

Notice: This is the author's version of a chapter published in

Capel, S. & Blair, R. (eds.) *Debates in Physical Education* (2nd edn.) London: Routledge.

The chapter appears here in its prepublication format in lieu of the publisher's version of record. The book can be found at <https://www.routledge.com/Debates-in-Physical-Education/Capel-Blair/p/book/9781138586871>

Recommended citation:

Bowler, M., Newton, A., Keyworth, S. & McKeown, J. (2020) 'Secondary School Physical Education' in Capel, S. & Blair, R. (eds.) *Debates in Physical Education* (2nd edn.) London: Routledge. pp.170-189.

Chapter 11

Secondary school physical education

Mark Bowler, Angela Newton, Saul Keyworth and Joanne McKeown

Institute of Sport and Physical Activity Research and School of Teacher Education
University of Bedfordshire, Bedford, UK.
Email: Mark.Bowler@beds.ac.uk

Introduction

Enter quietly, remove jewellery, place your valuables in the tray and change quickly without fuss. As per last week, once I press play and the 'Mission Impossible' theme tune starts, you've got precisely 3 minutes and 27 seconds to be changed and in the sports hall – let the mission commence...

Does this changing room scenario sound familiar? Is it a 'mission' to enthuse and engage all pupils to change promptly and with minimal fuss (as well as engage and enthuse all pupils throughout a lesson)? Is the minimal time available for physical education utilised as efficiently and 'actively' as possible? We acknowledge that the daily changing routines of some pupils being slow and resistant to change requires some attention and thought; for example, why are some pupils resistant to get changed? Is this because, as described by Myerson (2005), physical education can inspire or alienate, elicit feelings of pride or prejudice, ecstasy or agony in equal measure?

However, it is not just some pupils who stand accused of being slow and resistant changers. Recent work by Casey and Larsson (2018), Kessel (2016) and Robinson and Randall (2016) has suggested that some physical education teachers and the subject itself have been slow to change to keep pace with societal change. Casey and Larsson (2018, p. 1) go as far as stating that the subject is caught in 'Groundhog Day', namely 'a situation in which a series of unwelcome or tedious events appear to be recurring in exactly the same way'. One plausible reason for this situation is that many physical educators struggle to see the subject through any negative filter in terms of aims, content and delivery. We see this first-hand when meeting new recruits to initial teacher education (ITE), who predominantly report a positive experience and their desire to pass this on to their future pupils. Clearly, this does not

pertain to all teachers and, as Dowling (2011) noted, some people enter teaching from an 'alienated' entry point and are sensitised to teach differently, or as hooks (1994) said, 'to transgress'. Further, there are also physical educators who have transformed their curriculum practices. Therefore, in the context of teacher socialisation we argue that all physical education teachers should be clear about their view of the subject, considering their physical education journey, their pedagogical history and how this has impacted their values and beliefs, vision and practices. We believe, as Warren (2011) suggested, that tracing past experiences in and outside the subject and school can lead to a better understanding of personal beliefs, how they were developed and how they influence practice. Thus, a key point of reflection in this chapter is that teacher's beliefs, understanding and behaviours shape young peoples' experiences and views of physical education.

In order to support a vision for developing an inclusive and engaging physical education curriculum in secondary schools that enables all pupils to achieve the aims of the subject, this chapter focuses on key issues faced by secondary physical education teachers. It debates three key issues: (1) curriculum aims and purposes (the 'why'); (2) the content (activities, movement forms, experiences or themes) for physical education (the 'what') and (3) possibilities regarding 'how' the curriculum content might be taught in order for the subject to realise its aims within and beyond the school gates.

The first section of the chapter debates the 'why', the aims and purposes of secondary physical education, discussing three different perspectives through the lenses of value orientations and teacher socialisation literature. This section asks what are the possible aims and purposes of the subject so that it remains relevant for society? The second section connects the overall aims of the subject with a discussion relating to the 'what', the different content – activities, movement forms, experiences or themes that might be taught in a secondary physical education curriculum in order to support young people to develop their knowledge, understanding and competence for physical activity and human movement. We discuss the prevalent multi-activity curriculum as well as other alternative approaches related to the 'what' of the subject. The final section adds the dimension of 'how' physical education might be taught in secondary schools in order to realise its aims. This section focuses on the potential benefits of utilising diverse pedagogical approaches to support pupil learning. It is important to acknowledge that the issues discussed in this chapter are longstanding and therefore the aim is to provide a critically reflective account to stir the reader to consider current and future practices in secondary physical education.

Aims of secondary physical education

Capel and Whitehead (2013) stated that it is important that teachers are clear about what they want their pupils to be able to do, know and understand as a result of their engagement in physical education throughout secondary school. However, it is argued that some teachers (and the profession as a whole) are not always clear what the aims of the subject are or should be, nor are they always clear about how they should or indeed do interpret the aims of secondary physical education. Clear aims enable the most relevant subject content and teaching approaches to be selected, supporting more effective and meaningful pupil learning and progress. For example, most physical educators claim that promoting pupils' healthy active lifestyles is a key aim; however, many children and young people are leading inactive lifestyles. Is this at least partly because content and teaching approaches are not

appropriate to enable this aim to be achieved? To this end, has physical education failed the very young people it aims to serve?

Multiple aims have been cited for the subject, including developing motor and social skills, cognitive, moral and emotional development, as well as health and fitness (see, for example, Bailey et al., 2009; Whitehead, 2015). Why are there multiple goals for the subject? One reason is educational policy and the nature of physical education as a subject, which has changed its aims or focus to remain current, even important, to society. Another reason is the diverse values and beliefs held by teachers, which provide a filter for the prioritisation of these in practice.

Given the widely cited aspirations, or aims, of physical education, it is not difficult to see why some within the profession, as well as those outside physical education, are unclear about its priorities. Indeed, Kirk (2006) argued that these have left the profession 'ambivalent' about its role and Pate and Hohn (1994) argued it has a 'muddled mission'. It has been described as the 'chameleon of all curricula' (McKenzie, 2001), 'changing its colours' in order to meet specific government, educational, school, physical activity and health priorities. In short, it is trying to do 'too much' in terms of affective, cognitive, physical and social learning outcomes (see Bailey et al., 2009; Casey and Goodyear, 2015; Kay, 2003; Kirk, 2013). Therefore, given the large number of potential aims and differences in practice, can we reconcile these different aims? Coming up with a unified set of aims and purposes for the subject is perhaps futile given, for example, the different contexts in which physical education is being taught and the increasingly bespoke needs of different demographics of society.

