

European Physical Education Review

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

Naming the Game. Discourse and Domination in Physical Education and Sport in England and Wales

Dawn Penney and John Evans

European Physical Education Review 1997 3: 21

DOI: 10.1177/1356336X9700300103

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://epe.sagepub.com/content/3/1/21>

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/3/1/21.refs.html>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Apr 1, 1997

[What is This?](#)

Naming the Game. Discourse and Domination in Physical Education and Sport in England and Wales

Dawn Penney¹ and John Evans²

¹University of Queensland, Australia

²Loughborough University, England

21

Introduction

Over the last fifteen years in the UK, the USA and elsewhere we have witnessed what Apple (1993) has called a 'rightist resurgence in education'. 'What education is for, what and whose knowledge is considered legitimate, and who has the right to answer these questions; all of this has been reconstructed during the conservative restoration' (ibid, 1993, p.9). Apple explains that in the USA these transformations have been 'evident in attacks on teaching and the curriculum, on the needs of business and industry being seen as more and more the primary, if not the only goals of schooling, the tighter control of teaching in many states, and in the increasing integration of education into the conservative project' (ibid, p.10). The same is true of the UK, where the needs and interests of the economy (of capital accumulation) rather than of children and teachers have taken precedence in the development of a national curriculum for state schools in England and Wales, in an endeavour to nurture particular forms of 'citizenship', skilling and social control.

The introduction of a National Curriculum for Physical Education has been an important part of the Conservative project and its ongoing implementation continues to highlight very clearly not just the socio-political and cultural environment from and amidst which initiatives in education are arising, but also specifically the range of values and vested interests at play within and upon

the subject matter of Physical Education (PE) (Talbot, 1993; Evans and Penney, 1995a,b). During its development we have documented the struggles to define the National Curriculum for Physical Education (NCPE) in England and Wales.¹ Our research has highlighted the way in which central government in the UK has succeeded in positioning *particular* discourses of PE and sport in policy texts defining PE in schools. Specifically we have drawn attention to the progressive privileging of "restorationist" ('back to basics') and pragmatic discourses over and above educational discourses in the development of these texts (see Evans, Davies & Penney, 1994; Evans & Penney, 1995a; 1995b).

Two policy texts issued by central government in 1995 are critical to the continuation of this process — the *revised National Curriculum for Physical Education* issued by the Department for Education (DFE) and the Welsh Office (WO) (DFE & WO, 1995) and a policy statement entitled *Sport — Raising the Game* issued by the Department of National Heritage (DNH, 1995). In the first part of this paper, therefore, we examine the nature of the discourses that are privileged within and by these texts. In the second part we focus on the relationships between the two policy documents and the *contexts* of education and schooling in which they are being "read" and implemented. We consider the way in which these contexts may nurture and frame *particular* inter-

pretations of the texts and presage readings that further reinforce and legitimate the discourses privileged within and by them. As we highlight the limits now set to the autonomy of PE teachers in schools in England and Wales to define and shape their subject, we question the scope that remains in the system for innovation, interpretation and "resistance" in their implementation of the NCPE, that is to say, for the kind of 'slippage' between centrally determined policy and practice in schools that some have emphasised in their commentary on National Curriculum developments in the UK (Bowe & Ball with Gold, 1992). Finally, we note that the making of the NCPE has illustrated vividly not only the contested nature of the curriculum but also the inequalities and inequities inherent in education and which recent policies seem set to sustain. Therefore, although our analysis centres on PE it points to processes that may be of relevance across subject boundaries and to those who have little or no interest in either sport or PE, but who are concerned with the future of democracy and the professional autonomy of teachers in state schools.

Here, as in our previous work (see Evans, Davies & Penney, 1994; Evans, Penney & Bryant, 1993a; Penney, 1994; Penney & Evans, 1994a) conceptually we set out analysis within a view of *policy as a complex process* involving the production of *multiple texts*, which may be written, spoken or mental conceptualisations of policy and inherent in which are a *variety of discourses* each expressing particular interests and ideologies. Like others (Apple, 1986; Ball, 1993a) we draw attention not only to the inclusions and exclusions in and from texts, but also to the influence of discourses *surrounding* the texts, and to their location within power relations which influence their production and 'implementation'.² As Ball has emphasised, discourses are not only about what is said and thought, '... but about who can speak where when and with what authority' (Ball, 1993b, p.14). The

discussion below illustrates these matters vividly and highlights not only that discourses are created under particular conditions and rules but also that the control of those conditions and rules is a critical factor in the struggle to establish and sustain particular definitions of PE and concomitantly particular forms of consciousness within and through education (Bernstein, 1990).

