



2010

The Role of PETE in Developing Joy-Oriented Physical Educators

Bonnie Tjeerdsma Blankenship

Suzan F. Ayers

Western Michigan University, s.ayers@wmich.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/humanperformance_faculty



Part of the [Education Commons](#), and the [Sports Sciences Commons](#)

WMU ScholarWorks Citation

Blankenship, Bonnie Tjeerdsma and Ayers, Suzan F., "The Role of PETE in Developing Joy-Oriented Physical Educators" (2010).
Human Performance and Health Education Faculty Research. Paper 11.
http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/humanperformance_faculty/11

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Human Performance and Health Education at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Human Performance and Health Education Faculty Research by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact maira.bundza@wmich.edu.



The Role of PETE in Developing Joy-Oriented Physical Educators

Bonnie Tjeerdsma Blankenship and Suzan F. Ayers

The current focus on utilitarian outcomes (e.g., fitness, health, skill development) in physical education has not been effective in producing life-long movers and makes physical activity a duty to be performed. An alternative to a utilitarian focus is to have a joy-oriented focus in which physical activity is promoted because it is joyful, pleasurable, and personally meaningful. In this paper, we present factors that inhibit a joy-oriented focus in physical education and reasons physical education teacher education (PETE) programs have thus far failed to produce joy-oriented physical education teachers. We then present a new approach to PETE—the foundational approach—in which the joy of movement forms the foundation of and is threaded throughout the program. Ten specific changes to PETE programs are proposed to produce joy-oriented physical education teachers.

The value of physical education has long been questioned. Over the years, physical educators have sought to increase the stature of their profession in any number of ways. Recently, practitioners have jumped on the utilitarian bandwagon (Kretchmar, 2008); that is to say, physical education is important because it can produce health benefits such as a decrease in obesity and disease, and enhance job productivity and quality of life. But few studies provide direct evidence that physical education can actually achieve such outcomes (Rink, 2009; Shephard & Trudeau, 2008), and such an emphasis has not been all that effective in producing life-long movers (e.g., Dishman, 1994; USDHHS, 1996), as suggested by the persistent obesity crisis. Moreover, the utilitarian focus makes physical activity a duty or an obligation—the joy of movement, the human component, has been ignored (Kretchmar, 2008).

An alternative to such a utilitarian focus is to have a joy-oriented focus—physical education is important because movement is joyful, pleasurable, provides intrinsic satisfaction, and can be personally meaningful and central to the human experience. Playful movement is an essential part of being human; theologian Jurgen Moltmann (1972) states that it “. . . leads us into the categories of being, or authentic human existence and demonstrative rejoicing in it” (p. 23). And physical education programs that have a joy-oriented focus and produce students who love physical activity will end up enhancing health and developing life-long movers (Kretchmar, 2008).

Blankenship is with the Dept. of Health & Kinesiology, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN. Ayers is with Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI.

What Constitutes a Joy-Oriented Physical Education Program?

The concept of play is closely associated with joy-oriented physical education—and conversely minimized in utility-oriented physical education. Physical education scholars Daryl Siedentop (1994) and Andrew Hawkins (2008) assert that play is the very soul and most “essential meaning of physical education” (Hawkins, 2008, p. 353). Play is activity that is participated in freely, is outside of “real” life, and has its own locality, duration, and rules (Huizinga, 1950). Kretchmar (2005) asserts that play falls on a continuum between two extreme types: shallow and deep play. Shallow play is somewhat superficial and temporary; positive affect is experienced, we are amused for a time period, but it does not “. . . grab us at our core . . . engage the imagination . . . inspire . . . carry us away on wings of delight” (Kretchmar, 2005, p. 150). It seems shallow play is what most physical educators strive for in physical education; they are satisfied with their students experiencing a temporary positive affect during class. At the other end of the play continuum is deep play; it is extremely personal, long-lasting, and does engage, inspire, and delight us (Kretchmar, 2005). Deep play touches us and moves us; the activity becomes part of our identity (Kretchmar, 2005). We believe the true joy of movement that is found in deep play—the pleasure one experiences from skillful movement or becoming one with the movement/activity—is usually neglected by physical educators. Deep play would be a vital part of a joy-oriented physical education program.

