

This article was downloaded by:[University of Tasmania]  
On: 15 October 2007  
Access Details: [subscription number 778575679]  
Publisher: Routledge  
Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954  
Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



## Sport, Education and Society

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:  
<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713445505>

### Physical Education: What Future(s)?

Dawn Penney; Tim Chandler

Online Publication Date: 01 March 2000

To cite this Article: Penney, Dawn and Chandler, Tim (2000) 'Physical Education: What Future(s)?', Sport, Education and Society, 5:1, 71 - 87

To link to this article: DOI: 10.1080/135733200114442

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/135733200114442>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.informaworld.com/terms-and-conditions-of-access.pdf>

This article maybe used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

# *Physical Education: What Future(s)?*

DAWN PENNEY<sup>a</sup> & TIM CHANDLER<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Loughborough University, UK and <sup>b</sup>Kent State University, USA

**ABSTRACT** *This paper seeks to prompt professional debate about the future of physical education and, specifically, the form that curricula should take in rapidly changing times and societies. Arguments focus upon a reorientation and restructuring of the subject to address educational needs and interests relevant to the 21st century. The current revision of the National Curriculum for Physical Education in England and Wales is used as a basis from which to present a case for a distinctly new orientation to be reflected in the design of PE curricula, units of work and lessons. The work of Bernstein and Young is utilised in deconstructing long-established practices and outlining their potential reconstruction in ways that are informed by, and express, a 'critical pedagogy for social justice' [Fernandez-Balboa (1997) *Critical Post Modernism in Human Movement, Physical Education and Sport* (New York, State University of New York Press)]. A curriculum framework privileging learning achieved in and via activity contexts, as compared to learning of activities, is presented. The developments that are proposed are identified as highly challenging but arguably long overdue in physical education, and as matters of relevance to international professional communities, not only those in England and Wales.*

As teachers in England and Wales once again face the prospect of responding to a revision of the National Curriculum for Physical Education (NCPE)<sup>1</sup> (see Gilliver, 1999; Casbon, 1999), this paper seeks to prompt and extend debates about the future of the subject, future curricula and pedagogical practices. Specifically it addresses issues that seem to have been overlooked and/or marginalised in many contemporary discussions concerning changes in or to physical education, and the development of the NCPE in particular. In the paper we therefore foreground the matter of what the contribution of physical education should be to the education of children facing life in the 21st century, in a world, societies and economies very different from those of the 19th and much of the 20th century; and address the implications of the desired contribution for the structure and content of physical education curricula. We question the adequacy and appropriateness of the ways in which the subject is currently defined, structured and taught in state schools in England and Wales. We point to both the need, but also potential, for notable changes in policy, curricula and pedagogical practices in physical education.

We write as academics and researchers committed to critical work, with a desire not only to better *understand* contemporary policies and practices in education, but also to inspire and facilitate changes in these; and specifically changes in ways that extend both the quality and quantity of learning opportunities available to young people (Young, 1998, p. 4). In Young's (1998) words, we are concerned for our work to contribute to a sociology *for*, not merely *of*, education, and therefore, to provide concepts that will enable teachers and teacher educators to transform their practices. As previously (see Evans & Penney, 1995; Penney, 1998a), we draw upon the work of Basil Bernstein (1990, 1996) in presenting concepts that we feel offer particular potential in this respect, and link these to ideas more recently presented by Michael Young (1998). Taken together, the work of Bernstein and Young may offer a powerful framework for pedagogical critique and development in physical education. Although focusing attention specifically upon current

and potential future developments in England and Wales, we stress the international relevance of the issues central to our discussions. We also highlight that we are by no means the first to draw attention to matters of definition and structure in and of physical education (see, for example, Crum, 1993; Locke, 1992). However, they are matters that appear inadequately explored by the profession and that it seems timely to now revisit.

### Changing Times and a Time for Change

In his recent work *The Curriculum of the Future*, Young (1998) draws attention to the changing organisation of work and changing characteristics of economic development. Specifically, he sees societies moving towards 'human resource-led economic growth', in which 'it is *national systems of education and training* rather than *national economies* that will determine the fate of nations' (p. 69, original emphasis). In Young's view these changes raise fundamental questions about the current design of curricula, their inherent specialisms and divisions. He calls for new 'connective specialisms' to be developed, in which subject communities actively address and respond to the changing world of work, move beyond a view of subjects as 'ends in themselves' and address the complex contexts in which the knowledge to which they give access might be applied. While certainly supporting Young's stance, we point to a need to respond not only to the changing world of work, but to changes in *all* arenas of the societies in which we live and work. Arguably, the changing leisure activities, changing relationships between work and leisure, and changing relationships between individuals, should be as much a concern for educational planners as the changing world of work. Furthermore, we stress the need to move from a view of education *responding*, or needing to respond to such changes, to a view of it as a *force for future changes*. Thus, in considering new 'connective specialisms' we should be contemplating what worlds of work and leisure, and what societies we are seeking connections to. In the context of transformation of curricula, transformations of and in society should not be overlooked. Young (1998) emphasises that '... curriculum debates, implicitly or explicitly, are always debates about alternative views of society and its future' (p. 9). Furthermore, the dynamic between curricula and society is the very basis of our potential to be *proactive* rather than merely *reactive* in social change. We need to remember that *futures have to be made, they do not just happen*' (p. 79, our emphasis). Thus, in considering contemporary curricula, Young highlights the need to consider the extent to which these represent 'a future society that we can endorse or a past society that we want to change' (p. 21).

This brings us to questions that we believe should now be a focus for debate amongst all involved in physical education. First and foremost, as all educationalists, we need to be addressing our visions of and for the future. What type of citizens, what type of learners do we want to play a part in developing? What are the implications of these visions for the subject and specialism of physical education, and for our work as teachers and teacher educators? Does physical education contribute to the development of societies that we endorse? With changes in societies, and our visions for the future, is there a need for changes in our specialism? How can physical education be, in Young's terms, 'more connective' (within the subject, with other aspects of the curriculum, and with lives and societies beyond schools) and express a 'lifetime approach' to education? If visions are to be realised, what approaches and skills do teachers need to develop, what relations do they need to facilitate with pupils, amongst pupils, with colleagues, with parents and with individuals from other organisations involved in the provision of

physical education and sport for young people? Certainly, these are challenging issues for the profession to address, but also issues about which discussion seems long overdue.

