

European Physical Education Review

<http://epe.sagepub.com/>

Personal, Social and Moral Development through Team Games: Some Critical Questions

Andrew Theodoulides and Kathleen M. Armour
European Physical Education Review 2001 7: 5
DOI: 10.1177/1356336X010071004

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://epe.sagepub.com/content/7/1/5>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:

[North West Counties Physical Education Association](#)

Additional services and information for *European Physical Education Review* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://epe.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://epe.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations: <http://epe.sagepub.com/content/7/1/5.refs.html>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Feb 1, 2001

[What is This?](#)

Personal, social and moral development through team games: some critical questions

- **Andrew Theodoulides** University of Brighton, UK

and

- **Kathleen M. Armour** Loughborough University, UK

Abstract

This article raises critical questions about the place of pupils' personal, social and moral development in team games. It is argued that clearer conceptual definitions and critical debate within the physical education (PE) profession are needed in order to determine the role of team games in promoting pupils' personal, social and moral education. The complex inter-relationship between these aspects of pupils' development is discussed and a case is made for using 'socio-moral' education for the purpose of further analysis. Current ideology about how team games can enhance pupils' socio-moral education is examined against the background of historical developments in PE in both state and private schools over the last 150 years. The need for empirical evidence to substantiate knowledge claims in this multi-dimensional area of the curriculum is highlighted and some suggestions made for research in this area.

Key-words: character • socio-moral • team games

Introduction

The Education Reform Act (ERA) (DES, 1988) places pupils' personal, moral and physical development at the centre of the education process. Within this context, physical education (PE) has an important role to play, not only in physical development, but also in the broadly defined area of pupils' personal, social and moral development (DFE and WO, 1995). In particular, the contribution of team games to these multi-dimensional aspects of the curriculum is strongly argued (DNH, 1995). Team games have been regarded as a vehicle for children's personal, social and moral development since the rise of public school athleticism in the middle of the 19th

century, and in state schools during the 20th century. However, critical analysis of the role of team games in this respect raises some important questions. While team games are frequently seen as an effective means of enhancing pupils' personal, social and moral development, it is argued in this article that there is little empirical evidence to support this view. Furthermore, it is argued that clarification of the terms 'personal', 'social' and 'moral' in the context of education would be helpful to an analysis of the role of PE in their development.

This article seeks to address these issues in three stages. First, the notion of personal/social/moral education is explored in order to identify some of its conceptual and practical complexities. It is proposed that the term 'socio-moral education' can be used as an inclusive term for the purposes of this analysis. Second, claims made for the role of team games in education are traced historically, from the rise of public school athleticism in the mid-19th century. This provides a background for the analysis of current thinking, leading to some fundamental questions for practitioners. For example: 'Should teachers concern themselves with teaching socio-moral development through team games?' and, if they should, 'Are teachers clear about what it is they are attempting to teach and why?' It is suggested that fundamental questions such as these might lead to the development of a clearer framework for teachers' work in this area. Finally, it is argued that the PE profession needs to provide empirical evidence of the contribution team games can make to pupils' personal, social and moral development if socio-moral knowledge claims are to be substantiated. Some suggestions are made for a research agenda.

Socio-moral education

An analysis of the literature in personal/social/moral development presents two immediate difficulties. First, the sources of relevant literature are diverse, spanning psychology, sociology, philosophy, sport-related literature and education theory. Second, there is evidence of both conceptual overlap and conceptual confusion in the use of the key terms. For example, historically, 'character' has been used to refer to a range of socially desirable qualities which, it was believed, were developed through participation in team games. Yet, Shields and Bredemeier (1995) argue that there is no agreement as to what constitutes 'good character'. Given the historical and cultural context within which it has been used over the last 100 years (see next section), it is argued that the term 'character' may well hold cultural meaning which is more readily associated with traditional middle class values than those of the working class. This raises the question of whether 'character' is an appropriate term today, given the diverse make up of British society. More recently other terms have been used to refer to the range of personal, social and moral attributes that may be developed through PE, for example, 'psycho-social development' (Lee, 1996), 'socio-moral development' (Miller et al., 1997) and 'ethical value' (Reid, 1997). The use of different labels for the contribution team games can make to pupils' personal, social and moral development may well be a source of confusion. What is clear is that the inter-relationship

between personal, social and moral development is complex, and conceptual differences between each attribute are not easily distinguishable. Aspects of personal development often have social and/or moral consequences, in the same way that good or poor moral action has personal and social implications for the individuals concerned. However, in the absence of widespread agreement on terminology in the literature, and for the purposes of this article, the term 'socio-moral' education (Miller et al., 1997) provides a useful 'umbrella' under which to group the myriad aspects of personal, social and moral development. Miller et al. (1997) certainly use the term 'socio-moral development' to capture the complexities of learning in this diverse area, and it is particularly helpful in two respects: it highlights a key concern with pupils' development in a social context, similar to Lee's (1996: 40) emphasis upon the centrality of 'interpersonal relations' between pupils in education, and it reinforces the interlinked and overlapping nature of the different strands of this area of learning. From this focal point, it is possible to begin to critically examine the role of PE, and team games, in pupils' socio-moral development.

Within the broad area of socio-moral development, a number of educational claims have been made for PE. For example, it has been argued that PE has an important role to play in children's personal development (DES, 1972). Within this area, a number of different attributes have been seen as fundamental. Ryder and Campbell (1988) argue that personal development is concerned with autonomous decision-making and integrity, while for Galloway (1989) it is about self-awareness and self-acceptance. Within PE, personal development has often manifested itself in a concern for self-esteem (DES, 1989, 1991; NCC, 1992). Yet, both Fox (1992) and Lee (1996) note that there are a number of 'self' constructs, which are often used interchangeably, highlighting a possible source of confusion for PE professionals. Fox argues that self-esteem 'carries an evaluative global judgement on whatever criteria the individuals in question consider important to them' (1992: 37). Self-esteem, therefore, is constructed in a social context and, consequently, aspects of individual importance may not necessarily 'reflect the moral tone of society' (Fox, 1992: 37). The example Fox uses to illustrate his point is the increase in self-esteem which may accrue to an individual because s/he smokes and is consequently regarded as 'cool' by peers. What this highlights, according to Fox, is that personal development through increased self-esteem is inextricably linked with socially desirable moral values.

