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Anchored in the narrative inquiry tradition, this paper examines commonly held motives about curriculum making from the perspectives of four experienced physical education teachers in Korea. Field texts were collected throughout by employing narrative research tools such as in-depth interviews, focus groups, class observations and documents analyses, and transformed into research texts using broadening, burrowing, and storytelling and restorying as suggested by Connelly and Clandinin. For experienced physical educators, this paper illuminates what motivates curriculum making as a narrative phenomenon storied and restoried over time. Different stories produced different motives of curriculum making, and a number of issues related to teacher development for curriculum making emerged.
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Introduction

To better educate children and students, curriculum reform in all countries has been continuously undertaken. One common theme traversing many nations’ approaches is to decentralize or deregulate the authority of government. An essential part of this change process is connected to teachers’ roles in curriculum work (Hansen, 1998; Curtner-Smith, 1999; Spillane, 1999; Kirk & MacDonald, 2001; Leander & Osborne, 2008). Focusing attention on teachers’ actions at the local level means that more emphasis is given to teachers’ influence on the school curriculum with the hope of impacting what transpires in teacher–student curricular exchanges.

In the educational community, the ‘teacher’ has arguably been viewed as separate from curriculum (Clandinin & Connelly, 1992; Penney & Glover, 1998; Carlgren,
1999; Penney & Evans, 1999; Craig & Ross, 2008), regardless of the special role that teachers play in curriculum enactment. To date, in most countries, curriculum researchers or specialists have mainly made or developed national, state and local curricula, whereas teachers have performed the role of curriculum user or transmitter (Ha et al., 2008). In general, teachers have been told what to do and have been supervised to make sure that they had done it at the national, state or district levels. This notion has resulted in a wide discrepancy between the intent of desired curriculum reforms and how such reforms have been lived. Even when an ideal curriculum reform has been proposed or mandated at the national, state or local levels, teachers have rejected it because they have not participated in the design of the new curriculum reform or revision and their teaching intentions, practices, contexts and so forth have not been taken into account. Thus, teachers have rarely stuck to the intended curriculum documents in the ways reformers intended them to do (Penney & Glover, 1998; Carlgren, 1999; Penney & Evans, 1999; Craig, 2006).

Recently, some studies (Clandinin & Connelly, 1992; Kirk & MacDonlad, 2001; Hickey & Dinan-Thompson, 2003; Craig & Ross, 2008; Craig, 2009a) have stressed that the role of the teacher is pivotal because the teachers are the deciding factor in curriculum reform. In short, without the willing participation of teachers, abstract reform proposals and intentions will never be authentically lived with students in physical education (PE) classrooms. Some exemplars of teachers’ active roles in curriculum reform have already been depicted in the PE community (i.e. Cothran, 2001; Kirk & MacDonlad, 2001; Penney & Jess, 2004; Ha, Wong, Sum, & Chan, 2008, 2008). These fine-grained examples allow curriculum policymakers or scholars to enlighten the importance of teachers—on which the success or failure of curriculum reforms greatly depends.

First of all, it is vital to understand the role of teachers as curriculum makers. The concept of teacher as curriculum maker means that ‘teachers and students live out a curriculum . . . [with] intentionality, objectives, and curriculum materials play[ing] a part’ (Clandinin & Connelly, 1992, p. 365). To Connelly and Clandinin (1992), ‘designing curricula for teachers to implement for instructional purposes’ is ‘rather like putting the cart before the horse’ (p. 365). The teacher as curriculum maker image stands in direct contrast to the teacher as implementer version of curriculum, in which the teacher merely serves as a conduit (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995; Craig, 2002) to ensure that students meet minimum state requirements. However, by conceiving of curriculum as a ‘multistoried process’ (Olson, 2000), this study keeps both of these perspectives at the forefront of inquiry and examines the opportunities and challenges (Olson & Craig, 2001, 2005; Craig & Olson, 2002) associated with each. Furthermore, Clandinin and Connelly (1992) have explained that the concept of teachers as curriculum makers is more for teachers than it is for students. If teachers engage in curriculum making, their students automatically participate and benefit because of the organic relationship between teachers and students in the teaching–learning situation. Hence, curriculum making is a fundamentally practical and problem-solving enterprise in which teachers continually negotiate tensions arising from people having different interests, values, histories and politics, each of
which has a stake in the reflected curriculum (Carlgren, 1995; Chisholm, 2005). For this reason, teachers as curriculum makers tend to recreate curricula to also fit their pedagogical ideologies and beliefs within the given power structure (Curtner-Smith, 1999; Penney & Evans, 1999).

Since the early works of Connelly and Clandinin (1988, 1990), the concept of, and interest in, teachers as curriculum makers has not been comprehensively pursued to the extent one might expect in the field of education. For example, there exist only a few studies related to the view of teachers as curriculum makers in the fields of general education (i.e. Hansen, 1998; Feldman & Kropf, 1999; Craig, 2006, 2009b; Craig & Ross, 2008). These studies have focused on physics teachers as curriculum decision makers (Feldman & Kropf, 1999), art and literacy teachers as curriculum makers (Craig, 2006, 2009b), on how student teachers can be prepared for their curriculum making roles (Hansen, 1998), and have summarized the literature concerning how teachers can be cultivated as curriculum makers (Craig & Ross, 2008).

However, few studies have addressed what inspires experienced teachers to embrace curriculum making in PE settings, although some of the literature favors the concept and stresses the importance of teachers as curriculum makers. According to Cothran (2001), constraints or barriers for curriculum changes at the high-school level are well documented, but factors that facilitate change are relatively scarce in the PE discipline. Some of the representative studies (i.e. Sparkes, 1991a, 1991b; MacDonald & Glover, 1997; Penney & Glover, 1998; Curtner-Smith, 1999; Penney & Evans, 1999; Ward et al., 1999; Dinan-Thompson, 2003; Bechtel & O’Sullivan, 2007) identify the limitations and barriers that obstruct curriculum changes. These obstacles include the status of PE, the reduction in curriculum time allocated for PE, the absence of adequate time for curriculum planning, the increase in administrative workloads for teachers, the lack of available indoor facilities, the dwindling of procedural competence, the contentious matter of teaching expertise and balkanized departmental relationships.