We believe that both types of play are important in joy-focused physical education. Deep play can lead one to be physically active for a lifetime; it provides deep, personal meaning for activity, which develops a commitment to an activity. Shallow play can lead to deep play. As an example, let us consider a fourth grade boy who is participating in some creative dance lessons in his physical education class. He does not necessarily enjoy the dancing, but he does have fun being in a group with his friends and having the opportunity to create dances about sports to music that he chooses (e.g., shallow play). At subsequent grade levels, he has more opportunities to develop creative dances, and with reinforcement from his teachers, starts to enjoy the dancing. In high school, he actually chooses a dance class as one of his electives, and later even joins an after-school dance club. He finds himself getting carried away with the music, the movements, and the interactions with fellow dancers, and time escapes him. He has, in fact, come to identify himself as a dancer. The shallow play he experienced with creative dance as a fourth grader introduced him to the possibilities, and with continued positive experiences with dance, led to deep play.

For this boy, dance became a “playground.” A playground is an activity that has slowly developed into a “second world” for the participant. It is a grown environment that has developed slowly through continued participation and success (Kretchmar, 2005, 2006a). A playground requires commitment, time, effort, and persistence to grow and continue. Key to playgrounds is the existence of “just-right” problems and challenges; play is most enjoyable when we attempt tasks that are not too easy or too hard for us. While many people share common playgrounds, the problems and challenges each person realizes in her or his own playground is part of the individual nature of that experience. In a joy-oriented physical education program, teachers would help students develop their own playgrounds.

Factors Inhibiting a Joy-Oriented Focus in Physical Education

So why don't physical education programs have a joy-oriented focus? Why do physical educators continue to emphasize the supposed utilitarian benefits of their programs? One issue that has limited the potential for physical educators to have a joy-oriented focus in their classes is the obesity epidemic. Physical educators have been identified as the most logical and qualified school personnel to organize and plan physical activity opportunities in required school wellness programs (Castelli & Beighle, 2007). We have latched onto the purported obesity-reducing value of physical education, to the exclusion of a focus on joy and personal meaning. Another practical limitation to helping physical educators foster delight and pleasure in their classrooms is the current focus on standards-based outcomes. Even though K–12 physical education Standard Six specifically addresses enjoyment (NASPE, 2004), it is our perception that physical education professionals tend to focus on the first four standards that address motor skill- and fitness-related knowledge and performance. Because outcomes related to standards are those that are valued in education, and since joy is only a small part of the NASPE standards, we believe physical educators are in a way “forced” to value and spend their time on more measurable outcomes. A third limitation has to do with the minimal time allocated for physical education in the schools. This reality contributes to each of the above—because we have limited time, most practitioners with whom we work choose to focus on functional outcomes rather than the joy of movement because they know they need time to (1) get students fit and reduce obesity and (2) meet standards as evidence that they are accomplishing something.

Two other factors that might inhibit a joy-oriented focus in physical education for some teachers are large class sizes and highly multicultural student populations. When forty or more students must be taught by one teacher, it is difficult for that teacher to provide the types of experiences that can lead to joy of movement, particularly “just right” challenges (as explained later in this paper). Similarly, trying to provide activities that personally appeal to a culturally diverse student population is quite a challenge, but that is one strategy for enhancing joy in movement. In both instances (large class sizes and highly multicultural student populations), physical education teachers may be forced to focus on more practical constraints like student safety, inadequate space and equipment, novel content and/or student-teacher ratios.

The Role of Teacher Education Programs

Yet another reason physical educators do not emphasize the joy and pleasure of movement and deep play in their programs may be because they have not learned to do so in their teacher education programs. We propose several reasons why physical education teacher education (PETE) programs may not teach future physical educators about joy-oriented physical education and how to develop playgrounds. Because there is a gap in the extant literature about how to provide teacher candidates with anything beyond utilitarian outcomes, we offer ideas based on our educational experiences as opposed to empirical support. First, among PETE professors, joy and pleasure are often associated with a “roll out the ball” culture. We think this is because many physical education teachers assume that the only way students will

experience enjoyment in physical education is if the teacher allows them to play whatever game, sport, or activity the students want instead of providing quality instruction. This unfortunate connection between joy and poor quality or missing instruction makes it particularly difficult for PETE professionals to accept the challenge to embed play, delight and a love of movement as central tenets of quality physical education programs.

