

A stalling influence ? Structures and `reform' in Physical Education

Dawn Penney.

Department of Human Movement Studies, University of Queensland,
Queensland 4072, Australia.

Paper presented at the ERA and AARE Joint Conference `Educational
research : Building New Partnerships'; 24-29th November, 1996,
Singapore.

Abstract

Drawing on research in both the United Kingdom and Australia this paper identifies dominant discourses and prevalent practices in physical education as signalling an absence of change in much of the contemporary `reform' of physical education. It pursues the reasons underlying this, centring attention on political and ideological influences and the institutional contexts in which developments are occurring. Bernstein's concepts of voice, message and the principles of classification and framing are used in examining the relationship between institutional structures and the potential for and direction of curriculum development in relation to both schools and teacher training institutions. Attention is drawn to present contradictions between institutional structures and progressive discourses in physical education, and the arguable need for significant structural changes if the continued reinforcement of `traditional' definitions and biases within physical education is to be halted.

Introduction

Between 1990 and 1995 I was involved in research that focused on the development, implementation and subsequent revision of the National Curriculum for Physical Education (NCPE) in England and Wales. Since then I have been working at the University of Queensland, where I am undertaking the study of comparable developments in Australia and Queensland in particular. This paper arises from a feeling that has grown in strength throughout this time; th furthermore, the way in which this stability has gone largely unchallenged and unquestioned. Goodson (1994) talks of the National Curriculum in England and Wales as giving rise to `... a wide range of initiatives and a flurry of activity', but reflects that `As always, frenetic activity in the foreground tends to obscure some deeper continuities in the background' (ibid,p.12-13). His observations of the impact of curriculum reform in the 1960s seem remarkably pertinent to the developments that we have seen more recently. He states

One might characterise curriculum reform in the 1960s as a sort of

`tidal wave'. Everywhere the waves created turbulence and activity but actually they only engulfed a few small islands; more substantial land masses were hardly affected at all, and on dry land mountains, the high ground, remained completely untouched. As the tide now rapidly recedes the high ground can be seen in stark silhouette. If nothing else, our scrutiny of the curriculum reform should allow recognition that there is not only high ground but common ground in the world of curriculum. Standing out more clearly than ever on the new horizon is the school subject, the `basic' or `traditional subject'...
(Goodson,1994,p.17)

Kennedy (1995) similarly sees recent `reform efforts' in the United Kingdom, the United States and Australia as entrenching rather than

challenging the established pattern of curriculum organisation and Peters (1995) has reported moves towards a similar focus in developments in New Zealand. Furthermore, although many of the recent education reforms have featured `restructuring' of education systems, as I emphasise below, structures within secondary schools have invariably retained a familiar and recognisable form, centring on subject based departments.

Certainly in England and Wales we have seen that `reform' can not only be equated with transformation, but also restoration, and that as Hall and Carter (1995) emphasise `There is a difference between `talking' `tinkering', and `transforming'. Their observation that `Too much of the effort in the US emphasizes talking, we are doing very little tinkering, and nearly no transforming' (ibid,1995,p.176) surely has international application. Meanwhile Hargreaves has voiced a concern that appears highly justified in relation to much of the research that has focused on these `reforms'; that `scholarly and policy debate' has been `deflected from the fundamentals of curriculum definition and who controls it, to the complicated details of curriculum implementation' (ibid,1994,p.3). This shortcoming in studies is, in Hargreaves view, all the more significant at a time when the fundamentals of curriculum construction have rarely been `so palpably political in nature' (ibid,1994,p.4). In a similar vein Bernstein has stressed that many analyses of the sociology of education analyse the discourses of education in relation to their power to reproduce dominant or dominated relations external to the discourse; the critical absence from pedagogic discourse, is in Bernstein's view `its own voice' (ibid,1990,p.165).

My aim in this paper is therefore to explore this most powerful dimension of education that has been resistant to and/or overlooked and unchallenged in contemporary `reforms' of education; the subject based structure. In particular I am concerned with the way in which irrespective of the direction provided by official policy texts, established and `traditional' identities are retaining their dominance