At this point we will be quite open about our own visions and agendas. In education and in physical education specifically, we are seeking curricula and pedagogical practices that are directed towards the development of critically informed citizens who are committed to playing a part in establishing more equitable societies in which all individuals are valued; in which individual, social and cultural differences are celebrated as a richness of society; and in which knowledge is something to be collectively, collaboratively and creatively advanced, rather than pre-defined and 'delivered'. We believe that physical education can play a key role in such developments. In particular we see it as having great potential to facilitate self-directed and self-inspired learning, and to provide contexts and experiences that demonstrate the importance and value of collective as well as individual agendas and actions. In our view, as a subject and a profession, physical education can take a lead in designing and developing an education 'for a world of rapid change in which both flexible attitudes and enduring values have a part to play' (DfEE, 1998, p. 12). However, we also believe that the realisation of such visions demands radical changes in and of physical education in all arenas, and specifically, in policy, in curriculum design and in lesson contexts.

In the remainder of this paper we expand upon the action that we regard as necessary in pursuing these visions, and in therefore adopting what might be termed 'a critical pedagogy for social justice' (see Fernandez-Balboa, 1997). We begin by expanding our discussion of the aims of physical education. We then address the implications of specific aims for curriculum structure and content and finally pursue the teaching strategies, methods and pedagogical relations that we should be looking to develop if we are to realise our stated aims. In Bernstein's (1990, 1996) terms, we emphasise the need for a curriculum structure that signals a very different 'voice' in physical education and that clearly prompts and supports the development of different 'messages' (Bernstein, 1990, 1996; see also Penney, 1998a). We identify a need for a weakening of both the classification and framing (Bernstein, 1990, 1996) of physical education curricula, characterised by an emphasis on the connective and collective value of different contexts of learning, and a shift from an emphasis on teaching *pre-defined* knowledge, skills and understanding, towards notions of the teacher as a facilitator of learning in a negotiated curriculum that seeks to address the individual needs and interests of all pupils, while also reflecting and pursuing collective interests and values.

For those readers unfamiliar with Bernstein's concepts, Bernstein (1990, 1996) explains that the form and strength of categories of knowledge provide curricula with a specific emphasis, orientation or 'voice'. Curriculum knowledge can be regarded as shaped and defined by categories (subjects, or in the specific context of physical education, often activities) and the relations between them. The curricula then developed within the context of particular categories represent the realised form of the voice, or the 'message'. Different voices (i.e. different forms of categorisation in and of curricula) signify the privileging of different knowledge. Bernstein emphasises that the key consideration in addressing the potential for the creation of a new voice is the strength of *classification* (degree of insulation between categories) inherent in curricula. Reducing insulation is fundamental to changing the principle of classification and thereby privileging new or different knowledge in education. If we are also concerned with the matters of who plays what role in the creation of knowledge, and the pedagogical practices that will feature in schools, we also need to consider the strength of *framing* (referring to relationships between individuals) that is promoted by the particular 'voice' of curricula and that

feature in the 'messages' arising. As we discuss further below, to facilitate different types of learning and different types of learners, changes in the roles and relationships of teachers and pupils seem particularly important. In summary, from Bernstein's work we see a need for:

- a change in the principle of classification of physical education curricula;
- a weakening of that classification and weaker framing in physical education;
- a new voice to be established for the curriculum; and
- the development of new messages in teaching.

Before advancing our discussion further, we should stress that we are not seeking to destroy physical education nor deny it (nor anyone associated with it) a future. Nor, more specifically, are we denying the *central importance of physical activity* in physical education. Rather, we wish to debate the form that physical education should take in the future and the nature and purpose of the physical activity within it. Like Young (1998), we stress that the changes envisaged are not away from specialisation *per se*, but rather towards new forms of specialism that emphasise connectiveness in contrast to divisions and insulation.

### The Aims and Claims of Physical Education

Over the years many within the profession have drawn attention to the inaccuracies inherent in both public and political perceptions of what physical education 'is' and 'is about'. Specifically, statements have been made that have sought to clarify that physical education is not merely about 'doing', nor can it be equated with 'sport'. For example, the non-statutory guidance issued to accompany the 1992 National Curriculum for Physical Education in England and Wales highlighted that:

In ***physical education*** the emphasis is on learning in a mainly physical context. The purpose of the learning is to develop specific knowledge, skills and understanding and to promote physical development and competence. The learning promotes participation in sport. (DES/WO, 1992, p. H1, original emphasis)

while

***Sport*** is the term applied to a range of physical activities where emphasis is on participation and competition. Different sporting activities can and do contribute to learning. (DES/WO, 1992, p. H1, original emphasis)

However, while physical educationalists may be in agreement about what the subject 'is *not*', the matter of what the core aims of the subject *are* remains far less clear and a source of apparent tension. Claims about the contribution of the subject to children's development, later lives and to society are multiple and diverse. For example, the mission statement of the Physical Education Association of the United Kingdom (PEAUK) states that physical education '... enables young people to develop an appreciation of skilful performance', that it 'aids the development of healthy lifestyles' and that it 'contributes to the spiritual, moral, social and cultural awareness of young people' (PEAUK, 1998, p. 4). Meanwhile, the British Association of Advisers and Lecturers in Physical Education (BAALPE) has stated that 'It remains critical to the *well-being of every child* and the *Nation's health* generally, that there is an entitlement to a rigorous physical education programme' (BAALPE, 1998, our emphasis), and Sir Rodney Walker, the Chairman of the English Sports Council, has stressed that 'The contribution of the PE curriculum to a child's

education and as an *integral element of Sport for All* at grass roots level should not be underestimated' (Walker, 1998, our emphasis).

