

Draft

Knowledge and Control: Repositioning Teachers as Agents of Change

John Evans and Brian Davies
Loughborough University and University of Wales Cardiff

Paper presented to the ERA-AARE Joint Conference, Singapore, November 1996

Abstract

Over the last fifteen years state education in the United Kingdom has been subjected to fundamental changes, in large part driven by deregulation and the dismantling of principles that had underpinned the system for over forty years. At the centre of the reforms 'acting as a kind of policy glue that holds everything together' (Ball 1996) has been the National Curriculum. Drawing on the sociology of Bernstein (1996) and Ball (1996) this paper will illustrate how the making of the NCPE in England and Wales has been a vital ingredient in what Ball refers to as the 'politics of depoliticization' and the assertion of symbolic control (Bernstein, 1996) - ways of relating, thinking, and feeling, and forms of consciousness -, processes that have 'drawn the discursive resources that constitute school knowledge more tightly inside and to the state'(ibid). These processes have involved the suppression not only of opposing positions' but also of the interests of many teachers and the pupils they serve. The paper goes on to suggest that teachers and pupils will need to be re-positioned centrally, discursively and professionally, as agents of and for change in partnership with parents if they are together to meet the challenges of a post modern age and provide forms of PE that are diverse, inclusive and capable of enhancing the consciousness and opportunities of children and young people.

Over the last fifteen years, in Britain, as elsewhere, teachers of all kinds and in every subject have had to contend with a variety of pressures for change, emanating from outside and within the profession. As Greene said of teachers in America some ten years ago, they have been 'metaphorically drenched by a rain of official reports charging schools with "mediocrity" and calling for an ill defined "excellence" for the sake of national defence and increased productivity' (1986:3). It was as if, said Greene, a 'new form of kitsch had permeated the school system and public alike as people all over the country agree that the nation is indeed "at risk", that standards must be raised' (ibid:3). In the UK the legislative rain has given way to a skin soaking storm. Teachers and Teacher Educators have had to contend with

a plethora of Acts, directives and advice from central government and its agencies, calling for change claimed to be improving the curriculum and assessment systems of state provided education and Initial Teacher Training (ITT). These have been set in a 'discourse of derision', a stream of vitriolic critique from the highly organised voices of the radical political Right. In PE this has attacked any form of educational practice that appears 'progressive' and must therefore constrain the ways in which children and young people are imbued with attitudes of patriotism, 'traditional' masculine values and, above all, competitive team spirit (Evans,1988, Kirk,1992).

That the images of PE conveyed in such 'debates' bear very little resemblance to what goes on inside schools, or to the concerns, issues and worries of educators, for example, over conditions of work, employment prospects, staff development opportunities, levels of resource and so on, has seemed to matter not a jot to politicians whose ideological persuasions and political agendas, disturbingly, permit only derisory lip service to contradictory hard facts. Indeed the massive disjuncture between the view of schools and PE promulgated in recent political critiques of the education system and the reality of practice in PE in schools deeply begs the question of what is going on. What is the Right's critique of education and PE designed to achieve? Whose interests does it serve? Whatever the answers to these questions, and we shall speculate later on the motives of the Right, PE teachers in England and Wales, as elsewhere, have been left facing a profound contradiction. On the one hand, they are told by prominent educationalists and politicians that they hold the key to the nations' future health and wealth, especially if they promote more team games and sport in their schools. On the other, curricular and resource changes tell them that they and their subject deserve less time, support and recognition than others. At the time of writing this paper, for example, the Teacher Training Agency (TTA), the government quango now running Initial Teacher Training (ITT) in England and Wales, announced new 'proposals' for funding ITT, involving a price tariff which, for the first time, differentiates between subjects in the

allocation of resources. The TTA, has deemed that 'PE, Music, Art and IT' are 'not in the same category as science, and Design and Technology in terms of the need for specialist staff and specialist space (our emphasis) including laboratories and equipment costs (TTA,1996:3). In effect, this will cut the allocation of resources to PE by around 6%. Thus, in the new, differentiated system students entering ITT PE will be worth less as 'professionals', economically and discursively, than their counterparts in other subjects where they previously held parity. At the same time, sport in schools receives massive economic and ideological support from central government and private capital. For example, the recently announced National Junior Sports Programme (1996) is to inject 14 million pounds into the development of sport for young people age 4 -18, the kind of money that educationalists would dearly love to receive. The initiative comprises Top Play, Top Sport, Champion Coaching and Top Club. The first two schemes are for Primary children. Top Play, for four to nine year olds, will develop core skills such as co-ordination, throwing and catching, and team work. Top Sport introduces seven to eleven year olds to the major games. Champion Coaching provides a fast track for talented 11-13 year olds and Top Club will encourage links between school and club. The projected statistics are impressive. We are informed that 'Four million children will be involved, using 1.7m pieces of equipment and helped by 250,000 trained staff at 20,000 schools and community sites by 1999' (TES, 1996). We will return to this piece of curriculum development later in the discussion.

For the moment the point that we wish to stress is that in the

reconstruction of PE as sport in the public eye, the concept of Physical Education as a worthwhile subject has all but disappeared as a 'discursive regime'. Debate on the school curriculum has been cast not in terms of the needs of pupils nor the development of the subject but rather in terms of social order, elite performance and the interests of sport. An over emphasis on Sport Education and Health Promotion by educationalists within the PE profession may have helped both exacerbate and nurture this trend. Recent initiatives in Australia, for example, The 'Active Australia Document' (1996) produced by the Sport and Recreation Ministers' Council, and the Standing Committee on Sport and recreation which, it seems (Kirk, 1996, PE network communication), marginalise PE teachers in the promotion of young people's opportunities to anticipate in sport, are a salutary reminder that the potential for sidelining educational practitioners and further eroding their involvement in what should be considered as important educational work is potentially as great in the Australia as it has been in the UK in recent years.