Defining Physical Education and Sport in England and Wales

The National Curriculum for Physical Education (NCPE), 1995

In 1993, acknowledging the many shortcomings arising in the development and implementation of the National Curriculum (NC) and most notably the 'curriculum overload' in schools generated by this initiative, the Secretary of State for Education called for a review of the NC and 'the framework for assessment of pupils' progress' (Dearing, 1994). The revision proposed a *reduction within the existing structure and framework* of the NC. It prohibited the questioning of either the underlying rationale for or merits of the subject based, strongly classified (Bernstein, 1971; 1990) structure of the National Curriculum; a structure which signals and endorses the distinctiveness of knowledge domains and separation and division both between subject areas and, in the case of the NCPE, also within the subject. The NCPE defined physical education as a distinct set of activities, identifying games, gymnastic activities, athletic activities, dance, swimming and outdoor and adventurous activities as the basis for developing Programmes of Study (POS)³ for the subject. The extent of the dominance and "establishment" of this activity based organisational structure for physical education is such that many readers may find it hard to conceptualise any alternative. The development in Australia of curriculum texts that centre on 'Key Learning Areas' (KLAs), one of which is 'Health and Physical Education' and within this KLA, the organisation of curriculum

content around the three strands of 'Human functioning and physical activity', 'Community structures and practices' and 'Communication, investigation and application' (see Curriculum Corporation, 1994a), illustrates the potential for a very different approach to teaching and learning 'physical education'. Inherent in such a structure is the privileging of learning over and above the activity. This alternative highlights how in the case of the NCPE in England and Wales, themes such as health education, personal and social education and equal opportunities have been marginalised (see also Evans & Penney, 1995a; Penney, 1994; Penney & Kirk, forthcoming).

In the review of the NC and NCPE specifically, the established structures were not themselves the subject of inquiry but rather underpinned and shaped the revision process. Attention centred on which subjects and what aspects within subjects should be retained within a 'slimmed down' curriculum (Dearing, 1994). Consequently, the possibilities for the development of alternative curricula and the expression of integrated codes (Bernstein, 1971; 1990) were again subordinated. The impression that a subject based and, within physical education, activity based curriculum, is the "natural" and only possible model for school curricula has been reinforced.

In our previous analyses of the development of the NCPE we have documented how the privileging of areas of activity over and above permeating themes has been accompanied by the hardening of the hierarchy of areas of activity long established within the subject of PE, in which "*games*" is accorded highest status in the curriculum (Evans & Penney, 1995a; Penney, 1994). Despite innovations in physical education in the UK such as the development of educational gymnastics and the promotion of outdoor education, it is games, with its origins in male traditions of physical education, that have retained dominance

(see Kirk, 1992). A residual feature of the development of games and this dominance has been its gendered nature, with girls and boys being offered different and stereotypically "appropriate" activities.

In the 1992 version of the NCPE games was defined as the sole compulsory component of the curriculum in *each year* of key stage 3 (incorporating school years 7, 8 and 9).⁴ Three other areas of activity were to be addressed at *some point during* the key stage. In key stage 4 (years 10 and 11) pupils had to experience two activities, from the same or different areas of activity (DES/WO, 1992). The revised order for the NCPE further endorsed the position of games as the dominant and defining feature of PE, especially in the requirements relating to the secondary years of schooling. Specifically it strengthened the distinction between games and other areas of activity, defining all areas *apart from games* in terms of 'full' and 'half units' at key stage 3. It was stipulated that pupils should be taught games in *each year* of the key stage, plus at least one other full unit of activity and two further half-units *during the key stage*. At least one half unit has to be either gymnastics or dance. Accompanying this change was an amendment to the requirements for key stage 4, the stipulation now being that at least one of the two activities pursued be a game (DFE/WO, 1995). Inevitably, the privileging of games has subordinated other areas of activity and concomitantly the commitment to providing breadth and balance within the curriculum of PE. Given that research has consistently pointed out that competitive games have limited appeal to many children, particularly young women, and indicated the importance of variety between and within areas of activity if the varying needs and interests of children are to be met (OFSTED, 1995; OHMCI, 1995; Penney & Evans, 1995a; Penney & Evans, 1994b; Penney & Evans with Hennink, 1994) any further narrowing of the curriculum may be very regrettable.

Furthermore as well as being in danger of restricting experiences in these terms, the revised NCPE also offers teachers the 'flexibility' within the statutory requirements to provide a sex differentiated curriculum. Again, therefore, the text has effectively endorsed long-standing practices and biases in PE in the UK. Recent inspection reports have drawn attention to the effects of these continuing practices; the limiting of both girls' and boys' experiences of and learning in PE (see OFSTED, 1995; OHMCI, 1995). Certainly with the statutory requirements as they stand, in years ahead it may be particularly difficult for the stated aim of the NC, to ensure the provision of a broad and balanced education for *all* children (DES, 1989) to be achieved in the context of PE.

