

Inclusion and curriculum in physical education

Gary Stidder and Richard Blair

Introduction

At a point in history when lifestyle choices, activity preferences and exercise habits for many children and young people are changing (Green, 2010; Piggin, Mansfield and Weed, 2018), this chapter draws attention to a range of issues relating to the physical education curriculum and teacher pedagogy and how they combine to support the inclusion of all pupils in the subject. The discussion aims to highlight the rhetoric of macro-level curriculum and policy against the reality, opportunities and challenges of localised practice in schools. Under the broad umbrella of developing an inclusive curriculum and teacher pedagogy, the chapter considers ways and means through which physical education is provided. It considers the physical education curriculum and the interpretation of the curriculum by physical education teachers and those in authority, including head-teachers and governing bodies. The debate is developed around the joined-up notion that head-teachers, school governing bodies and physical education teachers are all central agents in either supporting or challenging forms of inclusion within education and physical education. The implications for this are discussed and questions are presented regarding how schools and teachers might develop an understanding of the importance of a high-quality, inclusive physical education curriculum. The development of a more inclusive curriculum and teacher pedagogy is also discussed in relation to teacher education.

The educationalist Lawrence Stenhouse (1975, p. 53) defined curriculum as ‘an attempt to communicate the essential principles and features of an educational proposal in such a form that it is open to critical scrutiny and capable of effective translation into practice’. Bartlett and Burton (2016) wrote that knowledge included in a macro-curriculum has authority and is considered as a legal, social and moral force. It is considered a public statement about what is significant and worthwhile knowledge. They added, ‘to control the curriculum is to exert considerable power so governments regularly intervene in the nature of the school curriculum’ (Bartlett and Burton, 2016, p. 105). Therefore, it is suggested that the meaning of the word ‘curriculum’ moves beyond the simple listing of content to be taught. Rather, a curriculum is a way of

arranging and organising how pupils experience content, teaching methods and assessment (Bartlett and Burton, 2016). This suggests that the curriculum is socially constructed and complex (Husbands, 2012) and that curriculum development requires a willingness to explore the what, why and how of teaching (see Chapters 10 and 11, which explore the what, why and how of primary and secondary physical education, respectively).

Understanding the complex, socially constructed phenomenon of inclusion is a significant issue that all schools and teachers should aim to understand if the idea of an inclusive curriculum and pedagogical practice is to be ‘more than just a façade behind which old habits hide’ (Evans and Davies, 1993, p. 21). This chapter refers to the concept of inclusion as how schools and teachers value equally the accomplishments, attitudes and well-being of every pupil, while providing a curriculum that is relevant and meaningful (Stidder and Hayes, 2016). Furthermore, over 25 years ago, Evans and Davies (1993) made the point that if teachers develop an understanding that supports a curriculum and pedagogical approach which embraces differences in pupils as a resource it enriches the educational experience of all. This is equally relevant today, specifically in the context of physical education. The idea that teachers should embrace differences in pupils with a positive perspective is not only a moral issue but also a position aimed at supporting access to broader educational aims. This position gains critical relevance for Stidder (2015) who suggested that the physical education community is aiming to be inclusive for all pupils and genuinely embrace pupils’ differences. Sharing a view that difference adds value to the educational experience and is of central importance. To achieve this aim, the physical education community should consider the content, design and interpretation of the curriculum (Stidder, 2015). This is a complex and difficult issue and forms a central part of the discussion for this chapter.

Debates about inclusion in education and physical education

Debates in education and physical education associated with inclusion have, in the past, focused primarily on single individual issues of social categorisation (Stidder and Hayes, 2013). These are clearly important issues and ongoing discussions relating to social class, gender, race, culture, ethnicity, religion, sexual identity and additional learning needs in physical education are well documented (see, for example, Clarke, 2013; Evans and Bairner, 2013; Hayes and Burdsey, 2013; Stidder, Lines and Keyworth, 2013; Vickerman and Maher, 2017). For example, Vickerman and Maher (2017) considered the challenges that physical education teachers face in providing relevant experiences for pupils who have stated special educational needs and disabilities. This work has brought attention to changes in policy and practice with respect to social inclusion. Evans and Bairner (2013) discussed issues associated with an under-researched aspect of social inclusion, including social class, and how socio-economic status can

determine unequal opportunities within physical education. Hayes and Burdsey (2013) discussed the importance of inclusion in physical education from the perspective of racial and ethnic stereotyping, highlighting the need for teachers to be aware of cultural sensitivities and the way in which physical education is presented to pupils from multi-cultural backgrounds. In addition, Clarke (2013) brought to the fore the scale and problem surrounding heterosexism, homophobia and transphobia in physical education. Research by Stidder, Lines and Keyworth (2013) investigated the extent to which gender influences the outcomes of the physical education curriculum and highlighted significant issues relating to how physical education teachers have interpreted the curriculum differently for boys and girls. However, the inter-relationship between each social category identified above should be acknowledged and viewed from a wider perspective and not in isolation.