The marginalisation of PE teachers, not just as contributors to initiatives in sport, but as educationalists in schools, is profoundly worrying and damaging, not only for the development of the subject of

PE but also the interests and aspirations of those who teach it. It is well illustrated in sentiments such as these, here expressed in the political rhetoric of Ian Sproat, the UK Conservative Minister for Sport,

The behavioural lessons of discipline, especially self discipline, courage, team spirit, learning to play with others and learning to live within the rules are all vital. If sport had been better taught in schools over recent years, I am sure we would not have witnessed some of the recent outbreaks of ill -behaviour. That is why the Government start from the premise that sport in schools is important (Sproat, 1996: 823)

In this discourse, bad PE and concomitantly bad PE teachers are to be replaced by clear headed (ideologically sound) providers of sport. The publication of the Government driven Sport - Raising the Game (Srtg) (DNH, 1995) made clear his party's intent to rebuild the British Nation through success and involvement in competitive sport in schools. In the Prime Minister's words,

Some people say that sport is a peripheral and minor concern. I profoundly disagree. It enriches the lives of the thousands of millions of people of all ages around the world who know and enjoy it. Sport is a central part of Britain's National Heritage. We invented the majority of the worlds great sports. and most of those we did not invent, we codified and helped to popularise throughout the world. It could be argued that nineteenth century Britain was the cradle of a leisure revolution every bit as significant as the agricultural and industrial revolutions we launched in the century before (DNH, 1995: 2).

Leaving aside the accuracy of such major claims about the global status and significance of 'British sport', we see here the expression, par excellence , of a view of sport as social cement, 'a binding force between generations and across borders'.

But, by a miraculous paradox, it is at the same time one of the defining characteristics of nationhood and of local pride. We should cherish it for both those reasons (DNH, 1995: 2)

Following the publication of 'Raising the Game' Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland were asked to publish 'their own' documents setting

out the aims of the Srtg text in their contexts. The sentiments of the PM were duly echoed and endorsed, by the Welsh Secretary of State, William Hague, in the text of Young People and Sport in Wales (Sports Council for Wales, 1996:2), the Welsh equivalent of Raising the Game.

A thriving Wales is a Wales that raises great sports men and sportswomen, that produces golfers, athletes, and cricketers of world

quality. It is a Wales where many enjoy sport at their own level of success and enjoy the reflected glory of the international success of others. May we all enjoy sport even more as new talent comes from our schools and colleges.

Clearly, in this view, sport is to wed potentially divergent forces to the British Nation state. In England, Wales and Northern Ireland it is to act simultaneously as a populist, British, imperialist ideal. Although the 'Northern Irish', 'English' and 'Welsh texts' are subtly different in significant respects, the latter, for example, as its title implies, centring attention more on the child and the young person than on performance in sport, and its production involved a level of consultation with teachers and sports providers in the Principality that was not a feature of the production of Srtg in England, they all announce their commitment to ensuring that "competitive sport is at the centre of PE in schools" (SCW,1996:15). Indeed, their shared platform is clearly that the text of the National Curriculum PE (NCPE) positions competitive team games in both England and Wales as the dominate form of activity in the PE curriculum in all state sector schools. The text of Srtg highlights that in,

The Revised PE National Curriculum

there will be a greater concentration in the revised PE National Curriculum on traditional team games and competitive sport. In future :

- i. all 5-7 year olds will be taught the skills of competitive games and how to play them;
- ii all 7-11 year olds will play competitive team games including mini-versions of recognised adult games;
- iii all 11-14 year olds will progress to play the fully recognised versions of team games : and
- iv all 14-16 year olds will play a competitive game, alongside other sports and physical activities of their choice (DNH,1995:7)

Changes to Initial Teacher Training (ITT), OFSTED inspections of sport in ITT every year and new incentives provided to state schools by Sportsmark and Gold Star award schemes (to qualify, schools have to provide minimum levels of PE and at least 4 hours of organised sport outside lessons) are to combine to ensure the institutionalisation of this state of affairs. Teachers have played an insignificant part in the making of these texts, just as they did so in the making of the National Curriculum PE (NCPE). PE in schools is now to express the Government's, not teachers, young people's, or parents' needs, despite the rhetoric of consumer choice.

Why such a massive amount of attention should have come to sport and

team games in schools from politicians, has been documented in some detail elsewhere (Evans and Penney, 1996a&b). Here we will comment only briefly on the underlying motives, before focusing upon the way in which teachers and teaching have been positioned within and by the Government's discursive project.

At first glance, it is tempting to read such views simply as the expression of a Victorian public school games ethos and restorationist ideal (Evans and Penney 1996). On the surface, they suggest little more or less than an aspiration to cultivate, 'restore', a form of citizenship founded on 'quintessential bourgeois English qualities' (Kirk, 1992: 86), whose icons are public schools for boys of character and competitive spirit and the stiff upper lip in the face of failure and adversity, all felt to be essential to Great Britain's historic social and economic well being and imperialist aspirations. But while reading these views in this way may be to correctly identify their social origin, it may also be to underestimate or mistake their contemporary significance. The 'principles' expressed in the rhetoric of the PM and the MFS, now embedded in the text of the NCPE are, in an important respect, critically 'dis-interested' in any specific cultural ideals. That is to say, they are as disinterested in the identities and aspirations of 'the English' (certainly in any regional aspirations that 'the English' may have) as they are in the particular/local aspirations of the Welsh, the Scots, or the people of Northern Ireland. As we have pointed out elsewhere, the making of the NCPE effectively and intentionally stripped the text of any commitment to equity and equal opportunities and, with it, sensitivity towards cultural difference and diversity within sport and PE in England and Wales. In this respect, the cultural ideals present in the NCPE are intentionally an absent presence. Sport and PE in schools are, indeed, to produce a particular form of citizen, 'the competitive individual', but by complex stealth, through the 'hidden' curriculum of team games, the content and mode of competitive sport and PE. Children and young people are to learn not only how to win and to lose at games, but also the rules of wider life, how to compete in the economic market place, accept gracefully a given positional status and place, to bask in the reflected glory of others' successes, even if they themselves never experience the opportunity to achieve or succeed. Thus the body is to be 'enfleshed' with an abstracted ideal, with generic qualities, that may well have once had their origins in the practices of the English public school, but now, recontextualised, are to know and respect no such boundary. They are purportedly as relevant and useful to the pupils of Wales as they are to those in England, Scotland and Northern Ireland, because they are driven primarily by the interests of 'the Nation', central government, capital and the Nation state. The forces of the NCPE, in this respect, are intentionally and inherently centripetal. The commitment arises from and is to be to the interests of the British Nation state and capital rather than the individual, the