Here we wish to question the degree to which physical education can legitimately continue to make varied claims and pursue multiple agendas. Debate about both the compatibility of these multiple claims and their implications for the content and structure of curricula seems to have been largely overlooked in contemporary times. As Armour and Jones (1998) have suggested, 'physical education may be trying to do too much' (p. 85). They suggest that it may have '... failed to identify a specific focus within its huge potential' (p. 85). Perhaps the critical failure is that the *implications* of the various aims for curriculum design, teaching and learning, have been inadequately explored, and furthermore, in the absence of such inquiry, we have witnessed (in England and Wales if not elsewhere) the emergence of a *particular* dominant form and focus. The form and focus that we refer to has become established to the point that it has attained the status of being 'the obvious' and for many people (most notably, members of the public and politicians, but surely also many within the profession itself), the *only possible* structure and orientation for the subject. While talk of refrigerators may seem far removed from our concerns, an analogy used by Goodson (1995) seems highly appropriate here. Goodson likened the making of the curriculum to 'the notion of trying to sell refrigerators to the eskimos ... Nobody asks the question of why refrigerators, of how such an inappropriate product came to be at the centre of the action' (p. 206). What we are referring to, of course, is the focus upon the learning of *activities* (and sports) and the fact that whatever sets of interests physical education has claimed to serve, its curricula have remained remarkably unchanged in form. Prior to and throughout the development of the National Curriculum for Physical Education, the form of most physical education curricula has given every appearance of legitimating a view of physical education as comprising merely a collection of activities. We acknowledge that this is by no means a characteristic unique to physical education in England and Wales, and indeed, stress that the matters we raise are ones of international relevance (see also Crum, 1993; Locke, 1992; Macdonald & Brooker, 1997).

Thus, central to our notion of a 'new specialism' with the capacity to facilitate realisation of our aims for learning and for learners in physical education is a fundamental *restructuring of the subject* that will signal a redefinition of the subject (and in Bernstein's terms, privilege a different voice) and that will demand quite radical reform of curricula associated with it. In these terms, we have some sympathies with Locke's reflection that 'If physical education is to have a significant presence in the secondary schools of the 21st century, it is better to chuck the dominant model ... and start over from scratch' (1992, p. 362). However, we emphasise that the reality in all arenas of policy and curriculum development is that we are *not* 'starting from scratch', that we cannot and should not deny the rich history of physical education, and that we need to be taking due account of, be building upon, and relating to, established practices.

### From Critical Pedagogy to Curriculum Framework

In this section we address the implications of specific educational agendas for curriculum design in secondary schools. Once again we draw attention to the apparent absence of this level of debate within physical education in recent years and the remarkably unchanging and apparently unchallengeable form and content of physical education, certainly in England and Wales. Throughout the development of the NCPE in England and Wales there has been very limited opportunity for any review of the underlying

structure and framework of the subject (see Evans & Penney, 1995; Penney & Evans, 1999). Activities, or areas of activity<sup>2</sup> have retained a privileged position in the framework, in the requirements for teaching and learning, and in the curricula developed in response to these requirements. We are not denying the centrality of activities (and sports) in physical education. Our concern is not the inclusion of activities in the physical education curriculum, so much as the purposes of their inclusion. Our view is that activities are not what physical education is only, or even primarily, about. Rather, we see the professional responsibility of teachers as centring upon the education of children in and through physical activities and contexts; and the provision of opportunities for *all* children to experience enjoyment and achievement in physical contexts, and to gain skills, knowledge and understanding that will be a basis for them to lead active and healthy lives. Furthermore, we see teachers as having a responsibility to provide educational experiences that establish children as creators, not merely receivers of knowledge, skills and understanding in our field. As indicated earlier, inherent in our vision for physical education, therefore, is a professional commitment to addressing social justice.

Certainly we question whether the longstanding activity-based structure is an appropriate basis from which to pursue these educational hopes and ambitions. In particular, our concern is that the activity-based structure prompts a focus on performance in the activities *per se*, and that teaching and learning invariably becomes orientated towards the development of elite performance in specific activities. With activity based divisions, and a continuing emphasis of the *differences* between various areas of activity (see below and Penney, 1999), the curriculum does not encourage a focus upon connective aspects or potential of the subject; that is, connections in the learning that may occur in different activity contexts; connections between learning in physical education and learning in other curriculum areas; and between learning in physical education and experiences and learning beyond schools. Currently the statutory order for the NCPE, and many curricula arising from those requirements, display strong classification and insulation (Bernstein, 1990, 1996) in relation to both the subject of physical education as a whole and what are then defined as its component parts. Regrettably, in our view, the latest revision of the NCPE may do little to counter this emphasis. A document recently issued by the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) that is explicitly designed to provide clarity and 'uniformity' in interpretations of particular terminology has highlighted the continued tendency to portray various areas of activity as *distinct* from one another, and to identify them as mechanisms for promoting *different* values and interests (see QCA, 1999a). We do not deny the value of diversity of experience in physical education, but we question the particular divisions that are established, the specific emphases then associated with particular activities in texts such as this, and the educational focus likely to be pursued in curricula in schools. We contend that statements such as 'The main purpose in games activities is for the individual or team to organise themselves in such a way that they can successfully attack and defend the opposition' (QCA, 1999a, p. 12); and 'In gymnastic activities performers have to think about how they produce skills and agilities with as much control, accuracy and precision as possible' (p. 18); provide and promote narrow interpretations of physical education and activities within it, and that one of the consequences of the emphases currently promoted may be notably limited coherence in teaching and learning in physical education.

To develop as a connective specialism (Young, 1998) and to establish a focus upon the contribution that physical education can make to the whole curriculum, and to the whole education of children, like Locke (1992) we question whether a solution can be found by

alterations to one or more of the established parts, or rather, whether whole-scale change is what is required. We agree with Macdonald & Brooker (1997) that the subject 'needs to be conceptualised as an educational process, positioned within educational discourses and drawing upon educational argument' (p. 159). To achieve this, we see a need for physical education to clearly articulate its purposes in relation to visions of and for future citizens and societies, to identify the kind of knowledge, skills and understanding that underpin the realisation of those visions, and to establish these as the core learning towards which teaching is explicitly directed. We contend that the *contribution to learning* that we see the subject as providing, rather than the activities through which we may ultimately achieve that contribution, should become the explicit defining feature of the subject, and should provide the framework for curriculum development. Therefore, we see a need for a *thematically oriented, rather than activity-based curriculum*, and a framework that openly privileges what we may term 'themes' or 'strands of learning'. Such an approach would emphasise the way in which *collectively* various activities (or areas of activity) may facilitate and further particular learning. It would provide a direct challenge to the current insulation and strong classification inherent in physical education curricula and specifically, in the statutory texts of the NCPE. As indicated above, for Bernstein (1990, 1996), reducing the degree of insulation between categories is fundamental to establishing (and legitimating) a new voice in curricula.