It could be debated that the idea of inclusion is based on understanding and interpretation of the curriculum (Penney et al., 2018). This interpretation constitutes a series of localised decisions made by key stakeholders, i.e. head-teachers and governing bodies, as well as by teachers. Head-teachers and governors are also in a position of power and authority, controlling the allocation of curriculum time, thus having an indirect influence on content, through funding and whole school ethos, values and beliefs. Both points regarding funding and ethos have the potential to impact significantly how the curriculum can be interpreted by teachers. This can result in either synergy or a clash between stakeholders, particularly those of head-teachers and governors versus those of physical education teachers, in relation to their values, beliefs and understanding of inclusive education and physical education. In the political decision-making processes of allocating curriculum time, funding and resourcing or staffing, attention is drawn to the complex social and cultural elements that surround all attempts at inclusion.

Bartlett and Burton (2016, p. 103) wrote ‘teachers interpret the curriculum within the context of their own situation, their subject and general professional practices, the culture of the department and the general ethos of the school’. This is a point further reinforced by Penney et al. (2018, p. 1071) who stated that ‘as teacher educators, we acknowledge that inclusion is impacted by structures well beyond the reach of the teacher...’ These acknowledgements of teacher interpretation mean the political challenges of resourcing and facilities alone would make including all pupils all the time an extremely difficult aim to achieve. But, the challenge for supporting and delivering inclusion, diversity and equality, however political, is the reality for all head-teachers, governing bodies and physical education teachers working in schools today. In the specific context of teaching physical education, Stidder (2015) questioned if the significant challenge of delivering inclusive lessons could be addressed through an engaged and informed debate based on localised circumstances, resources and facilities. This debate could ask questions relating to what knowledge is now relevant for education and physical education. And furthermore, how does this knowledge include

and link to the lives of children and young people? How might this knowledge be taught in specific social, cultural, political and economic contexts? A positive outcome from such debates would clearly be dependent on the values, beliefs and understanding of the people involved. Furthermore, any debate would need to have an acute awareness of what works in one school for one age, ethnic or gender group may not work in another (Pawson, 2006). Therefore, local opportunities and challenges need to be understood and carefully considered. This point leads to recognition that for schools to support a curriculum and pedagogy that is grounded in an intentional awareness of inclusion for all pupils, local discussions between head-teachers, governors and teachers need to support a progressive dialogue and give specific attention to the *what* as well as the *how* and the *why* of a school-based physical education curriculum.

Therefore, perhaps the inclusion challenge for schools is to ensure that head-teachers, governing bodies and physical education teachers collectively consider how they fund, resource, plan, interpret and assess the physical education curriculum so that all pupils can enjoy opportunities to learn and develop their physical competence, confidence and motivation (Theodoulides, 2013; Whitehead, 2010). The resourcing, planning and interpretation of macro-level curriculum is a position further reinforced by Stidder (2015), who expressed a strong view that a 'one-size-fits-all' model often associated with traditional, sex-segregated, gender-stereotyped competitive team games is not in the best interests of most pupils. This is also supported by Kirk (2010, 2013), who questioned the relevance to all pupils of a multi-activity sport-technique-based physical education curriculum. Furthermore, Penney et al. (2018) suggested that a multi-activity, games-based interpretation of the curriculum lacks meaningful connection with many pupils lives as it does not include enough awareness and explanation to help them understand how the programme relates to movement for everyday tasks, social engagement in physical activities and health-related participation. Therefore, it does not support a level of social engagement that reinforces to pupils that being physically activity supports their holistic health and well-being (Penney and Jess, 2004).

The issue of how inclusion relates to curriculum planning, content and pedagogy were points identified by the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills in England (Ofsted, 2014), which reported that it is becoming increasingly evident that in some schools the history of physical education is repeating itself. Thus, we are seeing a curriculum and pedagogical interpretation of physical education as competitive team sport (Ofsted, 2014), taught in a largely didactic way. This is a point previously developed by Nikkhah (2007) who, in the context of discussing the idea of inclusion, stated that physical education teachers have been accused of using pedagogical approaches that favour elite performers and further reinforce a disliking of overweight pupils, due to having an expectation that they under-achieve within physical education lessons. This accusation against teacher pedagogy is not an over-exaggeration as academics and researchers have consistently called for a more diverse and inclusive physical education curriculum (Green, 2010).

