functional. Desired outcomes included developing motor skills and efficient movement patterns, encouraging vigorous activity and attainment of physical and health-related fitness, fostering creativity and encouraging expression and communication through movement, promoting self-understanding and acceptance, promoting social interaction, and helping children learn how to handle risk-taking, winning, losing, and other challenges. While in 1971 daily physical education classes were recommended, in 1981 they were called necessities. The minimum of 150 minutes per week was consistent over this ten-year span, plus the 1981 statement added that class size should be consistent with those of other subject areas and that federal legislation protecting the rights of students should be incorporated into program philosophy. Providing sufficient and quality equipment along with all-weather surfaces and indoor facilities were stated as imperatives for quality programs.

Logsdon, et al's statement of philosophy stressed the individuality and integrity of children, the essentiality of the teachers' dedication to helping children achieve their potential as independent learners and decision makers, and the provision of experiences that improved the ability to move, to engage in thought processes, and to develop a value system.[19] Inherent within the preceding discussion of the objectives of elementary physical education was the concept that movement was the key.[20]

Historically, Rudolph Laban's system of movement analysis first influenced physical education in England in the late 1940s as its inclusion of problem solving techniques and a child-centered approach found considerable support. His theories were introduced in the United States by English teachers who taught in this country in the 1950s as well as by Americans who travelled in England observing their programs. The English program was notable for the total involvement of the children in the learning process, the vigorous and maximal participation by every child, the program's individualization, the skills of the teachers in creating a positive educational environment, and the integration of physical education into the school day.[21]

Generally the English approach was not widely accepted in the United States in the 1950s. Partially this was due to the terminology, to Laban's method and association with modern dance, and to the fact that many of the initial proponents were women college faculty who had never taught children.[22] Many teachers also did not value learning through problem solving and creative responses. During this time movement exploration most frequently became a unit within the total elementary physical education program and referred to both the content and the methodology.

The 1956 Anglo-American Workshop on Elementary School Physical Education provided the opportunity for individuals from the United States to learn more about this program but did not dramatically affect programs in this country,

probably because of the diversity of the perceptions about it.[23] For example, problem solving while not a new methodology, was applied within programs differently and was not widely accepted. The emphasis on problem solving, self-expression, and individualization of programs within physical education probably resulted from teachers' attempts to more consistently align their programs with the emerging trends in general education than to model the English program. Thus in the 1950s while physical education methodology changed somewhat along with educational philosophy, movement education was only one programmatic influence and was mostly incorporated into the teaching of dance rather than games.

Movement education in the 1960s gained momentum often due to exchanges between American and English teachers resulting in a better understanding of the program in England. Among the English travelers was Ruth Morison, the leader in educational gymnastics in her country. The second Anglo-American Workshop held in 1966 focused on movement education as individuals from the United States attended and visited English schools.[24]

Several programs were launched in the United States in the 1960s to promote the use of movement education. Laban's categorization of movement and the British form of movement education influenced each of these projects as well as increasing number of schools, textbook writings, and research. A divergence in movement education and its interpretation was evident in this decade.[25] While some held the viewpoint that movement exploration was a unit based on both content and methodology, others in the 1960s proposed that movement education was synonymous with physical education and thus should be accepted as the methodology.

Conferences and major curriculum projects highlighted the 1970s as movement education for some became an integrating process in the development of human movement potential. The term movement exploration was used less often to describe programs in the 1970s which stressed problem solving and guided discovery. At the same time increasing application of movement education principles were made

to the teaching of sports and games.[26] Much of the literature of the 1970s did not advocate the acquisition of skill within an environment consistent with movement education principles but instead criticized it or at least questioned its premises.

Just as textbooks reflected trends and developments in elementary school physical education, such as the emergence of movement education, so did conferences and convention programs. The National Conference of Physical Education in Elementary Schools held in 1951 was the first to look specifically at programs for children while two years later the National Conference on Program Planning in Games and Sports for Boys and Girls of Elementary School Age Children also examined curricular activities. The AAHPER Fitness Conference in 1956 was followed by the 1959 National Conference on Fitness for Elementary Age Children as this facet of the school program received a major boost. Movement education was the focus of the 1956 and 1966 Anglo-American Workshops on Elementary School Physical Education, as previously discussed. Personalizing Learning Environments in Physical Education for Elementary School Children, sponsored by the Elementary Physical Education Council of NASPE in 1976, provided a leadership workshop to explore the concepts underlying personalized learning and their implications for elementary school physical education programs.

