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Abstract:

In England, recent years have witnessed unprecedented central government policy commitment to investment in physical education and sport. The rationale for investment variously lies with the state of the health of the nation, obesity levels with associated health care costs predicted at £2 billion annually, sedentary lifestyles and in high drop-out rates of young people from sport. At the same time, research into effects of physical activity and cognitive functioning, influence on development of positive psycho-social qualities, and studies showing rising levels of attendance and attentiveness when children engage in regular exercise while exclusions and disruptive behaviour fall, provide evidence that a sports (broadly defined) active lifestyle can improve health, counter anti-social behaviours and foster social inclusion. Such juxta-positioning of apparent opposites is rather paradoxical. The government’s investment commitment has resonance in such a context by attempting to reconcile the historical duality of physical education and sport in partnership approaches.

This article addresses physical education/sport partnership issues along with government and quasi non-governmental agency interventions and the response of a higher education training provider, University of Worcester, to consequent occupational opportunities in present day England. Additionally, as a precursor to, and in order to provide a more informed contextual setting for the issues, interventions and provider response to be addressed, an overview of the evolution and subsequent development of physical education and sport is provided.
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Introduction

In England, recent years have witnessed unprecedented central government policy commitment to investment in physical education and sport. The rationale for investment variously lies with the state of the health of the nation, rising levels of obesity amongst the population in general and young people of school age in particular with health care costs predicted at £2 billion annually, increases in sedentary lifestyles and in high dropout rates from sport, estimated at around 70% of young people giving up almost all physical activity as soon as they leave school (Kelso, 2002). Generally the situation is perceived as a ‘ticking health time-bomb’ with a generation of fatter, less fit and less active young people, raised on a diet of nutritionally deficient ‘junk’ food, high in fat, salt and sugar. At the same time, and maybe expediently so for policy-makers, research into the effects of physical activity and cognitive functioning, the influence on development of positive psycho-social qualities, and studies showing rising levels of attendance and attentiveness when children engage in regular exercise while exclusions and disruptive behaviour fall, provide evidence that a sports (broadly defined) active lifestyle can improve health, counter anti-social behaviours and foster social inclusion. Such juxtapositioning of apparent opposites is rather paradoxical but it may be indicative of a failure of school physical education programmes to deliver relevant messages, or is one issue that national and local sports policies and strategies seem to have failed to address or both. The governmental investment commitment responses (arguably reactions) have resonance in such a context by attempting to reconcile the historical duality of physical education and sport in partnership approaches.

This article aims to address physical education/sport partnership issues along with government and quasi non-governmental agency interventions and the response of a higher education training provider, the University of Worcester, to consequential occupational opportunities in present day England. Additionally, as a precursor to, and in order to provide a more informed contextual setting for the issues, interventions and provider response to be addressed, we present here an overview of the development of school physical education and sport in England: from dualism to partnership.

Development of school physical education and sport in England:

The story of the late 19th century evolution and subsequent developments reveals influences variously shaped by military, political, economic, social, cultural, philosophical and pedagogical factors fostered either by individuals or institutions. Essentially, school physical education in England evolved out of two (‘dual’) traditions: organised games and competitive sports associated with 19th century private boarding schools; and physical training associated initially with military drill and then Swedish therapeutic gymnastics in the Ling tradition in state elementary schools from 1871 onwards.

Developments in sport as an important component of the physical education curriculum are inextricably linked with the antecedents in English private (boarding) schools in the 19th century. Though not exclusively so, these institutions for the sons (and later daughters) of the privileged laid down enduring foundations. Initially sporting activity was encouraged to structure boys’ leisure as an antidote to ill-discipline, immorality and general anti-social conduct, that is, as a form of social control. This is an early indicator of one of the ascribed roles in present day society in school and out-of-school settings of sport being administered to assist in the resolution of anti-social behaviour. The later 19th century English private schools’ ‘muscular Christianity’-grounded athletic traditions and belief in character development, social accomplishments and moral and ethical codes inspired the ideal of participation outranking winning. The private schools legacy was potent not only for subsequent developments in sport in wider society in general but also for curricular programmes in schools, because by the early 20th century, sport was fast emerging as a significant feature in generically termed physical education programmes in various parts of the world as testified in accounts of the evolution of physical education curricula and extra-curricular contexts pervasively across European education systems.