Furthermore, it is worth remembering that there are a significant proportion of children and young people who actively dislike physical education (Sport England, 2015). The Sport England (2015) survey found that almost one in five pupils either disliked or strongly disliked physical education lessons. The same report also stated that fewer than half of pupils viewed their physical education lessons as a positive experience. This point was reinforced by the Youth Sport Trust (2015), which reported that pupils are put off taking part in lessons because of an over-emphasis on competitive team games, a limited range of other physical activities, ugly kits, communal showers, gender bias, homophobic bullying, unhygienic changing facilities and unsympathetic physical education teachers. Similar issues were printed in the media, with *The Guardian* (Anonymous, 2015) reporting that one of the major factors that contributed to pupils' negative perceptions of physical education was a limited choice of activities other than traditional competitive team games and sports. Perhaps, the most interesting point regarding the national media reporting of this issue is that it has now become one of public interest. This therefore suggests that the implications of inclusive physical education are now having an influence on the broader social and economic life of children and young people. This links to public concerns regarding health and well-being and children and young people living an increasingly sedentary lifestyle (Piggin, Mansfield and Weed, 2018). The issue of how schools and teachers interpret the curriculum is discussed in the next section, which aims to develop discussion and debate regarding curriculum and pedagogy and how this is understood, interpreted, funded and resourced at a local level.

Curriculum interpretation in physical education

The National Curriculum for Physical Education (NCPE) in England (and other national curricula around the world) is a macro-level policy that can be interpreted in many different ways to suit different contexts and environments. Schools are not required by law to teach the example content such as badminton, basketball, cricket, football, hockey, netball, rugby, rounders and tennis (Department for Education (DfE), 2013). The fact that the example content appears at all is in itself an interesting point. But what is potentially more interesting is that no alternative example content is included beyond what is perhaps best described as traditional sports. This could very conceivably lead to the conclusion that the content being used as an example is aimed at encouraging or directing physical education teachers to stay within very conservative boundaries that only act to reinforce their own socialised experiences of being taught physical education (Capel, 2005; Capel and Blair 2013; Green, 2003).

It could be suggested that the answer to developing an inclusive curriculum and teacher pedagogy is to change the content (in this case, of the NCPE in England), in order that content is appropriate for the diverse range and needs of the pupils being taught and reflect the tastes, trends and fashions of the day. This could be part of the answer, but, as already stated, the NCPE is a macro-level policy that is open to teacher interpretation. Although teacher interpretation

can take many different forms, from a national position, it currently shows an over-emphasis on formalised and traditional competitive team games (see, for example, Capel and Blair, 2007; Casey, 2017; Kirk, 2010; Stidder and Hayes, 2013). Therefore, consideration regarding what could be changed in different contexts is a helpful point for reflection. Would change to the curriculum content lead to a more inclusive experience? Or is the issue more centred on a teacher's pedagogical interpretation, how teachers choose to deliver, for example, invasion games or athletic activities or indeed any of the identified sports within the NCPE (DfE, 2013)? In reality, if we are aiming for a more inclusive, contextualised and authentic physical education curriculum that connects with children and young peoples' identity, aligns with youth sub cultures and prepares pupils to be active citizens in a democratic society, could it be argued that *both* curriculum content and pedagogical interpretation will need to be, at the very least, nudged in a different direction to include all pupils? Furthermore, any suggestion of 'nudging' will more than likely need a local emphasis, aimed at addressing the specific needs of the pupils in any given social, cultural, political, economic and geographical context.

Indeed, it is interesting to reflect on what appears to be a remarkable consistency in the interpretation of physical education across different social, cultural, economic, political and geographical contexts. In truth, from the position of the taught content, would it not be desirable to see clearer differences in the reality and interpretation of localised curriculum design and delivery? For example, would you expect to see a school based in an urban, inner city context interpreting the content of the curriculum in the same way as a school in a rural, coastal context? Clearly, the answer to this question lies much deeper than the geographical context. Indeed, clarity regarding the social traditions, cultural values, economic position and political ideologies of the different contexts would be needed in order that some resemblance of a coherent and valid answer could be developed.

Furthermore, the position of teachers working in a wide range of different social, cultural, economic, political and geographical contexts, interpreting both the content and their pedagogical approach to teaching the physical education curriculum, with remarkable similarity, is further reinforced by Lawson (2018) from an American perspective and by Penney et al. (2018) from an Australian perspective. They both make similar points regarding a narrow multi-sports, games-led interpretation of physical education. These thoughts challenge the ideas and reality of inclusion within physical education. This is not to say that at a local level physical education lessons do not show elements of inclusive practice; clearly, they do. But, this similarity across broader contexts does require us to further question how the physical education community understands its responsibility to include all pupils regardless of their abilities, talents and backgrounds. Furthermore, the global scale of the issue, acknowledged by Kirk (2010), Lawson (2018) and Penney et al. (2018), suggests that the change may be needed at a macro policy and education level.