While the 1967 Conference for College Teachers Preparing Elementary Classroom Teachers to Teach Physical Education offered strategies to enhance these teachers' preparation and credentials, in 1968 the Conference for Teachers and Supervisors of Elementary School Physical Education sought to meet the needs of these specialists. Kent State University's conference on "Curriculum Decision - Making in Elementary Physical Education, co-sponsored by COPEC in 1980, was directed toward elementary physical education teachers as was its "Curriculum Planning: A Collaborative Effort" in 1982. Georgia State University has also held annual conferences on "Contemporary Elementary and Middle School

Physical Education" wherein physical education specialists, coordinators, and professional preparation personnel, along with classroom teachers interacted philosophically and shared practical concerns.

In 1972 the Elementary School Physical Education Commission and the Task Force on Children's Dance co-sponsored the National Conference on Professional Preparation of the Elementary Specialist. The purposes of the conference were to examine beliefs about children and their needs for movement, aesthetics, and rhythmical experiences; to develop insights about developmental programs for children; to clarify the role of dance in comprehensive physical education programs; to examine professional preparation guidelines; and to make recommendations for action.[27] According to Larry Locke's summation of this conference, it failed to focus on professional preparation but instead the presentations dealt more with curricular matters and making elementary school physical education the central thrust of the profession. Locke emphasized that teacher training as a process needed to be studied, that research should be conducted and its results translated into positive outcomes, and that the emergence of a new breed of teacher educator was essential.[28]

The Second National Conference on Preparing the Physical Education Specialist for Children held in 1984 focused on the issues in professional preparation of elementary school physical education specialists, on helping teacher educators make rational curriculum decisions, and on examining program models.[29] This COPEC-sponsored event first verified that a difference existed between teaching physical education in schools and teaching adults to become physical educators. Secondly, it affirmed that in the 1980s there emerged a nucleus of teacher educatiors in the colleges who sought to ensure that progress toward improved teacher education in physical education will continue.[30]

Lawrence Locke in summarizing this conference compared it to the 1972 conference by stressing how the earlier one had discussed the subject matter of movement while the second conference examined the scientific art of pedagogy-two distinct content areas. He analyzed that elementary physical education had

undergone tremendous curricular reform and sophistication resulting in dramatic changes in the past decade. For example, more preparation was available for elementary specialists, more research on teaching had influenced professional preparation programs, curricula were more diversified and rooted in general skills for playful and expressive movement, more pedagogical diversity existed, and more teachers benefitted from the use of systematic observation and feedback. On the other hand, research on teacher education was notably omitted from the conference agenda.[31]

In addition to conferences, AAHPERD conventions have included a wealth of elementary physical education programs. In 1954 the Elementary Physical Education Section sponsored its first pre-convention workshop, which examined what physical education could mean to children.[32] Both the number and the diversity of convention programs reflected the status of elementary school physical education.[33] Highlighted in Figure 4 are selected topics from convention programs between 1956-1984 (only years available). The few sessions in the early 1960s may have indicated a lack of focus for elementary school programs, whereas later in that decade movement became a popular program topic. Throughout these years, innovative and popular curricula remained the foremost themes, such as the annual programs on Basic Stuff in the 1980s. Notably, the number and variety of sessions concerning elementary school physical education now comprise a major component of the overall convention program. This trend in the growth in popularity of elementary programs was also evident in 1981-82 when AAHPERD members who checked elementary as a primary interest area (9329) far surpassed those who indicated secondary schools (6834) and colleges (4422).[34]

Children in most elementary programs in the 1950s focused on the mastery of skills in games, relays, dances, and other activities in large groups under the supervision of classroom teachers. They frequently faced elimination in their games, inactivity, and an absence of thinking, creativity, and affiliation.[35]

Since the mid-1960s curricula have focused more on learning through efficient movement, an individualized approach, and maximal activity.[36] The new physical education of the 1980s recognizes the dignity of each child, values human movement as the medium of learning, and is success oriented.