However, an understanding of the multitude of perspectives on the aims of physical education can enrich both understanding and practice in the subject. Furthermore, a teacher is centrally important in ensuring that the aims are appropriate for the pupils they are teaching. Teachers' perspectives on how the aims of physical education are defined (such as in perspectives 1, 2 or 3 below), and the enactment of these in the what (content) and how (teaching approaches) of the physical education curriculum are influenced by their occupational socialisation their value orientation(s). We argue, therefore, that it is important for teachers to critically consider the aims discussed here and elsewhere and to reflect on which are most suitable for the pupils they are teaching. In order for teachers to design a child-centred curriculum, a critical understanding of their own and others' philosophies, or value orientations, is fundamental to its success.

The aims of physical education have been considered elsewhere (see, for example, Capel and Whitehead, 2013; Kirk, MacDonald and O'Sullivan, 2006; Whitehead, 2010, 2015); therefore, this section seeks to develop a critical debate on teachers' value orientations and outlook on their priorities for aims of the subject. These orientations act as a moral compass and subsequent filter which illuminate or restrict a person's views of the subject. Following this discussion, we consider the merits, differences and similarities of three different perspectives on the aims of secondary physical education. These perspectives are provided to stimulate debate and are not intended to champion particular viewpoints, or indeed exclude others.

Over 25 years ago Ennis and Chen (1994) identified five value orientations that indicate the priorities of physical education teachers. A disciplinary mastery orientation prioritises pupils'

physical proficiency and performance-related knowledge. A learning process orientation prioritises developing pupils' understanding to enable them to learn new knowledge and skills. A self-actualisation orientation prioritises the development and nurturing of pupils' personal growth. A social responsibility orientation emphasises pupils' abilities to become socially responsible. Finally, an ecological integration orientation prioritises developing pupils' personal meaning through movement using a balanced curriculum that considers the needs of the learner, subject matter, educational context and social concerns.

In more recent research into value orientations of student physical education teachers, Capel (2016) found that, with few exceptions, most individuals in the study prioritised learning process, ecological integration and self-actualisation orientations. As positive as these findings are for child-centred practices, there always remains the scope for 'slippage' (Bowe, Ball and Gold, 1992) from rhetoric to reality, from policy to practice.

Clearly there could be debate around the ability of these value orientations to stand the test of time. The Occupational Socialisation Model (Lawson, 1986) suggested that student and newly qualified physical education pass through three phases of acculturation – anticipatory socialisation or apprenticeship of observation (pupil), professional socialisation (ITE) and organisational socialisation (subsequent role as a teacher). Whilst a teacher may have a leaning towards a specific value orientation(s), translating these into practice is perhaps easier said than done due to the salience of their own and colleagues' schooling, ITE and level of agency afforded by the context in which they work (e.g. social, geographical and political). Research consistently attests that a teacher's own physical education experiences are a blueprint for their later teaching, with the ITE phase seemingly having little-to-no long-lasting effect (Brown and Evans, 2004).

Despite the importance of personal value orientations of teachers, aims (as well as content and teaching approaches) undergo a level of interpretation and reappraisal as they are met by collective departmental 'value orientations' as well as by the agency particular workplace conditions afford (Capel, 2016; Ennis and Chen, 1994). Furthermore, as Webb, McCaughy and MacDonald (2004) discussed, teachers' practices are also shaped through power relations emanating from above (e.g. senior leadership and external inspectors (e.g. in England the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted)), laterally (e.g. peers in department/school) and below (e.g. parents/guardians and pupils). In short, these points influence, for better or worse, how teachers' visions for the subject can be realised in practice. In the next section, we consider three different perspectives on the aims of physical education.

Perspective 1 (Siedentop, 2002)

Talking from a wider perspective on physical education, youth physical activity and sport (for which he uses the umbrella term 'sport') in America, Siedentop suggested four potential goals for sport (including physical education): (1) the educative goal, concerned with the educational and developmental benefits of sport; (2) the public health goal, concerned with the health benefits sport provides; (3) the elite development goal, concerned with assisting the most talented and interested young people to pursue excellence and realise their full potential and (4) the cultural preservation goal, concerned with preserving, protecting and enhancing sport practices.

This perspective focuses on four goals of physical education, but importantly considers the subject's influence alongside participation in physical activity and sport. It should therefore be remembered that, as a physical educator (not an instructor or sports coach), some of the goals identified by Siedentop could form a more central focus whereas others could form a peripheral focus for a curriculum. For example, the idea of the elite development goal (with its emphasis on the most talented and interested young people) will seem irrelevant to those who believe that physical education is 'for all'.

Perspective 2 (International Physical Literacy Association (IPLA), 2017)

In this perspective, physical education plays a significant role in developing physical literacy, defined as 'the motivation, confidence, physical competence, knowledge and understanding to value and take responsibility for engagement in physical activities for life' (IPLA, online). Physical literacy is an inclusive concept – for all, as appropriate to an individual's endowment and should be regarded as a journey throughout the life course rather than an end product (Whitehead, 2010, 2019). Within this perspective, a key point for discussion is that physical literacy is a goal of physical education and is not something that is taught *per se*. Whilst life-long engagement in physical activity is a core goal for many physical educators, how physical literacy is interpreted, understood and manifested within curricula can vary significantly and this can affect its inclusivity and impact on pupils (Shearer et al., 2018). Shearer et al. (2018) continued that the perspective is highly laudable but it presents a difficulty in its realisation within and between international contexts, which has significant implications for the alignment of teachers' aims with the 'what' and 'how' of the subject.

Perspective 3 (Association for Physical Education (AfPE), 2015)

The subject association for physical education in the UK, the AfPE, claims that physical education 'involves both "learning to move" (i.e. becoming more physically competent) and "moving to learn" (i.e. learning through movement, a range of skills and understandings beyond physical activity, such as co-operating with others)' (AfPE, 2015, p. 2). This perspective suggests that physical education has the dual function of developing pupils' physicality whilst also educating them in a broader sense. Whilst 'learning to move' captures the subject's uniqueness as the sole area for educating young people physically, 'moving to learn' suggests greater potential for developing a broad range of life skills. The former risks treating the body and mind separately, whilst the latter may dilute the physical nature of the subject and conflict with similar 'life skill' goals claimed by other curriculum subjects. AfPE suggests 'both' are imperative, although the aims of a school's secondary physical education curriculum could prioritise either of these perspectives. In deciding the level of 'balance', teachers and departments need to consider the unique features and opportunities that physical education can offer that are different to what other school subjects offer, whilst also reflecting on important wider outcomes that are potential, yet realistic aspirations for their pupils.