The second of the ‘dual’ traditions emanated from what essentially represented a ‘victory’ of Swedish over German influences in a ‘battle’ initially largely fought outside the education sector. The Rousseau inspired pioneering work of Base-dow, Salzmann and GuthsMuths at the Dessau ‘Philanthropium’ had inspired Swiss Army Officer Phokion Heinrich Clias to develop a system of gymnastic exercises, which the British Army and Navy deemed as suitable for instilling discipline of a military kind and so were adopted in their respective recruits’ drill training courses in the early 19th century. It was only after Archibald MacLaren in the 1850s opened his Oxford Gymnasium and after an invitation to run courses at Army Headquarters in Aldershot that the German system was introduced into private schools, where Friedrich Ludwig Jahn’s ‘Turnen’ formed the basis of interschool gymnastic competitions, and after 1875 into some elementary schools by Non-Commissioned Officers (NCOs) trained instructors. It is relevant here to point to the perceived necessity for physically fit armed forces’ personnel to extend and defend the British Empire: the politics of colonialism were bound up with military might! It was the likes of Swedish Central Gymnastics Institute graduates Indebetou, (1838), Ehrenhoff (1840) and Georgii
(1849) who, through courses and with the aid of pamphlets, introduced Swedish ‘Medical Gymnastics’ based on Per Henrik Ling’s system into the country. Hungarian immigrant, Mathias Roth, a homeopathic medical practitioner, championed the cause of this form of medical gymnastics because of its held therapeutic values for homeopathic ‘medicine’ and perceived wider benefits. Thus, commenced the battle of the two systems with Roth fervently lobbying the Army, the Government and Government Boards, Royal Commissions, School Boards, politicians and Her Majesty’s Inspectors of Schools (HMI) by alluding to comparative situations in Sweden, Prussia, Switzerland, Russia and France. He pointed out that the neglect of physical education and hygiene within the English education system was the principal cause in the decline in the general health of the nation. Roth’s vociferous arguments heralded the addition of medical health and social welfare to factors shaping developments in physical education. The irony of this 19th century ‘health of the nation’ situation is not lost in the perceived parallels of the late 20th and early 21st centuries’ concerns over fitness, health and obesity levels amongst the population at large and young people in particular and the reactive responses of various agencies. The Swedish case was enhanced by London School Board invitations to Concordia Löfving (1878) and Martina Bergman, later Bergmann-Osterberg, (1881) to develop training programmes for elementary school teachers. Bergmann-Osterberg’s Dartford College graduate ‘disciples’ subsequently established female physical educators at the forefront of developments in England. By 1886, the government established the Cross Commission in seeking a ‘safe and scientific system of physical training’ reported against elaborate gymnastics apparatus (associated with German gymnastics). The bottom line was that Swedish gymnastics were cheap! Economic realities were a significant influence in the adoption of the Swedish system: large numbers of children could experience exercise drills with minimal facility or equipment provision; and in any event ‘therapeutic gymnastics’ were seen to be more health beneficial (concerned with whole body development) and so accorded with social policy, and the discipline, obedience and order inculcated through systematic exercises to command both with military requirements and the politically motivated social control of the children of the working classes. In any case, German Gymnastics were male and performance oriented, they were unsuitable for ‘rational’ physical training requirements (too acrobatic and apparatus oriented), over-developed the upper body and were ‘non-scientific’! (Hardman, 2002).

At the time of the Franco-Prussian War, the Elementary Education Act (1870) introduced non-denominational state schools with bye-laws requiring attendance of children aged 5-13. An amendment to the Act in 1871 permitted the inclusion of drill in the curriculum. These initial ‘physical education’ programmes reflected methods utilised by the Army; indeed in the last thirty years of the 19th century, part-time ex-army, non-commissioned personnel taught much of the permitted ‘military drill’ syllabus. The 1902 Board of Education Model Course of Physical Training was based on the Army training handbook of the day. The ‘official’ shift away from military drill was initially seen in the 1904 Syllabus of Physical Exercises, which contained elements from the Swedish system and then on the appointment of the national Chief Medical Officer (CMO), Dr. (later Sir George), Newman at the Board of Education with responsibility for school physical education. The Swedish system was a core feature of the Board of Education syllabuses for Physical Training in 1909 and 1919.