in and of curricula and pedagogical processes. To some extent therefore, this paper signals a move away from the political and ideological issues operating at the level of central government that we have particularly highlighted in much of our previous work (see for example, Evans, Davies and Penney, 1994; Evans and Penney, 1995a; 1995b; Penney and Evans, forthcoming), and instead, focuses on events at the institutional level. This is not to imply that the actions of central government are not important; rather to highlight that both governmental and institutional influences (and particularly their organisational structures) play a critical role in curriculum development. Goodson (1994) points to this interaction and combination of influences in his reflection that in England and Wales 'In many ways the governmental and structural support offered to school subjects as the organizing device for secondary schooling is reaching unprecedented levels' (ibid, 1994, p.21, my emphasis). As indicated above, the situation in Australia is less clear and in many respects it is the complexity and apparent contradictions arising in developments in Australia that have prompted the line of inquiry that I pursue in this paper. In short, in Australia we have seen the development of 'national texts' that at least to some extent prompt a move away from the traditional subject base. The irony is that in many instances it appears that this potential for significant change is not being realised. It is this apparent resistance and rejection that has prompted me to turn attention to influences that are admittedly 'not all-powerful in engineering curriculum change' (Goodson, 1994, p.117), but that are arguably, 'a very important, and as yet neglected, part of the overall picture' (ibid, 1994, p.117); the responses to these changes

from subject groups and moreover, matters (and particularly those relating to institutions) that are shaping those responses.

In addressing these responses and both what I see as the current absence of change and the potential for what could be regarded as 'real reform' of curricula, I use concepts developed by Basil Bernstein. Bernstein's work has been criticised in the past as inaccessible to many. However, I share with others the belief that his work is worth the perseverance it takes to comprehend and that some of the concepts that he has developed offer tremendous potential to unravel what underlies the enduring stability inherent in these reforms, the limits to change, but also, to identify a basis from which to begin to explore the potential for significant change. In their preface to Bernstein's most recent work, Singh and Luke identify Bernstein's concepts of classification and framing as '...among the most powerful and illuminating theoretical tools for those of us working in the field of curriculum studies' (ibid, 1995, p.xii). To these concepts I would add those of 'voice', 'message', 'singulars' and 'regions' that I develop in what follows.

Conceptualising Curriculum

National curriculum initiatives (and particularly those in England and Wales that have been identified as so overtly political) have served to highlight that the form and content of the curriculum is not neutral. The same can be said of specific school subjects. Embedded in and promoted by any structure or definitions are particular values and interests in relation to what it means to be educated, and indeed, physically educated. For Bernstein the concept of code is 'inseparable from the concepts of legitimate and illegitimate communication' and as such, is fundamental to the analysis and understanding of what is legitimate and illegitimate pedagogic discourse and practices. He defines code as 'a regulative principle', tacitly acquired, which selects and integrates (in a causal chain) our 'orientations to meanings', the 'forms of their realization' (or our 'textual productions') and their 'evoking contexts' (or 'specialized interactional practices') (ibid,1990,p.15). Codes are thus the key to what we define and recognise as legitimate meanings, the texts that we subsequently produce and the specific contexts that these texts create and arise in and from. For Bernstein the critical point is that codes not only regulate single contexts, but also the relationships between contexts. 'What counts as a context depends not on relationships within, but on relationships between contexts. The latter relationships, between, create boundary markers whereby specific contexts are distinguished by their specialized meanings and realizations' (ibid,1990,p.15, original emphasis). Thus it is through this regulation of relationships between contexts that relationships within contexts are regulated.

Bernstein identifies two sets of rules that shape the creation, reproduction and possible transformation of specialized contexts; recognition rules and realization rules.

'Recognition rules create the means of distinguishing between and so recognizing the speciality that constitutes a context, and realization rules regulate the creation and production of specialized relations internal to that context (ibid,1990,p.15; original emphasis). These rules relate directly to the two principles that Bernstein associates with the 'what' and 'how' of pedagogic discourse'; the principle of classification, concerned with 'the categories, contents and relationships to be transmitted' and the principle of framing, referring to 'the manner of their transmission' (ibid,1990,p.196). The principle of classification thus generates the recognition rules for

both 'transmitters' and 'acquirers' in relation to the specialization of their texts. The principle of framing provides the realization rules for the production of their text by defining legitimate and illegitimate modes of communication and relationships between transmitter and acquirer (ibid,1990,p.214).

'Practices' are thus 'the realization of categories', arising from the

rules generated by the principle of classification. The specificity of practices, Bernstein stresses, 'depends entirely upon the relation between these categories'; the insulation (and thus boundaries) between the categories. The insulation, its maintenance, reinforcement or deconstruction is thus the key to the identity or 'voice' of practices, since the degree of insulation '...regulates criteria of demarcation between categories and so the rules of their recognition'. If there is strong insulation, there is a strong principle of classification, if there is weak insulation, there is a weak principle of classification. Changing the insulation between categories is thus, according to Bernstein, the key to changing the principle of classification and the voice (ibid,1990,p.24).