The development of the 'self' also includes a concern with pupils' spiritual development (DES, 1989). After an OFSTED inspection 18 months ago, the PE department in which one of the writers (Theodoulides) taught was informed that PE staff did not do enough to promote pupils' spiritual development. The thought that PE could promote spiritual development was not one that had previously been embraced by the teaching team. However, it was a forceful reminder that the ERA requires schools to promote pupils' spiritual development. This is reinforced through the Education (Schools) Act (DES, 1992) and the National Curriculum Council, which states that spiritual attributes 'should be developed through all subjects of the curriculum' (NCC, 1993: 6). It can be argued that pupils' spiritual

development needs to be considered within a broad socio-moral framework, because much of the terminology used to describe it overlaps with that used for other aspects of socio-moral education. The NCC describes spiritual development as being concerned with 'personal beliefs ... feelings of transcendence ... the search for meaning and purpose ... self-knowledge ... relationships ... creativity ... feelings and emotions' (SCAA, 1995: 3). Blake argues that in terms of PE:

The essence of spiritual development for pupils in physical education centres around the development of each individual in terms of feelings, emotions, relationships, curiosity, personal reflection and the development of the inner-self relative to others, the environment and the activity. (1996: 7)

Clearly, a concern for pupils' spiritual development has important implications for teachers' planning in terms of achieving intended outcomes. More crucially, however, it is important for the PE profession to decide which of these attributes can be genuinely enhanced through participation in team games, and how they interlink with other aspects of socio-moral education for which they are planning.

In another dimension to this issue, Lee highlights the connection between personal and social development. Lee argues that personal interaction with others, which is an inherent requirement of team games, presents children with a set of 'complex social problems' (1996: 45) that they must solve. In solving these problems, it is suggested that children are able to develop a wide range of personal qualities. In addition, through cooperating and working together, children can learn social skills, such as listening to others, taking turns and helping other pupils. Furthermore, the link between personal and social development also extends into the moral domain (David, 1983; Lee, 1996). Kohlberg (1981) states that moral reasoning incorporates a concern for fairness, human rights and justice. These concerns often arise within the context of team games, particularly in instances of foul play or cheating. The very nature of team games, where players' actions and behaviour are evident to other individuals, means that socially unacceptable behaviour can be easily observed. Consequently, it has been argued that team games provide a means by which children's moral judgements and actions can be seen (Meakin, 1982; Miller et al., 1997; Reid, 1997). There are many other claims for PE too. For example, it is expected that PE, through team games, can teach 'fair play' (Gibbons et al., 1995), can encourage pupils 'empathy, moral reasoning and maturity, task motivation and personal and social responsibility' (Miller et al., 1997: 114), and will foster 'interpersonal respect, fairness, human rights and responsibilities, freedom, justice and benevolence, and virtues or qualities of character such as honesty, integrity, self-control and courage' (Reid, 1997: 8). What becomes apparent is that there is a complex relationship, both conceptually and practically, between all the various dimensions of personal, social, moral and spiritual development. This complex relationship may be illustrated using the concept of 'sportsmanship' (Feezell, 1988). The decision to commit a deliberate foul is a personal decision that a player makes. Whatever the underlying reason for the decision, it leads to a value judgement being made about that player's character and her/his capacity

to act in an acceptable manner, particularly if the player is frequently guilty of deliberately fouling other players. It might be said that the player who deliberately fouls another has no regard for the rules, or that s/he is an aggressive and violent person. But there are also social consequences that impinge upon the cheating player's actions. The player may well spoil the game for the other players, or s/he may be excluded from other group events as a result of her/his anti-social behaviour. Finally, the player who commits a deliberate foul has violated a moral principle, that of respect for a fellow human being, which is compounded if any foul play results in personal injury to another person. All of which leads to some questions. If socio-moral development is indeed as complex and interlinked in nature as suggested, then the planning for, and assessment of, pupils' learning in this area would need to be exceptionally detailed and systematic. But is it?

It has been argued that team games are a useful means of developing pupils' cooperation and teamwork (DNH, 1995). Yet, important questions for the profession might be as follows: 'What does PE offer which is more useful than other aspects of a modern curriculum where pupils often work together in groups and teams?' 'What evidence do we have to support a special claim for effectiveness in this area?' 'How far are we, and those outside the profession, relying upon historical claims for the role of team games in pupils' socio-moral development?' It is undoubtedly the case that, historically, claims for a special role for PE, and particularly team games, have been made. However, the nature and context of those claims are interesting, and what follows is a historical overview of the ways in which team games have been justified in the curriculum within the state and public school systems since the middle of the 19th century. In many ways, it makes for sobering reading.

Historical overview: the socio-moral role of team games within education and physical education

The rise of the games ethic in the 19th century

Credit for the rise in popularity of team games is generally attributed to Thomas Arnold, headmaster at Rugby School from 1828 until 1842 (Bamford, 1975). A deeply religious man, Arnold was concerned with the social unrest of the working class and felt the upper classes had a responsibility to lead the lower class (Bamford, 1967). However, the behaviour of the upper class boys who attended public schools at this time was often characterized by excessive drinking, rioting, cruelty and other forms of socially unacceptable behaviour (Bamford, 1967). Arnold set about improving the discipline and moral standards of the boys at Rugby by implementing a system of prefects who were responsible for maintaining order among the other boys through 'moral influence' (Gardner, 1973: 103). Team games became a central means of achieving this. By the middle of the 19th century the role of team games as a vehicle for developing 'character' was firmly established (Dunning, 1975). Team games were

a central part of the middle class ideal of 'Muscular Christianity' (McIntosh, 1987), whereby 'manliness', a sound moral character, cooperation, consideration for others, patriotism and other socially desirable attributes, were linked to 'godliness' (Bamford, 1967). Athleticism, as it became known, was a valued feature of a public school education (Mangan, 1975). This was recognized, officially, in the *Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners Appointed to Enquire into the Revenues and Management of Certain Colleges and Schools* (1864). Chaired by Lord Clarendon, this report, into nine of the country's leading public-endowed grammar schools, commented that central features of the education provided by such schools were the development of 'manliness of character' (p. 43), 'moulding the character of English gentlemen' (p. 56), and the formation of 'national character and social life' (p. 56). This reinforced the superior status of a public school education and the status of the ruling class (Shrosbree, 1988). Within this context, it was believed that team games were an important vehicle in the formation of boys' character and social development. By contrast, education for children from poor families was provided through infant schools, set up by charity and Christian organizations. In these infant schools the main focus was on reading, writing, arithmetic, children's physical well-being and moral and social training (BoE, 1931). The introduction of the Education Act in 1870 brought compulsory free schooling for all children between the ages of 5 and 12, although PE in the public school system and the state system continued to develop along separate lines. This difference in the ethos of education for children from different social backgrounds was to have a profound effect upon the underpinning ideological development of the role of team games as a vehicle for children's socio-moral development. It was also important in reinforcing the differences between the classes in the first half of the 20th century (De S. Honey, 1975; Kirk, 1992). In order to understand how team games have come to be seen as a major part of the PE curriculum, the next section examines the historical development of physical activity within the state system since the turn of the century.

