DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 319 712 SP 032 329

AUTHOR Fox, Connie
TITLE Basic Stuff--Ideas for Implementation.
PUB DATE 29 Mar 90
NOTE 12p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (New Orleans, LA, March 28-31, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Body Image; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Kinesthetic Methods; *Kinesthetic Perception; Movement Education; *Perceptual Motor Learning; *Physical Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Teacher Education Curriculum; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Use of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAHPERD) "Basic Stuff" (1981) series (which includes six texts explaining each concept and three texts illustrating their use in the elementary, middle, and secondary schools) is recommended for physical education teacher preparation programs. A study was undertaken to compare classes taught with a "Basic Stuff" approach to those taught with a traditional skill orientation. Two college beginning level volleyball classes and two high-ability swimming conditioning classes were taught, one class in each activity using "Basic Stuff" physiology and kinesiology, and one class in each activity using skill orientation. Following instruction, the "Basic Stuff" classes were found to have significantly more knowledge in skill analysis, movement analysis, technique, and strategy, and to have equal knowledge of rules compared to skill oriented classes. No significant difference was found between classes in skill development or in learning of a novel skill. However, a significant difference was found in a repeat test of the novel skill 2 days following exposure (JD)

Basic Stuff
Ideas for Implementation

Dr. Connie Fox
Assistant Professor
Northern Illinois University

Paper originally presented at
American Alliance for Health, Physical Education,
Recreation and Dance
annual Convention
New Orleans, LA
March 29,1990

AAHPERD 1990 New Orleans
Connie Fox
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL 60115

Basic Stuff

As a curriculum evaluator, I see a lot of schools who are not very successful at doing much of anything I believe is good for our children. I see lots of attempts to teach sports. But no real learning occurs because units of instruction are too short and too discrete. There is very little carry over from one sport to another and no attempt is made to transfer skills from sport to sport. Little understanding of fundamental movement principals is evident. Little understanding of abilities which underlie movement is evident. No understanding of the process by which movement is learned and no understanding of developmental skill progression is evident. No evidence exists that children connect their movement to feelings, expression or aesthetics. In short, our children participate in something called physical education, but rarely come away knowing much at all about the body of knowledge we profess to base our profession on. Some college level programs are called kinesiology rather than physical education, but I don't see teachers from these programs supplying their children with different information. These children don't know much kinesiology. They might know some physiology if they have a fitness "unit". They are grossly ignorant motor learning and motor development. And they don't even consider the psychosocial aspects or humanities to be important at all.

I don't think our programs are set up to deliver the knowledge of our field. Programs are set up to deliver sports and games. But they aren't succeeding because they are not grounded in the basic knowledge of our field. I think it is time we get back to basics in Physical Education. I believe that means teaching our children the stuff they need to know about movement, then provide movement experiences so the children can apply the knowledge. Don't think I am blaming the teachers for this lack of student

knowledge. I don't think professional preparation programs prepare teachers well enough to do this.

I don't think most teachers know what the basic foundation of the field is. Their preparation programs supplied them with a physiology, kinesiology, psychology and motor learning class. But most preparation programs never apply that information. And they don't teach the majors how to apply it when they begin teaching. The undergraduate major's program is stuffed full of courses with little or no integration. No connection is made between any "theory" class and an "activity" or sport class. Theory remains disconnected from anything else. Activity classes either focus on personal skill development or on teaching that activity. They do lots of drills and learn lots of neat tricks to teach skills, but don't have any idea why drills are effective or why the tricks work. In short, we don't prepare students to teach the knowledge of our field. Ask your students why they are required to take physiology or kinesiology if they want to teach. They'll tell you its irrelevant!

Before I try to change professional preparation programs, I decided to see if my ideas would work on "real students". I wondered if I could apply theory to an activity class. Since it had been a while since I took undergraduate theory classes, I was forced to study a little. I needed to know some basic ideas, the stuff on which the field is based. I need to examine some biomechanical analysis of movement, physiology of exercise, motor learning and development, psychological and sociological aspects and humanities. The American Alliance for Health Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAHPERD) has endorsed this concept in a series of texts aimed of teaching these concepts. The Basic Stuff (AAHPERD, 1981) series includes six texts explaining each concept and three texts illustrating their use in the elementary, middle and secondary schools. Higher

education instructors can easily apply the information to their classes.