Linked to the concept of voice is that of message; the realized form of voice. It is through this form that the code (and thus the principles of classification and framing with their inherent rules) is acquired (ibid,1990,p.32) and the voice thereby reproduced or challenged. The relationship between voice and message is complex. There seems both a hierarchy, but also, a two-way dynamic. Voice dictates the message; realisation rules presuppose and are limited by recognition rules; but inherent in the message is, according to Bernstein, the capacity to change the voice. There are, he contends '...potential contradictions and dilemmas in the order created by the principle of classification which serve as sources for the 'yet to be voiced', for alternative discourse...' (ibid,1990,p.30). The key to challenging the voice is, in Bernstein's view, '... the crucial space which creates the specialization of the category'; it is in the spaces between discourses, rather than the discourses themselves, that power lies; '...it is silence which carries the message of power; it is the full stop between one category of discourse and another; it is the dislocation in the potential flow of discourse which is crucial to the specialization of any category' (ibid,1996,p.20). Breaking this dislocation, the insulation between categories, 'filling the silence' is thus the key to challenging the identity of categories and thus the voice.

Analysis of pedagogic discourse and practices in these terms is, however, complicated by the fact that empirically, it is not possible to separate 'voice' from 'message'. 'Voice' (implicitly or explicitly) is always announced, realised in 'message'. In an important sense the classificatory principle is continuously present in every pedagogic relation' (ibid, 1990,p.33). Bernstein emphasises that 'All the 'voices' are invisibly present in any one 'voice'. Socialization into one 'voiced message' involves socialisation into all (i.e. into the principle of classification)' (ibid,1990,p.33). Thus, in the case of school subjects, 'Entailed in the recognition of the voice and realization of any one subject is the invisible presence of the classification of all other subjects and of the power relations of their separateness and distinctiveness' (ibid,1990,p.33). However, whilst this points to the control inherent in the process, we can also

identify the inclusion of multiple voices within a single voice as creating the very contradictions and dilemmas that give rise to the capacity to challenge the dominant voice (see below and Harris and Penney, forthcoming).

Voices and Messages in and of National Curricula

Studies of the development of the National Curriculum in England and Wales have highlighted the traditional subject base, the overwhelming dominance of this voice. Both Goodson (1994) and Aldrich (1995) have drawn attention to the fact that this 'major new initiative' (Goodson, 1994) bears an uncanny resemblance to the curriculum established with the Secondary School Regulations of 1904. The parallels between the 1904 and 1988 curricula highlight the reinforcement of not only the subject base of the curriculum but also the privileging of 'traditional' subjects (see Appendix A). Goodson explains that '...the re-establishment of traditional subjects is taking place at the expense of many of those new subject areas devised specifically to sponsor and promote learning across the full range of the comprehensive school; social studies, general science, urban studies, community studies and so on' (ibid, 1994, p.102-3).

The political pressures for this re-establishment have been immense and quite open. Duncan Graham has reported how the National Curriculum Council was instructed to 'abandon investigations into the whole curriculum' (the development of which sought to highlight that the curriculum should more than the specified national curriculum subjects) and instead 'get on with the real work of introducing the curriculum' - namely, the specified subjects (Graham with Tytler, 1993, p.20). Attempts to reduce the insulation and demarcation between subjects were thus openly opposed. The desire was for the establishment of a strongly classified curriculum, expressing and promoting collection codes (Bernstein, 1971) in which knowledge is organised and distributed through subjects and their hierarchies. In our own work focusing on the development of the National Curriculum for Physical Education we have illustrated comparable pressures within a subject; for a curriculum comprising distinct and divorced areas of activity. It is categories of activity (such as gymnastic activities, games, and athletic activities) that have been the voices established and reinforced in and by the official texts of the NCPE and much of the practice (or messages) subsequently arising in schools (see Evans and Penney, 1995a; 1995b; Penney, 1994).