Regarding enhancers to curricular changes, Bechtel and O’Sullivan (2007) described the cases of four secondary PE teachers all of whom exhibited two factors that contribute to productive curricular changes: (1) a receptive attitude throughout the system regarding teachers’ beliefs and visions of progressive changes in their fields; and (2) support and encouragement from colleagues, principals and students. Cothran’s (2001) narratives illustrate the success of six PE teachers who were involved in self-initiated curriculum change in their workplaces; who experienced positive change with respect to reflection on programs, the power of students and teacher solicitation of help from those outside their classrooms. Dyson and O’Sullivan (1998) identified the supportive factors for curricular innovations identified in two elementary schools. The factors included a shared vision, external support for school programs, curricular integration, centrality of PE and shared decision-making. In addition to the three previously cited studies, Ward et al. (1999) also suggested that a shared vision among physical educators is a key factor to curricula reform.
Even if a few studies (Dyson & O’Sullivan, 1998; Ward et al., 1999; Cothran, 2001; Bechtel & O’Sullivan, 2007) conveyed successful stories of curricular changes, little knowledge exists concerning the commonly shared motives that explain why experienced PE teachers have continuously engaged in curriculum making in their teaching practices. Thus, the purpose of this study was to portray the lived practices of what compels experienced PE teachers to actively engage in curriculum making. The study acknowledged the need to examine imperative that the motives and mitigating factors characteristic of experienced PE teachers engaged in curriculum making be examined within the contexts of particular school settings. Making public the driving forces behind experienced teachers’ curriculum making is important to the advancement of ‘PE’ as a school subject as well as to the field of education in general and the study of curriculum.

Conceptual framework: teacher motivation in PE

There is no question that preservice and in-service teachers are eager to derive meaning from the knowledge and experiences of veteran teachers who have distinguished themselves as curriculum makers and to use such knowledge gleaned from experience to subsequently pursue curriculum making in their own ways. However, not all teachers live curriculum in active and creative ways. The question arises, then, what motivates teachers to engage in curriculum making? And it more specifically pursues activities essential to curriculum making—active inquiry, planning, enacting curriculum and ultimately arriving at an approach to effective curriculum making that reflects their individual needs and abilities and responds to the students in their immediate charge. According to Chen and Ennis (2004), motivation in this context serves as a primary source of empowerment that leads the individual teacher to develop constructive approaches for reaching his or her goal.

Research on motivation in PE as well as in the field of education in general has a long history. In particular, research on student motivation in learning is well documented in the PE discipline (Chen, 1996, 1999, 2001; Chen & Darst, 2001, 2002; Chen & Ennis, 2004; Chen & Shen, 2004; Xiang et al., 2005; Shen & Chen, 2006; Shen et al., 2006), but teacher motivation in PE as well as in the broad field of education has been scarce. The extensive research on student motivation in learning PE stems from achievement goal theories (Chen, 2001), and recently situational interest research in PE has been growing (Chen & Ennis, 2004; Shen & Chen, 2006). In general, motivation research has sought to investigate the effects of personal and environmental factors in the teaching–learning process that would energize (or de-energize) and direct (or misdirect) student learning (Chen, 2001). Typically, motivation is understood as a purely psychological construct approached through quantitative means to acknowledge that this study has not approached motivation from this perspective, but rather, with focus on a lived experience. It has therefore sought to engage with the issue of motivation in and through narrative.
As mentioned earlier, the dearth of research on teacher motivation exhibited in enacted practice in PE is surprising, especially when compared with the rich research concerning students’ motivation toward learning. In contrast to the rather surprising absence of research in the area of PE, there is at least minimal research on teacher motivation in the area of education in general; however, this body of research has focused on preservice and in-service teachers’ motivation for teaching (Sinclair et al., 2006). In a certain sense, exploring teachers’ motivations to engage in curriculum making may be highly important for attracting teachers to, and retaining and involving them in, curriculum making in their professional contexts. Even if teacher motivation has been recognized as an important factor in curriculum making, we still do not have a clear understanding of its potential role in spurring teachers to become motivated to enact curriculum. If we can examine what spurs teachers’ desire to curriculum making, then we can play a more active role in the cultivation of their curriculum making. Teachers also need to be actively engaged in the curriculum making process in order to make meaning of their teaching experiences. For this reason, identifying factors within the educational context and effective methods that can propel teachers to be curriculum makers could provide a significant contribution to the process of eliciting and facilitating the active participation of disengaged teachers in PE. Hence, the purpose of this paper was to examine teachers’ motivation for curriculum making in the field of PE with an eye to contributing to both preservice and in-service teacher development and the literature.

**Method: narrative inquiry**

In order to characterize the lived experiences of PE teachers as curriculum makers, this study was conducted as a narrative inquiry (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). Building on Dewey’s (1938) conceptualization of experience and drawing on Schwab’s (1969, 1971, 1973, 1983) notions of ‘the practical’, narrative inquiry is an ‘against the grain’ methodology developed to challenge the logistic view (McKeon, 1952) underlying technical rationalist approaches (Schön, 1983) to top–down curriculum reform and process–product research (Elbaz-Luwisch, 1997). It is based on the premise that people live storied lives and that they tell and re-tell stories of these lives shaped in context and over time. Thus, when stories are rendered, ‘it is human experience, not narrative, that is the driving impulse…. narrative inquiry [is] a way to study experience …narrative is the closest we can come to experience’ (Connelly & Clandinin, 2000, p. 188). Hence, narrative inquiry follows where the sense of inquiry leads (Olson, 2000), and ‘strategies, tactics, rules, and techniques that flow out of other considerations…” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 188) are avoided. Thus, narrative inquiry is a ‘multilayered and many stranded’ (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. xviii) research approach, one where narrative serves as both method and form (Clandinin & Connelly, 1992) of investigation.
Given that narrative inquiry is a relatively unbounded form of investigation, one that is able to deal with both human and contextual indeterminacies, it is a highly suitable methodology for the nature of the study at hand and the research questions posed, all of which hinge on human experience rather than on directly evidential behaviors. A second reason for choosing narrative inquiry for this work is that it resonates well with the idea of teachers holding and expressing knowledge through narrating ‘stories of experience’ (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). A third reason is that an innovative approach is needed to examine how experienced PE teachers’ formal (paradigmatic) and practical (narrative) knowledge mingle as their learning in context unfolds. Our intended result is a narrative explication of ‘real acts [of teaching], real teachers, [and] real children’ (Schwab, 1969, p. 35). Another strength of narrative inquiry is that it recognizes the centrality of the teacher as the final arbiter of the curriculum decision with students in classrooms (Craig, 2009a, 2009b). This makes it particularly suitable for studying the driving forces behind teachers becoming curriculum makers. Also, it appreciates the time spent in schools and in relationship with research participants as an important element of research rigor. In the end result, narrative inquiry, a fluid form of investigation, opens up avenues for change by producing texts that are ‘narratives of enquiry’ (as Schwab called them), texts that vastly differ from those communicating ‘rhetoric of conclusions’ (Schwab, 1962), that is—lists of what is to be known and done.