Sport — Raising the Game

The revised NCPE clearly reflected central government's "restorationist" belief that games has '... the advantage of perpetuating the best of English traditions and cultural heritage' (NCC, 1991, p.14). This ideological leaning is even more apparent in the policy statement entitled *Sport — Raising the Game* issued by the Department of National Heritage in July 1995. This initiative was described by the UK Prime Minister, John Major, as '... the most important set of proposals ever published for the encouragement and promotion of sport' (John Major in DNH, 1995). Certainly the strength of direction and potential "control" inherent in this 'encouragement' is unprecedented. The proposals reach out to *regulate* not only the provision of sport in schools, in higher education and by clubs and governing bodies of sport, but also teacher training in PE. Key elements of the text reflect once again the government's privileging of elitism, nationalism and cultural restorationism within the arenas of PE and sport policy. As we illustrate below, neither the text nor the definitions of PE and sport that it provides can be regarded as neutral. Clearly it is *particular* values and interests that are

again being promoted and legitimated and, in parallel, others excluded and/or subordinated.

In his letter of introduction to the policy statement the Prime Minister states 'We want to sustain the place of minor sports that bring much enjoyment. *But I am determined to see that our great traditional sports — cricket, hockey, swimming, athletics, football, netball, rugby, tennis and the like — are put firmly at the centre of the stage*' (John Major in DNH, 1995, our emphasis). Absent from this list, just as they have been progressively subordinated and silenced in the NCPE, are sports with an aesthetic emphasis, or an emphasis on, for example, personal fitness rather than team performance. The privileging of games and more specifically "competitive", "traditional" team games runs strongly throughout the proposals. For example, in relation to school provision, one of the requirements outlined in the policy statement is for schools to publish for parents and governors details of their aims for, and provision of, sport and how these have been met during the school year. The "suggestions" are that these might include details of '... what sports and, *in particular, what traditional team sports are played at the school*' and 'the *results of school teams*...' (DNH, 1996, p.11, our emphases). Similarly it is stated that future inspections of schools will specifically address '... the range, time spent and quality of *games*, including *competitive team games*, offered as part of the formal PE curriculum' and the '... sporting provision that schools offer to pupils outside formal lessons ... *paying particular attention to traditional team games*' (DNH, 1995, p.12, our emphasis).

The ideological leanings of these measures are mirrored in the proposals concerning teacher training. The document states that 'the new criteria for teacher training will mean that all teachers of PE will be equipped to teach at least one mainstream game played in the summer and one mainstream game played in the winter', and that it is the

government's belief that 'every training teacher, not just those with PE as their first qualification, should have the opportunity to acquire coaching qualifications, and be strongly encouraged to do them' (DNH, 1995, p.15). Funding is to be tied to evidence of institutions having complied with the Government's desired aims — '... inspectors will be asked to monitor training to teach the *main traditional and competitive team sports*, and to see that all trainee teachers are made aware of the increased opportunity to gain coaching qualifications'. In the light of the evidence gathered 'quality indicators' will be developed to ensure that future funding supports 'the most effective training' (ibid, 1995, p.17, our emphasis).

The narrow, anglocentric, male, view of PE and Sport inherent in this document conveniently overlooks the more dubious and negative 'qualities' of citizenship that *any* sport may promote as well as the multicultural environment of sport and PE in the UK. As Winder points out, the emphasis on team sports, 'discipline' and 'commitment', '... all harks back to some ludicrous Victorian ideal of manly camaraderie, leadership, competition, cold showers and so on...' (ibid, the *Independent*, 15/7/95, p.17). Others have observed '... non-team games, such as rockclimbing or judo, can be just as challenging and character building' (*Guardian Leader*, 15/7/95, p.24). A point we would stress is that neither this nor any other outcome is guaranteed simply by participation in a particular activity. The needs and interests of children are not, of course, likely to be met through their relationship with an activity alone. Development, whether in sport or PE, has to be mediated and nurtured by good teaching and the actions of individuals well trained, imbued with sophisticated pedagogical skills. Regrettably these are qualities that the recommendations for teacher training in *Raising the Game*, together with the increasingly short time training teachers have in

higher education institutions (see Evans, Penney and Davies, 1996) may do little to either foster or sustain.

The proposals in *Raising the Game* also presage more elitism in PE. Although health, fun and enjoyment find a mention in the Prime Minister's opening letter, they are clearly not the government's priorities. Proposing the establishment of a British Academy of Sport specifically for the development of excellence, the document states 'Millions of people care about the performance of our national teams and sporting superstars' (DNH, 1995, p.34), and it is the prospective stars who are clearly privileged throughout the proposals in the policy document. For example, it is stated that 'Alongside teachers, clubs have an important role to play by expanding the range of sports on offer and providing coaching *to the most talented*' (ibid, 1995, p.9, our emphasis). Meanwhile, with respect to provision of sport in further and higher education, it is explained that a working party is to be established to specifically investigate the existing provision of university sport scholarships directed towards supporting individuals training and competing 'at the *highest level*' during their studies and how such schemes can be developed. In addition it is stated that the working group will '... examine ways of recognising and celebrating sporting achievements in appropriate presentation ceremonies at which the presentation of a "cap" or "blue" equivalent is made' (ibid, 1995, p.33). Much of this would be well and good if accompanied by the equivalent resourcing and celebration of PE and sport for *all*. In the absence of such investment, with Winder (1995) we pose the question '... is it better to promote a small elite of winners whom the rest of us can watch on telly, or a nation of participants?' (ibid, 1995, p.17). In his view it is 'Far better to spread facilities, coaching, equipment and encouragement as widely as possible, rather than buying new bats for the first eleven' (ibid, p.17). Notably the parallel policy