The development of 'character' in physical training

During the first half of this century, physical activity for working class children in the state elementary schools was very different to that of the boys from the ruling class, who attended public schools. The public schools emphasized the development of 'gentlemanly ideals' (Mangan, 1975) through team games, whereas physical activities such as gymnastics and 'drill' were felt to be appropriate for the working class (BoE, 1902b, 1904b, 1909, 1919a) because it was believed that they had different attitudes, habits and morals to the higher classes (Bamford, 1967). *The Code of Regulations for Day Schools* recognized 'drill' and physical training as an 'integral and important part of the curriculum' (BoE, 1902a: 41), and the *Model Course of Physical Training* (BoE, 1902b) was introduced as a framework for physical exercise. The *Model Course* required children to perform a range of physical exercises under the command of the teacher. These exercises, performed in lines and militaristic in nature, were intended to develop pupils' 'muscles and . . . the formation of habit and prompt obedience' (BoE, 1902b:

1). There was no place for team games within the *Model Course*, as they were not believed to be appropriate for children in elementary schools. The *Model Course* was short-lived, as it was thought not to have been developed on 'well defined general principles' of physical exercise (Committee on the Model Course of Physical Exercises, 1904: 5). In its place, a new *Code of Regulations for Elementary Schools* (BoE, 1904a) was published which set out the aims of elementary education, while reaffirming the low status of, and expectations for, children from working class backgrounds. It stated that the aim of elementary education was to 'form and strengthen the character and develop the intelligence of the child . . . to fit practically and intellectually for a life of work . . . whilst making them [working class children] conscious of their limitations' (BoE, 1904a: i). The formation of 'character', to which the *Code* was referring, centred on the development of traits such as honesty, determination, unselfishness, self-sacrifice, duty and consideration for others. Interestingly, these traits were similar to those praised by the earlier Clarendon Report, but the means of achieving them, through gymnastics and 'drill', was different to that in the public schools.

The *Syllabus of Physical Exercises for Use in Public Elementary Schools* (BoE, 1904b) acknowledged the 'Educational Effect' (p. 13) of participation in physical exercises, as being 'the exercise of the will'. Indeed, recognition of the 'educational effect' of physical exercise, and the relationship between physical activity, the general aims of education and the development of 'character' was to become more pronounced over the next 30 years. Robert Morant, in the Prefatory Memorandum of *The Syllabus of Physical Exercises for Public Elementary Schools* (BoE, 1909), outlined the general aims of the education provided by state elementary schools as the 'development of sound character, an active intelligence and a healthy physique' (BoE, 1909: v) because a 'healthy physical condition assists the development of the moral and mental facilities' (BoE, 1909: v). One important characteristic of state education was seen in terms of the benefit to society, whereby children learned to 'perform the duties of life with vigour and success' (BoE, 1909: viii). The 'educational effect' (BoE, 1904b: 13) of physical exercises was given greater recognition and importance in the 1909 *Syllabus*, as having both a mental and moral dimension. Through physical exercises, pupils were encouraged to develop endurance, determination, discipline, self-control, self-restraint and the ability to 'respond cheerfully and promptly to the word of command' (BoE, 1909: 5). The *Syllabus* thus outlined the role physical exercises can play in developing cooperation and the 'harmonious working with others' (p. 5). Moreover, a central feature in developing cooperation and working with others was recognition of the role games could play in this process. The recommendation that games should be part of physical exercise lessons for children in state elementary schools represented a move away from teacher-directed physical training exercises, even though team games were to be taught only 'for a few minutes' (BoE, 1909: 21) of the lesson. These were not team games similar to those found in the public schools, but rather running and jumping games, often played in teams, and still organized in lines and under the control of the teacher. The 1909 *Syllabus* stated (p. 155) that, through such games:

Children can learn more easily perhaps in this way than in any other the value of co-operation, and the need to sacrifice when necessary personal desires and wishes for the common good; . . . the habit of obedience is encouraged. Even little children can thus learn unselfishness and the control of their own feelings.

The publication of the 1909 *Syllabus* was important in reinforcing 'character' development within physical exercise. The 'educational effect' (p. 2) of physical exercise was viewed as 'not less important' (p. 2) than the 'physical effect', giving it equal ideological status within physical exercise. In addition, the belief that the 'educational effect' of physical activity promoted the 'formation of character and the development of higher mental and moral qualities' (p. 3) officially extended the scope of physical exercises into the moral domain.

Although education at the turn of the century was important in teaching children their role within society, it was after the First World War that the relationship between 'social and physical training' (BoE, 1918: 13) was explicitly stated. In a speech to the House of Commons, Herbert Fisher, the president of the Board of Education, highlighted the change in educational ideology which he attributed to the war and the need to rebuild the country afterwards. Education was now concerned with the 'whole man ... spiritually, intellectually and physically' (Fisher, 1917: 814) within a framework of 'more enlightened freedom' (p. 814). However, in reality very little changed in terms of the expectations for the working class. Fisher's vision of the role of state education highlighted the expectations those in power had for the working class at this time. While education provided a means of bettering the quality of life for the working class, it was seen as a 'vulgar ambition' (p. 800) to view education as a means of rising out of one's class. Fisher highlighted the importance placed by the government upon the development of 'the character' within education, and the importance the development of good 'character' had for the prosperity of the nation. Bad 'character', claimed Fisher, had grave consequences for British industry, as companies needed workers who were honest, hard-working and reliable. Fisher maintained that the education system should also develop a sense of 'civic spirit' (p. 814), so that, should the need arise, people would be willing and ready to act for Britain in any future hostilities with Germany.