In order to effectively implement this program for all children, continued improvement in professional preparation of elementary physical education teachers is needed as are in-service clinics and workshops for school physical educators, for college faculty, and for classroom teachers. Research on teaching elementary physical education needs to continue to utilize knowleges from perceptual-motor development, personalized learning, and curriculum development in order to offer the best programs for children.[37] Now that movement has been identified as the basis of physical education, specialists in this field merit the financial and philosophical support of legislators, administrators, and parents so that every child can reach their potential.

Figure 1*

Physical Education in Urban Elementary Schools, 1955-56

Instruction provided by	Grades 1-3	Grades 4-6
a) Classroom teacher only	26%	16%
b) Classroom teacher with help of specialist	62%	54%
c) Specialist in physical education	12%	29%

In-service physical education for classroom teachers	Grades 1-6
a) Classroom teacher situation	52%
b) Classroom teacher with help of specialist	87%

Specialist in physical education (5,225)	Male	Female
a) By gender	57%	42%
b) Teach children in the day-by-day classes	72%	72%

Daily instructional program	Grades 1-3	Grades 4-6
At least 30 minutes per day	23%	28%

Gymnasium or playroom available - 54%

All-weather play areas provided - 48%

*"Highlights from the Study of the Status of Physical Education for Children of Elementary School Age in City Schools Systems," Journal of Health - Physical Education-Recreation, XXXI (February, 1960), 21.

Figure 2*

Survey Results 1968-1979

Questions	Number of States Responding		Results	
	1968	1979	1968	1979
1. Number of elem. schools?	40	41	61,834	47,533
2. Elem. school PE required?	47	43	59%	70%[a]
3. Average number min./week?	NA	40	NA	104[b]
4. Methods required for classroom certification?	46	43	41%	35%
5. Methods required for PE certification?	42	42	83%	83%
6. Schools with fulltime specialist?	36	24	28%	11%
7. Schools with parttime specialist?	25	12	6%	10%
8. PE taught by classroom teacher?	47	43	83%	62%
9. Employment for elem. PE specialists?	NA	43	NA	25% Good 75% Fair
10. Competency based certification?	NA	43	NA	28%

a Percentages based upon number responding affirmatively.
b Seven states recommend amount of time rather than mandate.

*Sheila Caskey, "Status of Elementary School Physical Education - 1968-79," AAHPERD Update, (May, 1980), 5.

Figure 3*

Percentage Breakdown by Grade: Days of Physical Education Per Week Based on NCYFS

Days/Week	5th Grade	6th Grade
Not in physical education	2.3	3.0
1 Day per Week	22.3	9.9
2 Days per Week	26.1	32.1
2 Days One Week/ 3 Days the Next	5.4	4.2
3 Days per Week	12.1	13.3
4 Days per Week	8.4	8.3
5 Days per Week	18.7	27.4
Other	4.6	1.8

*James G. Ross, et al., "What Are Kids Doing in School Physical Education?," Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, LVI (January, 1985), 74.