Using a Basic Stuff approach means that classes are designed for teaching kinesiological concepts of movement through tne use of a particular game or sport. The activity is not an end unto itself, but is a means by which kinesiological principles can be learned and understood. These principles transfer from activity to activity. Therefore, when a student understands and applies a principle to movement in one sport, that principle can be applied to another sport. For example, the biomechanical concept of object projection can be applied to setting a volleyball. More force is gained when the knees are bent then straightened on contact. I decided to try this concept with my college level classes. I don't see much difference in skill level between college and high school. The difference seems to be in discipline. My students gave me one advantage, they listened where a high school student might not. Once volleyball and one swimming class were taught using a traditional recreational approach (RV and RS). One volleyball and one swimming class were taught using a kinesiological approach (KS and KS).

Classes within each activity displayed similar skill and knowledge levels prior to instruction and had approximately equal numbers of students and equal distribution of males and females. The volleyball classes were extremely poor players and also were poor athletes. The swimmers were highly capable, many were former swim team members, many had taught swim lessons and most were highly fit. Basic Stuff kinesiology, physiology, and motor learning were used in both KV and KS. Traditional basic skills of the activity, drills and recreational games were taught in the RV class. Workouts were given to the RS class based on level of fitness. In the KV and KS classes, a concept was introduced and activities were provided to illustrate each concept. Two-thirds of the way through the course (8 weeks in volleyball, 16 weeks in swimming) the

KV and KS classes were presented with a "problem" to solve using the concepts they had acquired and were asked to develop skill proficiency by applying the concept.

At the conclusion of each course a paper and pencil test was given which required knowledge of rules, movement skills, analysis of movement errors, techniques and strategies. No difference was found in knowledge of the rules between RV and KV or between RS and KS. However, significant differences in knowledge of all other areas were found (see Table 1) when examining the value of t using alpha $< .05$.

In addition, each student was given a performance test in both a basic game skill and in a novel skill (or a basic skill used in a novel situation). Students were told that each skill test would be repeated 2 days later and they could count the better of the two. Thus, the time was built in to correct errors in both a "learned" skill and in a "new" skill.

In the learned skill and the novel skill, few differences were found between the classes. Although the KV class and the KS class was better in the novel skill, the differences were not significant (see Table 2). However, with the novel skills, two things happened. The kinesiological group improved on the second day to the point where they were better than both the recreational group and better than their own previous performance.

So, let me tell you my solution. Although I want to say its what you need to do, I can say that I've seen some success and believe I'll see more. I believe that we must prepare our majors and provide experiences so they can provide their future students to live in a world that we have not witnessed. Although we don't know what the future holds, we can make some pretty intelligent predictions. I believe that we are in a knowledge explosion and that every year there will be more available to know. Therefore, we can't know all that is possible. And we can't decide which of the possibilities is more

important. Therefore, we'll teach students how to learn and prepare them to select what they need to know and prepare them to problem solve. In Physical Education, we already see a huge market in private gyms, health clubs, sports clubs and the "personal trainer". Why is it that a person who took PE for 13 years (K-12 in Illinois) doesn't know enough about an activity to be proficient in it or can't teach himself a new skill? I believe it is because he doesn't know how he acquires motor skills, he doesn't know any basic stuff and he can't translate what he does know to a new activity. So, I am a proponent of the Learning Process value orientation as explained by Eisner and Vallence. It is as important to know how you learn as it is what you learn.

In physical education, that means I use Jewett's Purpose Process Curriculum Framework. I don't use it all, just the Process section. The processes are a sequenced plan for acquiring motor skills. They provide an instructional strategy for teachers and are information for learners regarding how they learn skills. However, they don't address the content.

For me, content in physical education is the Basic Stuff. The fundamental knowledges of our field and the movements which illustrate those knowledges are the necessary content. I would like to see us teach the theoretical basis from Basic Stuff and use "gym time" as a laboratory for that information. While this is done in one high school, I'm familiar with, it is not the norm and may not be feasible for other situations. Thus, I think it would be practical to go into an existing program and modify it to use Basic Stuff.

Most existing programs are disciplinary mastery oriented curricula which use culturally significant sports as units of instruction. In those units, Basic Stuff can be infused. An obvious example of infusion is what is happening with many fitness programs. During a fitness "unit", physiological principles regarding training heart rate,

overload, specificity, and intensity are discussed. Then students go through a prescribed or specially constructed workout, and during the workout, the principles are applied. Fitness is an obvious match with physiology basic stuff. However, any sport can provide examples for physiology.

In my teaching, I use the physiology and kinesiology Basic Stuff extensively. I teach swim conditioning and advanced volleyball. I find both highly applicable. My students have accused me of teaching "physics" in these classes. But isn't all movement based on force, resistance, acceleration, and other "physics principles".