Second, as with K–12 schools, the focus of teacher education accreditation is on documentable, measurable outcomes. This leads to our professional emphasis on the functional aspects of physical education as opposed to the more difficult to measure outcomes of joy, personal meaning, identity, and delight. In fact, neither the 2003 nor 2009 NASPE beginning teacher standards (NASPE, 2003, 2009) make any mention of the ability of future physical educators to develop playgrounds or joy of movement in their students, so it is no wonder PETE programs may not teach those skills.

Still another reason joy in movement has not been directly addressed in PETE programs may be related to the historically low status of physical education in higher education. Because the health-oriented outcomes are observable, measurable, and valued by society at large, PETE professors often choose to focus on that side of physical education to be seen as a valuable part of education. Promoting the joy in movement as a valuable outcome in itself may not be conducive to professional status enhancement.

In addition, the growing requirements for grant-supported scholarship in the academy may force PETE faculty to participate in the more utilitarian and measurable outcomes typically addressed by the first four K–12 standards (NASPE, 2004). For instance, the lead author currently is involved in a grant project in which middle school students' fitness and physical activity levels are measured. This is based on the granting source's expectations and desired outcomes, not on her own personal beliefs about what will influence youth to become regular participants in lifelong physical activity.

It is also likely that PETE faculty may not realize how much we know about developing playgrounds and joy in movement. For example, the situational/personal interest (Chen, Darst, & Pangrazi, 1999, 2001; Hidi, 2000) and self-determined motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ntoumanis, 2001, 2005; Ryan & Deci, 2000) literatures contribute ideas about how teachers could foster playground development by enhancing personal interest, meaning, and intrinsic motivation. If PETE professors were aware of the strategies suggested in extant literature for enhancing joy of movements and playgrounds, they could in turn teach those methods to future physical educators.

Proposal—A Foundational Approach to Physical Education and PETE

We agree with Kretchmar (2000b, 2006b, 2008), who for years has urged that joy and utilitarian outcomes have parallel emphases in K–12 physical education programs. By extension, we further propose that PETE programs must change to prepare physical educators who can achieve these parallel outcomes. In revised K–12 and PETE programs, the development of joy and playgrounds would have priority, with the belief that the more functional outcomes would be achieved in the

process. The overarching idea is to spiral or thread the promotion of deep play and joy of movement throughout a PETE program; joy of movement becomes the foundation of the program. In the remainder of this paper, we propose several specific changes to PETE programs to produce physical educators who can promote the joy in movement concurrently with the functional side. We acknowledge that many of these proposed changes are still in the idea stage, requiring further development.

Make Joy of Movement an Explicit Emphasis in PETE Programs. It may be that many PETE faculty already believe that joy of movement is the most important priority in physical education. But, based largely on the previously identified limitations, we often fail to explicitly identify that priority to our candidates. Instead, consider this scenario as an example of making joy explicit. A PETE professor is teaching her candidates how to maximize opportunities to respond. She asks them this series of questions:

Q: Why should we limit class lines to three students?

A: To minimize waiting and maximize opportunities to respond.

Q: Why do we want to maximize opportunities to respond?

A: So students have every possible opportunity to develop skill in limited contact time.

Q: What will skill development allow students to experience?

A: It increases the likelihood students will enjoy the activity.

Q: And joy of movement can lead to what?

A: The development of their own playground.

This example illustrates one way to easily thread joy of movement throughout the PETE program incrementally. More substantive changes can provide foundational cornerstones for PETE programs—the basis for all we do and teach our teacher candidates to do—while still directly addressing motor skill, knowledge, fitness, and physical activity development.