Shortly after the end of the First World War the status of team games within state elementary schools was further enhanced with the introduction of *The Syllabus of Physical Training for Schools* (BoE, 1919a). The 1919 *Syllabus* again outlined the 'educational effect' of participation in physical exercises (BoE, 1919a: 7), and recommended that at least half of physical training lessons be given over to playing games, thereby enabling children to show 'personal initiative, freedom and enterprise' (p. 4) and in keeping with the new 'enlightened' concept of education. Greater emphasis was given to 'character' development within team games, highlighting the concepts of sportsmanship and fair play. The 1919 *Syllabus* stated (p. 65):

The exhilaration, the freedom, the putting forth of effort and putting oneself against a difficulty, always appeal to youth, and the sense of 'good sportsmanship,'

and all that that connotes – love of fair play, modesty in victory, cheerfulness and good temper in defeat, loyalty to one's side, generosity to an opponent, pluck, determination and perseverance – which is gained through competitive play, is of inestimable value later in life.

Team games were also believed to play an important role in the communal life of the school. Team games, it was argued, taught children how their actions had implications for others. 'Of all the school subjects it [team games] is the one which furnishes them with the most intelligible motive for co-operation and collective effort' (BoE, 1919b: 1).

By the mid-1920s team games had become synonymous with the development of social and moral attributes, under the general category of developing 'character'. The *Report of the Consultative Committee on the Education of the Adolescent* (Consultative Committee, 1926: 243) reinforced the 'pre-eminent place of physical education as a means of the development of character and social virtues'. Team games had become a central part of the physical training curriculum, so much so that it was recommended that all schools should have their own playing field, and where this was not possible, they should at least have access to one.

A 'new' view of education was contained in the *Report of the Consultative Committee of the Board of Education on the Primary School* (BoE, 1931). In order to meet the challenges that lay ahead, it was argued that education needed to provide opportunities for better intelligence, healthy growth and greater moral responsibility. To achieve this, the report outlined the need for a more child-centred approach to education, which encouraged 'healthy . . . happy children, vigorous in body and lively in mind' (p. xvi). Less emphasis was placed upon obedience, and more on 'social spirit and the imagination of children' (p. xviii), while the curriculum provided 'fields of new and interesting experiences to be explored' (BoE, 1931: xviii). In this context, the status of team games was again enhanced in 1933 with the introduction of *The Syllabus of Physical Training for Schools* (BoE, 1933). Recommendation was made that the amount of curriculum time given over to the teaching of games be increased, with at least one whole lesson of games taught each week. The 1933 *Syllabus* continued to recommend a variety of running, chasing and simple ball games for younger children, in order to develop a wide range of skills, but stated that versions of recognized team games such as football, cricket, netball and hockey may be appropriate for children in the later years of primary education. The *Syllabus* went further, extolling the benefits of physical activity for both the individual and society. Team games were particularly effective in improving health, 'moulding the character and developing team spirit' (1933: 37). So firmly were social and moral dimensions of the character embedded within the concept of games playing that the 1933 *Syllabus* stated: 'Fair play and sportsmanlike behaviour should never be lost sight of, for they are the ultimate test of good training in games and the highest standard of skill is of no value without them' (p. 45). The place of teams within physical activity was again highlighted as important. The house system, through the formation of permanent teams, was believed to

'foster a spirit of loyalty and responsibility' towards the group (p. 29). Leadership roles, previously limited to older children (BoE, 1919a), were now thought to be appropriate for younger children. For those children who were not given the opportunity to lead groups it was seen as desirable to be able to work under a variety of leaders in order to show ability to cooperate and "play the game" (BoE, 1933: 30). By the time *Moving and Growing* (Ministry of Education, 1952) was introduced, educational ethos had shifted firmly towards a pupil-centred approach (Central Advisory Council for Education, 1967) and this had implications for socio-moral development within PE.

From 'character' training to personal, social and moral education

Moving and Growing (Ministry of Education, 1952) introduced the new term 'physical education', with an emphasis upon children's experience of movement as a vehicle for greater body awareness. The *Physical Training Syllabuses* (BoE, 1902b, 1904b, 1909, 1919a, 1933) of the first half of the 20th century required children to perform physical exercises for the major part of their PE lesson. These static exercises allowed very little scope for free movement. Recognition was given to the fact that physical training exercises required 'little more than passive obedience' (Ministry of Education, 1952: 43) and consequently the tables of exercises were absent from *Planning the Programme* (Ministry of Education, 1953). With the tables of exercises gone, more emphasis was placed upon pupils participating in recognized versions of small-sided team games, football and cricket for boys, and netball and hockey for girls (Ministry of Education, 1953). *Moving and Growing* again highlighted the perceived relationship between socially acceptable behaviour and team games within British culture. 'Undesirable and uncivilised' behaviour was not a characteristic of being English (Ministry of Education, 1952: 37) and PE was seen as a means of suppressing these tendencies in children. The relationship between the mind and body was reaffirmed, but reference to 'character' had been replaced by 'the spirit' (Ministry of Education, 1952: 51). However, the development of children's social skills in team games and their ability to work with others was again stated, highlighting the unique role team games were thought to have in this area: 'In games it is possible to enjoy a relationship with others which is perhaps peculiar to the playing fields' (Ministry of Education, 1952: 58). Developments towards a more child-centred approach to learning continued during the 1960s and 1970s. The broad aims of primary education were translated into a concern for development of the 'whole person' (Central Advisory Council for Education, 1967). Central to this were moral and physical development and matters of social development such as the ability to adapt to changes, to live with others and show respect for other people and their feelings. Through games teaching, teachers were able to 'emphasise the essential nature . . . and the true spirit of the game. The establishment of sound attitudes is important from the start' (Central Advisory Council for Education, 1967: 258).