In my teacher preparation classes, I help prospective teachers to delivery Basic Stuff. Each student in the class in constantly being asked how and what they did in X class today will help them be a better teacher or a better analyst of movement. I keep a list of each students course work and attempt to integrate courses taken with teaching strategies, content and methods. Students are kept squirming because I'll ask them what they did in Psychology of Sport, for instance. When they reply that they worked on the inverted U theory of arousal, I ask them how that relates to teaching. They might reply that they'll get students optimally aroused for performance. I keep asking them how and ask for concrete examples of lesson plans and questioning strategies. Finally, they're asked how they would teach this theory and how they'd illustrate it.

Following my course, students go into clinical experiences in which they teach with a partner. The partner observes and analyzes teaching. One of the analyses is a description of the use of Basic Stuff information and examples. The practical work that students find themselves in is very different from our classroom. It includes "real world", where children think PE is really recreation and there is no content other than knowing the rules of games, parts of equipment and floor markings. My students are there only

a short time; too little time to fight the battle. So, they compromise, regardless of the sport "unit" they're asked to deliver, my students work in a Basic Stuff content area. They ask the cooperating teacher which area she'd like covered. Usually the cooperating teacher knows so little about Basic Stuff that she leaves it to my students. Then, my students select their favorite or their most knowledgeable, or the area that seems to "fit" best.

They compromise by infusing Basic Stuff into existing curricular content. Each day, the lesson begins with a 5-10 minute lecture discussion of a Basic Stuff content area followed by the teaching of sport skills, techniques, or strategies. The sport content is matched with the Basic Stuff content in such a way that the sport content provides an example to illustrate the Basic Stuff content.

For example, four of my students are in a volleyball unit for fresh/soph coed classes. They outlined the skills as following:

Skill	Kinesiology Content
Overhead Pass	Absorption of force
Overhand Serve	Resistance, gravity, spin, angle projection
Forearm Pass	Absorption of force, angle of rebound, stability
Spike	Force through muscle contraction (jumping), force application, trajectory
4-2 Offense	
Middle Back Defense	Stability, overcoming in inertia

They then matched kinesiological content. The offensive set didn't include any of the principles from kinesiology, but the student were able to supply logic for the type of offense being used.

Another group taught the same skills, but focused on cooperation-competition,

motivation, arousal, anxiety, need to achieve, need to fail, causal attribution and mental imagery from the psychosocial area.

Another group taught a golf unit and integrated a number of Basic Stuff areas. They decided not to rely on only one content, but they based the lectures on the Basic Stuff in Action chapter on joy, pleasure, and satisfaction. They included the idea that golf is a culturally valued game which has aesthetic movement. Goal setting was a much emphasized concept, as was satisfaction, aesthetic appreciation, positive addiction, and perception of achievement.

As a result of my student's lessons, their students have expressed satisfaction in going beyond typical recreational activities. Their cooperating teachers have been excited because they've learned (or been reintroduced to) concepts. My students feel more like teachers and less like babysitters. They've witnessed Basic Stuff working with secondary learners.

I believe that teacher preparation institutions must include Basic Stuff into the curriculum and must help students integrate learning. We emphasize research and theory building, but we must also be able to provide examples of application. Teacher preparation institutions must provide models of good teaching using Basic Stuff. Then our students can go into schools and deliver Basic Stuff. To borrow for Nike, its time we quit talking about it and JUST DO IT.

TABLE 1
KNOWLEDGE TESTS MEANS

	Rules	Skill Analysis	Movement Analysis	Technique	Strategy	
RV	4.7	2.7	2.4	2.4	3.6	n=36
KV	4.6	3.7*	3.9*	3.8*	4.2*	n=34
RS	4.3	2.6	3.2	3.2	3.1	n=27
KS	4.5	3.5*	4.1*	4.3*	4.3*	n=29
	n=5	n=5	n=5	n=5	n=5	

Total of 25 questions.

*Probability < .05 KV > RV and KS > RS

TABLE 2
PERFORMANCE TEST MEANS

	Learned Skill Day 1	Novel Day 1	Learned Day 2	Novel Day 2
RV	41.9	4.3	42.7	4.1
KV	43.1	5.1	46.1	7.1*
RS	14.2	8.1	14.2	8.3
KS	14.1	9.1	14.3	10.4*

*Probability < .05 $KV_2 > RV_2$ and $KS_2 > RS_2$