

INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION IN EDUCATION - II

Muska Mosston

Chairman, Department of Physical Education

Rutgers College

Rutgers University – The State University of New Jersey

Presented to a Symposium on: Innovations in Curricular Design for Physical Education

Sponsored by: Department of Education Psychology; Falk Lab. School; Department of
Education; Learning Research & Developmental Center; Department of Special
Education & Rehabilitation

University of Pittsburgh

February 7, 1969

In a symposium like this, one is tempted to resort to moralizing. At the same time, academic responsibility prods the need for the safety and objectivity of scientific analysis.

My dilemma is clear. Having been schooled, on one hand, in the rigor of cool, scientific and systematic approaches to problems I have the need to categorize, to identify taxonomies, to respect technology, to seek and create universal structure in my field.

On the other hand, I cannot divorce myself from the immersion in the humanist education I received at City College of New York which so enhanced my puzzlement about the destiny of man and focused my attention on the behavioral sciences. I cannot cease to wonder and ask myself: “Why did my teachers of the past say what they said and do what they did, what was it in their actions that either invited me to participate in the best of life or rejected me completely?” But, I have survived. What about those who do not?

So, I decided to do both; to engage in moralizing and in analysis. Let me quote:

“Hey, I’m not me – I’m you – I forget then you laugh and fake out some move. It all seems okay – for now. But with experience behind us we are now old - maybe we haven’t got the time to act anymore. Okay, says you – we’ll try it your way – be yourself – go ahead – fall down – break, crack, broken back. It doesn’t work – you can’t be you. Your memory won’t let you.”

This is a part of a poem written by a high school boy a few days before he killed himself. (Theory Into Practice – TIP, Vol.VII, No.1, February, 1968). Published by College of Education, Ohio State University, an issue devoted to Pressures on Children.

Let me also read to you “Lucky Puppy”, Disney (1960). That popular 25¢ book read to babies, describes Lucky, a puppy that is not enchanted with what the rest of the puppies do and decides to become a television star.

“He walked and walked and walked.

He tried to show people his television tricks.

But they did not understand.

“He doesn’t seem to know any puppy tricks,”

was all the people said.

* Some of these ideas were first presented to the Tri-State Conference at the University of Delaware, March 1967, under the title: Inclusion and Exclusion in Physical Education.

The PARADOX we are facing is fear, painful and probably dangerous. The paradox of our political-social procrastinations and the action-realities of the schools can be resolved only if we make new decisions about the relationship between philosophy and operation, between concept and action.

Our educational advertisement, cleverly manipulated by philosopher-kings, are full of statements concerning freedom of man, rights of the individual, man’s need for expression, the importance of self and so on.

Cremin (1965) reminds us that in our own country, it was Thomas Jefferson who first articulated the inextricable tie between education and the policies of a free society.

“He further suggests that one can trace an unbroken line of influence from Jefferson to Horace Mann to John Dewey - and to trace it to Dewey is, like it or not, to trace it to ourselves.”

In Physical Education, specifically, the earliest statements by Hetherington (1922), Wood (1962), Williams (1964), Nash (1931), and others have given this field a philosophical direction.

It is quite obvious that their concern was the integration of physical education with the general school curricula, in philosophy and in action. But when one examines the literature of the 50's and 60's, Irwin (1951), Sehon (1950), Kozman (1936), Vannier (1964), Davis (1948 and 1961), Brown (1963), Miller (1963), Wiles (1961), Jokl (1965), Walters (1966), Robb (1966), Lockhart (1966), Lawther (1966), one hardly finds an analysis of what actually occurs in American Gymnasia. Programs have slightly changed, activities have been reshuffled, but hardly any analysis exists of what they actually do to people. It seems as if most of these publications deliberately EXCLUDE current knowledge in the behavioral sciences, or at best hint at some scattered and fragmented information.

Books entitled “Methods in”, “Curriculum of” or “ Principles and Objectives of”, and the like still contain materials which are, in fact, statements of organization, descriptions and rules of games (which are changeable, anyhow) measurements of equipment, and so on. These materials still serve as the major substance fed to students of physical education in most schools all over the country. All done under the safe and gross canopy of that nebulous concept called democratic education.

Teaching for self-direction - ? What a marvelous statement of a desired objective. In traveling the length and breadth of the country, one can still observe thousands and thousands of “Luckys” doing their puppy tricks. Philosophically and behaviorally, accepting the notion “self-direction” means REDUCTION or even ABOLITION of “direction by others”. This “new” condition, and certainly the PROCESS toward this condition seems not hazardous and threatening to most teachers.