By questioning the reality of localised curriculum interpretation, a connection can be made to the concept of inclusion as offered by Penney et al. (2018),

who identified that physical educational settings lack meaningful connection for many children and young peoples' lives as they do not include enough awareness and understanding of movement for everyday tasks, social engagement in physical activities and health-related participation (Penney and Jess, 2004). Issues of localised curriculum design and pedagogical interpretation also relate to the points made by Beames and Brown (2016) from an outdoor adventure perspective. They highlighted the importance of contextualised and authentic learning and how these learning perspectives can influence an inclusive approach to curriculum design and pedagogy. They wrote that, from an educational perspective, being authentic is usually aligned with high and bespoke standards of engagement and learning and therefore, in theory, a bespoke, contextualised and authentic curriculum and pedagogical interpretation should be more inclusive (Beames and Brown, 2016). This notion challenges the present situation which sees the curriculum design in many schools having a negative effect by failing to engage those children and young people who do not naturally excel in traditional team sports (Penney et al., 2018).

Indeed, Nelsen and Seaman (2011) discussed concerns about the disconnection between individual relevance and approaches to learning. They were clear in stating that *context matters* in the learning process as it makes learning relevant and meaningful. Therefore, when considering inclusion from a curriculum perspective, the idea of the school and teacher's awareness and interpretation within the particular social, culture, political, economic and geographical context seems highly relevant. It connects to the constructivist paradigm that promotes a view of learning that sees the learner constructing knowledge and understanding through interaction with the world around them (Rovegno, 2006; Rovegno and Dolly, 2006; Vygotsky, 1978).

The responsibility of the physical education community to think critically regarding matters of inclusion is further challenged by Stidder (2015). He suggested that the broader theme regarding how adults interpret the teaching of physical education is leading to some secondary-aged pupils becoming increasingly disengaged from taking part in physical education lessons. Indeed, Stidder (2015) suggested that many pupils are not experiencing a curriculum interpretation that generates meaning and relevance in their lives. Therefore, as already suggested, physical education does not *include* them because it does not connect with their evolving identities and those of twenty-first century youth sub-cultures (Storey, 2015).

So, is the idea of authentic pedagogy supportive of teachers thinking about inclusion from a curriculum perspective? With the challenge for schools and teachers to make learning contextualised, authentic and *inclusive*, the notion of thinking about the learning context, including outcomes, activities, teaching methods and learning points, in relation to the context and *authenticity* for the learners, seems helpful. The idea of schools and teachers considering the notion of how *authentic* their physical education curriculum and pedagogy is in relation to their social, cultural, political, economic and geographical context seems relevant and potentially supportive of greater pupil engagement and inclusion.

This situation requires us to consider the relationship between funding, resourcing, teacher socialisation and education and inclusive pedagogy. Does the funding and resourcing of physical education departments influence how physical education teachers can interpret the physical education curriculum? Or is it the case that physical education teachers are advising head-teachers and school governing bodies that physical education, the school subject, is, for example, competitive team games and fitness testing? In reality, it is perhaps both. However, this ‘chicken or egg’ like conundrum and the politics of who is in the position to question the current diet of a competitive team game-dominated curriculum (Kirk, 2010) forms a central point for debate in relation to the inclusion of all pupils in physical education. The reality of this position is perhaps dependent on local conditions, i.e. the social, cultural, political, economic and geographical and teacher socialisation and agency. Teacher agency is discussed in further detail in the next section.

Inclusion and initial and continuing teacher education

It is clearly not the intention of this chapter to create a culture of blame aimed at schools and teachers regarding curriculum design, teacher pedagogy and inclusion. Therefore, it is important to acknowledge the relevance of providing schools, teachers and student physical education teachers with the confidence to consider alternative approaches to designing curricula and pedagogical approaches that support inclusive physical education. Stidder and Hayes (2013), supported by Light (2017), suggested that this supportive direction would require teachers to have a secure understanding of learning theory and how theory links to curriculum design and, in turn, their pedagogical interpretation. The option to consider a different way of doing things, through an explicit awareness and understanding of how learning theory relates to practice, could be the first step in achieving a more sustainable, authentic and inclusive type of physical education. The following section considers how initial and continuing teacher education might support an understanding of inclusion and how they relate to physical education curriculum design and pedagogical interpretation.