Turning to the specifics of structure and organisation of the curriculum, we are looking for a move away from teaching units or lessons defined in terms of an activity (for example, football or gymnastics). Instead, we envisage themes that represent the identified 'core learning' as defining units of work, and an activity or combination of activities then providing the medium and contexts for the learning that has been established as the focus for the unit, and that relates explicitly to the particular theme. The critical points to note are that the dominant focus is the specified core learning for physical education and that this is *not* defined in terms of specific activities or sports, but rather, in terms of themes. The basis for the categorisation of physical education curricula (and thus the principle of classification informing curriculum design) is different to that currently so firmly established in our subject. Our proposed structure therefore signifies the promotion of a different voice (Bernstein, 1990, 1996) for the curriculum and reflects Crum's (1993) view that 'the essence of physical education is not "learning to move" but "moving to learn"' (p. 345).

While emphasising this distinct shift in the focus and organisation of curricula, we stress that our proposed approach certainly does *not* preclude the development of skills, knowledge and understanding associated with specific activities or sports. To the contrary, we would expect that such learning would be notably advanced by the learning focus and experiences provided in physical education and articulated in the themes (or strands of learning) established for the subject. We anticipate that curricula will therefore be explicitly concerned with matters that are fundamental to the development of participation and performance in physical activity and sport, and that physical education will thereby play a key (and perhaps far more effective) role in enabling, encouraging and extending participation and performance.

We appreciate the difficulty of trying to envisage the implementation of what may seem rather vague ideas and the need to therefore substantiate our discussion with some further detail of the curriculum developments that we are proposing. Below we provide necessarily limited debate about what *could* constitute organising themes for physical education curricula and the activity contexts that may feature in new curricula. We stress the tentative nature of our suggestions and the need for far more discussion about



curriculum design, teaching and learning in physical education as we move into the 21st century. Our hope is that our discussions here will encourage others to engage in debate with us and provide ideas that will extend current debates beyond arguably limited and limiting discursive boundaries (see, for example, Penney & Evans, 1997).

### Defining Core Learning; Defining Curricula

The latest revision of the NCPE in England can be regarded as taking a step that quite openly seeks to clarify the focus of teaching and learning in physical education. Specifically, it is proposed that '*core strands of learning*' will be established (see Casbon, 1999) and these are currently<sup>3</sup> identified as:

- acquiring and developing skills
- applying and combining
- improving and evaluating performance
- Knowledge and understanding of fitness and health. (QCA, 1999b, p. 171)

Regrettably, in the context (and particularly timescale) of this revision of the NCPE, there has not been the scope, nor opportunity to debate whether these are the desirable or appropriate strands of learning for physical education in the 21st century. Furthermore, and arguably of greater significance, is the fact that while establishing these strands, the proposals have retained a structure in which areas of activity are the focus for outline of the programmes of study<sup>4</sup> in physical education. In retaining this characteristic the proposals appear to display and promote strong classification and insulation (Bernstein, 1990, 1996) in prospective curricula. In our view this focus on areas of activity *rather than the newly created strands* signifies a fundamental conceptual tension in the NCPE, and may prove a substantial barrier to attempts to develop 'new connectivity' (see Young, 1998) in teaching and learning in physical education. Past research has highlighted the potential for new statutory requirements to be accommodated within largely unchanged units of work and patterns of teaching (see Curtner-Smith *et al.*, 1995, 1999; Penney, 1994; Penney & Evans, 1999), and we are inclined to question the degree to which the core strands identified will be foregrounded in teaching and learning in physical education. In short, with the retention of the areas of activity we see every opportunity for the retention of organisational practices and foci that continue to legitimate the long established activity-based voice (Bernstein 1990, 1996) of physical education. In our view, if we are to see a new clarity of focus in teaching and learning in physical education, the programmes of study and the associated requirements for content coverage in curricula, and schemes of work arising in schools, must be (re-)defined in relation to the established strands. The identification of appropriate (and feasible) activity contexts in which the programmes of study can be developed is where we then see the matters of flexibility in curricula design and the need for professional judgements coming to the fore, and where we suggest that new approaches to curriculum design will be needed if consistency between the voice and message of curricula (Bernstein, 1990, 1996; see also Penney, 1998a) is to be achieved.

It is perhaps worth noting at this point that our suggestions for a thematic framework for curricula are not merely abstract, but rather, have important reference points. The 'history' of our particular suggestions demands some commentary. To a great extent, our suggestions for and visions of 'an alternative' structure and emphasis have come from the realisation through comparative experiences of physical education, that 'there *are* alternatives' and alternative possibilities for the focus and structure of physical education.

Although often centring upon Health and Physical Education (HPE), rather than physical education, policy and curriculum developments in Australia have provided concrete contemporary examples of curriculum frameworks that present a notable contrast to activity-based models. In the national text for health and physical education, the strands of 'human functioning and physical activity', 'community structures and practices' and 'communication, investigation and application' are the suggested organisational framework for curricula, and those of 'human development', 'human movement', 'physical activity and the community', 'people and food', 'health of individuals and populations', 'safety' and 'human relations' provide the suggested framework for assessment (Australian Education Council, 1994a,b; see also Penney, 1998b). Developments in Australia have certainly highlighted the challenges and also tensions arising in developing such proposals in school contexts, in which different boundaries and discourses may invariably be privileged in the organisational structure of the school if not the curriculum itself (see Penney, 1998a). In addition, however, these developments have prompted invaluable reflection amongst physical education communities in Australia and the initiation of some innovative curriculum developments (see, for example, Fox *et al.*, 1997). It is direct experiences of such developments that has particularly drawn our attention to the potential for different learning priorities to come to the fore in physical education and the key role that curriculum frameworks may play in prompting such moves.

Turning attention to the specific themes that we present below, these have emerged from sustained debates between ourselves. Our discussions have involved shared reflection upon these developments in Australia and the development of the National Curriculum for Physical Education in England and Wales, upon various literature (reflected in this paper) in physical education and education more broadly that has addressed curriculum change and school subjects, upon our hopes in relation to the future focus and status of the subject, and the relationship of these hopes to contemporary policy and school contexts. Our suggestions for themes have been driven by a desire to make explicit connections between 'the present' and 'the potential future' in these terms, such that people will see that much of what they recognise and value about their subject is not only 'still there', but is central to the future developments that we propose. We emphasise that underpinning our suggestions is a desire to facilitate lifelong interest and involvement in physical activity amongst all pupils, and thus to be defining our specialism with connectivity (Young, 1998) to education as a whole, and to lives beyond school, at the forefront of our thinking.