Diffusion of organised games and competitive sports throughout wider society was in part reinforced by the 1902 Education (Balfour) Act, which was responsible for the introduction of nation-wide state secondary education. The Act facilitated a merging of the two ‘traditions’, for it was in secondary schools that the sport and games institutionalised in the private boarding schools were more developmentally appropriate. The gradual pervasion of the education system by sport and games was manifested in the governmental Board of Education’s supplementary syllabus handbook on games in 1927 and the 1933 ‘Syllabus of Physical Training’ for use in state elementary schools. The Board of Education Syllabuses (1909, 1919, and 1933), as well as showing a gradual decline in support for the Swedish system, revealed the changes in philosophy from a drill-based programme, mainly concerned with inculcating discipline and obedience, producing good posture and promoting fitness through the exercise of muscles and joints to an ‘English system’, which drew from an amalgamation of the various imported (other influences included Danish Gymnastics, the Scandinavian ‘glädje’ movement and the Austrian ‘natural movement’) and home-grounded systems, and aimed at optimum development of the individual through a broader-based curriculum. This philosophical shift was also a clear indication of pedagogical change, which was associated with developments in educational psychology. It was a ‘shift’ that was later identifiable in the McNair Report’s (1942) commentary that “this subject...is a fundamental and integral part of general education” for which “…the term physical education (is) preferable to P.T.” and, perhaps just as overtly, if not more so, demonstrated in physical education curriculum trends in the second half of the 20th century. The final demise of the subject’s inclusion on remedial and therapeutic grounds occurred in 1945 when responsibility for physical education
was passed from the CMO (Chief Medical Officer) to the Ministry of Education. Indeed, the CMO Report for the years 1948-1949 highlighted the change of focus (particularly in primary schools) in physical education intimating that the Board of Education’s administrative absorption of physical education represented an acknowledgement of its educational purpose and function. The CMO specifically linked physical education with the term “Movement” (Ministry of Education, 1952a, p.16). It was a prophetic link as subsequent developments especially in its official acceptance at ministerial level in 1972 were to prove.

Some twenty years on from the CMO’s prophetic commentary and the Ministry of Education’s 1950s’ guideline publications (Moving and Growing, 1952b; and Planning the Programme, 1953), the Department of Education and Science (DES) issued its Movement - Physical Education in the Primary Years (1972), in which value was placed on children being given more responsibility for their own rate and pattern of work, with teachers being sensitive to individual needs and differences: child-centred delivery became the pattern of the day! These significant modifications of the ‘English System’ were embedded in influences stemming from the discovery learning theory and Rudolf Laban’s analysis of movement, which pre-empted innovative approaches to gymnastics’ teaching (educational gymnastics), movement education in general with its variations in didactical approaches in both primary and secondary schools, and which arguably were the forerunners of the activity for understanding approaches of more recent years (Hardman, 2002).

An aspect of the school physical education and sport delivery system in England (which serves as an example of ‘duality’ and ‘partnership’ working in unison) was the emergence of a comprehensive programme of extra-curricular activity, traditionally serviced by teachers on a voluntary basis. Such activity has its antecedents in Boys’ private schools of the 19th century. As attitudes to the concept of the female body image changed, so competitive sport began also to feature in Girls’ schools towards the end of the 19th century. In the emerging state sector, the spread of universal education facilitated the extension of school sport. From informally arranged ‘sides’, games in school playgrounds, competition in a range of sports developed through local town/district, county, regional to national levels, administered by hierarchically structured associations. Extra-curricular activity came to encompass a broad range of sporting activity engagement and its significance has been sustained up to recent times. However, as a result of a number of inter-related factors, (changing societal attitudes and leisure activity patterns, curriculum developments, and teacher ‘industrial’ action over contractual issues etc.), there has been, so some authorities claim, a marked reduction both in the numbers of pupils willing to participate and in teachers prepared to offer or contribute to the extra-curricular programme. A Secondary School Heads Association survey pointed to a diminution in weekend inter-school fixtures referring to the non-availability of pupils because of Saturday and Sunday jobs, teachers’ work loads and rigidity of contracts, the disapproval of voluntary activities by teacher union representatives and selling off of school playing fields as contributory factors to the deterioration in the amount of extra-curricular activity (Daily Telegraph, 1995). Nevertheless, the basic template of extra-curricular activity laid down over a century ago, still plays an important role in the physical education system in English schools.

**Government and quasi-governmental agency policy interventions: dualism and partnerships in unison**

After over a century of state-provided education, a government sponsored national curriculum for children aged 5-16 was implemented in phases in England (and Wales) in 1989 with physical education introduced as a statutorily required curriculum subject in 1992 for the first time in its history. The National Curriculum was intended to provide a broad and balanced curricular framework for 5-16 year olds, through which there would be an all-round improvement in the quality of the teaching process and learning experiences. Its development as a whole, and for Physical Education specifically, reflected central government’s concern for a return to ‘traditional’ values and content in the school curriculum. Physical Education was included as a Foundation Subject throughout the compulsory years of school attendance over four key-stages (5-7 years; 7-11 years; 11-14 years; and 14-16 years), which embraced so-called Programmes of Study activity areas (Athletics, Dance, Games, Gymnastics, Outdoor and Adventurous Activities and Swimming). The reality of the situation in many schools was, however, that Games, as the only compulsory ‘Programme of Study’ throughout the four key stages, was the dominant feature of the physical education curriculum. The evident bias in content of the physical education national curriculum merely underpinned what already was widely practised. Any analysis of curriculum content even in the halcyon days of “Movement” education would have revealed the dominance of games. Surveys in the 1980s by HMI (Her Majesty’s Inspectors) (DES, 1983; DES, 1985) looked at the education offered to children in middle schools and found that whilst games, gymnastics, athletics and swimming were offered, not all aspects were given equal emphasis within each year group or in each school: in the 1983 survey, expressive movement and dance...
were less frequently taught than other areas of the physical education curriculum; in the 1985 survey, dance was offered in only half the sample. The generic activity, *Games*, accounted for at least 40% of the physical education curriculum. The sport-based and games dominated focus was later reinforced through central government-driven initiatives announced in the ‘White Paper’ policy document (*Sport - Raising the Game*), in which then the British Prime Minister, John Major, asserted in a prefatory statement:

“Competitive sport teaches valuable lessons which last for life... (Sport) is one of the best means of learning how to live alongside others and make a contribution as part of a team. It improves health and it opens doors to new friendships..., it is at the same time one of the defining characteristics of nationhood and pride. My ambition... is to put sport back at the heart of weekly life in every school. To re-establish sport as one of the great pillars of education alongside the academic, the vocational and the moral” (Department of National Heritage, 1995, p.2).

The rationale also explicitly made the case for sport in the physical education curriculum. The case was based on Victorian era values in character formation, health promotion, moral development and socialisation. Physical education was identified as having an important role in perpetuating sport to achieve the ascribed outcomes through a physical education-sport partnership. Competitive sport, especially team games, was given prominence because the Government believed “fair play, self-discipline, respect for others, learning to live by laws and understanding one’s obligations to others in a team are all matters which can be learnt from team games properly taught” (Department of National Heritage, 1995, p.7).

In pursuit of such goals, it was recognised that the two hours’ aspirational curriculum time allocation was in itself insufficient to achieve the desirable outcomes of healthily fit young people associated with physically active lifestyle and additional (extra-curricular) time was advocated, a ‘back to the future’ restatement of the values of the historically embedded school extra-curricular activity programmes. In order to extend this so-called ‘sporting culture’ beyond the confines of school, the policy document expressed the need for a corporate approach and identified Further and Higher Education Institutions, sports clubs, local government authorities, youth services, the Sports Council and regional agencies, Governing Bodies of Sport, as well as private sector sponsorship as having contributory roles to play and acting in partnership with central Government. Hence, the vision was one of integral partnership of physical education and sport within broad-ranging educational and social institutional agencies’ partnership providers. The vision was further developed against a background of a deterioration in physical education in primary and secondary schools in England marked by decreases in curriculum time allocation, impoverished facilities and equipment, perceived lower esteem and status, inadequate teacher preparation, especially for primary school physical education and reductions in In-service Training (INSET) programmes and courses as well as poor British performances in international competitions. The general situation prompted the then Sports Council to seize the initiative to become actively engaged in school physical education developments. Its strategy for sport contained within its 1997 policy document, *England, the Sporting Nation*, expressed the view that school is where most children first encounter sport; hence, schools are in a prime position to encourage young people’s lifelong participation in sport. The Council acknowledged that the activities on offer in the curriculum do not always add up to those preferred by young people but, nevertheless, emphasised the importance of ensuring that young people experience a breadth of sporting opportunities in compliance with the Physical Education National Curriculum. The document also stressed the values of sport within the ‘extended’ curriculum asserting that extra-curricular activities contribute to personal development, broaden pupils’ interests and experiences, expand their opportunities to succeed and help to build good relationships with the school (The Sports Council, 1997). Two years on, the Council in its re-packaged form, ‘Sport England’, articulated the value and role of sport in schools in a context of schools having a statutory role for the delivery of physical education. Sport England recognised the role of schools in the development of physical competencies and positive sporting attitudes within the curriculum and then in encouraging young people to continue participation in sport, through the provision of links and opportunities in the extended curriculum and by the community links established by the school. At national level, it launched several initiatives aimed at “more people involved in sport, more places to play sport and more medals through higher standards of performance in sport” (Sport England, 1999, p.2) and were underpinned by the principle of inclusion through equal opportunities to participate.