However, as well as emphasising the dominance of particular discourses in this development, we have drawn attention to the multiple and in some respects contradictory discourses inherent in the 'official texts' of the NCPE in England and Wales, and pursued the potential for the privileging of discourses that are subordinated in the official texts. We have discussed the possibility of the official texts giving rise to

an 'alternative' curriculum that seeks to establish different voices within the established voice of physical education (see Penney & Evans, forthcoming; Harris & Penney, forthcoming). In outlining the potential for a NCPE that establishes health as its central focus (see Harris & Penney, forthcoming), we have, at least to some extent, directed our attention as Bernstein calls us to do, on the gaps between the established voices rather than the voices themselves. For unlike the situation in Australia (see below), health is not a clearly established voice in the NCPE in England and Wales. It lies between and can potentially not only link but also overlies the established voices of gymnastics; games; athletics and other activities. The gaps between these categories of activity can also be seen as the site of other presently subordinated discourses, such as equal opportunities. In terms of shaping and defining physical education in the United Kingdom, the gaps are therefore the site of the presently 'unthinkable'. The exploration of this 'discursive space' is the basis of the development of, in Bernstein's terms, a curriculum of physical education featuring weak classification (and thus boundary maintenance between the activity

categories); a curriculum expressing integrated codes. Bernstein explains that 'Where we have integration, the various contents are subordinate to some idea which reduces their isolation from each other. Thus integration reduces the authority of the separate contents, and thus has implications for existing authority structures' (ibid,1971,p.59-60). It is these implications that he sees as the key to understanding the opposition and obstruction to the development of integrated curricula; opposition that has been openly voiced by the government in the United Kingdom (see Graham with Tytler,1993; Evans & Penney,1995a;1995b). Before moving on to explore such opposition in the Australian context, I wish to draw attention to what are perhaps critical limitations of our previous discussions of the potential to develop alternative curricula within the framework of the NCPE.

Our point of reference in the identification and suggested development of 'alternative' discourses has been the established dominant discourses (of activities within physical education). Essentially we have defined the alternative in relation to these and in so doing, our message has arguably failed in its attempt to challenge the established voices. Even if the insulation is reduced, the established voices remain. In addition, we have obviously been confining ourselves to the boundaries of the subject and Bernstein's work prompts us to question the value of attempting to change relations within these curriculum categories. However, we should also consider whether, even if bounded by the constraints of a strongly subject based curriculum, can we nevertheless pursue, by attempting to change the voices within the subject voice, important reorientation and development within physical education? Changing the dominant voices within physical education can be seen as the key to changing its message, but at the same time Bernstein's work identifies that the message (that presently appears so

dominated by the established and traditional voices) is itself the basis for initiating this change in voice. Clearly this points to both teachers and teacher educators as key figures in 'reform' and below I expand on their role and influence in the reform process.

In relation to the matter of voice national curriculum developments in Australia have important and fundamental differences to those in England and Wales. The 'national' texts that have been developed can at least to some extent, be seen as a move to change the voice of the curriculum, and sub-voices within it. The identification of Key Learning Areas (KLAs) rather than subjects as the initial reference point for the development of curriculum content has provided an important challenge to traditional orientations and established practices. In particular, establishing KLAs that clearly embrace more than a single subject prompts us to question the rationale for having subjects as the organisational focus of curricula and of teaching and learning in schools. Similarly, the identification within the KLA 'Health and Physical Education' (HPE) of strands such as 'human functioning and physical activity', 'community environments'; and 'communication, investigation and application' that call for input from more than one of the subjects primarily associated with this KLA encourages us to take a critical look at the place, role and future of subjects within the curriculum (see AEC, 1994a; 1994b). These characteristics are clearly a sharp contrast to the firmly subject oriented curriculum established in England and Wales and the primary focus within the National Curriculum for Physical Education on areas of activity. However, the irony, for me, is that if we look more closely at the Australian texts and their implementation, certainly in some schools in some states, these contrasts are being obscured.

At a very basic level we can note that while learning areas have been identified, the majority of the areas equate to traditional subjects

(see Appendix B), and even the naming of one that attempts to cross these boundaries; 'Health and Physical Education', signals a latent division in curriculum content. Furthermore, what has become increasingly apparent in the responses to the texts is that there is certainly no guarantee that their implementation will signal significant changes in the direction and emphases of curricula. As Tinning (1996) has observed, 'Having a national curriculum statement which provides a framework for the connection between health and physical education is one thing, changing teachers' practice is another'. Rather than observing the development of HPE as an entity in and of itself, invariably I am seeing physical education and other subjects (particularly health education and home economics) being retained as the reference point for the organisation and division of teaching and learning within the KLA. Inherent in these approaches is the identification of curriculum content that is exclusively attributed to the subject, over and above its identity as a dimension of the

content of the KLA. Thus while the national texts can be seen as seeking to reduce the insulation between categories and support the development of a curriculum with weak classification, in implementation we are witnessing the reinforcement rather than reduction of insulation. We are indeed seeing the potential of the message to change the voice; but this change is not a break from tradition, rather a reversion to it.