Figure 4*

AAHPERD CONVENTION PROGRAMS ABOUT
ELEMENTARY PHYSICAL EDUCATION

YEAR	NUMBER	SELECTED PROGRAM TOPICS
1956	6	Physical Fitness; Mental, Emotional, and Physical Needs; Facts about Elementary Programs
1958	6	Preadolescent Child in Modern Society; Our Responsibilities; Physical Fitness; Program Adaptations; A Typical Lesson; Suggested Activities
1960	5	Homemade Equipment; Fundamental Rhythms; Posture and Body Mechanics; Fitness
1961	1	Developing Deeper Awareness
1962	1	Developmental Activities
1963	3	Movement Exploration in Dance; President's Physical Fitness Program
1964	1	What Do We Think We Know about Elementary School Physical Education
1965	3	Fundamental Movement; Skill Approaches; Creative Dance
1966	6	Learning to Move--Moving to Learn; Folk and Modern Square Dance; Implementation of Titles I, II, III, Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965; Exploration: A Method of Teaching Movement; Conditioning Rounds: Tinikling, Tumnikling, and Advanced Tumbling
1967	2	Perceptual Motor Training; Lead-Up Games to Seasonal Sports
1968	5	Teaching Basic Movement; Basic Movement Lessons; Creative Dance
1969	3	Educational Gymnastics in Great Britain; The Application of Movement Education to Instruction in Sport Skills
1970	5	A Look at the Preschool Child; Movement Education: An Approach to Teaching Games
1971	2	Perceptual Motor Development; Analyzing of Movement in Movement Education
1972	2	Learning through Movement; Developmental Activities
1973	3	Creative Approach; Primary Rhythms and Creativity

1974	3	Dance and Sport Activity; Let's Keep the 'Physical' in Elementary Physical Education; Individualized Movement Education
1975	4	Specialized Sports Skills; Rope Jumping; Parachute Activities; Competition for Children
1976	4	Movement Experience; Teaching Games; Competency Based Assessment Programs
1977	5	Future Directions of Elementary Physical Education; Traditional or Educational Gymnastics; Playscapes; Teacher Preparation
1978	9	Preschool Play Program for Moderately Mentally Retarded Children; Learning Centers; Developing Skillfull Game Players; Movement and Science; Movement and Reading; Movement and Math; Movement and Language Arts; 'Back to Basics' Movement
1979	3	Minimizing Sex Role Stereotyping
1980	9	Movement Education; Perspective on Physical Education for the Handicapped; Fitness; Movement Games; Mainstreaming;
1981	7	Creative Dance; A Focus on Children: Caring, Sharing, Daring; A Key to Teaching Motor Skill; Movement Education; School Olympics
1982	13	Health Fitness; Objectives for the 1990's--Relationship to School Programs; Physical Activity/ Weight Management; Incorporating Fitness Gymnastics, Games and Sports, Dance; Problems in Trying to Make Progress in Children's Physical Education; Educational Gymnastics; Movement Education
1983	21	Moral Development and the Sport Experience; Motor Development; Managing Stress; Curriculum Model for Elementary Physical Education; Creative Teaching; Children and Play; Family and Play; Adults and Play; Teachers and Play; Administrators and Play; Essentials of a Quality Elementary School Physical Education Program; Avoiding the Budget Guillotine; Basic Stuff
1984	14	Program Development; Teaching Preparation; Observing, Assessing, and Refining: A Key to Critical Teaching; Innovative Equipment; Motor Devleopment; Identifying Critical Problems in Professional Preparation; Motor Control

*Convention programs, American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, Archives, Reston, Virginia.

Endnotes

[1]Elsa Schneider, Physical Education in Urban Secondary Schools (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1959).

[2]Sheila Caskey, "Status of Elementary School Physical Education - 1968-79," AAHPERD Update, May, 1980, p. 5.

[3]"The National Children and Youth Fitness Study," Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, LVI (January, 1985), 44-90.

[4]"Basic Assumptions Agreed Upon by Participants in the AAHPER National Conference on Fitness of Children of Elementary School Age," Journal of Health - Physical Education - Recreation, XXXI (February, 1960), 19.

[5]"Progress Report from the President's Council on Physical Fitness," Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, XXXIV (October, 1963), 10.

[6]Elizabeth L. Sehon, Physical Education Methods for Elementary Schools (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders Company, 1953).

[7]Dorothy LaSalle, Guidance of Children through Physical Education (2nd ed.; New York: The Ronald Press, 1957).

[8]Elizabeth Halsey and Lorena Porter, Physical Education for Children - A Developmental Program (New York: The Dryden Press, Inc., 1958).

[9]Gladys Andrews, Jeannette Saurborn, and Elsa Schneider, Physical Education for Today's Boys and Girls (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1960).

[10]Hollis F. Fait, Physical Education for the Elementary School Child (Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders, 1964).