One vehicle to improve physical education provision and delivery and fulfilment of government policy outcomes was the establishment of Specialist Sports Colleges (SSCs), originally conceived by the Conservative government in the early 1990s and then adopted and expanded by the present Labour government, to provide opportunities for educational centres of excellence initially in technology, arts and languages and later extended to include sport. The first SSCs were designated in 1996. The SSCs are intended to have an extended school day,
improved coaching, significantly better facilities and to work closely with neighbouring secondary schools as well as establish links with ‘feeder’ primary schools, through sports co-ordinator appointments and designated ‘link’ primary teachers. The SSCs are well resourced and are seen by government as central to sport strategy in terms of talent development. Practices between the Specialist Sports Colleges vary: some emphasise broad participatory models, others follow more narrow and selected activities’ models; some have developed positive relations with feeder schools, whereas others have neglected links because of time/distance constraints.

Ministerial orders for curricula were modified in a revamped national curriculum model (Curriculum 2000) in 1999 under the advice of the School Curriculum and Assessment Authority (SCAA) in response to concerns within the physical education profession about the predominance of games and issues surrounding the relevance of the content of the physical education curriculum. For physical education, Curriculum 2000 aspired to two hours (that is 120 minutes) for the physical education curriculum AND extra-curricular activities across the four key stages! Unlike the preceding curriculum, competitive games became compulsory at key stages 1-3 only; at key stage 4 there is a choice of other activities. However, the sting remains in the tail because government continues to expect schools to provide competitive games for children who wish to exercise this option. The spirit of John Major’s prefatory comments in Sport – Raising the Game and the deeply embedded legacy of 19th century private boarding schools in the physical education curriculum were not exorcised.

Since 2002, central government in England has demonstrated a clear commitment to a partnership of physical education and sport with investments of £459 million to support school physical education and sport-related developmental initiatives and £750 million into infrastructural provision via New Opportunities funding. The policy plan for delivering government commitments was contained within the Cabinet Office Strategy Unit’s Game Plan (2002) strategy document, in which it is claimed that sport can contribute in key areas that could include social inclusion, community cohesion, reducing youth crime, life long learning, regeneration, economic benefits and health and well being of communities, and in which there is a vision to make England an active and successful sporting nation. The mission is to work with others to create opportunities for people to become involved in sport, to stay in sport and to excel and succeed in sport at every level. The Game Plan recommended that the government should adopt a ‘twin track’ approach to:

- increasing participation in sport and physical activity
- developing sustainable improvements in success in international competition

Whilst recognising that some of their respective values may differ, physical education and sport do have significant shared common agenda interests and properly should operate in partnership to achieve the common goals. Significantly, the joint Department for Education and Skills/Department of Culture, Media and Sport 2004 published High Quality PE and Sport for Young People offers guidelines for the recognition and achievement of high quality PE and sport in schools and clubs with a clear indication that leaders, managers, teachers and coaches should work together to positively influence young people’s physical activity behaviours.

Further evidence of central government’s commitment to excellence and winning is seen in the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) Agenda (Caborn, 2004), where there is a clear confirmatory statement on what is actually being done:

- increasing access to school sports through two hours’ entitlement
- improving the quality and quantity of community sport clubs
- focusing upon quality coaching in schools and the community
- investing in facilities and protecting playing fields
- developing the National Framework and Regional Action Plans for sport in order to raise participation.

In 2004 Sport England also launched a regional plan for sport (2004 –2008) with the familiar themes of participation, widening access, improving performance, improving health, creating safer and stronger communities and improving Education through physical education and sport all featuring prominently within the aims of developing sport throughout the country. The Sport England strategy has introduced new initiatives with culpable responsibilities that feature a coaching task force, Learning & Skills Councils, learning hub projects and a Sport and Education Manager. A Skills Active programme has been created to give the nation 21st century skills with the intention to help individuals acquire and maintain development of necessary skills to support sustained employability, a more rewarding life and a greater contribution to their lives. Administrators and managers have been appointed to activate the strategic plan.