Before moving on to explore what underlies this response, I should perhaps comment briefly on the concerns that it has raised for me. With a subject based approach to the teaching of the KLA, what we may put in jeopardy is the coherency and integration in the teaching of knowledge and skills that as the Statement and Profile identify, can not be solely associated with any one subject area. The dangers are of overlap, potential contradiction, but also of important aspects of the KLA being overlooked and 'lost' amidst subject focused developments, as the development in England and Wales of the NC and the NCPE specifically have illustrated (see Graham with Tytler, 1993; Penney, 1994). More worrying is the potential for the child to be lost. Goodson (1993) emphasises that the teacher - pupil relationships prompted by integrated curricula are notably different to those invariably arising from structures and contexts in which the focus is pre-determined subject-based knowledge. He refers us to the 1943 Norwood Report in the United Kingdom that warned that 'the child is apt to be forgotten' as values specific to each subject are '...pressed to the neglect of values common to several or all' (ibid, 1993, p.31). Here we see the tendency for a different definition of knowledge (and thus different voice) to give rise to different pedagogical practices (messages). As Bernstein (1971) has pointed out, a different concept of what counts as knowledge leads to a different concept of how the knowledge is to be acquired. He identifies the tendency therefore, for didactic teaching (and thus strong framing) to arise from curricula emphasising collection codes; and more group orientated approaches (weaker framing) to arise from those emphasising integrated codes. In his 1996 work Bernstein presents two contrasting models of pedagogic practice; competence model and a performance model to further illustrate these links.

Returning to the developments in Australia, the critical question is who and what are the 'insulation maintainers' that are producing the demarcation criteria and recognition rules that result in the realisation of the KLA in subject terms? Why is there an apparent rejection of a challenge to the established order of the curriculum? In Bernstein's terms, who and what is shaping the pedagogic discourse; that is 'the rule which leads to the embedding of one discourse in another, to create one text, to create one discourse'. Pedagogic

discourse is the key dimension in the ordering, privileging and subordinating of discourses within a discourse; the establishment,

reinforcement and denial of particular voices in a message. It is the principle by which discourses are selectively appropriated, relocated and related to one another 'for the purposes of their selective transmission and acquisition' (ibid,1996, p46-47).

In considering the particular voices being privileged and expressed in the development of the HPE KLA, I again stress the need for caution in generalisation. As highlighted previously the actions of state and territory governments are critical in the context of national curriculum developments in Australia. Their freedom to adopt, adapt, or reject federal policy in relation to education means that '...the national curriculum in Australia has not been taken up in the form originally envisaged by the AEC, but has been variously interpreted and modified to suit the needs of states and territories and their prevailing political orthodoxies with respect to the provision of education services' (O'Neill,1995;p.7). However, rather than pursuing the actions of the states and territories, here I am concerned to explore influences that have influence and application in curriculum development not only throughout Australia, but also worldwide. My focus firstly is with the structure of schools and professional identity of teachers. It is in relation to these matters that contradiction between the national texts and the practice emerging in Australia has been most apparent.

Essentially if the development of the KLA is to result in fundamental rather than merely 'surface level' changes in the teaching and learning of physical education, I see a need not only for changes in teachers' thinking and orientation, but also in organisational structures and teaching practices within schools. Arguably, the approach being adopted by some schools, of administration and timetabling being organised around the KLAs, needs to become common practice. Furthermore, within such structures there is then a need for teaching to be across, rather than merely alongside or 'with', the different subject areas. Critically such changes eradicate the formal separation of subjects within the KLA, and, in my view, it is only with such developments that the boundaries currently so obvious within teaching and learning can be progressively dissolved. While subject based divisions remain in terms of either the identification of school departments, arrangements for timetabling, or responsibilities in teaching, the implicit and very powerful messages are of the retention of traditional identities and outlooks within education. The organisation and structure expresses and reinforces demarcation and difference, rather than commonality; the implicit support is for the development of a curriculum that expresses collection codes (with strong classification) rather than integrated codes (Bernstein, 1971). David Warwick (cited in Goodson,1995) provides us with an insight into the organisational changes that a commitment to an integrated curriculum entail ;

... complete afternoons given over to realistic fieldwork of all kinds, the availability of two or more members of staff simultaneously

involved in one project : a breaking away from the conventional form of classroom divisions; and a `blocking' of the school timetable to give the facilities and space required.