In addition, in proposing an alternative framework we were concerned to challenge what has appeared a key omission in the development of the new proposals for the National Curriculum for Physical Education in England. Teachers and others wishing to respond to these proposals have had no scope to consider whether the strands of learning proposed for the new NCPE in England are the most appropriate, or what alternatives we could consider. Proposing alternatives at this point in time seems critical to prompt such debate. We foresee a likelihood that just as the activity-based structure has never been a matter for discussion (see Evans & Penney, 1995; Penney & Evans, 1999), so in the future development of the NCPE, these proposed strands may become a non-negotiable and fixed feature of the curriculum.

The themes that we suggest that physical education curricula should adopt as an organisational framework and pedagogical focus are, therefore:

- movement and physical literacy;
- physical activity, health and fitness;

- competition and cooperation; and
- challenge.

In expanding briefly upon each of these themes we emphasise the multidisciplinary nature of teaching and learning in physical education that we wish to see promoted in each theme. We regard this as an important characteristic to be developed throughout physical education curricula, with reference therefore being made to physical, psychological, emotional and social dimensions of physical activity. We regard all dimensions as requiring explicit reference in curricula if the aims and claims relating to these dimensions of learning are to be realised.

In addition, although we emphasise our view that the curriculum structure should be such that particular units focus upon *one* theme, we acknowledge the need for curricula to be making connections between themes at appropriate points. We are thus not only presenting a case for a *new* principle of classification (Bernstein, 1990, 1996) (i.e. based upon themes rather than activities) but also, for curricula with *weaker* classification, so that links between different dimensions of the curriculum are promoted in teaching and learning. We discuss this potential in our outline of prospective themes. However, in relation to this and in other important respects, we stress that we are not presenting a fully developed model of 'an alternative curriculum'. We identify a number of issues that demand thorough debate prior to proceeding to that level of detail, not least of which are:

- whether the themes that we have identified are regarded as an appropriate and adequate articulation of the breadth of learning that physical education is concerned to address;
- whether there should be consistency in the themes that define and structure the curriculum in primary and secondary school contexts, whether the themes should be different for the two sectors or whether different learning priorities should be addressed via different 'weighting' of themes that are common to the two sectors; and
- precisely what we regard as desirable and feasible learning to address in and via physical education for each theme at different phases of education, and the progression in learning that we would therefore be seeking to facilitate.

All of these, we suggest, are key points to be addressed in any further development of a curriculum model such as this. Furthermore, decisions on all are arguably an essential prerequisite to any further development of units or lessons that may feature within a thematically based curriculum.

Our discussion below of the proposed themes therefore reflects and acknowledges the need for these crucial matters to be addressed, and certainly, not only by ourselves. Our interest here is in generating interest in potential developments, rather than providing comprehensive proposals for them. Any development of our proposals should feature extensive and collaborative endeavour in which we will not be the only, nor necessarily the central, players.

Our first theme, '***movement and physical literacy***' focuses upon the knowledge, skills and understanding that are associated with bodily awareness, development and expression, and that underpin participation, development of performance and enjoyment in and of the wide array of physical activities that feature in modern societies. There is a need to emphasise that the knowledge, skills and understanding that we refer to are not *only* physical in nature. The focus of attention is on physical development, but the complexity of that development is acknowledged. Thus, it is recognised that there are

important psychological and sociological dimensions to physical development and that social and psychological skills and abilities required for this development, and for participation and performance in physical activities, need to be more explicit in curriculum design and teaching than may currently be the case. While physical education may often claim to contribute to these dimensions of learning, it perhaps rarely facilitates or monitors this learning in a comprehensive or structured way. We also point to the collective as well as individual issues that are relevant here and that curricula need to engage with. As well as developing awareness of one's own body and its potential, we see physical education as having a role to play in instilling appreciation of the varied capacities of others in these terms. Developing this focus in our curricula seems essential if we are to be effective in *extending* patterns of participation and performance in physical activity.

With such extension in mind, we should also recall our emphasis above of the 'wide array' of physical activities in modern society. We suggest that there is a need to review the precise nature of the skills, knowledge and understanding that are currently associated with movement and physical development, and moreover, the *range* of arenas that this aspect of physical education will thereby facilitate access to, or connections with. Questions to consider are what skills, knowledge and understanding are being privileged and whether this is with particular patterns and arenas of physical activity in mind? Is there, for example, a tendency to be devoting attention to skills, knowledge and understanding that underpin participation and performance in team games and/or organised competitive sport, over and above giving due regard to that which is essential to the pursuit of more individually orientated participation in physical activity for the purposes of health and well-being? We are not suggesting that there are rigid boundaries in relation to the movement and physical development that we would regard as a foundation for engagement in different forms of physical activity for different purposes, but rather, we are stressing the need for the foundation to have sufficient breadth so as to maximise the scope of its potential application. We need a foundation that can facilitate multiple and diverse connections.

The second theme '**physical activity, health and fitness**' centres upon the relationships between participation in physical activity and the health and well-being of individuals and societies. This theme therefore addresses the ways in which different physical activities can facilitate, but also in some forms and at some times may place at risk, physical, psychological and social well-being throughout one's life. It addresses, therefore, issues relevant to 'active futures' and lifelong interests in physical activity and health. The theme also places individual participation and individual health and fitness in the context of societies and thus considers collective, not merely individual, agendas in relation to these matters. The inclusivity of provision and participation would be key issues to consider here, with curricula seeking to promote awareness and understanding of the different health needs and interests of individuals; help *all* pupils to develop patterns of engagement in physical activity that reflect their individual needs and interests in these terms; and consider the barriers that may currently be inhibiting the adoption of such behaviours. Also emphasised here is a conceptualisation of health that encompasses cognitive as well as physical dimensions, and a conceptualisation of fitness that facilitates links with both sport and health. The focus is therefore upon 'fitness for life', with fitness for participation and performance in sport representing one aspect of a broader agenda to be addressed in teaching and learning, and cognitive as well as physical aspects of fitness being considered within this. In contemporary societies, as curriculum developments in Australia have particularly reflected (see, for example,

Australian Education Council, 1994a), there seems a need for education to be concerned with pupils' current and future *mental* health, and for physical education to recognise and pursue the contribution that it may make in relation to this concern. We should perhaps be devoting more attention to the maintenance of mental health in and via various physical activities and therefore including experiences of, for example, martial arts in the curriculum.