Questions regarding what is considered relevant knowledge for physical education in both initial and continuing teacher education are central points in any curriculum debate, but perhaps have specific relevance in discussions about inclusion. In theory, greater inclusion in any educational context, regardless of the academic discipline, leads to the outcome of increased engagement, leading to the longer-term development of social and economic mobility. This is a point developed in the context of teacher practice by Mockler (2011), who considered the point of interpretation more broadly and was critical of discourses which privilege narrow, technical-rational understandings of various occupations and professions, which have a tendency to fixate on aspects of practice that are easier to quantify, measure and mandate and which leads to the reproduction of

alleged ‘gold standard’ routines and procedures, rather than the development of reflexive, politically aware practitioners.

In agreement with Mockler (2011), and in connection to the points already made regarding authenticity, meaning and relevance of experience, we suggest that teacher education that aims to support an interpretation of curriculum for the greater inclusion of all pupils will only truly be developed if it supports teachers to develop their agency. Agency requires teachers to develop their confidence and competence to question attempts by other stakeholders, i.e. head-teachers and governing bodies, to, for example, narrow the curriculum and distribute funding and resources to other test-driven subjects. With reference to the consequences of narrowing the curriculum, Crocco and Costigan (2007) wrote that it also narrows teacher’s pedagogical choice and, in the case of physical education, we would also suggest the choice of activity. Our thoughts relating to the development of teacher agency are grounded in a belief that humans make choices and act on these choices in order to make a difference (Martin, 2004, cited in Beames and Brown, 2016). In developing teacher agency, there is a need for physical education teachers to develop an explicit and reflective awareness of the complexities of learning in a changing society, including the real-world realities of social, cultural, political and economic discourses. This type of thinking has led Green (2008) and Marchant (2013), among others, to suggest that reforms to both initial and continuing teacher education are the most likely means of achieving inclusion for all pupils in physical education. Part of these reforms might include the consideration of alternative approaches to curriculum to include all pupils, an example of which is provided in the next section.

An example of an alternative approach to inclusive physical education

For Stidder (2017a, 2017b), one alternative model of teaching physical education which he used in teacher education to help aspiring physical education teachers to overcome insecurities in subject knowledge was what he called the ‘A list’ approach to physical education. This approach to physical education addresses issues relating to inclusion, for example, breadth, depth and balance of experience among student physical education teachers during school-based placement. It is designed to give prospective teachers greater agency to engage in alternative activity programmes, increasing their confidence and willingness to work outside the more traditional activity programmes (see Stidder (2017a, 2017b) for further information on the ‘A list’ for physical education).

Student physical education teachers were introduced to an example of the ‘A list’ physical education programme through the relatively new concept of ‘physical education on wheels’ (Stidder, 2017a, 2017b). Many young people engage in mountain biking, Bicycle motocross (BMX) biking, skateboarding, in-line skating,

street surfing and micro-scootering out of school, yet very few schools have recognised this as a means to increase pupils activity levels and therefore tend to ignore the potential of introducing these activities into their physical education lessons. This may, of course, link back to the political and economic issues of resourcing, identified earlier in the chapter. But, research by Stidder (2017a, 2017b) reported that during an alternative activity event, 93 per cent of pupils had never tried street surfing and those who tried it during the event enjoyed it because it was something different. One student physical education teacher commented,

There's twenty five kids here, and everyone is engaged and doing it with a smile on their face whereas if this was football or rugby you're more than likely going to have four or five of them not engaged in the activity.

(Stidder, 2017c)

The 'A list' is viewed as an example of an inclusive approach to physical education as it aligns with aspects of twenty-first century popular youth culture and engages pupils who might otherwise be excluded from a more traditional approach to physically active. This, of course, is a salient point, in that like a lot of innovative practice, it may include some pupils, but it may also exclude others, a point that reinforces the challenges of planning, delivering and assessing an inclusive physical education curriculum.

Conclusion

This chapter has discussed issues relating to supporting schools and physical education teachers to consider how they understand the relationship between inclusion and the physical education curriculum – more specifically, the curriculum content and how this is interpreted by schools and teachers. The debate has developed around the notion that head-teachers, governing bodies and physical education teachers are all central agents in either perpetuating or challenging forms of inclusion within physical education. The issue of design and delivery of a physical education curriculum has been presented as a central component in the search for an inclusive, relevant and meaningful physical education experience – a curriculum interpretation that presents all pupils with an authentic experience that connects to their self and cultural identity.

Research by Stidder (2017a, 2017b) has shown that alternative forms of physical activity rather than competitive team games have the potential to reach and make a contribution to the health and well-being of a broader range of pupils. The implications for this have been discussed and questions presented regarding how schools and teachers might develop an inclusive physical education curriculum interpretation.