(Warwick in Goodson,1995,p.146)

Clearly such changes are not minor matters that can be quickly addressed. To the contrary, the reorientation that they represent involves change that is potentially fraught with barriers and pitfalls.

Perhaps the greatest of these is the present strength of teachers' association with their subject. Despite the acknowledged diversity and divisions within `subject communities' (Goodson,1993; 1995), the commitment and orientation to subjects should not be underestimated and a critical consideration in relation to this is the fundamental link of resourcing and status to subject identity. As Tinning has emphasised, competition between different interest groups `... is not just academic jousting, it relates to people's careers, to department resources and growth, and to political affiliations' (ibid,1994,p.17). Goodson similarly states that `The material interests of teachers - their pay, promotion and conditions - are intimately interlinked with the fate of their specialist subject' (ibid,1995,p.188). Goodson identifies both a material and symbolic dimension to subject status, with the latter including `the authority or respect accorded to the subject' (ibid,1994,p.83), and we can add, individuals identified with the subject. In his view `High status academic knowledge gains its aspirants less through control of the curricula which socialize than through well-established patterns of resource allocation and the associated work and career prospects these ensure' (ibid,1995,p.180). These material and symbolic factors that operate at both an institutional and individual level can certainly be regarded as critical barriers to changing voice in curriculum development. Furthermore, in the Australian context they are an important contradiction to the voice that the statement and profile can be seen as seeking to promote. However, the contradictions run deeper; and most obviously extend to initial teacher education and the tertiary institutions in which this is based.

Clearly it is in tertiary institutions that the orientations of future teachers and thus `identity' of the subject and the curriculum as a whole are to a great extent shaped. Teacher educators as well as teachers are key figures in the production and development of school subjects and if we explore what voices are being promoted in and by these institutions, we can perhaps identify some critical barriers to any change in those so dominating school curricula. The fact that in both the United Kingdom and Australia physical education studies are sometimes located not within education departments but rather, departments of Sports Science or Human Movement Studies, is significant

in this respect. The location signals distinction from other aspects of the curriculum rather than compatibility with them. Bernstein (1990) similarly notes the dislocation in teacher education of the discourses of education and of 'professional subjects'. The insulation is all too apparent and clearly points to the development of subject based expertise. As in schools, underlying the maintenance of these voices and the insulation is the combination of the symbolic and material dimensions of status. Particularly in the current political and economic climate physical education studies may be far better resourced if identified with science rather than located elsewhere. With this identification, however, we have to question the degree to which the message imparted in teacher training can privilege an educational discourse. Instead, the pressures may well be (as we see evidenced in many course structures) towards discipline based foci and divisions. In both of the institutions in which I have worked most recently I have seen modules such as exercise physiology, sport psychology and biomechanics dominating the curriculum in the initial years of teacher training for physical education. 'Education' certainly in some instances, appears an 'add on' in later years of study; a marginalised rather than defining voice.

If we look more closely at the message of much teacher training, we can see that invariably the organisational and teaching arrangements further reinforce the divisions and insulation, rather than

facilitating their deconstruction. Modules are taught in relative isolation from one another, invariably each by a different member of staff, who in pressurised times, may have little communication with one another. Here, as in schools, there are boundaries between staff, emphasising the distinctiveness of their discipline focused identity, and reinforcing the strong classification of the curriculum. In relation to the developments in Australia, therefore, we can reflect as Tinning has, that 'Balkanised university departments of Health Science, Human Movement, and Education do not facilitate the integration of health and physical education knowledge' (ibid, 1996,p.11). Thus, until we see structural changes and the initiation of programmes committed to preparing teachers to teach throughout the KLA, I see little prospect of attempts to promote truly integrated curricula in schools being either successful or sustained. Only with graduates identified as 'specialists' in the KLA and orientated towards teaching the area as a whole, will genuine reorientation and a change of voice occur.

Singulars and Regions

In this final section of my paper I want to look again at the KLA development in Australia and essentially question the extent to which this move can be regarded as a significant step towards a change in the voice(s) of the curriculum and equally, therefore, the degree to which the type of restructuring that I have discussed, can produce 'real

reform'. I introduce two further concepts from Bernstein's work; the singularisation and regionalisation of knowledge (ibid,1996).