The concept of PE as a 'medium of learning and expression' (DES, 1972: 8) continued to gain support in government documents during the early 1970s, and PE was

seen as a process of exploration and discovery (DES, 1972). Team games were regarded as an integral part of this process (DES, 1972). Reference to the contribution of team games to 'personal' development had been implicit in PE publications since the *Syllabus of Physical Exercises for Use in Public Elementary Schools* (BoE, 1904b). By 1972 it was officially recognized that games playing 'can contribute considerably to personal development' (DES, 1972: 67). However, the focus of personal development within team games had shifted. Team games were effective in developing 'resourcefulness', 'confidence' and the ability for one to be 'at ease among his contemporaries', all of which were useful qualities in adult life (DES, 1972: 12). More specifically, in addition to the concepts of fair play and sportsmanship, team games presented a 'challenge', which children had to 'strive to overcome' (p. 67). Concern for the development of the individual continued into the 1980s and the 'intellectual, personal, social and physical development of its pupils' (DES, 1985: 7) became a central focus on the curriculum. The aim of education was seen in terms of enabling children to 'become competent, confident, rational and self-reliant adults who can manage their own lives and play their part in society' (DES, 1985: 3). Such was the focus upon pupils' socio-moral development that, by the mid-1980s, schools had introduced specific personal, social and moral education lessons into the curriculum. Although it was regarded as the responsibility of all teachers to foster pupils' socio-moral development, some subjects were seen as being more able to promote these dimensions of the curriculum than others (DES, 1985).

The National Curriculum for Physical Education

The growing emphasis within the school curriculum on pupils' personal, social and moral development was recognized in the Education Reform Act. The ERA placed pupils' 'spiritual, moral, cultural mental and physical development' (DES, 1988: 1) at the centre of the education process, and the importance of these multi-dimensional aspects of the curriculum has since been strengthened further (DES, 1992). The National Curriculum for Physical Education (NCPE) was implemented in 1992 and, with a long tradition of fostering pupils' socio-moral development, PE was seen as being well placed to make a strong contribution in this area. *Physical Education from 5–16* (DES, 1989) paved the way for the implementation of the NCPE (DES, 1992). A great deal of the language and requirements in this publication were similar to those contained within the original, and subsequent, NCPE documents (DES, 1992; DFE and WO, 1995). In addition to skill development, the aims of PE were to promote 'fair play, honest competition and good sportsmanship', and a number of other desirable socio-moral attributes (DES, 1989: 1). To foster the development of these attributes, children were expected to carry out a number of tasks. Some of these tasks, such as evaluating the movement of another pupil, indicated a move away from the traditional focus on performance, towards the development of cognitive skills. This was to become the forerunner to the three-strand approach to understanding physical activity in the NCPE: planning, performing and evaluating.

The change in philosophy in PE and team games, to achieve specific socio-moral outcomes as an explicit part of the activity, can be seen in *Physical Education from 5–16* (DES, 1989: 7):

If tasks are suitably challenging and if there is appropriate help and recognition of progress made, pupils can be encouraged to develop positive attitudes. Similarly, well structured work, which gives pupils explicit opportunities to share ideas and to lead and organise groups, as well as to act independently, can contribute to their personal and social development.

In setting out what children should be able to do (DES, 1989), the PE curriculum contained specific learning outcomes which required pupils to utilize skills in the socio-moral domain. For example, evaluating the performance of another pupil requires empathy, understanding and social skills in order to carry out a discussion. Consequently, the role of team games in fostering pupils' socio-moral development had not only been reinforced, but also made more explicit. Moreover, within the NCPE Orders (DES, 1992), the End of Key Stage Statements set out what children should be able to do in specific socio-moral aspects. For example, it was stated that pupils at Key Stage 2 and 3 had to devise and evaluate tactics in game situations in cooperation with other team members; at Key Stage 3 pupils were required to develop a greater appreciation of what fellow pupils were capable of doing; while at Key Stage 4 they were expected to make judgements about other pupils' performances (DES, 1992). In order to achieve these outcomes, teachers had to set up specific learning situations that required pupils to develop and utilize a range of complex socio-moral skills.

By the time the previous NCPE (DFE and WO, 1995) Orders were implemented, socio-moral learning outcomes were enshrined within both the General Requirements and the End of Key Stage Descriptions. The General Requirements stated (p. 2) that:

To develop positive attitudes, pupils should be taught;

- (a) to observe the conventions of fair play, honest competition and good sporting behaviour as individual participants, team members and spectators;
- (b) how to cope with success and limitations in performance;
- (c) to try hard to consolidate their performance;
- (d) to be mindful of others and the environment.

Within End of Key Stage Descriptions socio-moral learning outcomes were outlined in the following ways. At KS 3 pupils had to work in group/team situations effectively with fellow pupils, know and apply rules and show appreciation of what other pupils are capable of doing. At KS 4 pupils had to coach and officiate within team games. It is interesting to note that within these General Requirements, there is a concern with the individual, the behaviour of spectators and the environment. Evans et al. (1996) argue that in times of unfavourable social conditions, the physical education of the body is one way in which social concern is expressed. The inclusion of

appropriate spectator behaviour may be seen as a response to the poor behaviour of British spectators at sporting events, whereas concern for the environment may reflect a growing public concern with local and global pollution issues. However, within the new NCPE, implemented in September 2000, these requirements have been omitted, although it could hardly be argued that the underlying concerns upon which outcomes were based have disappeared. In the revised NCPE, the place of team games within the PE curriculum is again reinforced within a sociocultural context and their perceived contribution to pupils' socio-moral development highlighted: 'Sport and competitive team games are an important part of the social fabric and help develop team work and social interaction' (DfEE, 1999: 9). Learning outcomes based upon increasingly more complex forms of pupil social interaction are included within the eight level descriptions. In summary, perhaps it is important just to note that in 'official' texts about PE, there is an enduring faith in the pivotal role of the subject in pupils' socio-moral development. However, this analysis raises some interesting questions about the reasons for such a belief, and about the evidence supporting it.