Keep Philosophy of Movement Courses in PETE Programs. Unfortunately, we have heard of several PETE programs around the country that are eliminating philosophy courses from the preparation of future teachers, usually because philosophy of movement and physical education are barely mentioned in the NASPE beginning teacher standards (2003, 2009) and so are not necessary for accreditation. Such eliminations are counterproductive to the goal of developing future physical educators who understand and can nurture their students' joy of movement. Philosophy courses must NOT be eliminated from PETE programs. In such courses, PETE candidates learn about competing philosophies of physical education, dimensions of play, and the nature of and value in various forms of movement. In these courses, PETE candidates can start to identify their own philosophies, how they experience delight in movement, and how and why joy of movement in some form developed for them. These courses provide a defined “space” in the PETE program to foster candidates' perspectives on joy and playgrounds; here they can first learn about the philosophy that joy matters, the concept of personal playgrounds, and a variety of movement subcultures.

Help PETE Candidates Experience and Become Aware of Their Joy in Movement and Personal Playgrounds During Activity Courses.

Most physical education majors likely enjoy movement; it is probably a key reason for their choices to become physical education teachers. Yet, according to Hawkins (2008), “Unfortunately, it is likely that we do little in higher education to capitalize on these dispositions, and perhaps much to dissipate them” (p. 354). One thing we can do to avoid squelching our PETE candidates’ joy in movement is to explore those dispositions during activity courses. All PETE programs have courses during which PETE candidates learn to perform and/or teach physical activities. Such courses provide excellent opportunities for students to become aware of their joy in movement and playgrounds, and perhaps even develop a love for a new movement form (e.g., a new playground) or be introduced to a new movement subculture. Spend time with students in those classes discussing what they enjoy (or do not enjoy) about the particular movement forms they are learning. Ask them to describe any movement forms in which they have found an identity (“I am a soccer player”), and ask them to discuss why they think that identity developed. Ask students to describe times during which they were participating in movement and they got “lost in the moment,” and experienced sheer delight in the situation; why is that possible for them but perhaps not for other movers? At the end of class, discuss with students the various levels of play they may have experienced, and help them to distinguish between those types of play (Kretchmar, 2000b). Just as important, determine why students may not have enjoyed class. PETE candidates must become aware of their own pleasurable experiences with movement, and understand the differences between shallow play and all forms of deep play if they are to help their own students develop a love for movement. PETE candidates cannot be expected to help foster the development of playgrounds in their own students if they have not experienced it themselves.

Infuse Joy of Movement Into Subdiscipline Courses. Philosophy and activity courses are not the only places to explore the deeper meanings in movement with PETE candidates. All PETE candidates take an array of subdiscipline courses, during which they supposedly learn the foundations upon which skilled and fit movers can be developed; this is part of the “science” focus in a health-oriented physical education program. Instructors of such courses should be encouraged to share their own personal experiences of joy in movement; perhaps such deep play is what moved them to study their subdiscipline field. These instructors should also be asked to periodically discuss with students how concepts studied can enhance children’s play in various forms. For instance, instructors can describe for students how various changes in bodily functions with exercise can enhance play, or how changes in children’s bodies as they grow may affect their experiences of play and joy. This conversation should also address how joy and play are experienced differently as one ages. In our own programs, little attention is given to the physiological and psychological practicalities that influence lifespan participation in playgrounds. If candidates do not explore this content in their PETE programs, it is unlikely that they will embed this content into their practice as K–12 professionals.

Transitioning From Shallow Play to Joy-Centered Instruction. So how do we move students from shallow play to deep play and the development of