school, local community or any lesser 'Nation'. Although it may seem somewhat exaggerated to suggest it, the NCPE represents reflects and responds to wider changes in the world order, particularly the globalisation of economic organisation, that threaten to render 'small scale language communities such as Wales', 'even more vulnerable and marginal to the interests of global culture' (Williams, 1995: 62/63).

These fundamental changes in state education in England and Wales over the last fifteen years have, ostensibly, been driven as much by the desire for deregulation and the dismantling of the principle of producer interest partnership between providers (Local Education Authorities, central government and teachers) that had underpinned the system for over forty years, as it has any educational or other ideological ideals. At the centre of the reforms 'acting as a kind of policy glue that holds everything together' (Ball, 1996) has been the National Curriculum which has been instituted 'progressively' in all state school, for children age 5-16, since the legislative enactment of the Education Reform Act 1988. Our research, like that of others, has illustrated how the making of the NCPE for state schools in England and

Wales has been a vital ingredient in what Ball (1996: 99-100) refers to as the 'politics of depoliticization' and the assertion of symbolic control, processes involving the imposition on teachers and pupils of particular ways of relating, thinking, feeling, and forms of consciousness, that have 'drawn the discursive resources that constitute school knowledge more tightly inside and to the state. These processes, built upon on the erosion of Teacher Trade Union negotiating rights and powers in the late 70 and 80s, have involved 'the suppression of any form of opposing positions', most notably progressivism, that might obstruct the interests of capital and central Government's apparently restorationist ideals. The making of the NCPE and, more recently, the publication of *Srtg*, which we have depicted as presaging the discursive reconstruction of PE as sport in public debates, have been part of this process of wresting ownership and control of the curriculum from teachers and redefining the nature and status of their work. The proposed introduction of a National Curriculum for Initial Teacher Education (ITT) in 1997 is further expression of these trends seeking to redefine the nature and status of teachers' work.

In September this year the TTA issued a "Draft Framework for the Assessment of Quality and Standards in Initial Teacher Training" (TTA, 1996b), a document proposing 115 criteria for the evaluation of teacher education, and which would effectively tie the allocation of students and accreditation to the assessment rating received by the provider, judged against an untried and untested evaluative scheme. The logic of the market thus links funding to 'success'. It is a logic which has encouraged schools to seek potentially successful pupils/students at the expense of others, who may have a lower market

value or more expensive needs. Thus 'the steered education market of schools and now ITT is to be characterised purportedly by differentiation, flexibility' and cost efficiency' (Ozga:1995:30).

All students entering ITT in 1997 will have to follow a curriculum which, for the first time, explicitly prescribes what they should learn and how they should teach it. Current arrangements simply state what a reasonable student should look like at the end of the course. Although the new rule will apply only to Primary English and Maths initially, Secretary of State Shephard has asserted "that is just a start". "I intend over time to recast all initial and in-set training" (TES, 1996, September 20th :2). Whether or not this represents a significant threat to the autonomy and academic freedom of Universities, or merely a reasonable imposition of quality standards is a matter for debate. Either way, it will inevitably force ITT providers to focus on 'core provision' and review the time that they can commit to foundation subjects such as PE. This will hardly help, discursively and professionally, to re-position PE and its teachers centrally in ITT, something which, we contend, will have to happen if they are to provide forms of PE that are diverse, inclusive and capable of enhancing the consciousness and opportunities of children and young people and will help children, together with parents and others with interest in children and sport, meet the challenges of a 'post modern age' (Evans, Penney and Davies, 1996).

The struggle to control the teaching profession has, then, entered a new phase. Ten years ago we centred attention on the content of a highly influential, peak viewing time, BBC Panorama programme (see Evans, 1990) which vilified 'progressive' PE teachers for purportedly distorting the curriculum of PE and undermining standards. In June this year, Panorama embarked on a similar diatribe on teaching methods, pointing to the success of didactic, whole class teaching methods in Taiwan as the most appropriate way forward for pedagogy in the UK, with

shameless disregard of the perils of such cross-cultural generalisation. Previously educational outcomes (the curriculum) were the sole concern of Government. How teachers arrived at those outcomes was largely up to them. As McAvooy reminds us, the national Curriculum Council's publication Curriculum Guidance No3: The Whole Curriculum. made it clear that "It is the birthright of the teaching profession and must always remain so, to decide on the best and most appropriate means of imparting education to pupils" (McAvooy, 1996, June 21:18). In the minds of Government and Opposition, that is no longer the case. Arguably the contest to control the curriculum of state schools and of PE, has already been fought and lost by teachers in the UK. What is now evident is that both Tory government and opposition Labour Party in the UK have shifted their attention away from the structure and content of the National Curriculum and assessment towards pedagogy, the nature of teaching itself and the best ways of stimulating learning. The

professionals of the future are to have little say as to either what or how they may teach.