Overcoming these hazards and threats is not a matter of “Technology of Education”. Using “teaching machines” and “programmed instruction” is only one tiny aspect of the process of “teaching or self-direction”. In a broader sense it represents “a total commitment to a different image of man which redefines the decisions concerning the role of the teacher and the role of the student in the teaching learning act”. (“Problem Solving – A Problem for Physical Educators”. A paper presented to the Annual Meeting of N.Y.C. Association of Physical Education Teachers – February, 1968).

The concept of “Teaching for self-direction means relinquishing what “has been” to what “might become”. It means shifting from statements made by teachers to statements made by students and more powerfully it means a shift from QUESTIONS made by teachers to those made by students.

Maybe this is what Maslow (1962) means when he writes:
“Only the flexible creative person can really manage the future, only the one who can face novelty with confidence and without fear. I am convinced that much of what we now call psychology is the study of the tricks we use to avoid the anxiety of absolute novelty by making believe the future will be like the past.”

The emphasis in our professional lives in our commitment to the public, to the community-present and future. Our commitment permeates our entire professional image and reflects our value system. Some of us are docile, some aggressive, some play the role of the hidden persuaders and some are bold enough to exhort in the open. Some tacitly accept decrees and help maintain the safety of status quo; others are restless, inquiring, re-designing, experimenting, and defying. Some are committed to commitment and there are those who are diligently committed to no commitment.

Regardless of the kind or degree of commitment, the Gestalt of the behavior of teachers reflects their value systems. These value systems, diversified as they may be or may become, can be essentially categorized into two polar groups. Those value systems committed to INCLUSION and those committed to EXCLUSION.

Every decision made by a teacher in every act of teaching has the consequence of inclusion and exclusion. These decisions serve as a powerful and sometimes irreversible antecedent to what actually occurs to the learner, for or against the learner.

Between the suggested poles, one can conceive of a theoretical continuum which represents gradations of inclusion and exclusion. If this is so, then several questions must arise: Who is included? How much inclusion? How often inclusion? What are the criteria used for decisions made in answering these questions? Is there such a thing as “part-time inclusion?” or “token exclusion?” And, indeed, some fundamental questions emerge: What are the implications of these questions to a teacher’s behavior? Can one exclude these questions from one’s behavior? What are the implications of the answers to these questions to teacher’s behavior? To their commitment-position on the inclusion-exclusion continuum?

The following thoughts and examples, which represent this polarity, are deliberate; they are deliberated in that they focus on seemingly extreme examples, but extreme they are only in their consequences not in their prevalence. They do exist, and exist too frequently in our educational behavior.

Now, what kind of conditions impose exclusion?

1. Conditions where students cannot reproduce accumulated knowledge or experience. This is evident in any single-standard type of program. A program in which all students are called to perform and reach a particular quantitative or qualitative level because of the decisions of a committee, a teacher, a coach, state norms, aspirations, or limitations of an indigenous pressure group, and so on.

We have given enough lip-service to individual differences. ALL DATA – physiological, psychological, sociological, and cultural point to the variability in man's ability to perceive, to learn, to perform!

Studies in perceptual-motor performance done by Cratty (1964, 1966 a. & 1966 b.), Kephart (1960), and others virtually demand a re-examination and introduction of alternative decisions and behaviors in our teaching acts. Gagne (1965) in his book The Conditions of Learning and Bruner et al. (1960) in A Study of Thinking, enhance the importance of individuality in learning strategies. Yet, we have not been able to internalize these premises so that it affects our own behavior as teachers.

2. The second kind of conditions which often imposes exclusion is when teachers confront those who seek and discover new or alternative

knowledge; these are often viewed as deviants, trouble makers, disturbers of the peace, non-disciplined, and so on. Many teachers, who apparently operate under pressure to be the same, to be good, to be loyal and obedient, project the same kind of pressure on their students.

The literature on pressures is fertile. Fleming & Doll (1966), Holt (1964), the ASCD Yearbooks (1962 & 1964), the N.J.S.S.T.A. Yearbook (1966): Pressures that Disorganize in Secondary Schools) contains statements by Sol Gordon, Virginia Bennet, James JanTausch, Jack Bardon, Leo Litzkey, Lawrence Hopp, Harry Bredemeier, Muska Mosston, and others – a rather diverse group of psychologists, sociologists, and educators; all united in their protest against the pressure exerted on children to be what they are not and become what they cannot nor will not.