The intent of this research was to capture the motivational forces fueling experienced PE teachers as curriculum makers at the secondary level. From the beginning, it is important for readers to understand that this article is different from other motivation research in PE, which employs quantitative methods. In this narrative inquiry, the word motivation can be likened to lived desire or what Schwab (1954/1978) termed ‘eros’—the human compulsion to want to know in ways that could spur action, enhance growth and enrich one’s sense of being. Although initiating curriculum change is closely related to teachers’ wills to change, few narrative studies have reported teachers’ motivation to undertake curriculum changes while performing their roles as curriculum makers, probably because the word motivation is heavily laden with psychological connotations. Thus, the research participants in this study were selected for their curriculum leadership in the PE discipline. For this reason, four experienced teachers (two men and two women) from large school districts in urban South Korea were selected on the basis of the following criteria: (1) 10 or more years of teaching experience; (2) a completed graduate degree or teaching awards or both; and (3) peer and student recognition for outstanding teaching (Schempp et al., 2004). Because the campus contexts and teachers involved in this work are located in the same vicinity, pseudonyms were assigned to all school sites and all individuals who are named. Whereas some teachers do not mind the use of their personal names, others believed that their stories could not be publicly shared without the anonymity that pseudonyms would provide.

In the narrative inquiry tradition, field texts in the study were collected in five ways: (1) document analysis of the PE curriculum at national, district and school levels along with unit and lesson plans; (2) an open-ended questionnaire for gaining
an understanding of teachers’ perceptions of curriculum making; (3) in-depth personal and focus group interviews for lived stories of curriculum making; (4) classroom observations; and (5) reflective teaching journals that capture the process of curriculum making in teachers’ own words.

Once assembled, the field texts were triangulated using three different modes of analysis: broadening, burrowing and restorying. These modes of analysis transformed the field-based texts into research texts (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990), which were subsequently made available through print and digital means. The first analytical tool, broadening, set-up the general context of study. Broadening painted the temporal and social/contextual horizons within curriculum making in a local level. It showed how the curriculum making in PE takes on meaning in experienced teachers’ lives. Through broadening, the influences and complexities of the four teachers’ practices were revealed. The second analytical device, burrowing, is concerned with how happenings and goings on in the four teachers’ teaching practices can be reconstructed by using the multiple points of view provided by them in the research study intertwined with the research team’s interpretations of the field notes. The third tool in the narrative inquiry research repertoire, restorying, captures paradigmatic and transformative changes in teachers’ ‘meaning making’ in terms of both individual and group actions, particularly with respect to the assessment of changed practices over time. Furthermore, because the restorying process necessarily involves the personal and the social, progress can simultaneously be achieved at multiple levels (i.e. school level, local level, national level) of the educational enterprise.

Motives for curriculum making: four narratives of experience

In this study, it became obvious that experienced PE teachers played significant roles as curriculum makers. That is, they adapted, modified and recreated the national PE curriculum to fit their own teaching philosophies and views about PE. Ten years ago, it was mandatory that schools in South Korea meet and follow the many requirements of the National Physical Education Curriculum. However, the seventh national physical education curriculum reform has shifted from a government-controlled to a school-led curriculum. That is, the newly revised national curriculum in PE allows the teachers to act and make decisions concerning physical activities in their educational contexts without being controlled by a government. So depending on the educational milieus of particular schools, teachers are able to choose how they organize their curriculum (Kang & You, 2004; You, 2011).

Against this policy backdrop, four distinct motives surfaced in the four participants’ stories: (1) changing the PE culture as reformer; (2) helping other teachers as a mentor; (3) overcoming students’ nonresponsiveness as a facilitator; and (4) bridging theory and practice as an active agent. These narratives of experiences—exemplars of teachers’ personal practical knowledge (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995) in action—will now be shared.
Story 1: changing PE culture as a reformer

Ryu, a veteran teacher in her late 30s, is in good physical condition. She is an experienced teacher with 12 years to her credit, but is newly employed at a high school for girls. Prior to accepting her current position, she worked at three middle schools. She has had strong athletic experiences and participated in the 1988 Summer Olympic Games as a national player in one of the field games, throwing the javelin. As a result of her impressive sports record, Ryu has served as a coach in field and track events and has worked as a PE teacher in 10th grade. Her current school is located in an urban center serving low socioeconomic status students and this school, like other high schools, typically supports a number of academic subjects in order to prepare students for college entrance. In South Korea, PE is not mandated at the high-school level. Especially in high schools for Korean girls, a popular belief exists among PE teachers that female students are unwilling to engage in strenuous physical activity and rarely participate in PE classes. The PE classes in most Korean high schools are not well attended and suffer from a lack of interest on the part of students and teachers. Even worse, PE is one of the subjects in high school that ranks at the bottom. No one has cared enough to create a PE department within the school. Indeed, the school system demands that PE classes be used for making up tests in subjects such as math or science. For this reason, even though the campus’s student population is more than 1500, the school has only four PE teachers. Ryu works with the three male senior teachers, all of whom are older than 50 years. Given her age and gender, Ryu always seems to be busy and has many responsibilities, both in and out of school. She observed:

In general, most schools have regular departmental meetings thus giving PE teachers an opportunity to discuss how to develop the school curriculum, but this school has not scheduled departmental meetings as part of its program. Consequently, I proposed that regular departmental meetings be incorporated in the PE program, but my proposal was denied by the department chair. The chair argued that a meeting or meetings devoted to curriculum making would be superfluous, a waste of time. There was no reason why he should not re-submit the old PE curriculum documents; there was no need for revision. This decision on the part of the department chair came as a shock to me.

Within the professional knowledge landscape (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995) of the PE department, Ryu was seriously disappointed with the department chair’s decision. Regarding the submission of a PE curriculum by the department, Ryu suggested to the department chair that she would rewrite the PE curriculum by herself, with the final recognition being attributed to the department chair. Fortunately, the chair agreed with her suggestion and then said to her, ‘The document is just a document, let us do it the same way we did before’. Ryu understood what the chair meant. As had been the case the previous year, the senior teachers, including the department chair, rarely conducted their PE classes in the sports field. Generally, the teachers required their students to remain in their classrooms to study tested subject matter such as math and science, which added to the negative reputation of PE in the
school. As can be seen, a big gap existed between the official curriculum and the practical curriculum (Penney & Glover, 1998; Penney & Evans, 1999) as lived in Ryu’s school milieu. Even though Ryu had known of her colleagues’ neglect of their teaching duties, she had not mentioned their unprofessional behavior or argued with the senior teachers. Initially, she was very angry with her colleagues’ neglect of their central roles as curriculum makers, but she decided to take action rather than engage in an exchange of words. Despite her colleagues’ complaints, she worked harder.