Physical education and sport partnership: issues and institutional provision

It is clear that central government is determined to focus upon physical education and sport togeth-
er in its vision for young people in the foreseeable future; it would also appear that physical educationalists are recognising that more collaboration is needed if any sort of relationship is to succeed. Despite the desire of the government to integrate the values of physical education and sport with major investment support, there is a suggestion that the two cultures still operate in isolation. A difficulty in forging partnerships has been mistrust of each other’s agendas (e.g. schools/clubs, teachers/coaches). A challenge is to develop catalysts, which protect the integrity of all partners (Campbell, 1998). Those who wish to unite physical education and sport must accept that many educationists remain deeply concerned about being linked too closely with modern top-level sport in view of some of its excesses and negative aspects: the exploitation of young children and youth, the use of performance-enhancing drugs with long term, harmful side-effects, violence in and surrounding certain sports, corruption, and the effects of excessive commercial and/or political pressures on athletes of all ages. Moreover, the ‘trickle down’ effect, whereby the resourcing of elite sport is alleged to influence others and the continuum of a broad pyramidal base producing more top-level performers at the apex, is not sustained as an argument. Sport has Janus face characteristics. On the one side, its links with ‘citius, altius, fortius’, associated with Olympism, generate ideals of the individual pursuit of excellence, which is frequently or generally more closely (but incorrectly) identified as elitism; on the other side, it has connotations of all-embracing sport for all, which more readily equates with grass-roots or mass sport with its emphasis on recreational outcomes rather than performance outcomes. It is little wonder that uneasy relationships have existed between physical education and recreational sport on the one hand, and highest level, increasingly professional, sport on the other. The inherent tensions here need to be resolved. Physical education teachers are not employed to produce elite sports performers or highly specialized physical recreationists. Primarily they are educators and facilitators. However, in pursuit of the optimum development of young people, they do have responsibilities for creating awareness of opportunities for activity engagement in out-of-school and beyond school settings. Thus, at the very least, their professional preparation should embrace familiarisation with pathways for participation in wider community multi-sector provision and the achievement of personal excellence. Bridges do need to be built, especially to stimulate young people to participate in physical activity outside of, and beyond, the school during their leisure time.

One institutional development in attempting to bridge gaps between physical education and sport ‘cultures’ is a strategic initiative introduced at the University of Worcester, UK, to ensure that future key practitioners in physical education and sport including teachers, coaches, sports development officers, co-ordinators, administrators and volunteer personnel not only empathise and support each others work but also have practical experience and realistic awareness and understanding before entering the ‘real world’ and attempting to meet the needs of all young people. Following a strong tradition established over more than half a century in teacher training and fifteen years of bachelor-degree programmes in Sports Science/Sports Studies, the University of Worcester has launched a series of programmes to differentially and yet empathetically prepare graduates to contribute to the development of young people through PE and Sport activity. The three-pronged strategic approach comprises programmes in: a) Physical Education (non Qualified Teacher Status, QTS) as a joint degree with Coaching Science or Sports Studies; b) Sports Coaching Science; and c) an extensive community/outreach programme that embraces schools and colleges (primary and secondary and Further Education (FE) Institutions, clubs (all levels), a number of social groups, sports’ governing bodies and coaching staff from a broad range of sports and disciplines.

The new degree in Physical Education was formulated to meet the changing needs of students at local and national levels: as a joint ‘honours’ subject, it would be of particular interest to anyone wishing to pursue a Post-Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE), which brings qualified teacher status at either primary or secondary school level. The ‘joint programme’ arrangement allows students flexibility of career pathways. During the programme, the students have an opportunity to undergo work-based experience placements within schools, which provide valuable ‘real-world’ experience. Within a range of modules, which would include studies of physical education and the Physical Education National Curriculum as well as pedagogical and didactical approaches and interventions in teaching, there is also the opportunity to acquire:

- an understanding of the work of regional sports development and coaching officers and the British Association of Advisors and Lecturers in Physical Education (BAALPE)1 headquarters based on the University of Worcester campus.
- National Governing Body coaching awards available through the Coach Education Programme

1 At their respective Annual General Meetings in July 2005, members of the Physical Education Association of the United Kingdom (PEA UK) and BAALPE voted to merge the two agencies to form a single national association as from 1 January 2006.
The overall aim of the BSc (Hons) course is to provide a comprehensive introduction to the conceptual and practical issues that underpin sports coaching. The programme is characterised by a reciprocal relationship whereby all partners must make a series of commitments in order to obtain the significant benefits. This format is instrumental in transforming the vision of sport and physical education working together into a reality. The strategic planning and organisation is central to effective sport and physical education development for all. The key partners within the scheme can be identified as: Higher Education Institutions (HEI’s); Students (under/postgraduates); Primary and Secondary Schools; Sports Clubs and organisations. Specific features for each ‘Partner’ can be summarised as follows:

a) **The Higher Education Institutions** provide:
   - High quality specialist expertise encompassing a multi-disciplinary approach to Coaching Science and Physical Education at all levels
   - Extensive training for mentors who guide the students while on coaching/teaching experience placements
   - Opportunities for partnership coaches to interact within modules that relate to the National Curriculum (gaining an insight into the aims of the physical education)
   - Quality assurance for all activities and individuals within the process
   - Central venues for a range of events involving key partners.