playgrounds? What does instruction that focuses on joy and the deeper dimensions of play (e.g., delight, personal meaning) look like? As described earlier, we believe that shallow play can lead to more deep forms of play, so PETE programs should teach preservice teachers to employ strategies to enhance both types of play. More shallow forms of play can be incurred through dimensions of novelty, challenge, and participation (Kretchmar, 2000b). A concept similar to shallow play is situational interest, which produces a temporary positive affective state due to the characteristics of a particular situation (Hidi, 2000; Hidi & Anderson, 1992). Chen and his colleagues (Chen et al., 1999, 2001) propose that activities with the following characteristics yield higher situational interest, and perhaps shallow play: novelty, challenge, cognitive demand, instant excitement, and student intention to explore. Using different instructional models (e.g., peer teaching, personalized system of instruction) can provide novelty and instant excitement for students; other instructional models (e.g., inquiry model) are cognitively demanding for students and enhance their intention to explore (Blankenship, 2008). Utilizing technology in physical education (e.g., pedometers, heart rate monitors, video cameras) can catch students' situational interest in physical education lessons (Blankenship, 2008). Preservice teachers can find other activities with these characteristics at conferences or on physical education websites like PE Central. These strategies are just a few of many that can help develop situational interest or shallow play, which form the groundwork for deep play and playground development.

Kretchmar (2008) gives us some ideas about how to develop deep play: "We take advantage of physical activity's inherent qualities related to adventure, achievement, and sensuousness, and we build on them. We shamelessly and enthusiastically try to foster physical activity experiences that are special, memorable, and personal" (p. 167). For example, adventure and outdoor education are activities that are adventurous, foster achievement, and by nature engage the senses. A sport education curriculum can enhance achievement (since students practice skills for an entire season), and the use of team membership, festivity, regular competitions, and participation in various roles can make physical education activities special, memorable, and personable. Personal interest and meaning in activities (Chen et al., 1999, 2001), which are related to deep play and playgrounds, can be developed by providing middle and high school students, who may have already developed some strong personal physical activity interests, with choices of activities in which to participate (Blankenship, 2008). Students get to choose activities in which they are most interested and have high personal meaning. These activities should take students beyond the basic skills involved in an activity, into more complex skills and strategies involved in an activity. It will also be necessary to provide students with information about activity participation opportunities outside of school, so that students can actually get involved in a particular movement subculture (Blankenship, 2008).

It also takes a certain level of skill to develop deep play (Hawkins, 2008). It is difficult for beginners to experience delight and develop a personal identity with a movement form. So we still need to help our PETE candidates develop the technical skills found in most of the NASPE beginning teacher standards (2003, 2009) so that they can help students increase their own skill levels: developing an appropriate progression of tasks, how to provide clear task presentations, giving

feedback, etc. Moreover, we agree with Rink (personal communication, June 10, 2008) that learning skills IS enjoyable; the reason why most students in physical education do not like working on skills is because they never actually work on skills long enough to become competent, let alone proficient, at one particular activity. Current skill development is too brief to see any true improvement; teachers must be more patient in conducting skill development tasks (see below).

Change Language That Marginalizes Joy in Physical Education. PETE professors need to change their language about joy in physical education, and also help physical education majors change their language. For instance, we need to say and help our majors learn to say, “We are getting kids active, fit, skilled, and knowledgeable about movement *so that* they can experience joy in movement,” rather than “Let’s make these activities enjoyable *so that* movement will get kids fit and skilled.” The first statement puts the priority on the joy of movement—that is the ultimate product—while the second statement puts the priority on the functional results of movement. PETE professors need to promote the notion that games and activities are valuable in their own right; teachers do not need to always point out that this activity will “increase your cardiovascular endurance” or “will make you more skilled”—just do the activity and enjoy it! According to Hawkins (2008), making the “subsidiaries” of movement (e.g., fitness, individual skills, knowledge of rules) the focal point reduces personal meaning of the movement for students. Yes, these subsidiaries need to be developed, primarily because they help lead to meaningful game play and movement. And when tasks are specifically developed to enhance fitness, motor skill competence, or knowledge of rules, teachers need to help children understand that they are working on those aspects to enhance the meaning in their game play and activity (Hawkins, 2008).

Along with changing our language and that of PETE candidates, PETE professors need to avoid being defensive about physical education, movement, and play—and in turn teach their PETE candidates to do the same. How many times have PETE candidates heard, after informing someone that their major is physical education, “Must be nice to play games all day.” PETE candidates need to first view such statements as compliments, and not the put-downs that the deliverer might have intended. After all, play is an integral aspect of the human condition. Do not apologize for being a promoter and teacher of joy in movement, and do not immediately try to justify physical education based on its utilitarian outcomes of fitness and health alone. Instead, point out that play and movement are vital to the human experience, that yes, you are glad you get to “play games all day” because it brings significant meaning to lives. PETE candidates must be taught to promote the delight and meaning in movement concomitant with the pragmatic aspects.