Before the class bell rang, as was her custom, she greeted her students in the field and prepared various physical activities along with the necessary equipment to enact them. Fortunately, her efforts proved to be of real value. In Ryu’s classes, traditional stereotypes were broken and the faces of girls were covered with sweat as well as smiles. As time passed, the senior teachers became curious about what was happening in her classes every day, possibly due to positive reports that they were hearing from students. In other words, Ryu tried to show how to prepare and teach a PE class through her daily teaching practices. At the same time, she shared her precious teaching materials in which she had invested tremendous time and effort.

Ryu explained her approach in the following way:

Following what I confess is my own agenda, I give senior teachers CD-ROMS, worksheets, websites, etc. I then tell these teachers to use these materials at any time when they meet unexpected situations or have to cope with rainy days or other conditions that interfere with their schedules. I believe that if they use any one of the materials, their students will benefit and learn from them. Initially, the teachers did not even look at the materials I gave them, but presently some of the teachers tend to use them and then to confide in me in privacy that the materials are not bad.

Ryu’s story reminds the reader of ‘strategic compliance’ (Lacey, 1977) as one of the coping strategies of younger teachers within the conservative milieu of PE departments. In fact, she knows that the senior teachers would resist her suggestions, either because the suggestions are incompatible with their personal goals or because they think their positions could be threatened if they follow these suggestions. According to Sparkes (1991a), most teachers are likely to be ‘sideliners’ when curricular change is introduced, either because they think that the curricular change is personally irrelevant or because they want to avoid making a decision as to whether the proposed changes are favorable or not (Curtner-Smith, 1999).

Recently, Ryu started to notice subtle signs of change among the senior teachers. For instance, the department chair frequently talks to Ryu, making public remarks such as ‘I cannot do what you are suggesting’ or ‘I do not want to do what you are asking of me’. At the same time, he has recognized her efforts and has taken pride in telling his colleagues how different the PE department has become. The chair is likely to mention Ryu to other teachers, making humorous comments such as ‘Teacher Ryu is not good at making an archery bow. Students in archery like my hand-made bows much better than they like the teacher Ryu’s own bows’. In fact, Ryu suggested that an archery range be set-up so that archery could be taught during the current semester, a practical move because such a range does not require much space on the playground. Since the previous semester, the school has been coping
with the inconveniences associated with constructing a new gym. Thus, it has been very difficult for all PE teachers to find teaching space. The old image of the department chair involved ‘giving up’ or ‘doing nothing’. In contrast, the new image of the department chair highlights ‘finding a possibility’, for example, figuring out how to arrange to offer an archery class although the department lacks funds for buying archery bows. Through following Ryu’s suggestion and her lived example, the chair could find his preferred role of making archery bows for his students instead of buying them that he is interested in teaching his class and has fun making his own equipment designed to facilitate his students’ learning. In addition to the department chair, two other teachers in the department also made subtle but significant changes in their teaching approaches. Even though they were not comfortable with making dramatic changes, they tried their best in their current positions. For example, one of the senior teachers made a space for PE equipment that students would presumably use, and the other teacher held his classes at the park near the school. While these are small changes, they may, in turn, lead to more substantial shifts with respect to teachers’ active involvement in curriculum making.

Obviously, these changes within the PE department came as a consequence of Ryu’s silent actions in the high school for girls. Her personal innovations related to curriculum making were seemingly invisible, but for her colleagues within the same department, Ryu’s unobtrusive, wordless ‘message’ was so powerful that her effort resulted in the subtle transformation of the context of their teaching. The PE department looks crowded, because the PE teachers now host teachers from other subject areas. As Ryu’s colleagues have engaged in change, their work environment has likewise changed. Furthermore, the senior PE teachers congratulate themselves on the change. As they have constructed new images of themselves as teachers, Ryu has led through example as she explains below:

In my search for a solution to curriculum making in this school, I was finally able to negotiate a settlement that to some extent satisfied the concerns of both sides of the issue. Aware that one of the senior teachers was a basketball player and prefers to teach that and similar sports, I suggested adding a basketball program to the PE curriculum. Simultaneously, I have proposed some new sports that all PE teachers could teach regardless of teachers’ motor skills; furthermore, these are sports that would allow our female students to experience active participation. Of course, I provided the teachers with rich teaching materials and resources.

As is evident in the research context, Ryu seldom argued her points or attempted to force her ideas and methods on the senior teachers who have fallen into the traditional department culture; rather, she encouraged them to discover things that they might possibly try or teach. As her way worked, she moves forward one more step. She shared her experience in dealing with a high school for girls in this way:

Due to the fact that a gymnasium is under construction at the school, very little teaching space in a playground setting is available. Thus I have been compelled to discover some alternative activities geared to a narrow space so that my students are able to participate. The process was not easy, but ultimately the situation given to me was not bad. The inappropriate situation made me look for new activities and
then try to implement different ways of teaching them. Just as I did in a similar environment at a high school for girls, I have also searched for alternative ways to communicate with the senior teachers or to work with them whenever I face some obstacles by my colleagues.

When she first encountered the traditional, conservative culture within the department of PE that has existed within the inequalities of hierarchy and power relations (Penney & Evans, 1999), she was confronted with dissonances—between thought and action, word and deed, project and reality, concept and actuality, means and ends—but transformed these incongruities through collaborative efforts and leading through unspoken lived example. That is, because Ryu was not constrained by powerful significant others who have possessed the conventional curriculum implementation culture, she was able to demonstrate an authentic role as curriculum maker of a newly revised national curriculum in PE and set an example for how others might consider following her lead.

**Story 2: helping other teachers as a mentor**

Noh has just turned 40 years old and has more than 15 years of teaching experience. For a second year, middle schools in the area have been struggling to become highly competitive, focusing on academic subjects. The school where Noh teaches has been nominated as one of the exemplary schools in urban South Korea. The school has a good school facility with extensive parental support. Many students move to this school from other areas of the urban core. Being fit, energetic and constantly on the go, Noh is a mover who likes to try new ideas. Disliking replication and monotony, he never wastes a moment, making sure that his students are always busy; in fact some students complain that the pace is too fast for them. Although Noh never gives the impression that he has too much to do, he is engaged in many projects beyond the usual. For example, he leads a school project that involves him mentoring and working with other teachers in the school. Drawing from these experiences he explicates how he enacts various ideas in his class.