statement issued by the Welsh Office reminds us that encouraging the elite and catering for the needs and interests of others not so talented are not necessarily mutually exclusive aims. Launching the Welsh initiative the Secretary of State for Wales explained 'Participating in sport goes much further than achievement at national or international level . . . Although Wales has a wealth of sporting talent — which I hope this blueprint will further encourage — we should not forget that sport is fun and we can enjoy it at whatever level of achievement we reach' (William Hague in Welsh Office, 25/9/95).

Reading the Texts

How are the texts of the revised NCPE and *Raising the Game* to be "read" by teachers of PE? Are they likely to be interpreted in ways that are responsive to the needs of all children, to the circumstances of the school and the communities they serve? Will teachers any longer have the autonomy and the "freedom" to decide what their responses will be? As we will see, it is here, at the point of "implementation", that the relationship between the two policies becomes explicit, significant and problematic, as does their interaction with the broader educational contexts in which responses to them are being made.

As with the previous NCPE text (DES/WO, 1992), the revised NCPE nurtures the illusion that individual schools and teachers have considerable choice in matters of curriculum design and delivery relating to sport and PE. With the exception of the prescriptive requirements concerning games, the areas of activity to be included in the curriculum and the attention to be devoted to them are matters for individual schools and teachers to determine. Furthermore, neither the allocation of time between areas within the subject nor the "teaching methods" to be used are matters that the statutory requirements explicitly address. Much, it seems, is to be left in the hands of a

teacher's innovatory ideals. However, once we register on the one hand the powerful discourses inherent in these documents, and on the other those dominant in the contexts of their implementation, we begin to see that the scope for "flexibility", "choice" and the opportunities for 'slippage' (Bowe et al, 1992) between the intentions of Government and the implementation of the NCPE are severely limited and curtailed.

As mentioned above, the "official" NCPE text endorses a definition of and structure for the curriculum of PE which has long featured in PE. Although the text does not exclude the possibility of adopting alternative curriculum structures, founded for example on the theme of health education and 'integrated' rather than 'collection' codes (Bernstein, 1971), neither does it encourage such developments. The absence of any discussion of, or guidance on, "alternative structures" have been noticeably absent from the texts of the NCPE (see Evans & Penney, 1995a; Penney, 1994) and is a much needed debate in the subject. As indicated above, the National Statement and Profile for Health and Physical Education developed in Australia (Curriculum Corporation, 1994a; 1994b) may be a useful first point of reference in our endeavours to make explicit what such alternatives might "look like". At present, however, there is certainly an absence of such enlightenment and the contexts in which teachers are working may serve to further obstruct the development of innovative approaches and ideals, and once again reinforce the biases inherent in both the NCPE text and much current practice.

Returning to our focus on the position of games within PE, on the surface the text of the NCPE provides as much scope to challenge the dominance of games within PE as it does to endorse its privileged position. The requirements of the NCPE are identified as only the *minimum* required provision for PE, leaving the way open for schools to achieve "breadth and balance" by supplementing the NCPE with additional

provision. Theoretically, therefore, considerable attention could be given to those areas of activity accorded a lower status in the government's texts, with schools ensuring perhaps that other areas of activity are experienced with the same frequency and to a similar depth as games. However, in the absence of any explicit encouragement for such an approach to curriculum design and within conditions that, as we explain further below, may be far from supportive of such developments, neither the willingness nor ability on the part of schools and teachers to "even out" the imbalance of games in PE can be assumed. Not all schools have the staff expertise, facilities, equipment and funding to support diversity in the curriculum. Others lack the support of head teachers and/or senior staff in timetabling and staffing arrangements to facilitate curriculum development, or face conflict with them over the direction that development should take (see Evans, Penney & Bryant, 1993b; Penney, 1994). In a climate in which pupil intakes are the very basis of school survival and/or prosperity,⁵ headteachers and school governors with heightened consciousness of the importance of "marketing" their school may see merits in a games centred PE, seeing this as the basis for achievement in the publicly visible and valued arena of extra-curricular sport. Furthermore, the prospects of newly qualified teachers emerging from training with an ability or a desire to innovate or reflect critically upon present practice may also be diminished once the recommendations of *Raising the Game* come into play.