[11]Daniel D. Arnheim and Robert A. Pestolesi, Developing Motor Behavior in Children - A Balanced Approach to Elementary Physical Education (St. Louis: C.V. Mosby Company, 1973).

[12]Evelyn L. Schurr, Movement Experiences for Children: A Humanistic Approach to Elementary School Physical Education (2nd ed.; Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975).

[13]Elsie Carter Burton, The New Physical Education for Elementary School Children (Boston: Houghton Miffin Company, 1977).

[14]Hubert A. Hoffman, Jane Young, and Stephen E. Klesuis, Meaningful Movement for Children - A Developmental Theme Approach to Physical Education (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1981).

[15]Bette J. Logsdon, et al., Physical Education for Children: A Focus on the Teaching Process (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: Lea and Febiger, 1984).

[16]Victor P. Dauer and Robert P. Pangrazi, Dynamic Physical Education for Elementary School Children (7th ed.; Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1983).

[17]"Essentials of a Quality Elementary School Physical Education Program," Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation XLII (April, 1971), 43.

[18]Essentials of a Quality Elementary School Physical Education Program (Reston, Virginia: American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 1981).

[19]Logsdon, A Focus, p. 13.

[20]Robert S. Fleming, "Movement - An Essential in a Good School Day," in Physical Education for Children's Healthful Living (Washington, D.C.: Association for Childhood Education International, 1968), p. 15.

[21]Marie Riley, "A History of the Influence of English Movement Education on Physical Education in American Elementary Schools - The Fifties" (paper presented at the 95th convention of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, Detroit, Michigan, April 11, 1980). (Mimeographed.)

[22]Ibid.

[23]Ibid.

[24]Bette Jean Logsdon, "A History of the Influence of English Movement Education on Physical Education in American Elementary Schools - The Sixties" (paper presented at the 95th convention of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, Detroit, Michigan, April 11, 1980). (Mimeographed.)

[25]Ibid.

[26]Kate R. Barrett, "A History of the Influence of English Movement Education on Physical Education in American Elementary Schools - The Seventies" (paper presented at the 95th convention of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, Detroit, Michigan, April 11, 1980). (Mimeographed.)

[27]Preparing the Elementary Specialist . . . A Report of the Proceedings of the National Conference on Professional Preparation of the Elementary Specialist (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1973), pp. 5-6.

[28]L.F. Locke, "Teacher Education: One Minute to Midnight," in Preparing the Elementary Specialist . . . A Report of the Proceedings of the National Conference on Professional Preparation of the Elementary Specialist (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1973), pp. 87-103.

[29]"Second National Conference on Preparing the Physical Education Specialist for Children," Council on Physical Education for Children, Orlando, Florida, October 20-23, 1984. (Printed brochure.)

[30]Hubert A. Hoffman, "Orlando '84: A Significant Teacher - Education Conference," Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, LVI (January, 1985), 16.

[31]Lawrence F. Locke, "From the Ozarks to Orlando: Now That We Understand the Question, What's the Answer?," in Physical Education Professional Preparation: Insight and Foresights - Proceedings from the Second National Conference on Preparing the Physical Education Specialist for Children (Washington, D.C.: American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 1985).

[32]Elsa Schneider, "Workshop in Elementary School Physical Education," Journal of Health - Physical Education - Recreation, XXV (September, 1954), 32.

[33]Convention programs, American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, Archives, Reston, Virginia.

[34]Margie R. Hanson, "Report on Elementary Programs," State Presidents Elect Conference, Reston, Virginia, June, 1983, p. 1. (Mimeographed.)

[35]O. William Blake, "What Every Child Needs from Physical Education," in Physical Education for Children's Healthful Living (Washington, D.C.: Association for Childhood Education International, 1968), pp. 10-11.

[36]Margie R. Hanson, "Elementary School Physical Education: The Base of the Profession, A Challenge for the 70s" (speech given at the Iowa Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation Convention, Des Moines, Iowa, April 30, 1971), in Echoes of Influence for Elementary School Physical Education (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1977).

[37]Margie R. Hanson, "Physical Education for Children - A Positive Look," Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, LIV (September, 1983), 54.