From the time he joined this school, Noh has tried to communicate with other PE teachers, because there have been no regularly scheduled department meeting. Because of the recent establishment of the school, all PE teachers were hired to teach subjects other than PE and, hence, have belonged to other departments. Noh is surely on target in singling out the need for a PE department in this school. He has managed to persist in his efforts to persuade both the school principal and the assistant principal of the importance of organizing the PE teachers as a department. As a result, his idea has come to fruition. All five PE teachers are now able to work together in a PE department. He explained the process of having a department meeting within his school as follows:

When I first came to this school, there were no PE departmental meetings. This means that I have to confer with each PE teacher individually during lunchtime. While having lunch with the other PE teachers, I explained that we need to be working closely together as a unified department dedicated to the same goals. In
addition, I have proposed many plans, hoping to give the other teachers concrete ideas about what we might accomplish as a department.

Observing Noh as he interacts with his colleagues reveals important reasons for his success; his associates accept him and clearly enjoy talking with him. Noh has shared his classrooms stories with them since the beginning of their relationship and often invites them into his class. He carries around huge amounts of materials, which he is unfailingly eager to share. Contrary to the view that describes beginning teachers as anxious, inflexible and controlling, Noh appears to put himself in potentially risky, open-ended situations of collaborative teaching, which he enjoys. These situations are not built on a structured model. They are truly authentic attempts to construct a meaningful space for learning that is based on trust and collaboration.

Of course, Noh’s explanation and proposal were not welcomed by all other PE teachers. Before Noh came to this school, there were six teachers four of whom were over 50 years of age and two of whom were beginning teachers in their late 20s. The PE staff generally falls into two groups, separated by a significant generation gap. For this reason, they hardly communicated with each other. Perhaps, unsurprising, teacher curriculum making has never occurred at this school. Faculty used to copy other schools’ documents without any intentions of developing better PE programs and offering students better PE curricular experiences. Noh, however, has developed the strategies to improve the inactive climate that currently exists within the PE culture at his school as he explains below:

I am sure that one-on-one conversation is very essential to some aspects of curriculum making. In order to implement my curriculum plans, I need to explain them and to negotiate with each individual teacher. However, it has been my experience that it is easier to get a consensus of opinion and arrive at a satisfactory agreement on a particular agenda when teachers are brought together in a real departmental meeting. Moreover, departmental meetings offered me an opportunity to provide beneficial help and suggestions for the other teachers. For example, I gave all my various teaching materials to beginning teachers or non-motivated experienced teachers. I would say, ‘you can choose and use some of the things I gave you if you like’. That is, I seldom stress that the teachers could themselves research and discover materials that they would be able to use in their classes. This indirect approach does not work all the time, but is one way of steering teachers in the direction of an enriched curriculum.

Noh’s mentoring approach has worked well thus far. Some of his colleagues have had satisfying experiences and felt the intrinsic rewards of teaching. Using his proposed ideas and materials, they have tried different teaching approaches in their classrooms and have had an opportunity to observe the positive changes in students’ attitudes and behaviors that Noh’s approach engenders. In fact, his colleagues have realized that changing their teaching methods slightly was not as difficult as they initially had thought. Because of their successful experience in teaching, they themselves have made efforts to identify more teaching materials. Sometimes they have shared their own ideas with Noh. Their capabilities have been cultivated in terms of what to do and how to develop their curriculum knowledge and experience curriculum making.
Noh’s role at his workplace has been that of mentor, and his mentoring in connection with curriculum making is not limited to beginning teachers at schools. He has cultivated a mentoring partnership (Hudson & Latham, 1996, p. 166) through the axis of time. His narrative retelling consists of a string of accounts indicating that, for him, mentoring means the simultaneous orchestration of different activities. He reflects on the shifts in his situation this way:

The emotional and intellectual climate of my department has undergone a change. Recently, I have felt that communication among PE teachers has been active and open. As a result of our ongoing discussions, several ideas for making curriculum changes have been offered. When that occurs, I immediately propose ‘let’s do it!’ In fact, most of the teachers are willing to accept my suggestions. This is a major step forward, though I am aware, of course, that not all PE teachers would be happy. However, the senior teachers did not disagree with our decisions. Even if they are not likely to try new things, they are ready to share their past experiences with incoming teachers.

This departmental story reinforces Noh’s view that mentoring is a process of shared inquiry, and of being both separate and connected, but he also emphasizes the authenticity of that process. He describes pedagogical mentoring where curriculum making involves a way of being oriented toward students’ learning. He states that there is a pleasant atmosphere in his department, that he and his colleagues are having fun together. He talks about a kind of partnership that has emerged. That is, there is a distinct process of growth, where both Noh and his colleagues share a united goal to ‘be there’ for each other. They share a common understanding that if a person interrupts the process, he or she cannot make up for it. Noh’s story is about how, consistent with the staff development program, he formed a mutual relationship with his colleagues that deeply informs his mentoring process as he explains below:

I think the teachers in my department are of one mind, in agreement, which all things possible, so to speak. When we worked together on our school PE curriculum, I told them, ‘Let’s do it again like last year’s’. The only thing I expect of you is to discuss openly the content that was most difficult for you and then to make changes only in that difficult area. Right after that, they started to tell me their weaknesses in teaching and to ask me what they would do. Only then would I advise them, utilizing my knowledge and experience with curriculum improvement. Moreover, I would suggest ways of using the materials I had provided to them. Through this strategy, their teaching approaches are being changed slightly and finally our curriculum making work is evolving.

Although Noh has served for many years as a department chair at his current place of employment, as well as at other schools where he taught previously, he insists that curriculum making in PE is the most complex work he has ever done. Unlike other school subjects that include only subject matter content, PE curriculum making should be inclusive of various components such as PE contexts, after-school programs, sports club programs, athletic department programs, fitness and health promotion programs and facility management. Over a period of 15 years, Nob has had the opportunity to grow and benefit from the varied experiences involving previous dimensions in school PE curriculum making. For this reason, Noh has been engaged in curriculum making as a mentor with the ability to help other teachers with limited experiences in PE curriculum.
work (Craig & Ross, 2008). In particular, the successful mentoring partnership is underpinned by the concept of individuality and respect for the individual. Without this basis, neither the mentor nor the mentees are likely to reap any benefit from the relationship.