The benefits accruing to the Higher Education Institution include: the securing of pertinent placements for students; opportunities to acquire insight to, and further understanding of, the needs of the community; and provide students with meaningful degree level qualifications that are tailor-made for this specialist field. Concomitantly, this healthy partnership may lead to positive recruitment of prospective students in the future.

b) **The Under/Postgraduates** provide partners with:
   - Expertise and knowledge acquired throughout the programme of study
   - Dissemination of current theoretical principles and subsequent practical application
   - Appropriate role models for young people in schools and the community
   - Enthusiasm to feed the ‘hunger’ of the challenging young people
   - The time required to nurture the development of young people
   - Officials and administrators for extra curricular school events and community projects
   - Assistance to teachers and coaches

In return, the students receive the guidance from mentors whilst gaining invaluable experience; they acquire knowledge and understanding in the disparate subject areas, coaching and academic qualifications as well as a meaningful curriculum vitae that will serve them when seeking future employment; and, on occasions, students may receive payment.
c) Primary and Secondary Schools provide partners with:
- Experienced mentors and teachers who work with students and schoolchildren
- In-service training (INSET) for coaches and students and contribute to lectures within the undergraduate/postgraduate courses
- Facilities and venues for all partners to use
- Vocational placements
- Enhanced opportunities for young people in physical education and sport
- Opportunity for professional development for existing staff

In return, the schools will receive motivated teaching staff who develop skills and knowledge in a range of sport and physical activities. There are increased options for children in curricular/extra curricular and community activities. There is an opportunity to pursue accreditation, provide assistance ranging from highly qualified coaches to enthusiastic volunteers in a variety of activities and there will be an inclusive programme which will increase participation for all children at all levels of performance.

d) Sports Clubs and Organisations provide partners with:
- Experienced mentors and coaches who work with students and schoolchildren
- INSET training for teachers in both primary and secondary schools and a contribution to lectures within the undergraduate/postgraduate programmes
- Facilities and venues for all partners to use
- Opportunities for National Governing Body accreditation
- Vocational placements

By way of 'pay-back', sports clubs secure realistic experiences for their existing coaches; gain an insight into, and understanding of, the values of physical education; have the opportunity to recruit aspiring coaches, players, officials and volunteers; acquire understanding of recent developments in academic research; and obtain sports science support from HEI's.

Concluding Comments

Physical education in England has made significant progress from the late 19th century, when in the early years the concern was for the immediate health and fitness of the nation and the emphasis was on training the physical in state elementary schools and cult of ‘Athleticsism’ for the privately educated rich elite. From the early decades of the 20th century, when most of the initiatives were discipline and short-term fitness related, physical education in English schools has developed from a narrowly defined teacher directed subject to its current position of orientation to pupil-centred learning, with an accent on learning ‘how to learn’, health-focused physical education, links with other subject areas, development of assessment procedures and partnership schemes with the local community. The progression has been variously marked by the emergence of an English system shaped by ‘imported’ external influences on to which were grafted indigenous ‘English games’ and other competitive sport activities and which was subsequently modified by innovative pedagogical and didactical approaches. These innovations ushered in discovery learning, movement education and activity for understanding approaches to the teaching/learning interface. From the 1950s onwards, teachers were encouraged to adopt different teaching styles and to apply more general educational principles to the teaching of physical education. There was more emphasis placed on the acquisition of movement skills, which placed greater demands on the teacher to understand the fundamental principles of movement to plan balanced progressive schemes of work for their children. Inexorably, the trend in the second half of the 20th century was from the ‘doing’ child, through the ‘doing and thinking’ child to the ‘reflective thinking’ child of the post-1990s physical education national curriculum era. In the 1990s, the inclusion of physical education within the national curriculum established its legitimacy as a subject and gave credibility to its status. However, despite the philosophical and pedagogical intention supported by politico-ideological will, it is clear that the dominant physical education curriculum ideology in schools remains sport, particularly games, driven. The pedagogically inspired movement approach era has been replaced (if ever it needed to be replaced) in the return to the quest for ‘traditional values’. It is a return, which is endorsed for selfish (and often political) motives by government supported agencies and the autonomous national governing bodies of sport – for the inclusion policy of ‘more people’ read ‘more medals’! Whilst a balanced curriculum is a rhetorical ideal, the reality is a school physical education curriculum, which is dominated by the potent legacy inherited from sporting traditions established in 19th century private boarding schools.

As demonstrated in the historical development overview, the relationship between physical education and school sport, including extra-curricular activity, is neither a new nor a recent phenomenon in English schools. Implicit throughout historical development is the notion of partnership between the dual domains of physical education (narrowly defined) and sport whether in schools or the wider community. Indeed, government Board of Education Circulars 1444 and 1445 in 1936 testify to central government recognition of the need for partnerships to promote and foster the benefits of provision for, and participation in, physical and sporting
activity. It is the (re)interpretation or arguably the reconstruction of the relationship between them in a mutually supporting partnership with a common agenda that is novel.