The botched 'comprehensive experiment' of the 1960s and 70s pales into deep and irrelevant insignificance as a piece of social engineering and political intervention in contrast to the ways in which the radical Right in Britain has successfully gone to the heartlands of schooling and ITT, to the curriculum, modes of evaluation, assessment and resource, securing control under the ideology of the free market (Evans and Davies, 1988). Not for a very long time has the teachers' lot been such an unhappy one, as they have inexorably been positioned as both the victims and the agents of reform. Never before in peacetime have they had to contend either with such prolonged and sustained upheaval or to deal with so many pressures for change from different sources, parents and politicians, having had to deal with the heightened and varied expectations placed upon them in the knowledge that powerful conservative pressure groups outside the profession have successfully designed to redirect, organise and monitor their work. Unsurprisingly, many teachers in the UK, as elsewhere (Macdonald, 1995), feel vulnerable and alienated sometimes by the pace, form and content of the variety of reforms and innovations, ranging from the National Curriculum and benchmark testing to appraisal of their own performance. They are expected to understand and effect change in which they are not invited to participate as authors, increasingly emanating from outside the profession. It can be no surprise to find surveys in the UK reporting that the number of teachers quitting the profession has risen for a third year running (TES, 1996, September 27, p3). 'Proletarianisation', feelings of loss of control over key elements of the job, rather than of enhanced professionalism, have become, for many, the name of the game.

Although caution is always required when generalising about any aspect of teachers' work, given that different organisational contexts impact differently on their outlooks (see Macdonald, 1995), this is the social and educational context in which PE teachers in Britain have to be placed. Redundancy, redeployment and early retirement, are for many experienced teachers the order of the day, while the new recruit is likely to face the prospect of a long period on short - term contract, on the lower pay scales of the career structure, knowing that chances for promotion, even when they become 'tenured', will be few and far between, their possibilities of rising up the career ladder within PE limited by their senior/elders' declining opportunities to leave the subject for more obviously pastoral or academic careers.

If nothing else, political intervention in the organisation, content and methodologies of schools and ITT in recent years has re-emphasised and clearly illustrated that teachers are workers, teaching is work and

that the school is an institutionalised work place (Whitty, 1985,

Connell, 1985, Apple, 1986, Shaw, 1987, Evans and Davies, 1988, Macdonald, 1996). Taking this perspective we have to view recent debates about the PE curriculum and pedagogy as part of a broader battle for ownership and control over what is to be produced and how it is to be distributed and evaluated, part of a struggle over ownership and control of the labour process of teaching, over how teachers, teacher educators and students, should think and act. To consider teaching in this way is to ask how power, authority, responsibility and reward are distributed, how teachers and pupils are differently positioned, discursively and materially, in and through the work of PE, who has influence over what and what are the principles that govern this process (Connell, 1985, Macdonald, 1995). However, despite the valiant efforts of a few researchers (Sparkes, Templin and Shcemp, 1993, Kirk, 1993, Wright, 1995, Macdonald, 1995) our understanding of the labour process in PE remains as limited as our understanding of the division of labour in the subject. Why the process of teaching takes a particular, often very limited, form and how it is constructed or framed by the ideas, decisions, values and interests of individuals not only inside the classroom but also in sites outside them, for example, in departmental, Faculty, Higher Educational contexts and wider political contexts remains sadly under explored. What we do know of the UK in recent years, is how the curriculum of PE has been increasingly strongly framed, if not determined outside education and sport.

We share Ozgas's view that what we are witnessing now in the UK is just the most recent manifestation of shifting relationships between the state and professionals. The 'licensed autonomy' enjoyed in the 1950s, 1960's and early 70s, by teachers in the UK is being wrenched away. Ozga argues (1995:23) 'The current transformation of the bureaucratic Keynesian Welfare State (KWS) into the small strong state in the service of the market inevitably brings with it a reduction of professional power and status' (p23). It also presages new forms of control.

Marketisation in education is not accompanied by the elimination of mechanisms of control but by their reformation and relocation. The efficient operation of the market is secured thorough a combination of legislative controls (juridification) and internal institutional mechanisms, notably performance indicators and inspection, which ostensibly provide consumers with a basis for selection but more importantly provide powerful managerial imperatives' (opcit:30).

In Ozga's view, professionalism as a means of control in its historic form has been replaced by managerialism

which is school based and which offers enhanced status and financial reward to those responsible for ensuring delivery of the service against a set of externally determined criteria and in pursuit of externally generated aims and targets. Senior teachers are thus co-opted in a redefinition of professionalism that is essentially

managerialist, and may disseminate this definition through processes that extend surveillance, manufacture consent and render dissent illegitimate.

If senior managers in education choose to work within this discourse then they must recognise the consequences for other teachers, and particularly for the deskilled, part time labour force. However there are invidious consequences for all teachers, managers and managed, in the acceptance of externally constructed agendas that contribute to loss of control over the meaning and purpose of work, which is the essence of deskilling (opcit: 35)

It is in this context that we need to explore the discursive positioning of PE teachers in schools and ITT and the 'meanings of empowerment and collegiality' that may be evident in such contexts, in the UK and elsewhere, 'as these terms, along with the proliferation of management teams, may conceal the increase in the monitoring and surveillance of teacher's work' (ibid, p33)

Beyond Critique : Repositioning PE

Bernstein reminds us that schools

metaphorically hold up a mirror in which an image is reflected. There may be several images, positive and negative. A school's ideology may be seen as a construction in a mirror through which images are reflected. The question is: who recognises themselves as of value? What other images are excluded by the dominant image of value so that some students are unable to recognise themselves? In the same way, we can ask about the acoustic of the school. Whose voice is heard? Who is speaking? Who is hailed by this voice? For whom is it familiar? In this sense there are visual and temporal features to the images the school reflects and these images are projections of a hierarchy of values, of class values (1996:7)

What forms of physical culture and images of physical activity will be valued, included and excluded in the PE curriculum in schools in the UK if it is reduced to team games and sport and if Physical Educationalists are not positioned as 'professionals', centre stage in curriculum development and change? The kind of PE and teachers we want in schools is going to depend greatly on what we envisage 'our' society to be and whether or not we want our PE practices to reflect the diversity of cultures that define our communities, or the narrow aspirations of politicians and their pernicious imagery of how little England, little Wales, little America, little Australia, used to be.