The first issue of The Journal of Creative Behavior (1967) presents an interesting collection of statements concerning behavior which seeks beyond, behavior based on inquiry, questioning, discovering, and creating.

Contributors like Guilford, Torrance, Suchman, Taylor, and others seem to encourage the inclusion of such behavior in the education of a child.

Harold F. Harding, who editorialized on Taylor's article, "Questioning and Creating: A model for Curriculum Reform", says: "but the fact remains that in our society the art of questioning is not popular. (Its greatest practitioner. Socrates was put to death).

Today the persistent questioner is not a welcome companion. He annoys. Samuel Johnson reminded us that “questioning is not the mode of conversation among gentleman”. Teachers nowadays think of students who persist with questions as discourteous. Are what passes for good manners in the classroom more valuable than the process of creative thinking?”

Let us include here another statement to illustrate this point. Melvin Tumin in his article, “Popular Culture and the Open Society” (1957) says:

“Real creativity is viewed with suspicion and distrust because it means, above all, difference, intolerance, an insistence on achieving an individual identity. Real feeling is viewed with equal distrust and hostility because it almost always means bad manners, spontaneity, unpredictability, lack of realism, failure to observe routines. Well-rounded, adjusted, happy – these are the things we are told it is important for us to be. No points, no sharp cutting edges, no despairs and elations. Just nice, smooth billiard balls, rolling quietly on soft green cloth to our appointed, webbed pockets, and dropping slowly into the slots under the table to be used in the same meaningless way in the next game. Chalk one up for mediocrity. For it is the only winner in this game”.

Donald A. Schon (1966) wrote a most striking article called “The Fear of Innovation” in which he analyzes the dilemma of industry and the

strategies used to harness, control, and sometimes quarantine innovations.

He states:

“The modern industrial corporation is required to undertake technological change, change that is destructive to the corporation’s stable state. The corporation is ambivalent to innovation: On the one hand, it believes itself to be committed to it – it believes that technological innovation is essential to corporate growth – but on the other hand, it fears innovation and it tries, in various ways, to prevent it”.

Perhaps the time has come for teachers to include themselves in the process of progress and change. Time has come for teachers to fortify themselves and be less threatened by a questioning student, by the introduction of a different thought; be more accepting and certainly be more willing to examine a proposal which has a flare of innovation and the unexpected. It is the role of both teachers and students to participate not only in the repetition of knowledge but also be involved in the evolution of ideas.

These two conditions of those who cannot reproduce accumulated knowledge and those who perhaps are restless enough to seek beyond, can also be viewed through the categories of excluding factors: (and perhaps there is a hierarchy here!).

1. Exclusion due to visible factors. Goffman (1963) in his book Stigma suggests that stigma is “a special kind of relationship between attribute and stereotype”, and a stigmatized person is “reduced in our minds from a whole person to a

tainted, discounted one”. He further states that “not all undesirable attributes are at issue, but only those which are incongruous with our stereotype of what a given type of individual should be”. Goffman proposes different types of stigma: “The various physical deformities, blemishes of individual character perceived as weak will, domineering or unnatural passions, treacherous and rigid beliefs...and finally, there are tribal stigma of race, nation, and religion”.

The “visibility” of a particular stigma serves as means of communicating its prevalence. Our field of human movement intrinsically possess and produces the quality of high visibility. The difference between those who can and those who cannot is quiet apparent and often quiet disturbing. The most indicting aspect of the visibility factor is its range of exclusion which potentially includes so many: The extreme somato-types, the handicapped, the unwilling, the racially different, and combinations of all of these.

Goffman further states that “the fully and visibly stigmatized must suffer the special indignity of knowing that they wear their situation on their sleeve, that almost anyone will be able to see into the heart of their predicament”.

Indeed, the physical educator, particularly the one who has been brought up with the professional myth of Greek standards of beauty, harmony, and perfection, must learn to grapple with the reality of a pluralistic society and re-examine his notions of standards and norms.

2. Exclusion due to emotional factors. These are less visible and harder to detect. However, the observation of improper attitudes and deviant feelings are often made but teachers who are incapable of conceiving and accepting

the existence of alternative emotions. Their interpretations serve, in turn, as a basis for inclusion or exclusion.

Moreover, these interpretations of the individual's status are the consequences of the individual's failure to adhere to, or maintain the established norms. This failure has a direct effect on the psychological integrity of the individual. The vicious cycle has begun. Goffman offers the following: "In a sense, there is only one complete unblushing male in America: A young, married, white, urban, northern heterosexual, Protestant father of college education, fully employed, of good complexion, weight and height, and a recent record in sports".