In supporting a critical stance regarding the aims of physical education, we have explored three different perspectives. Whilst Siedentop identified four broad, yet explicit goals of physical education, AfPE suggested two diverse aspirations and Whitehead considered physical literacy as a core goal of physical education. Each perspective has both complementary and contrasting elements which will resonate to a greater or lesser extent depending on value orientations.

Once aims are prioritised, it is important to decide how these could be realised in practice, recognising that this may not always be possible, for a number of reasons (see above). The next two sections build on the issues of prioritising curriculum aims and purposes and discuss the ‘what’, the content of secondary physical education, and then the ‘how’, the pedagogical approaches used to teach the curriculum. Both of these ultimately determine the extent to which the aims are achieved. However, whilst the ‘what’ and ‘how’ of teaching are considered separately below, it is the expert ‘fusion’ of subject matter and pedagogy that is key to unlocking positive learning experiences for pupils. In fact, definitions of pedagogy refer to a multidimensional perspective including learners and learning, knowledge in context and teachers and teaching (Armour, 2011; see also Kirk, MacDonald and O’Sullivan, 2006; Rovegno, 1998) which indicates that these elements should not be separated in considering what effective secondary physical education should look like in any one context.

‘What’ to teach in secondary physical education

A guiding principle for organising and delivering an engaging and productive physical education curriculum is that it should be rich in breadth, depth and balance. What is meant by breadth, depth and balance, and how best to realise these in practice are, however, ongoing debates for the profession (Kirk, 2010; Lockwood, 2000; Penney and Chandler, 2000; Penney and Evans, 1999), at least in part, because teachers have different priorities (due to socialisation and value orientations), and are often not thinking in the same way, moving in the same direction or acting in the same way. As with any enactment of policy, there are varying interpretations and understanding of a curriculum and hence, breadth, depth and balance.

Evans and Penney (1995) highlighted that, in reality, teachers need a significant degree of desire and aptitude in interpreting a curriculum in order to turn it into a reality. This raises the question, ‘how important is breadth, depth and balance to teachers?’ – not just in what they say, but importantly how actions thereafter align (or not) to this. For example, although breadth, depth and balance have been referenced in various iterations of the National Curriculum Physical Education (NCPE) in England (e.g. Department of Education and Science and the Welsh Office (DES/WO), 1992; Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA), 2007; Department for Education (DfE), 2013b), the level of prescription and emphasis has altered. However, teachers have a level of autonomy in ‘what’ content they teach. Freedom in terms of ‘what’ to teach allows teachers and departments the freedom to select specific content. This allows scope for taking a ‘preferred reading’ that either most closely aligns to teachers’ beliefs, competencies and situational dynamics or is prioritised by heads of department and others, e.g. to focus on particular games in which school teams compete. This freedom in terms of ‘what to teach’ generates debate regarding the breadth, balance and relevance of physical education in many secondary schools and impacts on the physical education experience of pupils.

Considering the issue of breadth of curriculum and using an example from England, the current NCPE (DfE, 2013b) includes the aim to ‘develop competence in a broad range of activities’. In the authors’ experience, although many schools opt for a broad curriculum, designed to support children to develop their confidence to get involved in physical activities and sports beyond school and throughout their lifespan (DfE, 2013b), this is frequently interpreted as a broad range of games activities, but often less breadth in other activity types such as the aesthetic, lifetime and adventurous activities (DfE, 2013a; Fairclough, Stratton

and Baldwin, 2002; Penney, 2006). A broad curriculum, which has also been referred to as a multi-activity, sports-technique-focused curriculum (Kirk, 2010), which is 'a mile wide and an inch deep' (Kirk, 2010, p. 7), is frequently characterised by short blocks of learning in a variety of activities, which provide a wide range of introductory experiences. This has been argued by many teachers as a means to encourage young people to find an activity they enjoy and foster their subsequent life-long participation. A multi-activity curriculum is also attractive to some teachers as it may also demand less depth of content knowledge as they teach a number of activities, each for relatively short periods of time. However, as an alternative argument, does the dominance of the multi-activity, sports-technique-focused curriculum in secondary physical education pose one of the biggest threats to the achievement of the subject's legitimate learning outcomes (Kirk, 2010)?

Another perspective is whether pupils' confidence, competence and interest can be developed more effectively by increasing the depth and reducing the breadth of learning. Greater depth of learning through teaching fewer activities in any one year could support young people to develop greater competence and confidence, increasing their subsequent likelihood of participating in physical activity across the life course (Whitehead, 2010). This is reinforced through research which has highlighted that self-efficacy and perceived competence are crucial determinants of future participation in physical activity (Bauman et al., 2012; Biddle, Mutrie and Gorely, 2015; Sallis, Prochaska and Taylor, 2000). Debate around longer blocks of work, with increasing depth, at least theoretically, has the potential to support a more generic interpretation of human movement, emphasising a variety of 'movement types', as opposed to blocks of a single activity such as a single invasion game. Further, this may have a positive impact on the number and variety of pupils who participate in school and community sport and physical activity and the generation of greater school-club links.

Fewer activities are taught over the course of an academic year if blocks of work are longer; therefore, if overall curriculum aims are to be realised, a point of discussion regarding what is taught through these lessons is vitally important. In order for all young people to achieve the subject's broad aims, there is a need for them to access a breadth of content across and within a variety of movement types. An example from games activities would be the use of a generic interpretation such as teaching a genre of games rather than a specific game. This may deepen pupils learning and their development of transferable principles, movements and techniques more effectively. This is maybe particularly relevant in the early secondary school years. The debate regarding which approach works best is perhaps located firmly in how a department or an individual teacher views the aims and purpose of physical education and how they interpret these in relation to the broader social, cultural, political and economic context in which they teach.

One way that teachers and departments interpret breadth of curriculum is by ensuring pupils experience each of the content areas of activity in the curriculum, described in various iterations of the NCPE (e.g. DES/WO, 1992) as athletics, dance, games, gymnastics, health-related physical education, outdoor and adventurous activities and swimming (i.e. aim for breadth across 'activities'). Several alternative categorisations to guide high-quality curriculum planning in physical education have been proposed (e.g. Murdoch and Whitehead, 2013; Penney and Chandler, 2000; Whitehead, 2010). For example, in categorising various 'forms of movement', Murdoch and Whitehead (2013) suggested a curriculum which includes breadth and balance in the 'adventure form', the 'aesthetic and

expressive form', the 'athletic form', the 'competitive form', the 'fitness and health' form and the 'interactional/relational form'. They did not specify the precise activities or vehicles for learning; instead, they emphasised the type of movement and the range of contexts that, in their view, pupils should experience in order to be physically educated. As with a categorisation on areas of activity, we argue the need for breadth and balance between and within these movement forms. Teachers therefore need to consider critically, effective ways in which, for example, each form could be manifest (beyond the obvious alignment with already dominant activities), in order to realise their aims for the subject.