**Story 3: overcoming students’ nonresponsiveness as a facilitator**

Kim is a male teacher in his early forties with 16 years of teaching experience. Recently, he moved to a high school that has just opened and been in operation for one year. In addition, this is Kim’s first year to teach at the high-school level. Before that, he had worked at four different middle schools in the capital city of South Korea. In Korea, all public school teachers must rotate from the school where they are employed every four or five years. As a middle school teacher, Kim was satisfied with his life, but he found himself understandably changed in the last middle school. While reflecting on his teaching life, he confessed, ‘I had a seriously difficult time at the previous school. To be honest, I did not want to go to school every Monday’. Simultaneously, he missed the life that he was able to enjoy at the third middle school where he taught. He remembered the third school as the most memorable school that he had encountered in his life as a teacher. When he worked at the campus, he was keenly aware of many advantages and positive characteristics:

Communication among teachers is the most important element in teachers’ professional development. Our team members were so great! Every day we got together, did exercise together, had lunch or dinner, and discussed extensively how we were going to teach students in our classes. We reflected on our teaching, raised problems or limitations we have faced, and then tried to solve them within our particular teaching contexts.

This method of interactive communication became the way to transform theoretical aspects of teaching into lived practices. The reason Kim moved to the high-school context was his feelings of frustration and isolation when he was appointed to his fourth middle school. He could not assimilate into the tradition and culture of the PE department at that school. As before, he had concentrated on his approach and professional commitment. Unfortunately, the more he experimented with new methods and approaches at his last middle school, the more he was criticized and attacked by other senior PE faculty. It did not help that he was the youngest teacher on the school campus. In fact, because all the senior teachers had never tried to teach or to make efforts to teach, they initially forced Kim to use the same teaching approaches that they did. Kim’s lived experiences in the last middle school were congruent with teaching as an exertion of power and point to the mechanisms of repression exercised by senior teachers in a dominant PE culture. But Kim’s story is not simply one of conceding power; it is about some discoveries that he made about himself. He felt disempowered by the mutual refusal of senior teachers to acknowledge and respect his professional attitude toward better teaching.

Even if his teaching life was painful in the fourth middle school, his move was successful. The high-school culture among teachers in most of subject matters taught there is dynamic and energetic enough to make the school curriculum more
meaningful in terms of students’ learning. The campus is located in an urban area viewed as a low socioeconomic one. The school environment was not very satisfactory, because despite the school having a gym, it did not have a field area large enough for PE classes. Regarding the importance and role of school curriculum, Kim confessed, ‘I have thought a national curriculum is a kind of regulation rather than a guideline, so I was not willing to remake the school curriculum based on the national curriculum. Recently, I realized the relationship between the national curriculum and the school curriculum’. Because of his fresh reunderstanding of the school curriculum, Kim has worked toward building a more creative learning environment. Also he continued in his confession, ‘I think curriculum making is not a just procedure, but it is a form of property. The more I have, the better I feel free’. Such a belief prompted his conscious move toward a different paradigm of teaching that focuses on students’ learning. Unlike other PE teachers on his campus, he also decided to open his classes to the public. The reason he started to demonstrate his classes to the public was to cope with his fear of teaching high-school students. Kim further explained his memorable experience as follows:

I have opened my class to other physical education teachers within a school or at other schools, not because I was directed to do so by school authorities but for my own accountability. My philosophy is that if I do this for ten years, I may be able to teach my students without fear, regardless of the educational environment or situation. I am not interested in ‘show casing’ my classes but in overcoming my own fears. It has been very painful for me to observe my students’ lack of response to my teaching. Whenever I see their nonresponse, I feel frustration and irritation. So I do try to make my teaching more constructive and meaningful for students. I have thought that one of the ways to improve my teaching is to open my class to the public.

It seems Kim’s fear of students’ nonresponsiveness toward his teaching developed during his first year of teaching at the first middle school. He explained:

When I was at the first school, one day it rained. I was embarrassed, because I did not prepare for a rainy day. So I had to teach students inside the classroom. Spontaneously, I ran the class with humor and common sense. I was very lucky to finish an unprepared class due to the raining day. However, I realized we had 10 minutes left after I painstakingly killed the lesson time. My body was sweaty, because my students kept watching my face while longing for further story. But I have nothing to tell my teaching story. I felt like dying at that moment. For ten minutes, I was living a nightmare!

In addition to the rainy day, Kim used to experience the same feeling whenever class time remained or his students did not respond in an appropriate manner. In particular, just looking at unmotivated students or at the indifference of students in his classes has proved to be very hard for Kim. For this reason, he has made efforts to facilitate students’ positive responses to his teaching. First of all, he enjoyed designing experiments to discern whether his redesigned curricula could spur students’ positive response or not. Like the study of Cothran (2001), Kim’s story also showed that the power of students is the initial drive for teacher and/or curricular change. That is, Kim’s thirst for curricular making validates his students
who become the main key to the change process in his teaching practices (Bechtel & O’Sullivan, 2007).

Concurrently, Kim has tried to build an interactive relationship with students. His soft voice tone and readiness to listen have earned his students’ respect. For Kim, voice and ownership are interconnected and conditioned by the physical situation. Perhaps these efforts promote in his class the pleasant atmosphere of fun and togetherness. Kim knows that before doing anything else, he is responsible for creating an effective learning environment for the students. On the basis of his long teaching experience, he believes the teachers’ first and most important task is to create an environment of mutual trust, care and enjoyment, in which teachers and learners can engage in authentic conversations and relationships with each other. These authentic conversations are like friends talking together in a mutual manner with a reciprocal intention in mind. As soon as he arrived at the high school, Kim made trial and error attempts as follows:

At the earlier time, I thought the high schoolers were different from the middle schoolers. So with high expectation, I taught them in a formal manner. That was my fault. They stayed quiet and stiff during my entire class. At that time, I realized that there was something wrong. So at a next class, I used different approaches and then it worked out.

Like these experiences at his first high school, Kim keeps trying to find the best way for facilitating students’ responses toward his teaching, because he desires to meaningfully interactive with his students. His desire for curriculum making arises from the essential process of finding out what his students are interested in and taking the approach of furthering his knowledge of these interests alongside with his students.