The above pressures within schools do, in part, help to explain the tendencies towards consolidation and assimilation rather than innovation and development that we have observed in the implementation of the NCPE. Our research has drawn attention to the failure of the introduction of the NCPE to sponsor widespread or comprehensive critical review and development of PE curricula, its requirements instead

being in many instances *accommodated within* largely unchanged practices (see Evans & Penney, 1995a; Penney, 1994). However, our investigations have also directed us to some of the other factors contributing to this response. Certainly, feelings of having little "ownership" of the changes required, and a lack of time and support to reflect on and review them, have also played their part in sustaining the status quo. Teachers were not positioned centrally as active "agents of change" in the making of the official NCPE texts and they have been similarly marginalised in the production of *Raising the Game*. Once again they are being asked to implement policies over which they have had little say or control. With respect to time, the publication of the statutory orders in 1992 allowed teachers only a matter of weeks to plan their implementation for the forthcoming academic year. Although allowing more time for preparation the timescale for the introduction of the revised curriculum is nevertheless acknowledged as 'demanding' (Dearing, 1994, p.26). Time and space for reflection and development remain absent features of school life. To make matters worse, the NCPE burdened teachers with heavy administrative demands that in many instances took precedence over and detracted from attention being given to the "practice" of teaching PE (see Graham with Tytler, 1993; Penney, 1994). Clearly these are not conditions likely to sponsor a positive approach to curriculum development.

Furthermore, the implementation and revision of the NCPE came at a time of diminishing support, guidance and professional development opportunities for teachers in England and Wales. Issues of assessment and "accountability" have subsequently emerged as the priorities in the limited support that is available (see Evans & Penney, 1994). *Raising the Game* may further narrow the range of in-service provision and demands. Its text not only threatens inspections focused on schools' provision

of games in school, but also provides accompanying incentives for schools to direct PE provision more towards competitive sport. The document advocates formal recognition of 'effective policies for promoting sport' via the introduction of 'SportsMark' and 'GoldStar' awards for schools, and identifies the awards as beneficial acquisitions in schools' bids to attract parents and thus prospective pupils. The criteria for the awards, yet to be confirmed, will clearly be critical in shaping future provision. The initial suggestions are that schools devote at least 50% of in- and extra-curricular PE time to games, develop links with local sports clubs, and that teachers improve their coaching skills. Our fear is that the emphasis on "coaching" and links with clubs may together further presage an emphasis on sport performance and the needs of the able few. In considering likely responses from schools we need to again look to the wider context in which the text will be read. Post the ERA, schools in England and Wales have to attract sufficient pupils to finance their existing staffing levels and their curricula. In these conditions the pressures to adopt rather than adapt or resist the discourses on games and sport are considerable. If they are to survive, or indeed prosper in the "education market", many schools may feel that they have little choice but to 'play the government's game' (Penney, 1994). Furthermore, when one considers the views and interests purportedly prevalent amongst the parents that schools are seeking to attract, there is little incentive for promoting "alternative criteria" to those suggested. Given the messages peddled discursively in the public domain by central Government and the media in recent years (see Evans, 1990) it is perhaps unsurprising that parents, (paradoxically it often seems in the light of their own unfavourable experiences of being taught games in schools) continue to endorse the importance of sport in PE. Attempting to inform or change these perceptions is no easy

task and one that few schools may feel able or encouraged to embark upon.

Conclusion: Autonomy and Control in Policy Implementation

Given the "authority" of the discourses inherent in the texts of the NCPE and *Raising the Game* and acknowledging the economic and socio cultural conditions in which these texts will be interpreted and read, in the years ahead we should not be surprised to find schools and institutes of further and higher education increasingly adopting, and thereby appearing to endorse, a C/conservative view of PE as sport. However, whilst acknowledging the very real constraints now placed upon teachers and schools and the noted absence of support for alternative developments, we should guard against an overly deterministic and pessimistic view of the impact and influence of Government policy on schools. Teachers and teacher educators are not automata or mere puppets in the policy process. Although they face ever increasing pressures to respond in set ways, they remain key and influential elements in the interpretation and expression of policies as practice in schools. Here lies the rub of a top down view of policy implementation and the check on the limits of central state control. Policy can not implement itself (sic). Central Government has to rely on the good will and co-operation of teachers (who it has often sought to deride) if its policies are to materialise in schools. As others have noted, the actions of teachers are fundamental to the success of particular initiatives and hence the dominance of particular discourses and values in physical education. Certainly, we need note with Ball (1993b) that '... there is agency and there is constraint in relation to policy — this is not a sum-zero game' (ibid, 1993a, p.13). Thus as the *Daily Telegraph* observed following the launch of *Raising the Game*, 'Crucial to this grand design is the goodwill and practical support of the teaching profession' (The *Daily Telegraph*, 15/7/95,