In considering breadth in any of these categorisations of content, teachers may also wish to consider less frequently taught activities. For example, what value could combat activities (e.g. boxing or judo) or cycling (e.g. road, off-road, BMX (bicycle motocross)) add to the secondary curriculum? (The same question could be asked of other under-represented or marginalised activities within the curriculum.) In relation to breadth within activity areas, what benefits could those activities which are deemed marginal or emerging bring to the curricula? For example, in relation to marginalised activities, greater diversity of water-based activities (e.g. synchronised swimming, diving, water polo, personal survival, rowing, sailing or water-based exercise) could align with and further support the high level of adult participation in swimming (Swim England, 2016) through an activity which is both inclusive for all (Amateur Swimming Association (ASA) 2014) and rich in diverse benefits for participants (ASA, 2014; Jorgensen, 2013; Royal Life Saving Society (RLSS), 2017; Stubbs and Cumming, 2017).

Whilst there is an argument that cost can be a barrier to inclusion in some of these activities, we argue that within cost constraints, the curriculum should only be limited by teachers' imagination in order for all pupils to achieve the stated aims of the subject. In addition, teachers may consider how growing trends, such as 'student-designed games' (or games making) (Vidoni and André, 2018), may also help their pupils work towards achieving the aims of the physical education programme. A central tenet of games making, for example, is to make games for learning, rather than merely to play games for learning, a clear alignment with AfPE's (2015) aspirations of both learning to move and moving to learn. Student-designed games can also overcome the potential issue with much games teaching, which alienates many pupils, by giving them opportunities to design, trial and review games which are appropriate for all involved (Vidoni and André, 2018). It could be said, however, that student-designed games, in some instances, can skew the curriculum towards a prioritisation of life skills over movement skills. Again, we would argue that this relates back to the earlier discussion about aims and purpose of physical education.

Let us be clear here – we are not suggesting that less frequently taught activities are simply added to the curriculum, creating further fragmentation. Rather, if breadth is considered in terms of activities taught, we are suggesting that the content is considered carefully with both breadth and balance in mind. For example, teachers could honour breadth within activity areas, but not as an approach to reduce the offer in such a way that one activity area dominates, such as teaching a curriculum dominated by games (invasion, net/wall, striking and fielding) or, for example, swimming (although this could be considered to provide a breadth of experiences based on the varied aquatic activities available, such as competitive, aesthetic, adventure and challenge, individual, team and health/ fitness). Further, benefits of deeper learning can only be realised if teachers give careful consideration to how content is taught and also the nature of the physical learning experiences themselves.

Another contemporary debate in secondary physical education surrounds the relevance of content selected for inclusion in the curriculum for all young people. One argument is that the dominance of games and sport-based activities within secondary physical education curricula is not reflective of the type of activities that are popular with adults. For example, Sport England's (2017) Active Lives survey indicated that so-called lifetime activities, such as going to the gym, exercise and fitness and other individual pursuits, are more popular with the adult population than many team games and sports. Interestingly, the lifetime approach to physical activity has been established for a long time, with Ross et al. (1985, p. 76) defining lifetime activities as those which can easily be 'carried over into adulthood because they generally need only one or two people'. Establishing a balance of activities may be difficult in many schools given the marginalisation of lifetime activities in the physical education curriculum (Fairclough, Stratton and Baldwin, 2002; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), 2014). This might be due, at least in part, to the value orientations of teachers.

One argument for the inclusion of lifetime activities is that the secondary physical education curriculum should closely match the type of activities that adults are most likely to participate in. However, an alternative argument is that, despite adult participation trends, schools should not necessarily offer pupils these activities at a younger age – instead arguing for activities which pupils enjoy currently, at a particular age, and that can develop other skills and characteristics (see Fairclough, Stratton and Baldwin, 2002; Lund and Tannehill, 2015). Central to this latter argument is that young people 'do' physical activity differently and enjoy many different activities from adults (Green, 2010). For example, a recent survey by the Youth Sport Trust and Women in Sport (Youth Sport Trust, 2018) rated the top five activities that girls and boys wanted to do in physical education as football, trampolining, dodgeball, swimming and parkour. However, Fairclough, Stratton and Baldwin (2002) warned that exposure to a range of lifetime activities is not enough, by itself, to encourage life-long physical activity; pupils must also develop feelings of enjoyment, competence and self-determination.

One way of managing the dilemma of which activities, movement forms, experiences or themes are most relevant to specific secondary school pupils is to provide greater levels of pupil voice (see, for example, O'Sullivan and Macphail, 2010). Many pupils are given some choice of activity later in their secondary school experience, but throughout most secondary schooling, activities are decided by the teachers, and most often driven by teacher interest and expertise as well as by the school's extra-curricular sport calendar. However, physical activity for the few (such as those representing the school in extra-curricular sport) should not drive physical education for all pupils. Teachers therefore need to consider the needs and interests of their pupils, just like a disc jockey (DJ) needs to read the dance floor in order to create the 'right mix'. As the chapter has previously alluded, teachers therefore need to take a critical stance on 'what' (content) they are teaching, in order to both provide a curriculum which is appropriate and relevant for all pupils and align the curriculum with the aims they have identified.

Whatever approach to curriculum content is taken, this is likely to be influenced by teachers' subject content knowledge, value orientations and their occupational socialisation; as well as external influences from above, sideways and below. In order to implement a broad and balanced curriculum, teachers need subject content knowledge to teach a variety of

activities, movement forms, experiences or themes. However, a teacher's subject content knowledge may be limited in some areas, frequently dance and gymnastics.