Socio-moral education through team games: a critique

Historically and ideologically, there would appear to be strong support for the role of team games in promoting pupils' socio-moral development. The discussion so far has demonstrated how successive PE publications have emphasized the place of team games in the curriculum. It has drawn upon evidence that shows how the education of the body has been implicated in the construction and maintenance of social order (Hargreaves, 1986; Kirk, 1992) as well as in promoting the benefits of physical activity to the individual (Harvey and Sparkes, 1991). Early PE syllabuses (BoE, 1902b, 1904b, 1909, 1919a, 1933) reinforced the appropriateness of socio-moral training within PE in ways which were believed to be culturally significant and which suited the ruling class (Hargreaves, 1986). Interestingly, it becomes ever clearer that the increased status given to team games in the state system during the 20th century has meant that PE has become similar to that which was formerly taught in public schools (Kirk, 1992). State schools, through government documentation, have been encouraged to embrace the traditional ideology of team games as a means of 'character' development, while the PE profession has also been eager to argue for its role in pupils' socio-moral development (Arnold, 1968; Bilbrough and Jones, 1963). Furthermore, some of the links between NCPE material and earlier education documents are striking. For example: 'Modesty in victory and cheerfulness and good temper in defeat' (BoE, 1919a: 65) appears remarkably similar to 'understand and cope with a variety of outcomes, including both success and failure' (DES, 1992: 2); and the historical focus on cooperation and teamwork has been translated into a need to appreciate 'the strengths and be aware of the weakness of both themselves and others' (p. 2). Yet, the tradition of a strong socio-moral knowledge claim for physical education is not supported by any empirical evidence; indeed, it has been argued that team games have the capacity to cause anti-social behaviour (BoE, 1933; DES,

1972; Penney and Evans, 1994). So why has the PE profession been so keen to claim a key role in pupils' socio-moral development?

One reason may be what Talbot (1997: 7) labels 'the mystification of specialist knowledge' in the battle for status. Kirk (1992) argues that following the redefinition of PE at the end of the Second World War, the profession was keen to use the myth that team games were central to the development of 'character' as a means of enhancing the status of the subject. Williams (1989) concurs, and argues that, with the move towards a child-centred curriculum in the 1950s, the PE profession was anxious to secure the place of PE on the curriculum on 'educational' grounds. Consequently, Kirk argues, despite the fact that they were a relatively new addition to the curriculum in state schools, by the end of the 1950s the belief that team games was a core element of PE was evident both within and outside the profession. Talbot (1997) has argued that the profession has often attempted to enhance its status by making knowledge claims that are not wholly proven. Certainly, it is argued here that the socio-moral knowledge claims for team games within PE provide one good illustration of Talbot's point. Rather than enhancing the status of PE, making claims which are unsubstantiated by empirical evidence may in fact be detrimental to the credibility of the subject. At present there is little evidence of sustained critical analysis in this area and what appears to be required is fundamental research (Armour and Jones, 1998) which would identify exactly what is being claimed for the special links between PE and socio-moral education, and why. A useful starting point for this would be critical debate on some key conceptual questions about the nature of socio-moral development within team games, as was argued earlier. However, there are also some pressing questions about the role/responsibilities of the PE teacher in this area.

Armour and Jones (1998) have argued that the role of the PE teacher as socio-moral educator warrants some urgent critical reflection. Historically, it was suggested that, through participation in physical activity, 'the child unconsciously acquires habits of discipline and order and learns to respond cheerfully and promptly to the word of command' (BoE, 1919a: 10). However, concern with what was perceived as over-competitiveness in team games led to recognition of the teacher as a mediator in ensuring that children 'play in the right spirit' (BoE, 1933: 41). This change was reflected in later publications too. Recognition of the teacher's role in the process of fostering aspects of socio-moral development was highlighted in *Movement: Physical Education in the Primary Years* (DES, 1972), with success in this area of pupils' development attributed to good teaching. In the National Curriculum, it is clearly stated that socio-moral education is the responsibility of all teachers (NCC, 1993). As a result, teachers are encouraged to plan more effectively in order to achieve demonstrable socio-moral learning outcomes (Hellison, 1998; NCC, 1993; Rees, 1998). Evidence that these learning outcomes are being considered at the planning stage has not been forthcoming and therefore research could identify what, if anything, teachers are doing to promote their pupils' learning in this area.

In terms of teaching strategies, it has been argued that PE programmes which

focus specifically upon the development of 'socio-moral' attributes (Miller et al., 1997) and 'responsibility' (Hellison, 1998) can be successful in enhancing children's development in these areas. But how willing are teachers likely to be to implement such teaching programmes? PE has traditionally focused upon the development of physical competence. A PE programme that places such a heavy focus on pupils' socio-moral learning would need to be accompanied by a significant change in thinking by many PE staff. Further research, identifying how open teachers are to such ideological changes, and the confidence they have in their ability to implement new practices, would be helpful. However, Brandl-Bredenbeck (1998) argues that teachers are unlikely to be effective in developing such concepts as 'fair play' in pupils within team games. In his study into the levels of moral reasoning of student PE teachers, Brandl-Bredenbeck found that, as a result of being successful performers, in sport-specific situations many student teachers did not demonstrate higher levels of moral reasoning than the children they were teaching. This calls into question the suitability of these teachers to teach moral issues and lends some weight to Lee's (1996) claim that we need a better understanding of how theories of moral development impact upon the way in which moral development is taught in practice. Similarly, in the context of sport, Houlihan (1998) claims that existing findings from research into the effects of participation on socio-moral development have been equivocal. What seems to be required, therefore, is research which looks at both PE and sport, and which seeks to critically examine the pedagogical issues raised by claiming to teach socio-moral development through team games within PE. Useful opening questions might be as follows: 'What exactly are we attempting to teach?' 'What do we expect pupils to learn?' 'Why?' 'How can we know if we have been successful?'

Conclusion

Learning in education is centrally concerned with developing pupils' 'self-esteem, health and well-being' (DfEE, 1999: 12) and Reid (1997) argues that the value of PE within the curriculum rests upon the degree to which it can contribute to these aims. The NCPE (DFE and WO, 1995) and *Sport: Raising the Game* (DNH, 1995) represent the 'official' understanding of the contribution team games can make to pupils' socio-moral development. Penney and Evans (1994) argue that this reflects a nostalgic ideology based upon a 19th-century public school ethos. Despite the claims made by the PE profession about the contribution team games can make to pupils' development in this area, there is a pressing need for empirical evidence to support (or refute) those claims. It has been argued in this article that critical debate within the profession, initially about conceptual clarity in the socio-moral area and then about practice and the teachers' role, could help us to develop a better understanding of what it is that PE teachers ought to be attempting to teach through team games. Burt (1998) argues that, as part of the wider field of human movement, PE has the capacity to play an important role in addressing some of society's more pressing problems,

but that it has yet to realize this potential. Critical analysis of the theory and practice of teaching socio-moral development through team games could make a significant contribution to understanding why not.