Have PETE Candidates Participate in and Learn to Teach More Physical Activity for Self-Expression. Our own PETE programs have a heavy emphasis on existing sports and games, and a very small focus on creative movement. If our PETE candidates and physical educators are to help their students enjoy movement for its self-expression, we need to increase opportunities in PETE programs for creative games, dance, and gymnastics. It is in the midst of such creative endeavors that movers can get lost in the moment, discovering new aspects of movement, and can develop personal meaning. For instance, we have watched as our PETE majors develop educational gymnastic routines, getting immersed

in the process of creating and the sheer enjoyment of presenting their finished works. These movement experiences then become possible activities for their own students to participate in and enjoy. An obvious benefit to this suggested change in PETE programs is the development of future physical educators who are more comfortable participating in expressive movement and should be more likely to avail their own students of similar opportunities.

Help PETE Candidates Understand That the Development of Playgrounds and Joy in Movement Takes Time and Submersion Into a Subculture.

While fun in the form of shallow play can be experienced quite quickly, deeper play, meaning, and the development of playgrounds take considerable time (Kretchmar, 2008, 2000a, 2000b). A level of motor skill competence, knowledge of rules and traditions, and fitness are needed in order for meaningful play to occur and for one to totally immerse oneself in a movement form (Hawkins, 2008). Meaning is the product of this extended commitment to movement, not necessarily a prerequisite to desiring participation in an activity. Thus PETE candidates need to develop patience when teaching their students (Kretchmar, 2000a); the traditional two- or three-week units within multiactivity curricula will not work. Playground development must be patiently nurtured, because playgrounds are developed, not found (Kretchmar, June 13, 2008 personal communication). PETE candidates must learn to introduce students to a movement subculture—all of the skills, rules, and traditions associated with a movement form. We must teach our PETE candidates to use curricular models like sport education, in which students learn many different aspects of an activity and are held to higher standards of skill acquisition (Kretchmar, 2000a). Such a model has aspects of shallow play that will immediately catch students' interest (e.g., teams, mascots, competitions) as well as deep play with extended immersion in the activity. PETE candidates should learn other curricular and instructional models as well, like the tactical games model and adventure education, as long as the students have time to become fully engaged in the movement form. According to Rink (2009), an essential component of improving quality physical education is to do less, more often and better.

Teach PETE Candidates to Foster the Development of "Just-Right" Challenges.

Employing the concept of developmentally appropriate instruction, teaching candidates to provide their students with just-right challenges is a primary component of playground development. Just-right challenges have been proposed to increase situational interest (Chen et al., 1999, 2001). Likewise, mastering just-right challenges is proposed to enhance perceptions of competence, which in turn can lead to intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2000) and deep play. Yet this is one of the most difficult aspects of teaching physical education. One way to develop tasks that can match each student's current skill level is to extensively develop an activity's content (Rink, 2002). The development of tasks across the games stages allows a physical education teacher to adjust tasks using teaching by invitation and intratask variations; when teachers have such a list of tasks available, they are more likely to provide appropriate challenges for their students. By the time candidates leave their PETE programs, they should have content development plans for many different activities available for their use. In addition, preservice teachers need PETE professors' help in learning to use such content development plans. For instance, when teaching a volleyball lesson to middle school students

during a secondary methods course, a PETE professor could work beside the pre-service teacher to point out students who could perform easier or harder versions of an initial task (i.e., intratask variation). Providing appropriate challenges is one of the most important pedagogical skills teachers who are to help students develop playgrounds can learn. PETE faculty must help future physical educators get over the idea that all students must perform the exact same task at the same time; what is easiest for the teacher is not necessarily what is best for student learning.