In addition to 'what' is taught in physical education, many would argue that 'how to teach secondary physical education' is of even greater concern in relation to achieving specific aims. A wealth of literature (e.g. Lawson, 1986; Richards and Gaudreault, 2017) has suggested that how someone was taught as a pupil is often the blueprint for how they teach throughout their career. This was reinforced by Mordal-Moen and Green (2012) who believed that teachers from a background defined by games and sport teach in a didactic way and find it challenging to visualise different curriculum content and teaching approaches. Furthermore, they show a reluctance to embrace different ideas. This is an interesting point, as from a broader historical context, 18 years earlier Evans, Davies and Penney (1996) suggested that teachers and student teachers are seldom shaken to activate change(s) to content and/or teaching approaches. Further, Brown and Evans (2004) suggested that most teachers are cut from the same cloth, and their outlook and behaviours are enduring. This is developed by Bailey et al. (2013) who wrote that with the exception of physical development, the key to realising the wider aims of the subject, i.e. affective, cognitive, social, lies in the relationships developed between teacher and pupils, thus reinforcing the importance of how physical education is taught. Together, these indicate that change is a slow process. Issues surrounding ways of teaching secondary physical education are explored in the next section.

'How' to teach secondary physical education?

Despite potential breadth in a curriculum offered in secondary schools, and a 'delightful and vigorous array of [teaching] approaches' (Joyce and Weil, 1972, p. xiii) available to teachers, the reality is that in many secondary schools there is neither breadth of content nor a variety of approaches within the subject (Kirk, 2010). If teachers use a limited range of content and, particularly, teaching approaches, it is likely that only a narrow range of outcomes will be achieved (Mosston and Ashworth, 2008). A significant point that should be kept in mind in this section is that the broad aims of the subject cannot be achieved unless appropriate and varied teaching approaches are employed (Blair with Whitehead, 2015). Furthermore, physical education's apparent failure to achieve many of its aspirations could be due, at least in part, to some teachers' refusal to 'get changed' in terms of their predominant teaching approaches. In this section, we debate some of the possible teaching approaches teachers can adopt to achieve a variety of aims for the subject. It appears that it is not an uncommon approach in planning a multi-activity curriculum to select the activity first and the learning outcomes and teaching approaches retrospectively (Kirk, 2010; Penney and Chandler, 2000; Siedentop, 2002). Teachers' emphasis on curriculum content/activities over pupil needs has been identified by Armour and Harris (2013) as a common pedagogical limitation. However, in order to achieve aims of the subject, a teacher should consider first what they want pupils to learn in order that appropriate content and teaching approaches can be selected as the vehicle to achieve learning outcomes (Arthur and Capel, 2015; Metzler, 2011).

A 'delightful and vigorous array of approaches'

There are a plethora of approaches to teaching and learning which allow a broad range of learning intentions and experiences to be unlocked (see, for example, Bennett, 1976; Joyce, Weil and Calhoun, 2015; Metzler, 2011; Mosston and Ashworth, 2008; Oeser, 1966). Perhaps one of the most well-known frameworks within physical education is Mosston and Ashworth's (2008) 'spectrum of teaching styles', which proposes that teaching can be categorised through the decisions made before, during and after the teaching and learning process. Their spectrum of 11 styles begins with the 'command style', where all decisions are made by the teacher, and ends with the 'self-teaching style', where the pupil makes all decisions. In a multi-activity curriculum dominated by physical education as sports-techniques (Kirk, 2010), the first five styles (the 'reproductive cluster') (Mosston and Ashworth, 2008) are most prevalent. These styles are more likely to be championed by teachers whose aims align with 'learning to move' (AfPE, 2015), physical literacy's development of physical competence (Whitehead, 2010) and Siedentop's (2002) elite development goal. Alternatively, the next six styles (the 'production cluster') (Mosston and Ashworth, 2008), where new knowledge (for pupils) is created, would more closely exemplify AfPE's (2015) 'moving to learn' aspiration. The spectrum of teaching styles is not intended to be hierarchical; instead, selection of any one style should be matched to the pupils' needs and the learning intentions. To unlock pupils' learning, teachers need to be flexible, skilled and knowledgeable in a range of teaching approaches (in this example teaching styles). However, it seems to us that the range of teaching styles is generally not used fully. This may relate back to the individual teacher's socialisation into teaching in which they have experienced a narrow range of teaching approaches – along with a limited range of content related to specific aims and purposes, as discussed earlier. Whatever the reason, the debate returns to what sort of learning is valued and furthermore how teachers understand their role in achieving pupil learning.

Models-based practice in physical education

One approach to widening the range of teaching approaches (and content) beyond that of the current predominant multi-activity curriculum approach (or a curriculum designed around, for example, the movement forms identified above) taught largely through didactic methods is the use of pedagogical models or models-based practice (e.g. Casey, 2014, 2017; Casey and MacPhail, 2018; Haerens et al., 2011; Lund and Tannehill, 2015; Metzler, 2011). A pedagogical model is a coherent plan, or blueprint, that includes a theoretical foundation, intended learning goals, learning, teaching and assessment structures as well as teacher and contextual requirements (Metzler, 2011). Each model offers a unique set of learning outcomes that can support practitioners to help young people to achieve legitimate goals of the subject (Casey, 2017; Jewett, Bain and Ennis, 1995; Lund and Tannehill, 2015). The successful implementation of a pedagogical model starts with, and therefore requires, a critical understanding of the model's theory of learning and, in broader terms, of how young people learn effectively.

As with the selection of a range of teaching styles, skilled delivery of models-based practice is able to satisfy a range of goals for physical education (see, for example, AfPE, 2015; Siedentop, 2002). Teachers can select, for example, a model with a physical emphasis (e.g. Direct Instruction, Personalised System for Instruction, in Metzler, 2011), social emphasis (e.g. Cooperative Learning, in Dyson and Casey, 2012; Teaching for Personal and Social Responsibility, in Hellison, 2011) or affective emphasis (e.g. Health-Based Physical Education, in Bowler, 2019 and Haerens et al., 2011). It is recognised that no one model can

achieve all of the legitimate learning outcomes for physical education (Casey, 2017; Jewett, Bain and Ennis, 1995). Thus, put simply, teachers can use different models as a framework to guide their practice in order to achieve specific outcomes. In order for pupils to achieve specific outcomes through a models-based approach, teachers should choose a model (or models) for pupils to learn through for a given period of time.

However, models-based practice has been subject to critique (see, for example, Landi, Fitzpatrick and McGlashan (2016), Stolz (2014) and others). For example, some would claim that a models-based approach is used to mask a teacher's lack of subject content knowledge within an activity, movement form, experience or theme. Indeed, it is very unlikely that all teachers can demonstrate both a breadth and a depth of subject content knowledge, across all areas of activity or movement forms. However, it is conceivable that their knowledge of, for example, pedagogy or child development is more transferable, and therefore more supportive of using a models-based approach in weaker subject content knowledge areas. Whilst pedagogical models can effectively align with particular aims, there is also an argument that, in some practices, the model takes priority over the pupil or the activity. Further, with the significant number of pedagogical models with a 'life skill' focus, it is possible that some teachers could lose sight of the unique aims of the subject, i.e. movement.