'*Competition and cooperation*' is a theme that addresses what may regard as defining characteristics of participation and performance in a number of physical activities and particularly, in organised sports. Here we see a need for teaching and learning to focus upon the critical links between competition and cooperation rather than to mirror the tendency (certainly amongst the media and politicians) to regard them as diametrically opposed agendas in physical education. Thus, developing team work and 'fair play' would be foci in units associated with this theme and we see important potential for initiatives developed under the umbrella of 'Sport Education' and 'Teaching Games for Understanding' to inform the development of this theme (see, for example, Almond, 1997; Alexander *et al.*, 1996; Thorpe *et al.*, 1986). The sport education model has usefully pointed to the valuable contribution that experiences in physical education make to a *range* of learning, and has arguably done much to promote and extend that range and encourage broader conceptualisations of 'skill development' and 'knowledge' relating to physical education. In addition, Sport Education points to the potential development of the 'negotiated curriculum' experiences referred to above, with students playing a more proactive role in defining these experiences and their own roles in them.

However, as we discuss further below, in this and in all of the themes, there is a need to retain a commitment to the contribution that a wide range of physical activities may make to teaching and learning. We therefore stress the need for competition and cooperation to be explored in and via a *variety of contexts*, and not only, for example, in and via team games. We suggest that other areas of activity, including individual as well as team activities, will be valuable in facilitating breadth of learning relating to competition and cooperation and that diversity in these respects can also serve to highlight relationships between individual and collective agendas. In addition, we suggest that this may be an area in which there is a need for and/or potential benefit in extending the range of activities typically featuring in physical education curricula. In seeking to develop knowledge and understanding of competition and cooperation, it may be useful to include activities that pupils are less familiar with and that demand different patterns of play, communication and teamwork. Experience of a game such as chukeball could be a context in which these aspects of learning in physical education are notably extended.

The theme of '*challenge*' may similarly be regarded as a defining characteristic of some physical activities, but also one that has perhaps been rather narrowly defined and explored in and via physical education. Again we return to the multidisciplinary nature of teaching and learning that we advocate. In this context, we therefore point to the need for physical educationalists to be addressing the psychological and social challenges, as well as the physical challenges, associated with and arising in contexts of participation and performance in physical activity. With this broad perspective comes the potential linkage of the theme of challenge to a wide array of physical activities and environments. For example, learning experiences centring on dance would have as justifiable a place within a unit of work focusing on challenge as experiences of an activity such as rock climbing. Many pupils participating in a dance lesson may face notable personal challenges, the roots of which may well lie in social issues relating to body image and the

gendered labelling of certain physical activities. We stress the need for diversity in experiences and contexts if the multidisciplinary nature of the theme is to be articulated in teaching and learning. Obviously, the precise nature of the contexts ultimately incorporated in a unit for this and indeed, any of the themes, would need to take due account of a number of issues, not least of which will be the physical resources, time and expertise on hand, but critically, also pupils' prior experiences and learning. Coherency and continuity must be a focus amidst diversity.

The different dimensions of 'challenge' that we have pointed to could certainly be addressed within the context of a single area of activity. For example, while one dance lesson may specifically focus upon extending the physical demands, another lesson may be directed towards developing awareness and understanding of the inhibitions that some children and adults may experience in dance contexts. In this or a further lesson, situations (perhaps notably 'public' performance or assessment situations) could be designed to enable psychological as well as sociological aspects of challenge to be addressed. When and whether it is appropriate to move to other activity contexts to address particular aspects of learning associated with a theme are, therefore, matters to be debated amongst the profession and for individual departments and teachers to make decisions upon. In the theme of competition and cooperation, we could envisage units of work that centre upon games, but if the purpose of the unit is to develop learning about different forms of cooperation relevant to participation and performance in a range of sporting contexts, then we would see great value in incorporating a variety of games in the unit, demanding different patterns of cooperation. Diversity in the learning experiences would seem to be critical to developing both range and depth of learning in relation to the theme. We see the potential for progression towards increasingly complex unit designs in the later years of education and see units that incorporate contrasting activity contexts as presenting pupils with both prompts and challenges to address transferability in their learning. Arguably this remains an inadequately developed aspect of learning in physical education, and we therefore see a need for units of work that explicitly seek to challenge the established boundaries to knowledge both within and between different areas of activity. A point to also mention here is that the *length* of units may need to be a further area in which we see greater flexibility emerging in curricula.

A final issue to comment upon in relation to our proposals for themes is the matter of links between the various themes, and the ways in which these may be explored in and via curricula. Our discussion above has undoubtedly assumed and implied a degree of overlap between various themes. Most notably, it is clear that the development of learning associated with 'movement and physical literacy' will be a prerequisite to successful engagement in learning experiences associated with the other themes. This points to the need to consider further the appropriate balance between the respective themes at particular points in education, and the ordering of units that will be most appropriate at different times. The connection referred to above is not, however, the only one that we are concerned to acknowledge and promote in curricula that may emerge from a thematically oriented model. There are clearly relations to be pursued between 'challenge' and 'competition and cooperation' and valuable linkages to be made between 'challenge' and 'physical activity, health and fitness'. Arguably, a key role for physical education is to facilitate all pupils finding challenges that are attainable and that will retain their interest beyond school and, here again, there is important scope and a need to pursue greater pupil involvement in the design and focus of their own learning in physical education.

### Pedagogical Practices

In this final section of our discussion we return to the heart of our concerns and discussion: the experiences and learning of children in physical education lessons. In focusing upon the relations that shape those experiences, we are acknowledging that 'new look' schemes or units of work are no guarantee that our hopes and visions relating to the learning that we are seeking to promote, and type of learners that we wish to see in schools, will be realised. A focus on the detail of teaching is certainly a critical dimension to consider, arguably *the* most significant, and one that others have highlighted as inadequately pursued in contemporary contexts of policy and curriculum development in physical education (see, for example, Evans *et al.*, 1999; Mawer, 1999). In Bernstein's (1990, 1996) terms we are specifically concerned with the capacity of the 'message' to either reinforce or challenge the voice of the curriculum. In addressing this matter, we have a twofold interest. On the one hand, we want to pursue the potential for new messages to counter a long established voice; on the other, we are aware of the potential for 'traditional messages' to deflect attempts to establish a new voice in and for physical education. As Penney (1998a) has highlighted in relation to developments in Australia, establishing a thematically based framework in policy documents is no guarantee of new emphases emerging in teaching and learning. So, what approaches, methods and pedagogical relations can be regarded as consistent with a 'critical pedagogy for social justice' and with the 'new voice' that we have proposed for the curriculum?