Develop Ways of Assessing Joy of Movement, Delight, Personal Meaning, and Identity and Teach These to PETE Candidates. One of the difficulties associated with employing a joy-oriented physical education program is that the desired outcomes, especially the dimensions of deep play (e.g., delight, aesthetic pleasure in movement, personal identity with movement, self-expression) are difficult to measure. It is much easier to teach our majors how to assess students' fitness knowledge/levels and sport knowledge/skills because there are existing valid and reliable means of doing so. Books like *PE Metrics: Measuring Student Success* (NASPE, 2008) include assessment tools and illustrate the priority that our national organization has on Standards One through Four. We challenge PETE professors to work on developing means of assessing deep play and, in turn, teach these to PETE candidates. Because of the nature of the desired outcomes, it is likely that such assessments will necessitate the use of qualitative measures; that means that PETE candidates will need to become more skilled in developing and interpreting qualitative assessments. This may include personal interviews, journals, reflection tasks, and critical incident reports. The obvious precursor to candidates becoming more skilled in the use of qualitative measures is the need to increase PETE faculty's facility with such measures.

Implications

In providing suggestions to PETE faculty about how to more centrally locate joy of movement in our curricula, we acknowledge some realities. Many of our recommendations already exist in quality PETE programs. We suggest making those components more explicit so candidates can clearly identify them throughout the program. For example, faculty may already believe that the development of playgrounds and joy of movement is the primary job of physical educators. Making this an explicit emphasis in PETE programs will require focused attention by the program's faculty. Likewise, PETE faculty may be unaware of how their current language and practices marginalize the joy of movement in physical education. This is another component of change for PETE programs that will simply take concentrated effort by the faculty.

Other suggestions we have made are already part of PETE programs, but need to be strengthened or expanded to prepare physical educators who can develop playgrounds. For instance, when philosophy of movement courses are already part of PETE programs, PETE faculty should ensure that the joy-oriented focus for physical education is one of the philosophies discussed. Moreover, it should be made clear to PETE students that the joy-oriented philosophy forms the basis for their PETE program. Some PETE programs may already have a course in which PETE students have opportunities for self-expression in physical activity. Such

opportunities should be expanded beyond creative movement and dance classes; any content area—invasion games, net/wall games, target games, aquatics, etc.—could include innovative tasks. PETE students should be given opportunities in activity classes to create their own novel activities; in their field experiences, they should be encouraged to teach creative games and novel activities.

In our own PETE programs, preservice teachers already learn how to create content development plans (which are necessary for just-right challenges), and learn that an extensive period of time is necessary for students' skill development. Both of these program components are somewhat utilitarian, in that longer activity classes in which just-right challenges are provided should result in higher levels of skill development. But we acknowledge that our PETE programs, and probably others, could do more with each of these components. We need to spend more time with our PETE students as they actually teach lessons, stepping in and showing them children who should be performing easier or harder aspects of a task (to get those just-right challenges). PETE students need to hear throughout the PETE curriculum, not just in one methods course, that playground development takes time and submersion into a subculture. They also need opportunities to see inservice teachers implement, as well as have the chance to actually implement themselves (perhaps during student teaching), longer activity units so they can see true skill development and perhaps playground development.

Other changes we have suggested in joy-oriented PETE programs may be new to programs. In both of our PETE programs, our PETE faculty would need to acquire the assistance of the instructors of activity and subdiscipline courses so that our preservice teachers could become aware of their own playgrounds and joy of movement as well as those of their instructors. These actions do not technically require curricular space, but definitely require a shift of instructional focus for instructors of those courses; PETE faculty would need to explain the need for such a focus and assist those instructors in achieving that focus.

Our remaining recommendations, also likely new to PETE programs, will require considerable time and effort by the PETE faculty. If a program is to teach future physical educators how to go beyond shallow play into deep play, the PETE faculty may need to become familiar with new literature areas, such as those mentioned previously on interest and self-determined motivation, and further develop ideas on how to move from shallow to deep play. The PETE faculty will also need to determine how best to incorporate such information and techniques throughout their curriculum. Possibly the most challenging task we propose for PETE faculty is to develop ways of assessing fun, joy of movement, delight, personal meaning, and identity and teach these to PETE candidates. This will undoubtedly require exploration of novel territory for many PETE faculty, which will likely result in an uncomfortable cognitive dissonance. The pay-off, however, from this process may be more beneficial than any other action we propose.