Bernstein (1996) identifies traditional subjects as 'singulars', each seen as 'a discourse which has appropriated a space to give itself a unique name' (ibid,1996,p.23). He goes on to address a move in the twentieth century away from the development of singulars towards the 'regionalization of knowledge' involving the '... recontextualising of singulars', illustrated in for example, medicine and engineering. Thus singulars '...address only themselves. Singulars are intrinsic to the production of knowledge in the intellectual field', whereas regions '...are the interface between the field of production of knowledge and any field of practice'(ibid,1996,p.23). Bernstein sees the regionalisation of knowledge as having 'many implications' and, furthermore, as 'a change in the classification of knowledge' (ibid,1990,p.23).

The extent to which the identification of KLAs in Australia, and in particular of 'Health and physical education' can be interpreted as regionalisation in curriculum development is a matter that I am continuing to contemplate. In particular, (and in the light of the continued divides) I wonder if HPE is a combination of singulars, or a combination of regions. A critical point of difference between singulars and regions is that while singulars have an internal focus and thus construct and reinforce strong boundary maintenance, regions '...face inwards towards singulars and outwards towards fields of practice' (ibid,1996, p.68, my emphasis). Furthermore, Bernstein identifies the contents of regions as likely to be increasingly dependent on the requirements of the fields of practice, such that the identities of regions '...are what they are, and what they will become, as a consequence of the projection of that knowledge as a practice in some context. And the future of that context will regulate the identity' (ibid,1996,p.68-9, original emphasis). The development of the KLA can be seen as featuring this dynamic and external focus; the irony being that the external focus is then acting to divide and deconstruct the KLA. As fields of practice, established and traditional subjects and practices are regulating the identity of the KLA. Thus we come full circle, to see present practice, existing structures and identities in

schools as a critical issue in terms of a change in voice. Messages are reinforcing the traditional and established voice and rejecting the 'new'.

Perhaps at this point we should also pose the question of whether amongst teachers and teacher educators there is the desire for such a change in voice, for it is only they who (even if constrained by the political desires of central government and their institutional contexts; see Penney & Evans,forthcoming; Penney and Kirk, forthcoming), can push for such changes. Perhaps we should reflect as

Hord, that 'What change is really about, rather than structures and strategies, is people' (ibid,1995,p.92). It is certainly true that there needs to be a commitment to the direction and purpose of structural change, that 'to restructure is not to reculture' (Fullen,1993 p.49) ; but change is in fact about all of these things; 'Teacher development and institutional development (of universities and schools) must go hand in hand' (ibid,1993,p.120).

Conclusion

Many questions arise from this analysis and the ongoing developments. It prompts us to reflect on the messages of teaching and teacher education, the voices being promoted but also those that are silenced. Hopefully in both arenas we can perhaps see the potential for and value of change. For 'real reform' it would seem that there is a need for us to have the courage to step outside of the security and familiarity of our subject communities, and to position ourselves marginally to these. Hargreaves explains

In marginality are to be found some of the most powerful sources of insight and creativity in social and intellectual life. In academic life marginal men and women stand at the borders of intellectual fields and traditions : not to protect and patrol, but to extend and explore...marginal men and women peer critically but not dismissively into the assumptions and traditions of different fields and make creative connections that often elude their colleagues who are too firmly rooted in particular traditions themselves

(Ibid,1994,p.8)

At a practical level, we have certainly seen that 'If there was ever a symbiotic relationship that makes complete sense, it is the collaboration of universities and school systems in the initial and ongoing development of educators' (Fullan,1993,p.121). As Goodson's (1995) work particularly highlights, a shared, negotiated agenda for reform is critical; we can not expect progress if teachers find developments 'either incomprehensible or unacceptable' (ibid,1995,p.175). Furthermore, there is a need for agreement amongst presently divided teachers. Goodson's work offers vivid illustrations of the 'emotional defence' of 'subject' and 'department' in the light of the perceived threat of developments. As he identifies, in many instances the perceptions have had 'a rational basis' with the prospect of 'new subjects' taking a slice of existing resources. A key point is that the 'new subject' has invariably been an addition, external to those in existence and as such has threatened to reduce the space and resources established subjects occupy and receive. The missing and critical characteristic has been a shared commitment to the deconstruction of these boundaries. An analogy used by Goodson highlights what still seems lacking in much of the curriculum debate.

He likens this debate to the notion of attempting to sell refrigerators to eskimos and explains, 'Nobody asks the question of why

refrigerators, of how such an inappropriate product came to be at the centre of the action' (ibid,1995,p.206, my emphasis).