3. Exclusion due to thoughts. This is the most private and powerful domain. A different thought, a new idea, an alternative, and an opposing possibility are all products of the ever flowing cognitive process. It is the very nature of thinking to do so. What, then, is the role of the teacher who confronts students who cognitive behavior is a typical? Conversely, what MUST a teacher do to avoid exclusion of thinkers? What MUST a teacher do to encourage, develop, and include thinkers?

Can one conceive of physical education being included in the educational community while it excludes thinking? What must a physical educator do to include cognitive operations in the teaching and learning of motor tasks?

Raths, in *Teaching for Thinking* (1967) discusses thinking operations such as comparing, summarizing, observing, classifying, interpreting, criticizing, looking for assumptions, imagining, collecting and organizing data, hypothesizing, applying facts and principles in new situations, and so on.

Another proposal for understanding the working of the intellect was offered by Guilford (1959). His model-through interpolation of the dimensions of operations, contents, products and their multiplicity of factors – offers many possibilities and “kinds” of intellectual operations.

Anderson & Ausubel (1965) present voluminous discussion in theories of Cognition and studies in meditation.

Bruner in his book Toward a Theory of Instruction (1966) is proposing Guidelines for teaching which develops and enhances cognitive behavior.

Mosston in Teaching Physical Education: From Command to Discovery (1966) analyzes and demonstrates styles of teaching which integrate cognition with performance of physical tasks.

What relevance does all this have to the teacher of Physical Education? Can he afford to exclude the student from participating in all these processes? Can he exclude himself from knowing about the existence and use of this knowledge?

The field of physical education has not projected an image committed to inclusion. Programs across the Nation are based on principles of exclusion while verbal attributions are made to promulgate the myth of inclusion.

In order to examine the quiddity of this field – several aspects or dimensions must be reviewed:

1. The subject matter design – any activity designed for inclusion must be arranged and offered in multiple variations based on the kinesiological principle of Degree of Difficulty, preferably on a continuum. For example: the high jump with its horizontal rope (or bar) is designed for exclusion. It is

appropriate for competition purpose where the process is $X \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 0$.

X represents the initial number of participants and the arrow signifies the process of reduction until a single participant - a winner – remains (or none at all). Educational purposes for all call for a different designation: $1 \rightarrow X$.

Therefore, in the example of the high jump an adjustment must be introduced – what would that be? One solution is to slant the rope! How joyfully children would discover this alternative when they are asked. Any single exercise design imposes exclusion. Mosston in Developmental Movement (1965) and Mueller (1967) in his paper to the conference on Mental Retardation at Newark State College discuss and demonstrate variable analysis within any given movement and the potential variations in order to accommodate all levels of ability within the same movement experience.

Elimination games MUST be eliminated from our programs. There is an endless number of games designed for inclusion without diminishing the values inherent to the concept of play. Physical Education is the ONLY field in the current curriculum to present activities which are a priori designed for exclusion.

2. Equipment Design. Most if not all, of our equipment is designed for exclusion. Any rigid, singular and non-modular equipment is INTRINSICALLY AN EXCLUDER. For decades we have permitted manufactures to dictate to us the content of our educational distance and procedures. Millions of American children must adjust (or fail) so the 4” Balance Beam because thus, it was decided by the Olympic Committee and

thus, it is produced. Our basketball equipment, the weight and circumference of the balls, the vaulting box, the thickness and the height of the climbing ropes, the distances among the rungs of the stall-bars, the weights of the field throwing implements, and many more – are all designed for competitive purposes only (and to that end they are successful –and thus, they are intrinsically excluders. Their designs are incongruous with the concept of graded movement design. They are incompatible with the abilities and grasp (figuratively and literally) of most children they negate the fundamental principles of individual growth, development, and learning.

3. And now – to Teaching Behavior. It is quite obvious that sense the teaching act involved particular kinds of transactions between the teacher and the student it is necessary to DEFINE, DESCRIBE, and even PRESRIBE specific models of teaching behavior and involve specific kinds of Teacher-Student interaction.

There has been a considerable number of proposals of teaching the models: The use of S-R theories, Skinner’s operant Conditioning, Tab’s work in social studies, Polya’s heuristic process in Mathematics, Katona’s research in guided discovery, Guilford’s model of “Three Faces of Intellect”, Torrance’s plea for creativity, Anderson’s work in mediation models, Bruner’s push for cognition, discovery and a theory of instruction, Stanford’s micro-teaching, and more recently Berkley’s mini-courses in teaching behavior. All focusing on the activating agent of learning: The Teaching!