Conclusion

We continue to ponder ways of developing physical educators who can teach for joy first, with the hopes of helping children develop playgrounds. We acknowledge that the ideas we have presented are introductory, perhaps raising more questions

than answers at this time. But we hope that our ideas will stimulate discussion about the goals of PETE, joy-oriented physical education programs, and the role PETE can play in developing life-long movers.

References

- Blankenship, B.T. (2008). *The psychology of teaching physical education: From theory to practice*. Scottsdale, AZ: Holcomb Hathaway.
- Castelli, D.M., & Beighle, A. (2007). The physical education teachers as school activity director. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 78(5), 25–28.
- Chen, A., Darst, P.W., & Pangrazi, R.P. (1999). What constitutes situational interest? Validating a construct in physical education. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science*, 3, 157–180.
- Chen, A., Darst, P.W., & Pangrazi, R.P. (2001). An examination of situational interest and its sources. *The British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71, 383–400.
- Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227–268.
- Dishman, R. (Ed.). (1994). *Advances in exercise adherence*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hawkins, A. (2008). Pragmatism, purpose, and play: Struggle for the soul of physical education. *Quest*, 60, 345–356.
- Hidi, S. (2000). An interest researcher’s perspective: The effects of extrinsic and intrinsic factors on motivation. In C. Sansone & J.M. Harackiewicz (Eds.), *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: The search for optimal motivation and performance* (pp. 309–339). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Hidi, S., & Anderson, V. (1992). Situational interest and its impact on reading and expository writing. In K.A. Renninger, S. Hidi, & A. Krapp (Eds.), *The role of interest in learning and development* (pp. 215–238). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Huizinga, J. (1950). *Homo ludens: A study of the play-element in culture*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Kretchmar, R.S. (2000a). Movement subcultures: Sites for meaning. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 71(5), 6–9.
- Kretchmar, R.S. (2000b). Moving and being moved: Implications for practice. *Quest*, 52, 260–272.
- Kretchmar, R.S. (2005). *Practical philosophy of sport and physical activity* (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Kretchmar, R.S. (2006a). Life on easy street: The persistent need for embodied hopes and down-to-earth games. *Quest*, 58, 345–354.
- Kretchmar, R.S. (2006b). Ten more reasons for quality physical education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 77(9), 6–9.
- Kretchmar, R.S. (2008). The increasing utility of elementary school physical education: A mixed blessing and unique challenge. *The Elementary School Journal*, 108, 161–170.
- Moltmann, J. (1972). *Theology of play*. New York: Harper & Row.
- National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (2003). *National standards for beginning physical education teachers* (2nd ed.). Reston, VA: Author.
- National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (2004). *Moving into the future: National standards for physical education* (2nd ed.). Reston, VA: Author.
- National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (2008). *PE metrics: Assessing the national standards: Standard 1: Elementary*. Reston, VA: Author.
- National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (2009). *National standards and guidelines for physical education teacher education* (3rd ed.). Reston, VA: Author.
- Ntoumanis, N. (2001). A self-determination approach to the understanding of motivation in physical education. *The British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71, 225–242.

- Ntoumanis, N. (2005). A prospective study of participation in optional school physical education using a self-determination theory framework. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 97*, 444–453.
- Rink, J. (2002). *Teaching physical education for learning* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rink, J.E. (2009, October). *Physical education and the health crisis: Threat or opportunity?* Presentation at the PETE Conference: Exploring An Ocean of Change. Myrtle Beach, SC.
- Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *The American Psychologist, 55*, 68–78.
- Shephard, R.J., & Trudeau, F. (2008). Research on the outcomes of elementary school physical education. *The Elementary School Journal, 108*, 251–264.
- Siedentop, D. (1994). *Introduction to physical education, fitness, and sport* (2nd ed.). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- United States Department of Health and Human Services. (1996). *Physical activity and health: A report of the Surgeon General*. Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.