Further, it is often claimed that whilst pedagogical models provide a framework for teaching and learning, the need for high fidelity in the delivery of a model, argued by some (e.g. Hastie and Casey, 2014), means they are complex and difficult to fully understand (Casey, 2017). Indeed, Launder (2001) claimed that their complexity makes them suitable for use by the equivalent of 'test pilots', pilots with additional training, or the 'best of the best'. Therefore, due to a range of social, political and economic challenges, the effective use of a pedagogical model may be beyond the abilities of many physical education teachers working in schools today. However, it has also been argued that pedagogical models are flexible and provide space for 'local adaptation' (Kirk, 2013). Kirk stated that through a number of identified modifications to a model's initial framework, not least to the specific strategies or styles, models become adaptable and relevant across contexts.

Conflicting arguments regarding the need for high fidelity in the delivery of a models-based approach (Hastie and Casey, 2014), the common practice that sees teachers using watered-down or cafeteria-style approaches to models-based practice (Curtner-Smith et al., 2001) and debate regarding the use of a programmatic (Kirk and Haerens, 2014) and multi-model (Lund and Tannehill, 2015) approaches for teaching physical education raise a renewed discussion point, which perhaps has its roots firmly located in the teacher's awareness, or lack of, in the social and political context in which physical education is being taught.

This section of the chapter has been based on the premise that broad aims of the subject cannot be achieved unless appropriate and varied teaching approaches are employed to teach a range of content. A teacher should consider first what they want pupils to learn and then select appropriate content and teaching approaches to enable those aims to be achieved. This can be achieved in a number of ways, for example selecting from the plethora of different teaching approaches or using a models-based approach. Whatever way is selected, deliberate decisions need to be made so that teaching approaches (and content) are appropriate to enable specific aims to be met.

Summary

This chapter has ventured along a path well-trodden, considering specifically issues associated with the why, what and how; aims, content and teaching approaches in secondary physical education. Despite longstanding calls for new 'visions and voices' (Bain, 1990) for physical education, it has been suggested that we are trapped in 'Groundhog Day' (Casey and Larsson, 2018). As we detailed at the outset, this is no more evident than in the daily 'mission' of getting some resistant changers to hurry along and ready themselves for physical education. As we have explored, some, although not all, teachers could also be accused of being slow or resistant changers due to an amalgam of their value orientations, occupational socialisation and the level of agency afforded for change and transformation in schools. To overcome some of these barriers, we argue that the development of teachers' critical understanding regarding the vast array of aims, content and teaching approaches could support teachers making curricular decisions which are initiated from the aims ('why'), to which the selection of content ('what') and approaches ('how') are aligned. Although the chapter has largely considered aims, content and teaching approaches separately, it must be remembered that it is the expert 'fusion' of the what and how which allows specific aims to be met.

Questions for reflection

- 1 How does secondary school physical education support children and young people to understand the importance of being physically active throughout their life course?
- 2 How do teachers communicate the aims of a physical education programme?
- 3 Why do teachers prioritise certain activities within the curriculum? Can you offer an explanation to support your answer?
- 4 To what extent are explicit aims helpful? Do you prioritise certain aims? Can you explain why?
- 5 Consider challenges students and qualified physical education teachers face in developing content knowledge, general pedagogical knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge for teaching physical education?
- 6 What do you consider to be the central components of a broad and balanced physical education curriculum?

Further reading and resources

Bartlett, S. and Burton, D. (2016) *Introduction to Education Studies*, 4th edition, London: Sage.

This book is not a physical education specific text, but it provides an excellent introduction to the broader discipline of educational studies. It includes sections on the nature of education, organisation of teaching and learning and social factors, gender ethnicity and social class.

Ennis, C. (2017) Routledge Handbook of Physical Education Pedagogies, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

This book considers different positions in relation to physical education and pedagogy and includes sections that discuss: curriculum theory and development; curriculum, policy and reform and analysing teaching.

Herold, F. (2011) 'Becoming an effective secondary school physical education teacher', in K. Armour (ed.) Sport Pedagogy: An Introduction for Teaching and Coaching, Harlow: Prentice Hall, pp. 258–270.

This chapter takes a practical approach to considering the teaching of secondary school physical education and asks question relating to: what does it take to become an effective secondary school physical education teacher? What should we know about how physical education should be taught? The chapter also discuss issues relating to professional values and personal philosophies.

Physical Education Practitioner Research Network <http://www.peprn.com/about.aspx>

This website and blog is for practitioners to read, reflect and engage in dialogue with others in the physical education community. Recent blogs have reflected upon the 98 papers published in the 'Major Themes in Education' series, as well as on issues surrounding models-based practice and practitioner research. Most blogs reflect directly on published works, which provide an opportunity to mobilise the knowledge and skills of practitioners who may not readily have access to academic research.

The following physical education journals should support further reading. There are also many education journals which contain articles related to relevant topics across education more generally, which are useful to extend debate further. They may also contain physical education specific articles.

- European Physical Education Review
- Journal of Teaching in Physical Education
- Physical Education Matters
- Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy
- Quest
- Sport, Education and Society

References

Armour, K. (ed.) (2011) Sport Pedagogy: An Introduction for Teaching and Coaching, Harlow: Prentice Hall.

Armour, K. and Harris, J. (2013) 'Making the case for developing new PE-for-Health pedagogies', Quest, 65 (2), 201–219.

Arthur, J. and Capel, S. (2015) 'How planning and evaluation support effective learning and teaching', in S. Capel and M. Whitehead (eds.) *Learning to Teach Physical Education in the Secondary School: A Companion to School Experience*, 4th edition, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 31–48.

ASA (Amateur Swimming Association) (2014) *School Swimming Census 2014 Findings Revealed Today*, viewed 20 August 2018, from: www.swimming.org/schoolswimming/school-swimming-census-findings-revealed-today/

AfPE (Association for Physical Education) (2015) *Association for Physical Education Health Position Paper*, viewed 20 August 2018, from: www.afpe.org.uk/physical-education/wpcontent/uploads/afPE_Health_Position_Paper_Web_Version.pdf

Bailey, R., Hillman, C., Arent, S. and Petitpas, A. (2013) 'Physical activity: An underestimated investment in human capital?', *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 10, 289–308.