Therefore, the challenge of inclusion through engaging all pupils in an authentic, meaningful and relevant physical education curriculum, delivered with an inclusive pedagogy, perhaps lies beyond the immediate and sole control

of physical education teachers. A potential solution to the issue of inclusion may be found in the joined-up nature of how head-teachers, governors, teachers and other local stakeholders might work together in relation to, for example, funding and resourcing and even timetabling. Furthermore, there is a need for these stakeholders, in the first instance, to fully understand what inclusive physical education is in their context. This development of stakeholder understanding is something that should perhaps be led by physical education teachers. This further demonstrates the need for teachers to be politically aware and social engaged, in order that they can inform and influence. The role of the physical education teacher as influencer and educator of head-teachers, governing bodies and local communities is, perhaps, nothing new but in the broader context through which children and young people are now experiencing a greater choice in relation to their engagement with being physically active or inactive, the context brings to the fore the increased relevance and importance of the physical educator's role as social and political influencer. There has, perhaps, never been a more important point in history for an aligned effort to promote a school and community culture that places significant value on the importance of all children and young people being physically active and physically educated (Lawson, 2018). The final concluding thoughts are presented by the authors individually and aim to bring a personal perspective to the debate in this chapter.

From Gary, unless anyone can persuade me otherwise, I remain convinced that changes to the content of the physical education curriculum in secondary schools, along with reforms to physical education initial and continuing teacher education, are the way forward and the most likely solution to achieving inclusive experiences for all pupils. I realise that changes to the content of the physical education curriculum will take time and, as Brown (2005, p. 20) has stated, this will require the hard drives of physical education teachers to be wiped, with new data inputted and stored until the inconceivable becomes the achievable. Nonetheless, there is a groundswell of interest among physical education teachers and pupils for a more diverse physical education curriculum which many feel is more inclusive, the aims of which are inherently more achievable for more pupils in secondary schools (Stidder, 2017a). If this does not happen, either physical educators are not listening or they are simply ignoring what the research is telling us.

From Richard, for me, inclusion from a curriculum perspective centres on how schools, including head-teachers, governors and teachers, work together to form a shared vision for inclusive education. This leads to all stakeholders constantly evolving their understanding of their role as a policy interpreter. How we view, understand and develop physical education curricula and teachers' pedagogical identity must be informed from a critically reflective and politically aware position (Mockler, 2011). This position relates to how we communicate the value of being physically educated, as reflected through the school's organisational culture, curriculum design and teacher pedagogy. I agree with Young (2013) in relation to the purpose of the school curriculum being to enable the next

generation to build on existing knowledge and create new knowledge, as this is how human societies progress and how individuals develop. By extension, and in relation to the points made over 20 years ago by Fernandez-Balboa (1997), I also agree that part of the *nudge for inclusion* is the need for a new type of teacher who has a deep sense of humanity which, in turn, will enable them to relate to their students in a positive and empowering way. They will also have a strong commitment to the larger world, supporting children and young people to think critically about the longer-term importance of being physical active and educating them to see the relevance of this for their future social and economic sustainability.

I do believe there is a need to *nudge* the interpretation of curriculum and policy and to give careful consideration to the specifics of the social, cultural, political, economic and geographical contexts in which we work. This will perhaps be achieved if we are all prepared, aware and willing to engage in the political discussion regarding, for example, funding, resourcing, planning and evaluating the physical education curriculum and how this subsequently informs local physical education programmes.

Questions for reflection

- 1 In relation to inclusion, do traditional competitive team games have a place in a twenty-first century physical education curriculum?
- 2 Is it the content of the curriculum or the pedagogical interpretation of the curriculum by teachers that is the central challenge for inclusive practice?
- 3 Consider what teacher education might include to support physical education teachers develop their inclusive practice?
- 4 Can a school-based physical education curriculum be supportive of an authentic experience of physical activity or human movement that is relevant and inclusive for children and young people in the twenty-first century?
- 5 What are the potential longer-term implications for society if the issue of inclusion in education and physical education is not carefully considered and acted upon?

Further reading and resources

Dagkas, S. and Armour, K. (2012) *Inclusion and Exclusion through Youth Sport*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

This is a book that is dedicated to understanding issues of both inclusion and exclusion in youth sport and physical education. The book covers a range of issues including social exclusion from an economic perspective and inclusion, curriculum and student voice.

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. Chapter 32, by Kyriaki Makopoulou and Gary Thomas, discusses educating teachers for effective inclusive pedagogies.

Stidder, G. and Hayes, S. (2013) *Equity and Inclusion in Physical Education and Sport*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

This book considers issues of equity and inclusion through physical education and sport and includes chapters on physical education and social class, policy, physical education and participation, inclusion health and the obesity discourse.