With Bernstein, we premise our aspirations for education and PE firstly, on an image of social democracy, the first condition of which,

he argues, is that people must feel that they have a stake in society. This means that if a democratic PE is to materialise then it will have to rest not just on the aspirations of politicians, or teachers, but on the those of parents and pupils and be grounded in the culture of the communities they serve. Its construction will have to start from the analysis of people as they are and be sensitive to existing forms of behaviour, not to what they might become. Whatever particular vision of the future we as teachers adopt, the first step has to be to involve students in linking the world of physical culture as they find it with the world as they would like it to be, through the curriculum of sport and PE. This must be to give pupils and parents a stake in their school communities and the wider societies that they serve. Second, Bernstein argues, 'people must have confidence that the political arrangements they create will realise this stake, or give grounds if they do not' (p.). Issues of ownership and control of the PE curriculum have to be addressed, a task made more difficult, for example, in England and Wales, by greater centralisation and the requirements of recent texts such as the NCPE and Srtg. Their rhetoric has disingenuously claimed to promote educational 'choice' while disempowering teachers, leaving them ill equipped and unable to respond to local needs. It serves the consumer with not one iota of greater control over either what should, or can, be taught and learnt in schools. In our view, privileging the interests of pupils, and necessarily the teachers too, would not signal slippage towards a narrow cultural or curriculum relativism that would limit pupils' horizons to the physical cultures of their immediate

geographic surroundings, as long as schools and PE teachers institutionalise what Bernstein refers to as three interrelated rights. The first is the right to individual 'enhancement'

a condition for experiencing boundaries, be they social, intellectual or personal, not as prisons, or stereotypes, but as tension points condensing the past and opening possible futures. Enhancement entails a discipline. It is not so much about creativity although that may be an outcome; enhancement has to do with boundaries and experiencing boundaries as tension points between the past and possible futures. Enhancement is not simply the right to be more personally, more intellectually, more socially, more materially, it is the right to the means of critical understanding and to new possibilities (1996: 6)

Enhancement is, therefore, not just an 'outcome' but a form of opportunity, a sense of responsibility and a condition for control, and is something which is unlikely to be achieved if PE is simply delivered to pupils, or confined either to a diet mainly of team games or only the sports and leisure activities that feature parochially in the pupils' local community.

Furthermore, the right to enhancement, Bernstein argues, is the condition for confidence.

Where that right is not met then neither students nor teachers will have confidence, and without confidence it is difficult to act. This right is a condition for confidence and operates at an individual level (ibid,p).

Few would deny that confidence is a key motivating ingredient in an individual's involvement in sport. Teachers are unlikely to nurture students who are confident and comfortable in physical activity if they are not able to offer them a sense of ownership and control over how their bodies are to be defined, exercised and expressed in contexts of PE and sport.

The second right is

the right to be included, socially, intellectually, culturally and personally. Now this right to be included is complex because to be 'included' does not necessarily mean to be absorbed. Thus the right to be included may also require a right to be separate, to be autonomous. Inclusion is a condition for *communitas* and this operates at the level of the social. ...

While the third right, then, is the right to participate

Participation is not only about discourse, about discussion, it is about practice, and practice that must have outcomes. The third right then is the right to participate in procedures whereby order is constructed, maintained and changed. It is the right to participate in the construction, maintenance and transformation of order. Participation is the condition for civic practice, and operates at the level of politics (Bernstein,1996 : 7)

This, of course, signals more than just a right to participate in in-curricular and extra curricular PE, in enhanced and confident ways. It announces a right to be involved in the construction of those opportunities to participate and the form that participation will take. It implies as much emphasis on planning and evaluation as upon performance in PE, processes now diminished by the requirements of our NCPE and which teachers without adequate training or resourcing find

hard to institutionalise in schools. Critically, it requires teachers who are pedagogically sophisticated, confident, committed, professionally well skilled and who feel that their expertise is supported institutionally and in the wider socio political domain. These are not conditions easily achieved in the contemporary conditions of work in schools and ITT.

Re-defining Teachers

While re-defining the meaning of teacher education has been a fundamental part of the process of de-professionalisation, of wresting control from teachers, the abundant animus of recent British Conservative government's towards educational procedure has been particularly pure in respect of our Teacher Educators (Maguire and Ball, 1993; Evans, et al 1996). Quite spectacular changes have beset those institutions involved with initial teacher education over the last decade. A whole series of legislative measures have effectively reconstructed the structure of TE, defining course content and, concomitantly, the conception of what it is to be a teacher educator. They have sought to tighten up the 'regimes of control in and around teacher education and shut down any gaps or spaces for accommodations or subversions' (Maguire and Ball, 1993 : 11).

Redefining the conception of teachers' 'professional knowledge' has been an important part of this process, of controlling teachers and teaching. Recent legislation has stated that courses will be required to

equip students with essential 'competencies', including the subject knowledge and professional and personal skills which new teachers need to manage, maintain order and teach effectively in their classrooms. The development of complete profiles of new teachers' competencies will help ease the transition from initial training to induction (DFE, 1993, p4)

Arguably, no one would contest the view that teachers need to be competent. But we have to be clear about what this term really leads to. As McNamara (1992) points out, it has been a fundamental and dominant assumption within Government education policy on the curriculum in recent years that the 'outcomes' of teacher education courses can be articulated as a set of competencies. Teachers have been encouraged to conceptualise teaching as a shopping list of constituent components which relate to composite skills and knowledge. None of this would be objectionable to most teacher educators so long as they are regarded as simple minimum rather than an adequate conceptualisation of what it means to be teacher (Maguire and Ball, 1993). However, these competencies are now assumed to be measurable and amenable to expression as profiles which map out student teachers' abilities at the completion of their initial training. John Patten, Secretary of State in 1993, stated

all teachers should start their careers with profiles of competencies, which set out their professional capabilities and give a picture of relative strengths and weaknesses. Such developments will help those recruiting newly qualified teachers to plan induction and development programmes, and can form the basis for a permanent record of the teacher's professional development throughout his or her career (DFE, 1993, p16).