**Story 4: emotional desire to bridge theory and practice as an agent**

Min is in her eighth year of teaching, but new at her school due to being temporarily off during two years of doctoral study. The middle school where she works is located in an urban area with an upper middle class population and student body, a campus that is recognized as having excellent facilities and equipment for PE classes. The school has five teachers, four of whom are young, with the fifth being a 55-year-old male. They all have graduate degrees and work hard as teachers. Unlike the other schools, not a single teacher rolls out a ball or willingly engages in nonteaching in his or her classes. In fact, the department meeting involves active and collaborative participation among PE teachers. Even if the senior teacher is not leading the department milieu, he is always supportive of the young teachers. The school is very special for Min, because it is her first workplace following her completion of her doctoral course work. In all of her encounters, she has made a special effort to integrate curriculum theory into teaching practices. Min explains:

I would like at this time to document my findings in regard to what constitutes an exemplary PE curriculum. I think it would be a shame if I, as a doctoral candidate, did not provide a good school physical education curriculum. The truth is that I have never produced a theory-based school physical education curriculum before.
As Min mentions, documenting PE curriculum based on curriculum theory in PE is neither easy nor common. However, she knows what documenting the PE curriculum means and why it is important, and tries to do it, even if she feels the workload is taxing. She describes her knowledge of curriculum as follows:

Yes, after an especially informative doctoral course, I now understand curriculum making in general and can discern the differences among a national curriculum, a district curriculum, and a school curriculum or teacher curriculum. In fact, I now understand why and how a teacher should engage in curriculum making.

Min’s curriculum knowledge has provoked her transition to a curriculum making perspective (Ennis, 1994; Rovegno & Bandhauer, 1997). In particular, her engagement in curriculum making is based on a philosophical shift from teacher-centered to student-centered curriculum development. The shift was internally initiated by the female teacher (Cothran, 2001) as Min explains below:

If I did not know of curriculum theory-based teaching, I would have taught my students based on my personal experiences only. For example, I would have planned a PE curriculum that I could be able to teach. However, I have tried to develop the curriculum based on the specific sports and physical activities that are beneficial for my students, whether I am skilled at teaching them or not. This is the nature of my transition.

In this reflective passage, Min identified a difference between her old and new self. This distinction is reassuring; it gives her a feeling of growth and a sense of agency. During the interviews, she distances herself from her old image of a teacher and makes these moments of discord and contradiction palpable. She contrasts the old and new images of her own curriculum making, her new view of the teachers’ role and position as curriculum maker. These comparisons allow her to assess her own progress, to make it visible to herself and to those with whom the research was conducted. Min realizes that through curriculum making alongside her students, her teaching became more powerful. This realization did not come easily. She realized that she held the power of transforming theory into practice. So she has tried to instantiate her curriculum work at the middle school. However, Min’s intention was not initially welcomed by other teachers within the PE department. Officially, most of the teachers agreed with her perspective, but they also view documenting their curriculum making as additional work, not essential to the work of the PE department. Min explained:

Before I grasped the concept of curriculum theory, I thought that documenting lesson plans and units of study was a kind of official work designed to reveal the inefficiency of other workers or for upper institutional levels like a school district. Recently, my perspective has changed. That is, I have realized that documenting plays a significant role in bridging the gap between curriculum theory and pedagogical practice. While documenting, I would be able to determine what and how I am going to teach my students. Personally, I think that Physical Education should provide students with a variety of learning materials just as other subject matter field do. For accomplishing this goal, documenting becomes inevitable for physical educators.

Much has been written about the ways that powerful ideas and emotions can alert us to new and unexpected aspects of our environment in PE. But Min’ story is more than evidence of theory-based curriculum making. She emphasizes that documenting lesson plans and units of study has meaningfully contributed to her professional growth and to
her students’ learning. In fact, through rigorous forms of documentation, she has managed to grow and develop herself, and she has helped others to learn to grow. Furthermore, she realizes that instantiating progress in curriculum making is a gift to cherish and enjoy. For this reason, she hopes to collaborate with her colleagues at the middle school, because she wants to form an intellectual partnership with them. The teachers are likely to agree with her desire, but the shared aim of improving their enacted curriculum making is not always positively received. It is a very different stance from that of the other teachers, who approach curriculum making in habitual ways. This is how Ming makes sense of the situation:

They think that curriculum making for physical education teachers is a kind of theory development in the curriculum area. To be honest, documenting comes to all teachers as a heavy burden because it really takes much time in our school lives. Even if they recognize the benefits that curriculum making could bring to teachers as well as students, the teachers feel very stressed by the added responsibility. For this reason, I formed the habit of encouraging them by having them document their pedagogical stories just as I have done so far.

As Min constructs a new image of herself as a curriculum maker, she, at the same time, monitors colleagues’ response. When Min interacts with them, she also listens for disagreement—between thought and action, word and deed, concept and actuality, means and ends and so forth. At times, it seems as if she is not sure of the direction of her voice. In her story, the process of the teacher’s perspective-taking is not necessarily triggered by a conscious and motivated decision to participate more actively in curriculum making. Definitely, she exhibits some professional aspirations as a curriculum maker. Rooted in her strong academic backgrounds on curriculum development, she feels that the school context is the best environment within which to engage in curriculum making through actively linking curriculum theory with pedagogical practice. Another important approach is conceptualizing and then translating the mental image into physical action through honing and perfecting the innate tendency to notice and take perspective—that is, through learning to see, feel and sense as if they were one’s own, not the efforts of another person to pursue inquiry, experience life and gain knowledge. Min describes how such motivation occurs within her workplace and how it engages her colleagues and her students. As she explains, her sense of herself is that she is at once separate and connected. She illustrates that through this process, she has gained a fresh understanding both of herself and of her role as a curriculum maker.

Facilitating teachers’ motivation for curriculum making

The concept of curriculum making for teachers is not easy to understand and engage in, given that teachers have historically been taught to be curriculum implementers as opposed to serving as curriculum interpreters or initiators/animators. There are many limitations and barriers to teachers being curriculum makers—that is, the institutional and authoritative forces that negotiate what gets taught, learned and lived in classrooms. As is commonly known, the success of the school curriculum greatly depends on teachers because they are the ‘fountainhead of the curriculum decision’ (Fox, 1985). There is a strong need to share, comprehend and assess the motives of experienced teachers who have successfully performed the role of
curriculum making in their daily teaching practices. In this study, four pedagogical motives were pinpointed: changing PE cultures as an impetus for reform, helping other teachers as a mentor, overcoming students’ nonresponse as a facilitator and emotional desire for bridging from curriculum theory into pedagogical practice as an agent. A common component of the four teachers’ different approaches to curriculum making had to do with their desires for curriculum improvements. The various underlying reasons were diverse, like their roles, ranging from a reformer, a mentor, a facilitator, to an agent.