Bailey, R., Armour, K., Kirk, D., Jess, M., Pickup, I., Sandford, R. and the BERA Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy Special Interest Group (2009) 'The educational benefits claimed for physical education and school sport: An academic review', *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 24, (1) 1–27.

Bain, L. (1990) 'Visions and voices', *Quest*, 42 (1), 2–12.

Bauman, A., Reis, R., Sallis, J., Wells, J., Loos, R. and Martin, B. (2012) 'Correlates of physical activity: Why are some people physically active and others not?', *Lancet*, 380(9838), 258–271.

Bennett, N. (1976) *Teaching Styles and Pupil Progress*, London: Open Books Publishing Ltd.

Biddle, S., Mutrie, N. and Gorely, T. (2015) *Psychology of Physical Activity: Determinants, Wellbeing and Interventions*, 3rd edition, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Blair, R. with Whitehead, M. (2015) 'Designing teaching approaches to achieve intended learning outcomes', in S. Capel and M. Whitehead (eds.) *Learning to Teach Physical Education in the Secondary School: A Companion to School Experience*, 4th edition, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 204–218.

Bowe, R., Ball, S.J. and Gold, A. (1992) *Reforming Education and Changing Schools: Case Studies in Policy Sociology*, London: Routledge.

Bowler, M. (2019) *Developing a pedagogical model for Health-Based Physical Education*. PhD thesis. Loughborough University. Available at: <https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/2134/37704>.

Brown, D. and Evans, J. (2004) 'Reproducing gender? Intergenerational links and the male PE teacher as a cultural conduit in teaching physical education', *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 23, 48–70.

Capel, S. (2016) 'Value orientations of student physical education teachers learning to teach on school-based initial teacher education courses in England', *European Physical Education Review*, 22 (2), 167–184.

Capel, S. and Whitehead, M. (eds.) (2013) *Debates in Physical Education*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Casey, A. (2014) 'Models-based practice: great white hope or white elephant?', *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 19 (1), 18–34.

Casey, A. (2017) 'Models-based practice', in C. Ennis (ed.) *Routledge Handbook of Physical Education Pedagogies*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 54–67.

Casey, A. and Goodyear, V. (2015) 'Can cooperative learning achieve the four learning outcomes of physical education? A review of literature', *Quest*, 67 (1), 56–72.

Casey, A. and Larsson, H. (2018) 'It's groundhog day: Foucault's governmentality and crisis discourses in physical education', *Quest*, 1–18.

Casey, A. and MacPhail, A. (2018) 'Adopting a models-based approach to teaching physical education', *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 23 (3), 294–310.

Curtner-Smith, M., Todorovich, J., McCaughtry, N. and Lacon, S. (2001) 'Urban teachers use of productive and reproductive teaching styles within the confines of the National Curriculum for Physical Education', *European Physical Education Review*, 7(2), 177–190.

DES/WO (Department of Education and Science and the Welsh Office) (1992) *Physical Education in the National Curriculum*, London: HMSO.

DfE (Department for Education) (2013a) *Evidence on Physical Education and Sport in Schools*, viewed 20 August 2018, from: www.gov.uk/government/publications/evidence-on-physical-education-and-sport-in-schools

DfE (Department for Education) (2013b) *National Curriculum in England: Physical Education Programmes of Study*, viewed 20 August 2018, from: www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-curriculum-in-england-physical-education-programmes-of-study

Dowling, F. (2011) 'Are PE teacher identities fit for postmodern schools or are they clinging to modernist notions of professionalism? A case study of Norwegian PE teacher students' emerging professional identities', *Sport, Education and Society*, 16 (2), 201–222.

Dyson, B. and Casey, A. (2012) *Cooperative Learning in Physical Education: A Research Based Approach*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Ennis, C. and Chen, A. (1994) 'Teachers' value orientation in urban and rural school settings', *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 66 (1), 41–50.

Evans, J. and Penney, D. (1995) 'The politics of pedagogy: making a national curriculum physical education', *Journal of Education Policy*, 10 (1), 27–44.

Evans, J., Davies, B. and Penney, D. (1996) 'Teachers, teaching and the social construction of gender relations', *Sport, Education and Society*, 1 (2), 165–183.

Fairclough, S., Stratton, G. and Baldwin, H. (2002) 'The contribution of secondary school physical education to lifetime physical activity', *European Physical Education Review*, 8 (1), 69–84.

Green, K. (2010) *Key Themes in Youth Sport*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Haerens, L., Kirk, D., Cardon, G. and De Bourdeaudhuij, I. (2011) 'Toward the development of a pedagogical model for health-based physical education', *Quest*, 63, 321–338.

Hastie, P. and Casey, A. (2014) 'Fidelity in models-based practice research in sport pedagogy: A guide to future investigations', *Journal of Teaching Physical Education*, 33 (3), 422–431, DOI: 10.1123/jype.2013–0141.

Hellison, D. (2011) *Teaching Responsibility through Physical Activity*, 3rd edition, Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

hooks, B. (1994) *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*, London: Routledge.

IPLA (International Physical Literacy Association) (2017) International Physical Literacy Association homepage, viewed 20 August 2018, from: <https://www.physical-literacy.org.uk>

Jewett, A., Bain, L. and Ennis, C. (1995) *The Curriculum Process in Physical Education*, 2nd edition, Dubuque, IA: Brown and Benchmark.

Joyce, B. and Weil, M. (1972) *Models of Teaching*, London: Prentice-Hall International.

Joyce, B., Weil, M. and Calhoun, E. (2015) *Models of Teaching*, 9th edition, Boston, MA: Pearson.

Jorgensen, R. (2013) Early Years Swimming – Adding Capital to Young Australians, viewed 20 August 2018, from: <http://kidsalive.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/2013-EYS-Final-Report-30-July-13-JM.pdf>

Kay, W. (2003) 'Lesson planning with the NCPE 2000 – the revised unit of work', *Bulletin of Physical Education*, 39 (1), 31–42.

Kessel, A. (2016) *Eat, Sweat, Play: How Sport can Change our Lives*, London: Pan Books.

Kirk, D. (2006) 'The 'obesity crisis' and school physical education', *Sport, Education and Society*, 11, (5) 121–133.

Kirk, D. (2010) *Physical Education Futures*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Kirk, D. (2013) 'Education value and models-based practice in physical education', *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 45 (9), 973–986.

Kirk, D. and Haerens, L. (2014) 'New research programmes in physical education and sport pedagogy', *Sport, Education and Society*, 19 (7), 899–911.