We have to see this not simply as an attempt to state the knowledge base of teaching but as a means of further deregulating entry to the teaching profession. McNamara (1992) points out, the switch of emphasis

from the process of teacher training to a focus upon competencies has a number of advantages for policy makers and politicians, but few, we suggest for teachers.

First, it provides a means of (superficially) demonstrating to the lay public that teacher training courses are being made 'relevant' to the needs of children and the schools. Second, by shifting the emphasis from course process to course outcomes it may be possible to persuade some teacher trainers that they have more autonomy and control over the training process, so long as their students manifest the appropriate competencies at the completion of their course' (opcit, 1992, p16).

McNamara cautions us against this because, embedded in this view, is a more fundamental challenge to teacher education. He goes on, once the emphasis is placed upon 'outcomes' the training process itself is called into question and is 'up for grabs'.

There is no longer any difficulty in reconciling criteria so that they relate to different routes into teaching be they conventional or non-conventional modes of training. In this way the institutional context and form of teacher training ceases to be important, what matters are the competencies students can demonstrate after the completion of a variety of training experiences. Moreover, any form of training becomes problematic; a prospective teacher who has worked in industry, the services, or other walks of life may be presumed to already possess many of the required competencies and, so it may be argued, training may need to offer little more than provide the requisite extra competencies (McNamara, 1992, p273).

Prescribing teacher education in terms of competency outcomes not only determines the structure and content of TE, it also ensures that teacher trainers are no longer free to decide how to train teachers as they judge professionally appropriate. McNamara reminds us that the Consultation Document (DES, 1992) statements removed reference to gender and multicultural issues, dimensions of teacher education which many teacher educators consider it essential for their courses to address (Ibid, p274). However, achieving competence is not the same as being an effective teacher. Personally we share McNamara's view that Teacher Education

involves assisting individual students, whatever their particular repertoire of dispositions and aptitudes, to develop the all-round competence which will enable them to teach effectively in the variety of contexts they will encounter during their careers.

This requires more than

instilling in students units of competence, made up of a number of elements of competence (with associated performance criteria) (Employment Department Group, 1989) (McNamara, 1992, p283).

It warrants practices informed by knowledge and understanding and, dare we think it, suitable amounts of appropriate theory.

Will the types of training proposed by recent legislation on ITT attract good candidates and produce better educated and more competent teachers? Will Teachers be given a sound basis for continued career long professional development? Will school centred training build on and extend a widely accepted commitment to partnership between tutors and teachers? Will shortened training courses send clear messages to potential recruits about the status and attractiveness of PE teaching or take account of the modest educational performance of many

candidates for such courses and the need for adequate time to be available in which to equip them with the necessary confidence and skills to work in difficult conditions, and provide support for them during periods of school based study? It is against the background of questions such as these that we must consider what recent ITT legislation and Ministerial pronouncement are designed to achieve? Will the 'de-theorising of teacher education, the privileging of the practical over the critical and through this the de-skilling of teachers' (Maguire and Ball, 1993: 19) raise standards in education, or will it simply break the connection between higher education and the training of teachers, curb the move towards an all graduate profession, undermine the professionalism of teachers and reduce TE to a functional and instrumental set of concerns 'emphasising only what will be professionally useful to teachers',

a form of instrumental knowledge which is typically portrayed as neutral and value free, where education is simply a means to given ends and all that is needed is a check list of competencies which need to be achieved (Maguire and Ball, 1993,p11)

In the eyes of some, recent education legislation has already seriously damaged the opportunities for teachers to develop pedagogies that are reflective and innovative. As Stones points out

The deprecation of pedagogy is continued in the way practical experience is held forth as the means by which teaching quality is to be enhanced. Coming through loud and clear is that it is practical teaching experience that counts and the best way to keep teacher trainers up to scratch is to return them to the real world of the classroom..

There is

absolutely no recognition of the need to develop a rigorous, theory based practically oriented pedagogy. It clearly is not necessary. All that is needed is to know the subject and have enough exposure to classrooms. Is this to be the ignorant outcome of the wealth of research finding on the need for a deep understanding of the way children think and learn (and don't learn) before one can teach them the academic discipline one is privy to? Any practice that arises from the fiats enunciated here (reference to legislation on ITT) could set back the development of pedagogy and teacher training for years to come (Stones, quoted in Smith, M. 1993: 55).

There may be places in the future where the narrow instrumentalism of the New Right is kept at bay and where space for reflective teaching and teacher education remains. Like Hartley (1993, p87) we maintain that much here will depend on the strength of local and national economies. If difficulties with public expenditure persist or deepens then the percentage of GNP to be spent on education, including teacher education, will be at risk. The principles of relevance, certainty, cheapness and choice, rather than educational opportunity and need, will drive practice in ITT and schools (ibid., p87). This is not what we need.

Teachers as Innovators and Agents for Change

We share Goodson's view that the time has come to bring teachers back into the fold and, with them, educational researchers and theorists who seek to support the development of teachers' professional knowledge (Goodson, 1995,p18), if for no other reason than that without them, the nostrums of politicians and sport agencies are incapable of conversion

or rescue as successful initiatives. For example, recent sport policy texts on equity in PE (SCNI,1996) have highlighted that the family and early years of schooling in the Primary sector are critical sites of influence upon children's and young people's attitudes towards self and involvement in PE and sport. They are contexts in which so much could and should be done to nurture positive views of self and others in relation to physical activity and sport. As the SCNI (1996, p8) points out,

The initial contact young people make with foundation skills is through the home. Parents influence children's patterns of play and it is apparent that early in their lives girls are stereotyped through the expectations of others and the choices open to them. The roots of inequality are laid early in life as boys are provided with more opportunities to develop self confidence and basic motor skills through play.