We can identify a number of features that arguably need to direct developments and previous initiatives in physical education (particularly Teaching Games for Understanding—TGFU—and Sport Education) provide some valuable pointers in these respects. Specifically, we see a need for *weaker framing* (Bernstein, 1990, 1996) that is consistent with a conceptualisation of knowledge production as an ongoing and shared endeavour in education and that will facilitate the development of valued 'connections' between learning, and with more pupils' lives. Curricula would therefore need to feature less directive, more student centred and individualised teaching that facilitates creative roles in and approaches to learning. However, Young (1998) has rightly pointed to the need to problematise concepts such as 'student centred learning'. We are prompted to take a more detailed and critical look at all teaching methods, and to be clear *what* learning students have been accorded a 'central role' in designing and developing, and whose and what interests are being advanced in this process. We emphasise a need for attention to focus upon the development of approaches that centre upon negotiation of experiences, but that also ensure relevance of these experiences for each and every pupil. We acknowledge that clear visions of such learning experiences are scarce. Our task here is not to attempt to provide such visions, but instead to try to identify characteristics that need to be built into future developments.

In relation to these interests we draw attention to the value, but also some notable shortcomings in contemporary initiatives in physical education. Drawing upon Evans' (1990) observations, we contend that initiatives have essentially failed to '... presage the arrival of a form of practice which helps challenge either the hierarchies of knowledge or the social hierarchies which prevail inside the subject, within the broader work context and outside the school' (p. 141), such that '... the dominant concerns remain unquestionably ameliorative and hedonistic rather than socially transformative' (p. 160). Although Sport Education has been valuable in extending student roles, we do not yet know enough about students' views of these experiences and furthermore, see the model as failing to adequately embrace a socio-critical agenda. While Sport Education contexts

may have seen the development of more democratic and equitable practices in schools, the tension that seems destined to arise between these practices and those beyond schools, where other discourses remain dominant, seems largely overlooked (see also Shehu, 1998). Once again, we therefore highlight the need for collective agendas to be addressed in and via physical education and for the transformative potential of education to be pursued.

In advancing these ideas a useful framework to adopt as a reference point for the design of units of work and learning experiences, and for mapping progression in learning, may be one focusing upon what Engestrom (in Young, 1998) has termed 'expanded learning'. Young (1998) explains that Engestrom's conceptualisation of 'expanded learning' comprises three steps in a cyclical process that progressively develops higher learning skills:

- the *context of criticism* in which the teaching and learning practices of the school are challenged and the tensions between a school view of the world as expressed in textbooks and the views expressed in the media and elsewhere are explored;
- the *context of discovery* in which new concepts are developed and used;
- the *context of practical application* in which new ideas are tried out in the real world. (Young, 1998, p. 154, original emphasis)

Inherent and explicit in these contexts is the transformative potential of physical education.

### Conclusion: Facing and Shaping the Future

We do not propose that realising this potential will be easy, or that it can be achieved overnight. Following Evans & Davies (1997), we stress that successful development demands highly skilled teachers and comprehensive support structures. We are all too aware of the constrained contexts in which teachers and teacher educators are currently working and of the ongoing absence of adequate supports structures and professional development opportunities in these arenas. We see a need for acknowledgement of these contexts and constraints in any attempts to advance proposals for curriculum development in physical education. Specifically we see a need for *partnerships* to feature in developments. New partnerships between teachers and pupils are arguably the most important in the developments that we have discussed, but if connections are to be made to pupils' lives beyond schools, greater involvement of parents and of representatives of other agencies providing participation opportunities seems crucial to the success of developments. Management of such relations, and negotiation of roles, are thus further challenges arising for the profession.

In conclusion, we turn attention to the *potential* for some or any of our suggestions to come to fruition. As indicated throughout, we regard substantial change within the subject as a matter of necessity if it is to have educational worth in the 21st century. Whether or not those either within or beyond the profession will agree with our proposed directions for developments, and can then facilitate their realisation, remains to be seen. As we have emphasised, there is not only *one* possible future for physical education. It is for all within the profession to address and debate what the futures should be and to ensure that policy and curriculum developments then reflect the visions established, and facilitate their realisation. We have tried to offer an openly articulated set of themes and compelling arguments that we hope will foster critical discussion and debate.



### Acknowledgement

This paper extends work presented by Penney at the Physical Education Association of the United Kingdom (PEAUK) Centenary Conference, April 1999), University of Bath and reported in the *British Journal of Physical Education* (Penney, 1999). The comments received from the reviewers of an earlier draft of this paper were greatly appreciated. They have helped us to further clarify and extend our thinking, and we hope that this is reflected in the paper now presented.

*Correspondence:* Dr D. Penney, Department of Physical Education, Sports Science and Recreation Management, Loughborough University, Loughborough, Leicestershire LE11 3TU, UK. Tel.: (0) 509 223494 (direct)/(0) 509 223282; Fax: (0) 509 223971.

### Notes

- [1] The whole National Curriculum is currently undergoing a revision, with new statutory requirements due to be implemented in September 2000.
- [2] 'Areas of activity' refers to the categories/groupings of activities established for the NCPE. Specifically, these comprise: games activities, gymnastic activities, athletic activities, dance activities, outdoor and adventurous activities, and swimming activities and water safety.
- [3] Proposals for the revision of the National Curriculum are currently the subject of formal consultation after which further amendments may be made.
- [4] 'Programmes of study' refer to the matters, skills and processes which must be taught to pupils in order for them to meet the objectives set out in the attainment target for the subject. The attainment target identifies the knowledge, skills and understanding that pupils of different abilities and maturities are expected to develop (DES/WO, 1991).