Kirk, D., MacDonald, D. and O'Sullivan, M. (eds.) (2006) *The Handbook of Physical Education*, London: Sage.

Landi, D., Fitzpatrick, K. and McGlashan, H. (2016) 'Models based practices in physical education: A sociocritical reflection', *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 35 (4), 400–411.

Lauder, A.G. (2001) *Play Practice. The Games Approach to Teaching and Coaching Sports*, Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Lawson, H. A. (1986) 'Occupational socialization and the design of teacher education programs', *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 3 (1), 3–15.

Lockwood, A. (2000) 'Breadth and balance in the physical education curriculum', in S. Capel and S. Piotrowski (eds.) *Issues in Physical Education*, London: RoutledgeFalmer, pp. 178–130.

Lund, J. and Tannehill, D. (eds.) (2015) *Standards-based Physical Education Curriculum Development*, 3rd edition, Burlington, MA: Jones and Bartlett Publishers.

McKenzie, T. (2001) 'Back to the future: health-related physical education', in P. Ward and P. Doutis (eds.) *Physical Education for the 21st Century*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska, pp. 113–131.

Metzler, M. W. (2011) *Instructional Models for Physical Education*, 3rd edition, Scottsdale, Arizona: Holcomb Hathaway, Publishers.

Mordal-Moen, K. and Green, K. (2012) 'Neither shaking nor stirring: A case study of reflexivity in Norwegian physical education teacher education', *Sport, Education and Society*, 19 (4), 415–434.

Mosston, M. and Ashworth, S. (2008) *Teaching Physical Education*, 1st online edition, San Francisco: Benjamin Cummings, viewed 20 August 2018, from: www.spectrumofteachingstyles.org/e-book-download.php

Murdoch, E. and Whitehead, M. (2013) 'What should pupils learn in physical education?', in S. Capel and M. Whitehead (eds.) *Debates in Physical Education*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 235–238.

Myerson, J. (2005) *Not a Games Person*, London: Yellow Jersey Press.

Oeser, O.A. (ed.) (1966) *Teacher, Pupil and Task*, London: Tavistock Publications.

O'Sullivan, M. and MacPhail, A. (eds.) (2010) *Young People's Voices in Physical Education and Youth Sport*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Pate, R. and Hohn, R. (1994) 'Introduction: A contemporary mission for physical education', in R. Pate and R. Hohn (eds.) *Health and Fitness through Physical Education*, Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, p. 2.

Penney, D. (2006) 'Curriculum construction and change', in D. Kirk, D. Macdonald and M. O'Sullivan (eds.) *The Handbook of Physical Education*, London: Sage, pp. 565–579.

Penney, D. and Chandler, T. (2000) 'Physical education: What futures(s)?', *Sport, Education and Society*, 5 (1), 71–87.

Penney, D. and Evans, J. (1999) *Politics, Policy and Practice in Physical Education*, London: E and FN Spon.

QCA (Qualifications and Curriculum Authority) (2007) *The National Curriculum: Statutory Requirements for Key Stages 3 and 4*, London: DCSF/QCA.

Richards, K.A. and Gaudreault, K.L. (2017) *Teacher Socialization in Physical Education: New Perspectives*, Abingdon, Oxon and New York: Routledge.

RLSS (Royal Life Saving Association) (2017) *Make water safety a priority this summer*, viewed 20 August 2018, from: <https://www.rlss.org.uk/news/make-water-safety-a-priority-this-summer>

Robinson, D.B. and Randall, R. (eds.) (2016) *Social Justice in Physical Education: Critical Reflections and Pedagogies for Change*, Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Ross, J., Dotson, C., Gilbert, G. and Katz, S. (1985) 'What are kids doing in school physical education?', *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 56 (1), 73–76.

Rovegno, I. (1998) 'The development of in-service teachers' knowledge of a constructivist approach to physical education: Teaching beyond activities', *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 69 (2), 147–162.

Sallis, J., Prochaska, J. and Taylor, W. (2000) 'A review of correlates of physical activity of children and adolescents', *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 32 (5), 963–975.

Shearer, J.C., Lavis, J., Abelson, J., Walt, G. and Dion, M. (2018) 'Evidence-informed policy-making and policy innovation in a low income country: Does policy network structure matter?' *Evidence and Policy A journal of Research Debate and Practice*, 14(3), 381–401, DOI: 10.1332/174426418x115330477583836

Siedentop, D. (2002) 'Junior sport and the evolution of sport cultures', *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 21 (4), 392–401.

Sport England (2017) *Active Lives Adult Survey May 16/17*, viewed 20 August 2018, from: www.sportengland.org/media/12458/active-lives-adult-may-16-17-report.pdf

Stolz, S. (2014) *The Philosophy of Physical Education: A New Perspective*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Stubbs, B. and Cumming, I. (2017) 'Chapter 2: The wellbeing benefits of swimming: A systematic review', viewed 20 August 2018, from: www.sportengland.org/media/11765/health-and-wellbeing-benefits-of-swimming-report.pdf

Swim England (2016) *Swim England's Schools Research 2016*, viewed 20 August 2018, from: www.swimming.org/swimengland/schools-research-2016/

UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) (2014) *Worldwide Survey of School Physical Education*, viewed 20 August 2018, from: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002293/229335e.pdf>

Vidoni, C. and André, M.H. (2018) 'What kinds of social interactions can be found when children are engaged in a student-designed games unit?' *Journal of Physical Education Recreation and Dance*, 89 (7), 56–56, DOI: 10.1080/07303084.2018.1492247

Warren, J.T. (2011) 'Reflexive teaching: Toward critical autoethnographic practices of/in/on pedagogy', *Critical Studies↔Critical Methodologies*, 11(2), 139–144.

Webb, L., McCaughy, N. and Macdonald, D. (2004) 'Surveillance as a technique of power in physical education', *Sport, Education and Society*, 9 (2), 207–222, DOI:10.1080/135733204000233949

Whitehead, M. (ed.) (2010) *Physical Literacy: Throughout the Lifecourse*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Whitehead, M. (2015) 'Aims of PE', in S. Capel and M. Whitehead (eds.) *Learning to Teach Physical Education in the Secondary School: A Companion to School Experience*, 4th edition, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 18–30.

Whitehead, M. (ed.) (2019) *Physical Literacy Across the World*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Youth Sport Trust (2018) Take a look at some other activities our research with @Womeninsport_uk has revealed as being girls' and boys' top five sports to do in PE [Twitter] 27 June, Viewed 20 August 2018, from: <https://twitter.com/YouthSportTrust/status/1011906263893073920>