p.14). However, whilst acknowledging this “agency” we have highlighted how Governments may nonetheless still subtly frame the opportunities of, and for, individuals to think and act otherwise, outside the frame set by “negotiated” policy measures. Regrettably, in the UK we have witnessed increasing constraint on the policy process. Texts are not being “read” in circumstances of the respondent’s own making (Ball, 1993a). The conservative “Right” have established an unprecedented degree of control over education, perhaps particularly in the arenas of PE and sport. We have witnessed what Clegg (1989) has described as a central feature of power, the ‘fixing of the terrain for its own expression’ (1989, p.183). As one of the members of the NCPE working group, Elizabeth Murdoch observed, whilst there may still be talk of flexibility for teachers, ‘It might be questioned just how free we are to make judgments on our practice. The pressures are subtle but nonetheless significant’ (1992, p.18) and together with the more obvious directives of legislative measures they directly contradict a view of policy as a process best established and realised by ‘communities of people within and across schools who talk about the provisions, enquire into them, and reformulate them, bearing in mind the circumstances and the children they know best’ (Hargreaves, 1995, p.5).

Many of the agencies concerned with sport in the UK, such as the British Association of Advisers and Lecturers in Physical Education (BAALPE), the Physical Education Association United Kingdom (PEAUK) and The Central Council for Physical Education, have welcomed *Raising the Game* ‘with great enthusiasm’ and regarded the ‘carefully crafted’ initiative as representing ‘out-standing good news for sport throughout the United Kingdom’ (Lawson, 1995). We are more guarded in our acclaim. Whilst not wishing to dismiss or temper any interest in sport in schools, we would encourage all to ask exactly what the government is

providing support for, who this support is directed towards, why the particular direction is being taken, and what the consequences of these initiatives will be for the identities and opportunities of children in schools? Certainly our analysis suggests that statements that ‘The joint impact of National Curriculum PE with this significant initiative [i.e. *Raising the Game*] for school sport makes it more possible for the Physical Education profession to meet the needs of all young people in schools’ and ‘Teachers of Physical Education will continue to offer the balance of experience expected within the National Curriculum’ (BAALPE/PEAUK, 1995, our emphasis) may turn out to be at best optimistic, at worst somewhat naive.

Footnotes

1. In this paper as in much of our research we refer somewhat uncritically to the National Curriculum for “England and Wales”. We acknowledge that there are significant differences between the two curricula and these, together with the exploration of the different contexts and responses arising have been a focus of attention in our latest research. These issues will be the subject of future publications.
2. Whilst we use the term “implementation” in our text we draw attention to our emphasis in analysing policy to deconstruct the divide between policy “making” and “implementation” in recognition of the continuation of development and adaptation throughout what is typically referred to as “implementation”.
3. Programmes of Study specified the essential teaching within each subject area in the National Curriculum (DES, 1989).
4. In the National Curriculum schooling years are defined in relation to age of pupils as follows: Age 5 or under: Reception (R); Ages 5-7: Years 1 and 2; Ages 7-11: Years 3-6; Ages 11-14: Years 7-9; Ages 14-16: Years 10 and 11; and the curriculum is structured around four “key stages”: Key stage 1 includes pupils in years R, 1 and 2; key stage 2 those in years 3-6; key stage 3 years 7-9 and key stage 4 years 10 and 11. (DES, 1989).
5. Local Management of Schools (LMS), introduced by the Education Reform Act (ERA) (1988), introduced the allocation of funds to schools on a formula basis, related to the number and age of pupils. Another policy within the ERA, Open Enrolment, removed previous restrictions on and LEA control of school intakes. Together these policies created conditions of competition between schools for pupils (see Maclure, 1989).

Acknowledgments

This paper is developed from papers presented by Penney at the ECER '95 conference, University of Bath, September 1995 (Penney & Evans: "'Scope for Slippage?' Reading between the lines of the National Curriculum for Physical Education') and at the Centre for Research into Sport and Society, University of Leicester, 9th September 1995 (Penney & Evans: 'Policy, Power and Politics in Physical Education and Sport'). The authors are grateful for comments received at these presentations.

This paper draws on research funded by the Leverhulme Trust (Project: F.1800). The support of the Leverhulme Trust is greatly appreciated.