### References

- ALEXANDER, K., TAGGART, A. & THORPE, S. (1996) A spring in their steps? Possibilities for professional renewal through sport education in Australian schools, *Sport, Education and Society*, 1(1), pp. 5–22.
- ALMOND, L. (1997) Sport education in schools, in: L. ALMOND (Ed.) *Physical Education in Schools* (2nd edn) (London, Kogan Page).
- ARMOUR, K. & JONES, R.L. (1998) *Physical Education Teachers' Lives and Careers: P.E., Sport and Educational Status* (London, Falmer Press).
- AUSTRALIAN EDUCATION COUNCIL (1994a) *A Statement on Health and Physical Education for Australian Schools* (Carlton, Curriculum Corporation).
- AUSTRALIAN EDUCATION COUNCIL (1994b) *Health and Physical Education—A Curriculum Profile for Australian Schools* (Carlton, Curriculum Corporation).
- BAALPE (1998) Council statement, 7 February.
- BERNSTEIN, B. (1990) *The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse. Volume IV Class, Codes and Control* (London, Routledge).
- BERNSTEIN, B. (1996) *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity: Theory, Research, Critique* (London, Taylor & Francis).
- CASBON, C. (1999) National curriculum review—key points in the review of the order, *British Journal of Physical Education*, 30(1), pp. 6–7.
- CRUM, B.J. (1993) Conventional thought and practice in physical education: problems of teaching and implications for change, *QUEST*, 45, pp. 336–356.
- CURTNER-SMITH, M.D., KERR, I.G. & HENCKEN, C.L. (1995) The impact of the National Curriculum Physical Education on teachers' behaviours related with pupils' skill learning: a case study in one English town, *British Journal of Physical Education Research Supplement*, 16, pp. 2–12.
- CURTNER-SMITH, M.D., TODOROVICH, J.R., LACON, S.A. & KERR, I.G. (1999) Teachers' rules, routines, and expectations prior to and following the implementation of the

- National Curriculum for Physical Education, *European Journal of Physical Education*, 4(1), pp. 17–30.
- DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT (DfEE) (1998) *Teachers Meeting the Challenge of Change* (London, the Stationary Office).
- DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE/WELSH OFFICE (DES/WO) (1991) *Physical Education for Ages 5–16. Proposals of the Secretary of State for Education and the Secretary of State for Wales* (London, DES).
- DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE/WELSH OFFICE (DES/WO) (1992) *Physical Education in the National Curriculum* (London, DES).
- EVANS, J. (1990) Ability, position and privilege in school physical education, in: D. KIRK & R. TINNING (Eds) *Physical Education, Curriculum and Culture: Critical Issues in the Contemporary Crisis* (London, Falmer Press).
- EVANS, J. & DAVIES, B. (1997) Editorial introduction, *Curriculum Journal*, 8(2), pp. 185–197.
- EVANS, J. & PENNEY, D. (1995) The politics of pedagogy: making a National Curriculum Physical Education, *Journal of Education Policy*, 10(1), pp. 27–44.
- EVANS, J., DAVIES, B. & PENNEY, D. (1999) The social construction of teaching and learning: the politics of pedagogy, in: C. HARDY & M. MAWER (Eds) *Learning and Teaching in Physical Education* (London, Falmer Press).
- FERNANDEZ-BALBOA, J.-M. (1997) *Critical Post-Modernism in Human Movement, Physical Education and Sport* (New York, State University of New York Press).
- FOX, B., TIMMINS, R. & MACDONALD, D. (1997) Working in the HPE key learning area: three case studies of curriculum change, *ACHPER National Journal*, 44(1), pp. 8–11.
- GILLIVER, K. (1999) Physical education 2000: review of the National Curriculum, *British Journal of Physical Education*, 30(1), pp. 4–5.
- GOODSON, I.F. (1995) *The Making of Curriculum: Collected Essays* (London, Falmer Press).
- LOCKE, F.L. (1992) Changing secondary school physical education, *QUEST*, 44, pp. 361–372.
- MACDONALD, D. & BROOKER, R. (1997) Moving beyond the crisis in secondary physical education: an Australian initiative, *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 16(2), pp. 155–175.
- MAWER, M. (1999) Teaching styles and teaching approaches in physical education: research developments, in: C. HARDY & M. MAWER (Eds) *Learning and Teaching in Physical Education* (London, Falmer Press).
- PEAUK (1998) PEAUK mission statements, *British Journal of Physical Education*, 29(2), pp. 4–7.
- PENNEY, D. (1994) 'NO CHANGE IN A NEW ERA?' The impact of the Education Reform Act (1988) on the provision of PE and sport in state schools. *PhD thesis, University of Southampton*.
- PENNEY, D. (1998a) School subjects and structures: reinforcing traditional voices in contemporary 'reforms' of education, *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 19(1), pp. 5–18.
- PENNEY, D. (1998b) Positioning and defining physical education, sport and health in the curriculum, *European Physical Education Review*, 4(2), pp. 117–126.
- PENNEY, D. (1999) Physical education: in changing times is it time for a change? *British Journal of Physical Education*, 30(4), pp. 4–6.
- PENNEY, D. & EVANS, J. (1997) Naming the game: discourse and domination in physical education and sport in England and Wales, *European Physical Education Review*, 3(1), pp. 21–32.
- PENNEY, D. & EVANS, J. (1999) *Politics, Policy and Practice in Physical Education* (London, E & FN Spon, an imprint of Routledge).
- QUALIFICATIONS AND CURRICULUM AUTHORITY (1999a) *Terminology in Physical Education* (London, QCA).
- QUALIFICATIONS AND CURRICULUM AUTHORITY (1999b) *The Review of the National Curriculum in England: The Consultation Materials* (London, QCA).
- SHEHU, J. (1998) Sport education: ideology, evidence and implications for physical education in Africa, *Sport, Education and Society*, 3(2), pp. 227–235.
- THORPE, R. & BUNKER, D. & ALMOND, L. (Eds) (1986) *Rethinking Games Teaching* (Loughborough, Department of PE and Sports Science, University of Loughborough).
- WALKER, R. (1998) Letter to Secretary of State for Education and Employment, 3 February.
- WRAGG, E.C. (1997) *The Cubic Curriculum* (London, Routledge).
- YOUNG, M.F.D. (1998) *The Curriculum of the Future: From the 'New Sociology of Education' to a Critical Theory of Learning* (London, Falmer Press).