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

- Anonymous (2015) 'Bad kits and homophobic bullying: A student's view of PE', *The Guardian* 1 November 2015, viewed 5 June 2019, from: www.theguardian.com/teacher-network/2015/nov/01/bad-kits-homophobic-bullying-students-view-of-pe
- Bartlett, S. and Burton, D. (2016) *Introduction to Education Studies*, London: Sage.
- Beames, S. and Brown, M. (2016) *Adventurous Learning a Pedagogy for a Changing World*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Brown, D. (2005) 'An economy of gendered practices? Learning to teach physical education from the perspective of Pierre Bourdieu's embodied sociology', *Sport, Education and Society*, 10 (1), 3–23.
- Capel, S. (2005) 'Teachers, teaching and pedagogy in physical education', in K. Green and K. Hardman (eds.) *Physical Education Essential Issues*, London: Sage, pp. 111–127.
- Capel, S. and Blair, R. (2007) 'Making physical education relevant: Increasing the impact of initial teacher training', *London Review of Education*, 51 (1), 15–34.
- Capel, S. and Blair, R. (2013) 'Why do physical education teachers adopt a particular way of teaching?' in S. Capel and M. Whitehead (eds.) *Debates in Physical Education*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 121–139.
- Casey, A. (2017) 'Models-based practice', in C. Ennis (ed.) *Routledge Handbook of Physical Education Pedagogies*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 54–67.
- Clarke, G. (2013) 'Challenging heterosexism, homophobia and transphobia in physical education', in G. Stidder and S. Hayes (eds.) *Equity and Inclusion in Physical Education and Sport*, 2nd edition, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 87–101.

- Crocco, M. and Costigan, A. (2007) 'The narrowing of the curriculum and pedagogy in the age of accountability. Urban educators speak out', *Urban Education*, 42 (6), 512–535. www.independent.co.uk/voices/why-do-teenagers-hate-doing-pe-at-school-let-me-count-the-ways-a6820026.html
- DfE (Department for Education) (2013) *Evidence on Physical Education and Sport in Schools: Key Findings*, June 2013, Reference: DFE-00093–2013.
- Evans, J. and Bairner, A. (2013) 'Physical education and social class', in G. Stidder and S. Hayes (eds.) *Equity and Inclusion in Physical Education and Sport*, 2nd edition, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 141–158.
- Evans, J. and Davies, B. (1993) 'Equality, equity and physical education', in J. Evans (ed.) *Equality, Education and Physical Education*, London: Falmer Press, pp. 11–27.
- Evans, J. and Davies, B. (2002) 'Theoretical background', in A. Laker (ed.) *The Sociology of Sport and Physical Education: An Introductory Reader*, London: Routledge, pp. 15–35.
- Fernandez-Balboa, J.M. (1997) *Critical Postmodernism in Human Movement, Physical Education and Sport*, New York: SUNY.
- Green, K. (2003) *Physical Education Teachers on Physical Education*, Chester: Chester Academic Press.
- Green, K. (2008) *Understanding Physical Education*, London: Sage
- Green, K. (2010) *Key Theme in Youth Sport*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Hayes, S. and Burdsey, D. (2013) 'Sticks and stones may break my bones, but words will never hurt me: Challenging racial stereotypes in physical education and sport', in G. Stidder and S. Hayes (eds.) *Equity and Inclusion in Physical Education and Sport*, 2nd edition, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 124–140. www.sportsthinktank.com/uploads/appg-fit-healthy-children-report-on-pe-5-18.pdf
- Husbands, C. (2012) 'Models of the curriculum', in V. Brooks, I. Abbott and P. Huddleston (eds.) *Preparing to Teach in Secondary Schools: A Student Teacher's Guide to Professional Issues in Secondary Education*, 3rd edition, Maidenhead: Open University Press, pp. 132–144.
- Kirk, D. (2010) 'The practice of physical education and the social construction of aims', in R. Bailey (ed.) *Physical Education for Learning: A Guide for Secondary Schools*, London: Continuum, pp. 15–25.
- Kirk, D. (2013) 'What is the future of physical education in the twenty first century?' in S. Capel and M. Whitehead (eds.) *Debates in Physical Education*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 220–231.
- Lawson, H. A. (2018) *Redesigning Physical Education, an Equity Agenda in which Every Child Matters*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Light, R. (2017) *Positive Pedagogy for Sport Coaching*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Marchant, A. (2013) 'A future for physical education and school sport', *Physical Education Matters*, 8 (2, Summer), 42–44.
- Mockler, N. (2011) 'Beyond 'what works': Understanding teacher identity as a practical and political tool', *Teachers and Teaching*, 17, 517–528.
- Nelsen, P. and Scaman, J. (2011). 'Deweyan tools for inquiry and the epistemological context of critical pedagogy', *Educational Studies*, 47 (6), 561–582.
- Nikkhah, R. (2007) 'Fattist' PE teachers exposed', *The Telegraph*, 11 February 2007, viewed 5 June 2019, from: www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1542314/Fattist-PE-teachers-exposed.html
- Ofsted (Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills) (2014) *Going the Extra Mile: Excellence in Competitive School Sport*, Manchester: Office for Standards