All these proposals are magnificent and indeed noble, but they all only nibble at a part of the problem, a part of the process. All seem to be singular in scope, purpose or modality.

Each seems to exclude the others by statement or by inference. This is, indeed, contrary to the human reality of multiple conditions of learning and it is incompatible with the multiple theories of learning styles.

All this is not helping the teacher “Teach for self-direction”. It certainly does not provide the teacher with clear guidelines of how to move toward INCLUSION. Teachers do tire of sacrificing at altars of different Gods.

Therefore, a Teaching Behavior Theory must not present a situation of Model A vs. Model B, nor a statement that Model A is better than Model B, but needs to construct the relationships among the identified behavioral models. Further, it must show the mobility from one model to another – preferably on a continuum. Then, and only then it becomes a UNIVERSAL and an ALL INCLUSIVE theory. Thus – the Genesis of The Spectrum of Teaching Styles. The Spectrum of Styles, developed at Rutgers’ Department of Physical Education seems to be the construct closest to the stated conditions.

Since the full theoretical delineator and the operational description of the Spectrum appears in Mosston’s book: Teaching Physical Education: From Command to Discovery (1966) let us focus here on its highlights and implications.

The point of departure of the Spectrum lies in the axiom that Teaching Behavior is a chain of DECISION MAKING. This axiom leads to the identification of the SETS of decisions that MUST be made in the teaching-learning act. These sets are identified as universals.

The relationships of these sets are defined in the ANATOMY OF A STYLE, the cornerstone of the Spectrum. Again, The Anatomy of a Style is universal.

Guided by the minimum to maximum continuum of decision making (as identified in the Anatomy) a variety of specific and distinctly different teaching styles emerge. Each style standing along with its theoretical and operational model, yet, tightly INTEGRATED to its predecessor and follower. Hence – the designation of a Spectrum. The direction of this continuum point to two polarities (the theoretical limits in the Teaching-Learning Transaction) of decision making: Maximum decision by the teacher on one hand and maximum decision by the student on the other; and therefore the subtitle: From Command To Discovery.

Perhaps the most powerful aspect of the Spectrum is its provisions for MOBILITY toward either pole by BOTH teacher and student. And intrinsic to this mobility is a gradual shift in physical involvement, social exchange, emotional stabilization and cognitive participation.

Mobility on the Spectrum, from command to discovery can teach for self-direction and total inclusion.

References

- Anderson, Richard C., Ausubel, David P. (Eds.) (1965). Readings in the Psychology of Cognition. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc. New York.
- ASCD (1962). Perceiving Behaving Becoming. ASCD 1962 Yearbook. Washington.
- ASCD (1964). Individualizing Instruction. ASCD 1964 Yearbook, Washington.
- Brown, Camile, Cassidy, Rosalind (1963). Theory in Physical Education. Lea & Febiger. Philadelphia, PA.
- Bruner, J.S. (1963). The Process of Education. Vintage Books, a division of Random House. New York.
- Bruner, J.S. (1961). The Act of Discovery. Harvard Educational Review, Vol.39, pp. 21-32.
- Bruner, J.S. (1966). Toward a Theory of Instruction. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. Cambridge, MA.
- Bruner, J.S., Goodman, J.J., Austin, G.A. (1960). A Study of Thinking. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York.
- Cratty, Bryant J. (1964). Movement Behavior and Motor Learning. Lea & Febiger. Philadelphia, PA.
- Cratty, Bryant J. (1966). The Perceptual-Motor Attributes of Mentally Retarded Children and Youth. Mental Retardation Services Board of Los Angeles, CA.
- Cratty, Bryant J. (1966). A Program of Developmental Physical Education Activities for Educationally Handicapped Pupils. Los Angeles City School. Los Angeles, CA.
- Cremin, Lawrence A. (1965). The Genius of American Education. Vintage Books. New York.
- Davis, E.C., Lawther, J.D. (1948). Successfully Teaching in Physical Education. Prentice Hall. New York.
- Davis, E.C., Wallis E.L. (1961). Toward Better Teaching in Physical Education. Prentice Hall. New York.
- Disney, Walt (1960). Lucky Puppy. Based on the Walt Disney Motion Picture "The 101 Dalmations". Golden Press. New York.