References

- Apple, M.W. (1986) *Teachers and Texts. A Political Economy of Class and Gender Relations in Education*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Apple, M.W. (1993) *Official Knowledge. Democratic Education in a Conservative Age*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Ball, S.J. (1993a) Education Policy, Power Relations and Teachers' Work. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol. XXXI, 2, June 1993, pp.106-121.
- Ball, S.J. (1993b) What is Policy? Texts, Trajectories and Toolboxes. *Discourse*, 13, 2, April 1993, pp.10-17.
- BAALPE/PEAUK (1995) *Press Release: Joint Statement from the British Association of Advisers and Lecturers in Physical Education (BAALPE) and the Physical Education Association United Kingdom (PEAUK) on "Sport — Raising the Game"*, 14 July 1995.
- Bernstein, B. (1971) On the Classification and Framing of Educational Knowledge, in Young, M.F.D. (Ed.) *Knowledge and Control. New Directions for the Sociology of Education*. London: Collier Macmillan.
- Bernstein, B. (1990) *The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse. Volume IV Class, Codes and Control*. London: Routledge.
- Bowe, R. & Ball, S.J. with Gold, A. (1992) *Reforming Education and Changing Schools. Case Studies in Policy Sociology*. London: Routledge.
- Clegg, S.R. (1989) *Frameworks of Power*. London: Sage Publications.
- Curriculum Corporation (1994a) *A statement on health and physical education for Australian schools*. Carlton: Curriculum Corporation.
- Curriculum Corporation (1994b) *Health and physical education — a curriculum profile for Australian schools*. Carlton: Curriculum Corporation.
- Dearing, R. (1994) *The National Curriculum and its Assessment: Final Report*. London: School Curriculum and Assessment Authority.
- Department for Education (DFE)/Welsh Office (WO) (1995) *Physical Education in the National Curriculum*. London: DFE.
- Department of Education and Science (DES) (1989) *National Curriculum — From Policy to Practice*. London: DES.
- Department of Education and Science/Welsh Office (1992) *Physical Education in the National Curriculum*. London: DES.
- Department of National Heritage (DNH) (1995) *Sport — Raising the Game*. London: DNH.
- Evans, J. (1990) Defining a Subject: the rise and rise of the new PE? *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp.155-169.
- Evans, J., Davies, B. and Penney, D. (1994) Whatever happened to the Subject and the State in Policy Research in Education. *Discourse*, 14, 2, pp.57-64.
- Evans, J. & Penney, D. (1994) Whatever Happened to Good Advice? Service and Inspection after the Education Reform Act. *British Educational Research Journal*, 20, 5, pp.519-533.
- Evans, J. & Penney, D. (1995a) The politics of pedagogy: making a National Curriculum Physical Education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 10, 1, pp.27-44.
- Evans, J. & Penney, D. (1995b) Physical Education, Restoration and the politics of Sport. *Curriculum Studies*, 3, 2, pp.183-196.
- Evans, J., Penney, D. & Bryant, A. (1993a) Theorising Implementation: A Preliminary Comment on Power and Process in Policy Research. *Physical Education Review*, 16, 1, pp.5-22.
- Evans, J., Penney, D. & Bryant, A. (1993b) Improving the Quality of Physical Education? The Education Reform Act, 1988 and Physical Education in England and Wales. *Quest*, 45, pp.321-338.
- Evans, J., Penney, D. & Davies, B. (1996) Back to the Future? Education Policy and PE, in Armstrong, N. (Ed.) *New Directions in Physical Education. Change and Innovation*. Cassell Publications.
- Graham, D. with Tytler, D. (1993) *A Lesson for us all. The Making of the National Curriculum*. London: Routledge.
- Hargreaves, A. (1995) Working with Paradox: Why We Have to Reinvent Educational Change, in *CEDAR, Re-Thinking UK Education: What Next?* Roehampton Institute London, pp.4-7.
- Kirk, D. (1992) *Defining Physical Education*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Lawson, P. (1995) *Press Release: Sport Wins the Jackpot*. CCPR, 14 July 1995.
- Maclure, S. (1989) *Education Re-formed* (2nd Edition) London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Murdoch, B. (1992) Physical Education Today. *The Bulletin of Physical Education*, 28, 2, pp.15-24.

- National Curriculum Council (1991) *Physical Education in the National Curriculum. A Report to the Secretary of State for Education and Science on the statutory consultation for the attainment target and programmes of study in physical education*. York: NCC.
- Office of Standards in Education (OFSTED) (1995) *Physical Education. A review of inspection findings 1993/4*. London: HMSO.
- Office of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Schools in Wales (OHMCI) (1995) *Report by HM Inspectors. Survey of Physical Education in Key Stages 1, 2 and 3*. Cardiff: OHMCI.
- Penney, D. (1994) 'No Change in a New Era?' The Impact of the Education Reform Act (1988) on the Provision of PE and Sport in State Schools. *PhD Thesis*, University of Southampton.
- Penney, D. & Evans, J. (1994a) From 'Policy' to 'Practice': the Development and Implementation of the National Curriculum for Physical Education, in Scott, D. (Ed.) *Accountability and Control in Educational Settings*. Cassell Publications.
- Penney, D. & Evans, J. (1994b) It's Just Not (and not just) Cricket. *British Journal of Physical Education*, 25, 3, pp.9-12.
- Penney, D. & Evans, J. with Hennink, M. (1994) (*Unpublished report*) The implementation of the National Curriculum for Physical Education: report of findings of a questionnaire survey of state secondary schools. Department of Physical Education, Sports Science and Recreation Management, Loughborough University.
- Penney, D. & Kirk, D. (forthcoming) National Curriculum Developments in Australia and Britain: A Comparative Analysis. *Journal of Comparative Physical Education and Sport*.
- Talbot, M. (1993) Physical Education and the National Curriculum some Political Issues, in McFee, G. and Tomlinson, A. (Eds.) *Education, Sport and Leisure: Connections and Controversies*, University of Brighton, pp.34-65.
- The Daily Telegraph (1995) A Sporting Chance. *The Daily Telegraph*, 15/7/95, p.14.
- The Guardian Leader (1995) Mr. Major's sporting wish-list. *The Guardian*, 15/9/95, p.24.
- Welsh Office (1995) *Press release*: 'William Hague Launches Sports Blueprint for Year 2000', 25/9/95. Cardiff: The Welsh Office.
- Winder, R. (1995) Comment in *The Independent*, 15/7/95, p.17.