First, a conservative culture within the PE department became a rather strong motive for the first female teacher, Ryu, who works at a high school. In particular, this tendency in many PE departments resulted from the status of PE in Korean high schools that emphasize setting up classes for subjects on which students are tested for college entrance. As the study of Bechtel and Sullivan (2007) indicates, the low status of PE is likely to hinder curriculum change. In general, even if teachers have enthusiasm for and willingness to engage in curriculum making, their motivations would be weakened whenever they face the realities of the status of PE within schools (Rovegno & Bandhauer, 1997). In the case of Ryu, she accepted the situation, but would not give up. Instead, she devised her own strategy for gaining respect and sympathy for her subject matter field. For instance, she rarely complained about the indifference and lack of support accorded to PE by other teachers. Rather, she demonstrated through her own methods what curriculum making involves and how to work at the process effectively. Getting her message across through powerful example rather than through words and arguments influenced colleagues and other educators to consider her line of thinking.

The second story of collegiality (Ha et al., 2008) represented a huge challenge for the male teacher, Noh, at a middle school. Craig and Ross (2008) mentioned ‘teachers helping teachers’ (p. 296) as one of the strategies to cultivate teachers as curriculum makers. This strategy was also used by Noh who tried to emphasize the view of teachers as knowing and knowledgeable human beings (Craig & Ross, 2008, p. 283) to other colleagues at his workplace. Mentoring cultures within and outside the workplace is commonly being encouraged and practiced by most schools. Such practice is a worthy enterprise because it enables teachers to produce a joint endeavor for professional growth and development. In addition, the mentoring partnership (Hudson & Latham, 1996) could build an official channel for teachers of different levels and career stages to reflect on their professional needs in implementing and assessing the curricular changes.

In the third story, the male teacher, Kim, has an interactive motivational experience inspired by his students’ learning responses. As Cothran (2001) indicated, the teacher has acknowledged his accountability for curriculum making and has tried to research and discover ways to stimulate unmotivated or unskilled students. This kind of perception and the resultant effect on the part of the teacher have created his ongoing challenge to address curriculum changes in order to maximize the learning outcomes of students (Ha et al., 2008). In fact, the evidence of improvement in the learning outcomes of students must align with the evolution and
renewal of teachers’ curriculum making. Even though teachers’ motives and their attitudes toward curriculum making stem from what they have previously learned and in the ways they have responded, practical actions facilitate teachers in the rejuvenation of their curriculum knowledge and approaches to create more successful learning experiences (Ha et al., 2004; Armour & Yelling, 2004).

The fourth story is about Min, a young female teacher, and her emotional desire for curriculum making. According to McCaughtry et al. (2006), the emotional dimensions for teacher change play a significant role throughout the changing process as to whether teachers decide to change, how they interpret changes, how they endorse the change process and how they navigate through challenges. In this study, Min is willing to engage in curriculum making based on her academic knowledge of PE curriculum work in order to restory her old image of herself as a teacher. She demonstrated emotional engagement and had successful experiences with making changes in her teaching practice during a school-wide curriculum-making project. Just as the concept of emotional geographies (Hargreaves, 2000) indicates, her lived story describes how the sociocultural, professional and political work influences her continuing stance toward curriculum making.

In conclusion, the motives for curriculum making offered by the four PE teachers were not self-evident or unitary but situated within their idiosyncratic teaching contexts and unique pedagogical backgrounds and experiences. In this article, we have tried to examine what the teachers have in common and how together they can contribute to what is known about experienced PE teachers’ curriculum making. Specifically, we have demonstrated how the individual stories, both separately and together, project four different motivations concerned with curriculum changes of respective teaching situations. Ultimately, these efforts could enlighten the understanding of lived curriculum making on the part of beginning and inexperienced teachers as well as other experienced teachers in the PE arena.

If we acknowledge that involving teachers in curriculum making is greatly needed, and there is ample evidence to indicate that the need is real and immediate, then the question becomes, how can we motivate unmotivated PE teachers to actively engage in curriculum making? Based on the findings of this study, there are some valuable lessons from the four unique stories of experience that can be taken away. First, sharing curriculum materials with colleagues inevitably contributes to collegial relationships within PE departments. Complaints, arguments or criticism directed at given environments and cultures have not worked in the past. However, doing and moving without specific direction is a most effective approach to recover eyes blinded and minds blocked to the positive aspects of curriculum making. For increasing a possibility of curriculum making, the collegial relationship among members of the PE department is important, if not requisite (Doutis & Ward, 1999).

Second, suggesting one possible small change to colleagues is feasible. Especially for beginning teachers, setting an ambitious goal that does not seem clearly and precisely geared to accomplish curriculum changes is impractical and useless (Schempp et al., 1998a). Accordingly, the colleagues could participate in a program of curriculum development in which they are encouraged to share their questions
and doubts concerning the curriculum reform and to discuss the extent to which their pedagogical needs are considered and supported as part of the curriculum making. The collegial norm can function as a safe and caring culture that supports professional development through collaborative listening and consulting.

Third, seeing students’ behavior changes that result from concerted efforts at curriculum making could be a powerful motivating influence for unmotivated teachers in PE. As previous studies (Cothran, 2001; Bechtel & O’Sullivan, 2007) have indicated, there is undoubtedly a need to acknowledge the empowerment of students as one of the intrinsic rewards of teaching. This empowerment has been associated with both the life histories and the personal practical knowledge (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988) of PE teachers coming to the forefront as highly influential factors in school-based curriculum development. As competent teachers have shown, teachers who are motivated in the area of curriculum making, when confronted with lack of change in negative behaviors of students in PE classes, are likely to view such student problems as reflecting inadequacies in the teachers themselves rather than in the students (Schempp et al., 1998b). Finally, presenting and sharing the role of teachers as curriculum makers (Clandinin & Connelly, 1992; Craig & Ross, 2008; Craig, 2009a, 2009b) is also obligatory for facilitating unmotivated teachers in PE. Current research is exploring the strong probability that PE teachers are no longer passive recipients of school curriculum reform efforts in South Korea. Rather, teachers are regarded as active curriculum developers who perceive, interpret and act as they see fit, based on national curriculum standards or curriculum theory in PE. Preservice and in-service teacher education programs enable future and experienced teachers to be aware of their authentic or professional roles as curriculum makers, and prepare for and enact their curriculum making. If these programs are effective, then ownership of curriculum making (Hickey & Dinan-Thompson, 2003) is readily accessible for all PE teachers in the educational enterprise.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Korea Research Foundation Grant funded by the Korean Government (MEST) (KRF-2008-220-G00005).

References


What spurs curriculum making in physical education? 265


Ennis, C. (1994) Knowledge and beliefs underlying curricular expertise, Quest, 46, 164–175.


MacDonald, D. & Glover, S. (1997) Subject matter boundaries and curriculum change in the health and physical education key learning area, Curriculum Perspectives, 17(1), 23–30.