It also notes that

Primary schools are required to cater for the physical development needs of all children, but the Physical Education programme provided in many primary schools may not always provide all children with the necessary foundation for later participation

In Britain, in the Primary sector, we find not only the very best of educational practice, the most sophisticated of pedagogy, Panorama notwithstanding, but also, paradoxically, the most limited of practices when it comes specifically to the teaching of sport and PE, a situation arising through no fault of our teachers. Over half of the Primary schools in our study (n = 39) (Evans and Penney, 1996) reported that they had no staff in schools with a PE related qualification. Nor were there many schools with established links with PE teachers in secondary schools or with other individuals or agencies who could help with the provision of PE. At the heart of this problem lies the nature of Initial Teacher Education for Primary PE. Frankly, the time made available for the preparation of teachers to teach PE in the Primary sector in England and Wales is a national disgrace. Recent research by Piotrowski and Capel (1996), for example, reports that

out of a total contact of 1440 hours allocated to a four year Primary Bachelor of Arts (Education) (Honours) (BAEd) degree, only 30 hours (2% of the total time) are available for preparing generalist teachers to teach PE in primary schools (plus a further 10 hours, 0.7 % of the total time) for those electing to take a Games Option course).

They go on to emphasise that recent

research by Carney (1994) suggests that this example of time allocation to PE within a Primary ITT course is not untypical. Forty institutions offering undergraduate courses in primary ITT responded to a postal questionnaire in October 1993. Eighty percent of these allocated a total of between 16 and 40 hours for ITT PE for generalist students. In the case of Post Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) primary course in ITT following a three year degree programme in a subject related to the specialism, e.g., Sport Science for PE students), 76 % of those institutions responding to the questionnaire, allocated less than 25 hours to ITT PE, with some institutions allocating only 4 hours to this subject in the programme

This suggests that the majority of teachers entering the primary sector will do so having received, if they are lucky, between 4 and 25 hours of training to teach PE. Many of our four year courses are in process

of being shrunk to three and we have evidence of even further squeeze on PE. By no stretch of the imagination is this the level of training that will allow teachers to develop the kind of thinking and

sophisticated pedagogical skills and practices that will bring about equity or excellence in PE, at its very foundations. Good pedagogies are expensive of resource and training. We are unlikely to produce either excellence or equity in PE on the cheap. As the Policy Framework (SCNI, 1996, p8) points out, in the absence of training, teachers tend to revert back to the methods that they experienced when they were young, relying on practices that are not always 'educational' or conducive to the promotion of equity in PE. Again, this is not a problem that can be solved by teachers or by ITT alone. Progress will only occur in a partnership of provision between parents, providers of sport and teachers of PE. Recent government policy forcing ITT to direct its limited resources to equipping all teachers of PE to teach 'at least one mainstream game played in the summer and one mainstream game played in the winter' (DNH,1995,p15) may be helpful and necessary, but certainly not a sufficient step towards improving the resourcing and teaching of Primary school PE.

In this respect the development of the National Junior Sports Programme (NJSP), is to be warmly welcomed. Although initiatives such as this are not designed or intended primarily as solutions to the problem of de-professionalisation and inequity in PE and sport, potentially they will have a very important bearing upon progress in that direction. Such initiatives not only highlight the importance of partnerships between but also the centrality of teachers, women particularly, as agents of change in sport and PE. If we have learnt anything from research on curriculum innovation in recent years, it is that initiatives constructed by 'others' outside the education system are unlikely to be successful or sustained unless they connect directly with the interests, aspirations and mainstream practices of those inside it. The history of curriculum innovation in schools, right up to and including the NCPE, is littered with examples of the broken, bright ideas of committed 'outsiders' who believed that they could simply impose their initiatives on teachers in schools. Innovations are unlikely to be successful if they do not give teachers, pupils and parents a sense of ownership and control. Very wisely, developments in the NJSP are progressing in partnership with teachers in schools. If they are to succeed they will have to embrace women teachers in particular, who comprise the majority of teachers in Primary schools though the majority of their Heads are men (Policy Framework, SCNI,1996). As we have found in our research, it is often the latter who manage resources for and set the tone and ethos of physical education and sport in those settings. But if PE and sport, including initiatives like the NJSP are to develop successfully and become integrated with mainstream thinking and practice in our Primary schools, it is these teachers who will have to be positioned and resourced as catalysts of change and women who will have to take the lead. For this to happen, they will have to be treated by policy makers, not as a barriers to effective change in PE, but as a central resource.

This, if nothing else, will mean recognising the skills, knowledge and aspirations that women possess in sport and PE, and also what girls and women want and do in their leisure time. We know that more and more girls and young women are following and enjoying aerobic and other health related exercise programmes, such as dance and swimming, in their 'free' leisure time outside school (Roberts, 1996,p56). But these are activities all too rarely encouraged or given status and space in schools, often because of the overly narrow and unhelpful definition of what constitutes sport and worthwhile physical activity peddled by the

UK Prime Minister and his Minister of Sport, now embedded in school policy and practice (DNH,1995; DFE,1995; see Evans and Penney, 1995). Recently, as the guest at a sports writers' lunch, Mr Sproat, the Minister for sport, echoing the Prime Ministerial sentiment, stated,

sport is so important because it affects the whole character of a generation, let alone its health. And when I say sport I do not mean aerobics, stepping up and down bars or countryside rambles.....What I mean is properly organised team games...particularly of the traditional games of this country : soccer, cricket, hockey, rugger, netball (TES, 1996)

Only teachers, intelligently connected to their own experiences and with the aspirations and activities of children and young people, repositioned centre stage as agents of curriculum innovation and change can re-make such lunch time legends. Policies may not be neatly reversed or unravelled, for at each notch they create and respond to interests and the contexts that they ongoingly create. But we have no doubt that enhancing (as a condition of their confidence), including and ensuring the participation of teachers, as a precondition of their capacities to do these things for children and young people, should be the clear goals of the social democratic shift that is imminent in Britain.