This vision of partnerships intimates the changing concepts of physical education and sport hitherto dualistically and respectively defined by Lee (2004), for example, with physical education placing emphasis on “learning in a physical context, the purpose of which is to develop knowledge, skills and understanding, and to promote physical development” and sport comprising “a range of physical activities where emphasis is on participation and winning” (p.6). Inherent terminological shifts are seen in ministerial and media representatives’ predispositions to treat physical education and sport as indistinguishable or interchangeable concepts (refer, for example, Smith, 2001 and Bee, 2005). The concept of physical education and sport functioning in partnership has consequences for education and training programmes for an employment market where job competences can embrace sectional and cross-sectional occupations. In the present climate it would appear that volunteers, coaches, teachers, co-ordinators and administrators out in the field are beginning to recognise the work of each other slowly and are attempting to bridge the gap that clearly exists between physical education and sport. The pro-active approach in Worcester can ensure that, in the future, the University’s sport graduates should be suitably equipped to contribute to the development of Britain’s young people in physical education and sport whilst still recognising that traditional values exist.
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**TJELESNI ODGOJ I SPORT U ENGLESKOJ: DUALIZAM, PARTNERSTVO I UVJETI ZA REALIZACIJU**

**Sažetak**

Od 2002. godine središnja vlada u Engleskoj pokazuje jasno opredjeljenje za uspostavljanje partnerskog odnosa između tjelesnog odgoja i sportske kultura. To se nasljeđe očituje u dobro uhodnim kazalačima i tradicionalnim aktivnostima koje obuhvaćaju širok teren trijumfa, odjeknula u stručnim krugovima zbog naglašavanja partnerskog odnosa između tjelesnog odgoja i sporta. Ova ideja učinkovita je učinila većinu učitelja sportskih subjekata i njihovih znanja o tjelesnom i izdvojenom odgoju na razini prvih godina 14-16 godina, u okvir nacionalnog kurikulumu, idealno o uravnoteženom kurikulumu, realnosti i retoriku, ali je ovo planiranje u većini slučajeva konstantno modificirano, uz pomoć innovativnih pedagoških i didaktičkih pristupa, u smjeru razvoja od tjelesnog odgoja u engleskim školama.

Evolucijski razvoj tjelesneg odgoja u školama i sporta u Engleskoj karakterizira pomak od dualizma (u 19. st.) organizirane igre i natjecateljski sport, povezivački su se s privatnim školama-internatima, dok su se kondicijski usmjereni treninzi prvo povezivali s vojnom obukom, a kasnije s Lingijskom tečajnom gimnastikom u državnim osnovnim školama. U svrhu odgovarajućeg drugog komplikiranog područja, tijekom povijesnog razvoja implicitno je oduzeta važna uloga partnernosti, dok su se konfliktni odnosi između tjelesnog odgoja i sporta često uklanjeni u funkciji zdravlja i života.

tezi razvoja sporta, koordinatori, upravljači i volontersko osoblje, ne samo da se međusobno dobro razumiju i podržavaju jedni druge, već da steknu i praktično iskustvo i razumijevanje te da postanu svjesni pravog stanja stvari prije no uđu u 'stvarnost' i počnu raditi na zadovoljavanju potreba mladih ljudi. Sveučilište Worcester pokrenulo je seriju studijskih programa kako bi na različite načine, ali s punim međusobnim razumijevanjem, pripremilo diplomande za doprinos razvoju mladih kroz tjelesni odgoj i sportske aktivnosti. Trosmjerni strateški pristup sadrži programe: a) Tjelesni odgoj (status nekvalificiranog učitelja, QTS) kao zajednički studijski smjer za stjecanje zvanja trenera (Coaching Science) ili trenera određenog sporta (Sport Studies), što bi studentima trebalo omogućiti fleksibilnu radnu karijeru; b) studij primijenjene kineziologije u sportu (Sports Coaching Science), program koji studentima pruža sveobuhvatan uvid u konceptualna i praktična znanja potrebna sportskom treneru i nastoji diplomirane studente pripremiti za široki raspon zanimanja za visokoškolski educirane kadrove i c) opsežan program otvoren prema društvenoj zajednici u najširem smislu koji obuhvaća škole i fakultete (osnovne i srednje škole, visokoškolske institucije), klubove (svih kvalitetnih razina), brojne društvene grupe, vladajuća tijela iz područja sporta, kao i trenera i osoblje u širokom rasponu sportova i sportskih disciplina. Proaktivni pristup na Sveučilištu Worcester jamči da bi, u budućnosti, diplomirani studenti sportskih fakulteta mogli biti odgovarajuće osposobljeni za rad s mladima u tjelesnom odgoju i sportu, a uz očuvanje prepoznatljivih tradicionalnih vrijednosti.