References

- Armour, K.M. and Jones, R. (1998) *Physical Education Teachers' Lives and their Careers*. London: Falmer Press.
- Arnold, P. (1968) *Education, Physical Education and Personality Development*. London: Heinemann.
- Bamford, T.W. (1967) *The Rise of the Public Schools*. London: Thomas Nelson.
- Bamford, T.W. (1975) 'Thomas Arnold and the Victorian Ideal of a Public School', in B. Simon and I. Bradley (eds) *The Victorian Public School*, pp. 58–71. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan.
- Bilbrough, A. and Jones, P. (1963) *Physical Education in the Primary School*. London: University of London Press.
- Blake, B. (1996) 'Spiritual, Moral, Social and Cultural Development in Physical Education', *Bulletin of Physical Education* 32(1): 6–16.
- Board of Education (1902a) *The Code of Regulations for Day Schools*. London: HMSO.
- Board of Education (1902b) *The Model Course of Physical Training for Use in the Upper Departments of Public Elementary Schools*. London: HMSO.
- Board of Education (1904a) *The Code of Regulations for Day Schools*. London: HMSO.
- Board of Education (1904b) *The Syllabus of Physical Exercises for Use in Public Elementary Schools*. London: HMSO.
- Board of Education (1909) *The Syllabus of Physical Exercises for Public Elementary Schools*. London: HMSO.
- Board of Education (1918) *An Act to Make Further Provision with Respect to Education in England and Wales*. London: HMSO.
- Board of Education (1919a) *The Syllabus of Physical Training for Schools*. London: HMSO.
- Board of Education (1919b) *Physical Training: Notes to Supplement Appendix B*. London: HMSO.
- Board of Education (1931) *Report of the Consultative Committee of the Board of Education on the Primary School*. London: HMSO.
- Board of Education (1933) *The Syllabus of Physical Training for Schools*. London: HMSO.
- Brandl-Bredenbeck, H.P. (1998) 'Let's Save the Handshake: Teaching Moral Values in Sport and Physical Education', Proceedings of the AIESEP–Adelphi World Congress, Adelphi University, New York, 12–17 July.
- Burt, J.J. (1998) 'The Role of Kinesiology in Elevating Modern Society', *Quest* 50(1): 80–95.
- Central Advisory Council for Education (1967) *Children and their Primary Schools: A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England)*, vol. 1. London: HMSO.
- Committee on the Model Course of Physical Exercises (1904) *Report of the Interdepartmental Committee on the Model Course of Physical Exercises*. London: HMSO.
- Consultative Committee (1926) *Report of the Consultative Committee on the Education of the Adolescent*. London: HMSO.
- David, K. (1983) *Personal and Social Education in Secondary Schools*. York: Longman.
- DES (1972) *Movement: Physical Education in the Primary Years*. London: HMSO.
- DES (1985) *The Curriculum from 5–16: Curriculum Matters 2*. London: HMSO.
- DES (1988) *The Education Reform Act*. London: HMSO.
- DES (1989) *Physical Education from 5–16*. London: HMSO.
- DES (1991) *Physical Education for Ages 5–16: Proposals for the Secretary of State for Education and Science and Secretary of State for Wales*. London: NCC.
- DES (1992) *Education (Schools) Act*. London: HMSO.
- De S. Honey, J.R. (1975) 'Tom Brown's Universe: The Nature and Limits of the Victorian

- Public School Community', in B. Simon and I. Bradley (eds) *The Victorian Public School*, pp. 19–33. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan.
- DFE and WO (1995) *Physical Education in the National Curriculum*. London: HMSO.
- DfEE (1999) *The Review of the National Curriculum in England: The Secretary of State's Proposals*. London: QCA.
- DNH (1995) *Sport; Raising the Game*. London: HMSO.
- Dunning, E. (1975) 'The Origins of Modern Football', in B. Simon and I. Bradley (eds) *The Victorian Public School*, pp. 168–76. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan.
- Evans, J., Penney, D. and Davies, B. (1996) 'Back to the Future: Education Policy and Physical Education', in N. Armstrong (ed.) *New Directions in Physical Education*, pp. 1–18. London: Cassell.
- Feezell, R.M. (1988) 'Sportsmanship', in W.J. Morgan and K.V. Meier (eds) *Philosophic Enquiry in Sport* (2nd edn), pp. 152–60. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Fisher, H. (1917) *Education Bill: Parliamentary Debates (Official Report)* (5th series), vol. xcvi, pp. 795–852. London: HMSO.
- Fox, K.R. (1992) 'Physical Education and the Development of Self-Esteem in Children', in N. Armstrong (ed.) *New Directions in Physical Education*, vol. 2, pp. 33–54. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Galloway, F. (1989) *Personal and Social Education in the Primary School*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Gardner, B. (1973) *The Public Schools*. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- Gibbons, S.L., Ebbeck, V. and Weiss, M.R. (1995) 'Fair Play for Kids: Effects on the Moral Development of Children in Physical Education', *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport* 66(3): 247–55.
- Hargreaves, J. (1986) *Sport, Power and Culture*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Harvey, J. and Sparkes, R. (1991) 'The Politics of the Body in the Context of Modernity', *Quest* 43: 164–89.
- Hellison, D. (1998) 'Teaching Responsibility in Physical Education', Proceedings of the AIESEP–Adelphi World Congress, Adelphi University, New York, 12–17 July.
- Houlihan, B. (1998) 'Fairness as a Global Issue in Sport', Proceedings of the AIESEP–Adelphi World Congress, Adelphi University, New York, 12–17 July.
- Kirk, D. (1992) *Defining Physical Education: The Social Construction of a School Subject in Post War Britain*. London: Falmer Press.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981) *The Philosophy of Moral Development*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.
- Lee, M. (1996) 'Psycho-Social Development from 5 to 16 years', in N. Armstrong (ed.) *New Directions in Physical Education*, pp. 337–47. London: Cassell.
- McIntosh, P. (1987) *Sport in Society*. London: West London Press.
- Mangan, J.A. (1975) 'Athleticism: A Case Study of the Evolution of an Educational Ideology', in B. Simon and I. Bradley (eds) *The Victorian Public School*, pp. 58–71. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan.
- Meakin, D.C. (1982) 'Moral Values in Physical Education', *Physical Education Review* 5(1): 62–82.
- Miller, S.C., Bredemeier, B.J.L. and Shields, D.L.L. (1997) 'Socio-Moral Education through Physical Education with At-Risk Children', *Quest* 49: 114–29.
- Ministry of Education (1952) *Physical Education in the Primary School: Moving and Growing*. London: HMSO.
- Ministry of Education (1953) *Physical Education in the Primary School: Planning the Programme*. London: HMSO.
- National Curriculum Council (1992) *Physical Education: Non-Statutory Guidance*. York: NCC.
- National Curriculum Council (1993) *Spiritual and Moral Development: A Discussion Paper*. York: NCC.