Bibliography

Apple, A.(1986) Teachers and Texts, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Ball, S. (1996) Culture, Crisis and Morality: The Struggle Over the National Curriculum, in Atkinson, P, Davies, B and Delamont, s.(eds) Discourse and Reproduction, London: Hampton Press inc.pp,85-103.

Bernstein, B.(1996) Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity : Theory, Research, Critique, London :Taylor and Francis.

Carney, C.(1994) Physical Education, Training of Primary Teachers in Higher Education, unpublished paper, PEA Higher Education interest group, De Montfort University, Bedford.

- Connell, R.W.(1985) Teachers Work, London George Allen and Unwin.
- DES.(1992) The Reform of Initial Teacher Training (Consultation Document), 40. London:Department of Education and Science.
- DFE. (1993) The Government's Proposals for the Reform of Initial Teacher Training, Department of Education for Science.
- DFE.(1995) Physical Education in the National Curriculum, London:HMSO.
- DNH.(1995) Sport - Raising the Game, London: Department of National Heritage
- Evans, J.(1990) Defining a Subject: The Rise and Rise of the New PE?, in British Journal of Sociology of Education, 11,155-169.
- Evans,J and Davies,B.(1988) Introduction, Teachers, Teaching and Control, in Evans,J.(Ed) Teachers Teaching and Control, London: Falmer Press, 1-21.
- Evans, J and Davies, B.(1996) Physical Education and Nationalism in Wales, unpublished paper, Loughborough University.
- Evans, J and Penney, D.(1995) The Politics of Pedagogy. Making a National Curriculum PE, Journal of Education Policy,10,1,27-44.
- Evans, J and Penney, D.(1995) Physical Education, Restoration and the Politics of Sport, Curriculum Studies, 3,2,183-196.
- Evans, J and Penney, D.(1996) All Things Bright and Beautiful : PE in Primary Schools Post ERA, Educational Review,48,1,29-40.
- Evans, J, Penney, D and Davies, B (1996) Back to the Future: Education Policy and Physical Education, in Armstrong, N (ed) New Directions in Physical Education, London:Cassell,pp1-19.
- Goodson, I.(1995) "Trendy Theory" and Teacher Professionalism, in Re-Thinking UK Education: What Next ? CEDARR, Rohampton Institute, London,pp15-18.
- Greene, M.(1986) Teaching as a Project: 'choice perspective and the public scene', in Carnes, M. (Ed) Proceedings of the Fourth Conference on Curriculum Theory in Physical Education, University of Georgia, Ga., 133-61
- Hartley, D.(1993) Confusions in Teacher Education : a post-modern condition?', in Gilroy, P and Smith, M (eds) International Analysis of Teacher Education, Journal of Education for Teaching, 19, 83-95.

- Kirk, D. (1988) *Physical Education and Curriculum Study: A critical introduction*, London: Falmer Press.
- Kirk, D. (1992) *Defining the Curriculum*, London Falmer Press.
- Maguire, M and Ball, S. (1993) *Teacher Education and Education Policy in England*, Unpublished paper, Kings College London.
- McCavoy, D (1996) Labour edging into risky territory, in *Times Educational Supplement*, June 21, p18.
- Macdonald, D. (1995) The Role of Proletarianisation in Physical Education Teacher Attrition, *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 65, 2, 129-141.
- McNamara, D. (1992) 'The Reform of Teacher Education in England and Wales: Teacher Competence, Panacea or Rhetoric?', *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 18 (3), 273-85.
- NJSP. (1996) *National Junior Sports Council*, London: English Sports Council
- Ozga, J. (1995) *Deskilling a Profession: Professionalism, Deprofessionalisation and the New Managerialism*, in Busher, H and Saran, R. (1995) *Managing Teachers as Professionals in Schools*, pp21-39.
- Piotrowski, S and Capel, S. (1996) Recent Influences on the Training of Physical Education in England and Wales, in *Sport, Education and Society*, 1, 2, pp
- Roberts, K. (1996) *Young People, School Sport and Government Policies*, *Sport, Education and Society*, 1, 1, 47-59.
- Shaw, K. (1987) *Skills, Control and the Mass Professions*, *The Sociological Review*, 35, 775-794.
- Smith, M. (1993) 'Ed Stones and JET: a retrospective', in Gilroy, P and Smith, M. (eds) *International Analysis of Teacher Education*, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 18, 111-13.
- Sparkes, A, Templin, T, and Schempp, P. (1993) Exploring dimensions of marginality: Reflecting on the life histories of Physical Education teachers, in *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 12, 386-398.
- Sports Council Northern Ireland (1996) *Women and Sport: policy and framework for action*, Belfast, Sports Council Northern Ireland.
- Sports Council for Wales, (1995) *Learning to Play*. Sports Update No.30, Cardiff: Sports Council Wales.

Sports Council for Wales. (1996) Young People and Sport in Wales, Cardiff: Welsh Office.

Sproat, I.(1996) Sport, Hansard, June, 1996, London: The House of Commons, p283.

Stones, E. (1992) Editorial, Journal of Education for Teaching, 18, 111-113

Teacher Training Agency. (1996a) Final Details of the New Funding and Allocation Methodology for ITT, London: Portland House.

Teacher Training Agency (1996b) Draft Framework for the Assessment of Quality and Standards in Initial Teacher Training, London: Portland House.

Times Educational Supplement.(1996a) Fourteen Million Pounds in Sports Projects Aimed at Youngsters, TES, March, 1, p13.

Times Educational Supplement.(1996b) Shepard Orders Training Re-design, TES, September 20, p2.

Times Educational Supplement.(1996c) Leaving Rate Rises for Third Year, TES, September, 27, p2.

Whitty, G (1985) Sociology and School Knowledge, London: Methuen.

Williams, G.A.(1995) Questions Concerning the Development of Bilingual Wales, in Morris Jones, B and Singh Ghuman, P.A.(eds) Bilingualism, Education and Identity, Cardiff: University of Wales Press, pp47-49.