- Fleming and Doll (1966). *Children Under Pressure*. Charles E. Merrill, Inc. Columbus OH.
- Gagne, Robert M. (1965). *The Conditions of Learning*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. New York.
- Goffman, Irving (1963). *Stigma*. Prentice Hall. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Gordon, Sol (Ed.)(19??). *Pressures That Disorganize in Secondary Schools*. 31st Yearbook 6, November, Secondary School Teachers Association.
- Guilford, J.P. (1959). *Three Faces of Intellect*. The American Psychologist, Vol.14, August.
- Hetherington, Clark W. (1922). *School Program in Physical Education*. World Book Co. New York.
- Holt, John (1964). *How Children Fail*. Dell Publishing Co. New York.
- Irwin, Leslie W. (1951). *The Curriculum in Health and Physical Education*. The C.V. Mosby Co. St. Louis, MO.
- Jokl, Ernest (1965). *The Acquisition of Skill*. Quest Monograph VI, May.
- Kephart, Newel C. (1960). *The Slow Learner in the Classroom*. Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc. Columbus, OH.
- Kozman, H., Cassidy, R., Jackson, S. (1938). *Methods in Physical Education*. W.B. Sanders. Philadelphia. PA.
- Lawther, John D. (1966). *Directing Motor Skill Learning*. Monograph,VI, May.
- Lockhart, Ailene (1966). *Communicating with the Learner*. Quest Monograph, VI, May.
- Maslow, Abraham H. (1962). *Toward a Psychology of Being*. D. Van Nostrand Co. New Jersey.
- Miller, A.G., Whitcomb, V. (1963). *Physical Education in the Elementary School*. Prentice Hall.
- Mosston, Muska (1965). *Developmental Movement*. Charles E. Merrill. Columbus, OH.
- Mosston, Muska (1966). *Teaching Styles – A Spectrum*. 69th Proceedings Annual Meeting National College Physical Education Association for Men.

- Mosston, Muska (1966). Teaching Physical Education: From Command to Discovery. Charles E. Merrill. Columbus, OH.
- Mosston, Muska (1966). The Integration of a Style of Teaching With Structure of the Subject Matter. An address presented to the National College Physical Education Association for Men, San Diego, CA. December. (To be published in the Proceedings, 1967).
- Mosston, Muska (1968). Problem Solving – A Problem for Physical Educators. A paper presented to the Annual Meeting of N.Y.C. Association of Physical Education Teachers.
- Mueller, Rudolf (1967). Immediate Feedback Activities – Their Design and Utilization. A paper presented to the Newark State College Conference on Mental Retardation, February.
- Nash, Jay B. (1931). Interpretation of Physical Education. A.S. Barnes & Co. New York.
- Polya, G. (1957). How to Solve It. Doubleday Co. New York.
- Raths, Louis E., et al (1967). Teaching for Thinking: Theory and Application. Charles E. Merrill Books. Columbus, OH.
- Robb, Margaret (1966). Feedback. Quest Monograph VI, May.
- Schon, Donald A. (1966). The Fear of Innovation. International Science and Technology, November, No.59.
- Sehon, Elizabeth, et al (1950). Physical Education Methods for Elementary Schools. W.B. Saunders Co. Philadelphia, PA.
- Taylor, Calvin W. (1967). Questioning and Creating: A Model for Curriculum Reform. Journal of Creative Behavior, Vol. 1, No.1, January.
- Theory Into Practice (TIP): Vol. VII, No.1, February 1968. Published by College of Education, the Ohio State University. (An issue devoted to: Pressures on Children).
- Tumin, Melvin (1957). Popular Culture and the Open Society. Mass Culture edited by Rosenberg, Bernard and White, D.M. The Free Press, Glencoe, IL.
- Vannier, M., Falt, H. (1964). Teaching Physical Education in Secondary Schools. W.B. Saunders Co. Philadelphia, PA.

Walters, Etta C., (1966). *Neuropsychological Aspects of Motor Learning*. Quest Monograph VI, May.

Wiles, K., Brown, C., Cassidy, R. (1961). *Supervision in Physical Education*. Prentice Hall, Inc.

Williams, J.F. (1964). *The Principles of Physical Education*. W.B. Saunders, 8th Edition.

Wood, Thomas D. (1962). *The New Physical Education* in Arthur Weston's "The Making of American Physical Education". Appleton-Century Crofts. New York.

SHAPE-UP. Rutgers, C.B.S. A weekly educational program designed and conducted by Muska Mosston, Channel 2, Saturday, 7:30a.m.