- Penney, D. and Evans, J. (1994) 'It's Just Not (and Not Just) Cricket', *British Journal of Physical Education* 25(3): 9–12.
- Rees, C.R. (1998) 'Building Character and the Globalisation of Sport', Proceedings of the AIESEP– Adelphi World Congress, Adelphi University, New York, 12–17 July.
- Reid, A. (1997) 'Value Pluralism and Physical Education', *European Physical Education Review* 3(1): 6–20.
- Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners Appointed to Enquire into the Revenues and Management of Certain Colleges and Schools* (1864) London: HMSO (Clarendon Report).
- Ryder, J. and Campbell, L. (1988) *Balancing Acts in Personal, Social and Health Education*. London: Routledge.
- SCAA (1995) *Spiritual and Moral Development: SCAA Discussion Paper No. 3*. London: SCAA.
- Shields, D.L.L. and Bredemeier, B.J.L. (1995) *Character Development and Physical Activity*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Shrosbree, C. (1988) *Public Schools and Private Education: The Clarendon Commission 1861–1864 and the Public Schools Act*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Talbot, M. (1997) 'Values and Aspirations for the Profession', *Bulletin of Physical Education* 3(3): 6–23.
- Williams, A. (1989) *Issues for Physical Education in the Primary Years*. London: Falmer Press.

Résumé

Le développement personnel, social et moral par les sports d'équipe: questions critiques

Ce papier soulève les questions critiques quant à la place du développement personnel, social et moral des enfants dans les sports d'équipe. Il est montré que des définitions conceptuelles plus claires et un débat critique au sein de la profession d'éducation physique sont nécessaires, afin de déterminer le rôle des sports d'équipe dans la promotion de l'éducation personnelle, sociale et morale des enfants. L'interaction complexe entre ces différents aspects du développement de l'enfant est discutée et un argument est donné pour l'utilisation de l'éducation 'socio-morale' dans l'intention d'une analyse ultérieure. L'idéologie actuelle ébauche une voie de recherche selon laquelle les sports d'équipe peuvent contribuer à l'accroissement de l'éducation 'socio-morale' des enfants, s'inscrivant contre les développements historiques en éducation physique dans les écoles publiques et privées depuis 150 ans. La nécessité d'un fondement empirique justifie l'investigation de connaissances dans les aires multidimensionnelles du curriculum et quelques suggestions sont faites pour des recherches dans cette voie.

Zusammenfassung

Die individuelle, soziale und moralische Entwicklung durch Mannschaftssportarten: Einige kritische Fragen

Dieser Aufsatz setzt sich kritische auseinander mit dem Stellenwert der individuellen, sozialen und moralischen Entwicklung von Schülern in Mannschaftssportarten. Es wird argumentiert, dass klarere konzeptionelle Definitionen und eine kritische Auseinandersetzung innerhalb des Berufsfeldes des Schulsports nötig sind, um die Eignung von Mannschaftssportarten für die Förderung der persönlichen, sozialen und moralischen Erziehung von Schülern zu bestimm-

men. Die komplexen Beziehungen zwischen diesen Aspekten in der Entwicklung von Schülern werden diskutiert, und es wird dafür plädiert, die 'sozio-moralische' Erziehung zum Gegenstand weiterer Forschungen zu machen. Gegenwärtige Standpunkte, die die Art und Weise skizzieren, in der Mannschaftssportarten die sozio-moralische Erziehung von Schülern fördern, werden vor dem Hintergrund der historischen Entwicklung des Schulsports in staatlichen als auch in privaten Schulen in den vergangenen 150 Jahren untersucht. Die Notwendigkeit empirischer Belege zur Untermauerung des Kenntnisstandes in diesem multi-dimensionalen Feld des Curriculums wird herausgestellt, und es werden einige Vorschläge für die weitere Forschung in diesem Bereich gemacht.

Resumen

El desarrollo personal, social y moral mediante los juegos de equipo: algunas cuestiones críticas

Este trabajo plantea cuestiones críticas acerca del lugar que ocupa el desarrollo personal, social y moral de alumnos en los juegos de equipo. Se propone que hacen falta unas definiciones conceptuales más claras y un debate más crítico dentro de la profesión de educación física para establecer el papel de los juegos de equipo en fomentar la educación personal, social y moral de los alumnos. Se consideran las relaciones complejas entre estos aspectos del desarrollo de los alumnos y se expone un argumento a favor del uso de la educación <socio-moral> para realizar un análisis más amplio. Se examina la ideología actual la que esboza los rasgos de la creencia de que los juegos de equipo pueden contribuir a la educación socio-moral de los alumnos, tomando en cuenta los antecedentes de los desarrollos en el campo de la educación física durante los últimos 150 años, tanto en los institutos del Estado como en los independientes. Se subraya la necesidad de pruebas empíricas para confirmar supuestos conocimientos en esta área multidisciplinaria del plan de estudios y se hacen unas sugerencias para investigaciones en este campo.

Andrew Theodoulides is a Lecturer in Physical Education at the Chelsea School, University of Brighton. He is currently undertaking doctoral research looking at the socio-moral discourse in physical education.

Address: Hillbrow, 1 Denton Road, Eastbourne BN20 7SP, UK. [email: A.Theodoulides@bton.ac.uk]

Kathleen Armour is a Senior Lecturer at Loughborough University. Her research interests are in the area of pedagogy in physical education, coaching and sports sciences. She is co-author, with Robin Jones, of *Physical Education Teachers' Lives and Careers* (Falmer Press) and joint editor of the electronic journal *Sosol* (*Sociology of Sport On line*).

Address: Department of Physical Education, Sports Science and Recreational Management, Loughborough University, Loughborough LE11 3TU, UK. [email: K.M.Armour@lboro.ac.uk]