- in Education, Children's Services and Skills, viewed 5 June 2019, from: www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/140002
- Pawson, R. (2006) *Evidence-based Policy: A Realist Perspective*, London: Sage.
- Penney, D., Jeanes, R., O'Connor, J. and Alfrey, L. (2018) 'Re-theorising inclusion and reframing inclusive practice in physical education', *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 22 (10), 1062–1077, DOI: 10.1080/13603116.2017.1414888.
- Penney, D. and Jess, M. (2004) 'Physical education and physically active lives: A lifelong approach to curriculum development', *Sport Education and Society*, 9, 269–287.
- Piggin, J., Mansfield, L. and Weed, M. (2018) *Routledge Handbook of Physical Activity Policy and Practice*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Rovegno, I. (2006) 'Situated perspectives to learning', in D. Kirk, D. Macdonald and M. O'Sullivan (eds.) *The Handbook of Physical Education*, London: Routledge, pp. 262–274.
- Rovegno, I. and Dolly, J.P. (2006) 'Constructivist perspectives on learning', in D. Kirk, D. Macdonald and M. O'Sullivan (eds.) *The Handbook of Physical Education*, London: Routledge, pp. 242–261.
- Sport England (2015) *New Teacher Training to Target Attitudes to PE in Schools*, viewed 5 June 2019, from: www.sportengland.org/news-and-features/news/2018/sep-tember/24/major-teacher-training-project-targets-improving-attitude-to-physical-education-in-schools/
- Stenhouse, L. (1975) *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development*, Oxford: Heinemann Educational.
- Stidder, G. (2015) *Becoming a Physical Education Teacher*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Stidder, G. (2017a) 'Assessing the value of alternative physical activities in the secondary school physical education curriculum', *Physical Education Matters*, 12 (3), 70–74.
- Stidder, G. (2017b) 'Evaluating the 'A' List in physical education initial teacher training', *Physical Education Matters*, 12 (3), 50–56.
- Stidder, G. (2017c) *Learning and Teaching through Alternative Physical Education*, viewed 6 June 2019, from: www.youtube.com/watch?v=ERq84WeFU9M&feature=youtu.be
- Stidder, G. and Hayes, S. (2013) 'Equity and inclusion in physical education: Themes and perspective for practitioners', in G. Stidder and S. Hayes (eds.) *Equity and Inclusion in Physical Education and Sport*, 2nd edition, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 1–16.
- Stidder, G. and Hayes, S. (2016) 'Introduction', in G. Stidder and S. Hayes (eds.) *The Really Useful Physical Education Book: Teaching and Learning across the 14–18 Age Range*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 3–17.
- Stidder, G., Lines, G. and Keyworth, S. (2013) 'Investigating the gender regime in physical education and dance', in G. Stidder and S. Hayes (eds.) *Equity and Inclusion in Physical Education and Sport*, 2nd edition, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 66–86.
- Storey, J. (2015) *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture an Introduction*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Theodoulides, A. (2013) 'Personalised learning in physical education', in G. Stidder and S. Hayes (eds.) *Equity and Inclusion in Physical Education and Sport*, 2nd edition, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 34–50.
- Vicars, M. (2006) 'Who are you calling queer? Sticks and stones can break my bones but names will always hurt me', *British Educational Research Journal*, 32 (3), 347–361.
- Vickerman, P. and Maher, A. (2017) *Teaching Physical Education to Children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities*, 2nd edition, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978) *Mind in Society*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Whitehead, M. (2010) *Physical Literacy throughout the Life Course*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Young, M. (2013) 'Overcoming the crisis in curriculum in theory: A knowledge-based approach', *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 45 (2), 101–118.
- Youth Sport Trust (2015) *National PE, School Sport and Physical Activity Survey Report*, viewed 5 June 2019, from: [www.sportsthinktank.com/uploads/yst-\(2015\)-school-sport-and-pe-survey-report-19.pdf](http://www.sportsthinktank.com/uploads/yst-(2015)-school-sport-and-pe-survey-report-19.pdf)