Résumé

Dénommer le jeu. Discours et dominance en éducation physique et sportive en Angleterre et Pays de Galles

Cet article concerne l'application en cours du Programme National pour l'Éducation Physique (NCPE) dans les

écoles d'état en Angleterre et au Pays de Galles. Il examine les discours privilégiés dans ce processus. L'analyse est centrée sur deux des textes officiels les plus récents de cette mise en place: la révision du NCPE publiée en 1995 (DFE/WO, 1995), et la déclaration de politique gouvernementale intitulée «Sport — Raising the Game» (DNH, 1995). Elle met l'accent sur la manière dont ces deux textes privilégient explicitement une définition de l'éducation physique en termes de *sport* et de *performance*. La discussion détaille la manière dont ces textes d'orientation politique éducative et d'autres ont contribué à créer des conditions telles que les enseignants et les professeurs d'éducation physique n'ont guère d'autre choix que d'adopter et légitimer des pratiques sportives de performance à l'encontre d'autres discours. L'analyse porte spécifiquement sur les objectifs d'égalité et notamment sur la question de savoir si oui ou non le but affirmé du Programme National en Angleterre et en Pays de Galles d'assurer une éducation large et équilibrée à tous les enfants (DES, 1989) est atteint dans le contexte de l'éducation physique.

M. Durand

Zusammenfassung

Der Name des Spiels. Diskurs und Vorherrschaft im Sportunterricht und Sport in England und Wales

Dieser Beitrag setzt sich mit der gegenwärtigen Umsetzung des Nationalen Curriculums für Sportunterricht (NCPE) in den staatlichen Schulen in England und Wales auseinander und untersucht die bevorzugten Diskurse in diesem Prozess. Die Analysen befasst sich vorrangig mit zwei der neuesten Regierungstexte, die bei dieser Umsetzung von Bedeutung sind; das überarbeitete NCPE, herausgegeben 1995 (DFW/WO, 1995) und die politische Erklärung der Regierung mit dem Titel "Sport — der Aufstieg des Spiels" (DNH, 1995) und zeigt deutlich, wie beide Texte explizit die Bedeutung einer auf Sport und Leistung basierenden Definition von Sportunterricht verstärken. Die Diskussion beschreibt dann detailliert, auf

welche Weise diese und andere Erziehungspolitik zusammen die Bedingungen schaffen, unter denen Lehrer und Ausbilder von Lehrern kaum eine andere Chance haben, als Diskurse von Sport, Spielen und Leistung anzunehmen und zu legitimieren. Im Zusammenhang mit der Analyse wird die Aufmerksamkeit auf Themen von Gleichheit und Gleichberechtigung gelenkt und insbesondere darauf, inwieweit das erklärte Ziel des Nationalen Curriculums in England und Wales, das auf eine breite und ausgewogen gewichtete Erziehung für alle Kinder (DES, 1989) gerichtet ist, im Zusammenhang mit Sportunterricht erreicht wird.

G. Doll-Tepper

Resumen

Definiendo el juego. Discurso y dominación en el ámbito de la educación física y el deporte en Inglaterra y Gales

El presente artículo analiza la puesta en práctica del curriculum nacional de educación física (NCPE) para escuelas públicas de Inglaterra y de Gales, y examina los discursos preponderantes que condicionan dicho proceso. El

análisis se centra sobre dos recientes textos gubernamentales que influencian su ejecución; por un lado, el enunciado NCPE, emitido en 1995 (DFE/WO, 1995), y por otro lado, las propuesta gubernamental titulada "Sport — Raising the Games" (DNH, 1995), los cuales terminan reforzando explícitamente la preponderancia del deporte y del rendimiento a la hora de definir la educación física. La discusión saca a flote los caminos a través de los cuales ésta y otras políticas educativas se combinan creando condiciones para que los profesores y los formadores de profesores tengan preferencia por adoptar y legitimar al deporte, a los juegos, y al rendimiento en detrimento de otras alternativas. Por todo ello, el análisis se centra sobre los aspectos relacionados con la equidad e igualdad, y más específicamente sobre la constatación de si, finalmente, el objetivo del curriculum nacional en Inglaterra de proporcionar una educación completa y equilibrada para "todos" los niños (DES, 1989), se cumple o no en el contexto de la educación física.

J. Campos Granell