To end however, I return to Bernstein, and our capacities to change this situation, to alter the focus of attention. Bernstein reminds us and the development of the National Curriculum in England and Wales has vividly illustrated that '...accredited knowledge of these discursive rules is one thing and their realization in a local context quite another. Thus knowledge of the rules does not necessarily permit their contextual use' (ibid,1990,p.23). Surely, however, it is time for more of us to attempt this in our work.

Appendix A

Comparison of the 1904 Secondary School Regulations and the 1988 National Curriculum
(Goodson,1994,p.103; Aldrich,1995,p.136)

Appendix B

Comparison of the 1988 National Curriculum in England and Wales* and the Australian Key Learning Areas

References

ALDRICH,R. (1995) Educational Reform and Curriculum Implementation in England : An Historical Perspective; in CARTER,D.S.G. & O'NEILL,M.H. (Eds.) International Perspectives on Educational reform and Policy Implementation. London : The Falmer Press.

AUSTRALIAN EDUCATION COUNCIL (1994a) A statement on health and physical education for Australian schools. Carlton : Curriculum Corporation.

AUSTRALIAN EDUCATION COUNCIL (1994b) Health and physical education - a curriculum profile for Australian schools. Carlton : Curriculum Corporation.

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

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

CARTER,D.S.G. (1995) Curriculum reform and the Neo-corporatist State in
Australia; in CARTER,D.S.G. & O'NEILL,M.H. (Eds.) International
Perspectives on Educational reform and Policy Implementation. London :
The Falmer Press.

EVANS,J.,DAVIES,B AND PENNEY,D. (1994) Whatever happened to the Subject
and the State in Policy Research in Education. Discourse, Australian
Journal of Educational Studies, 14,2,pp.57-64.

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.

FULLAN,M. (1993) Change Forces. Probing the Depths of Educational
Reform. London : the Falmer Press.

GOODSON,I.F. (1993) School Subjects and Curriculum Change. Studies in
Curriculum History (3rd Edition). London : The Falmer Press.

GOODSON,I.F. (1994) Studying Curriculum. Cases and Methods. Buckingham
: Open University Press.

GOODSON,I.F. (1995) The Making of Curriculum. Collected Essays (2nd
Edition). London : The Falmer Press.

GRAHAM,D. with TYTLER,D. (1993) A LESSON FOR US ALL. The Making of the
National Curriculum. London : Routledge

HALL,G.E. & CARTER,,D.S.G. Epilogue : Implementing Change in the 1990s
: Paradigms, Practices and Possibilities; in CARTER,D.S.G. &
O'NEILL,M.H. (Eds.) International Perspectives on Educational reform
and Policy Implementation. London : The Falmer Press.

HARGREAVES,A. (1994) Critical Introduction in GOODSON,I.F. (1994)
Studying Curriculum. Cases and Methods. Buckingham : Open University
Press.

HARRIS, J. & PENNEY, D. (forthcoming) Putting Health First : An Alternative Policy and Practice for Physical Education. *Pedagogy in Practice*.

HORD, S.M. (1995) From Policy to Classroom Practice : Beyond the Mandates; in CARTER, D.S.G. & O'NEILL, M.H. (Eds.) *International Perspectives on Educational reform and Policy Implementation*. London : The Falmer Press.

KENNEDY, K.J. (1995) An analysis of the Policy Contexts of recent Curriculum reform Efforts in Australia, Great Britain and the United States; in CARTER, D.S.G. & O'NEILL, M.H. (Eds.) *International Perspectives on Educational reform and Policy Implementation*. London : The Falmer Press.

O'NEILL, M. (1995) Introduction in CARTER, D.S.G. & O'NEILL, M.H. (Eds.) *International Perspectives on Educational reform and Policy Implementation*. London : The Falmer Press.

PENNEY, D. & EVANS, J. (forthcoming) Naming the Game. Discourse and Domination in Physical Education and Sport in England and Wales. *European Physical Education Review*.

PENNEY, D. & KIRK, D. (forthcoming) National Curriculum Developments in Australia and Britain : A Comparative Analysis. *Journal of Comparative Physical Education and Sport*.

PETERS, M. (1995) Educational Reform and the Politics of the Curriculum in new Zealand; in CARTER, D.S.G. & O'NEILL, M.H. (Eds.) *International Perspectives on Educational reform and Policy Implementation*. London :

The Falmer Press.

SINGH, P. & LUKE, A. (1995) Preface in BERNSTEIN, B. (1996) *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity. Theory, Research, Critique*. London : Taylor & Francis.

TINNING, R. (1996) Physical education and the health promoting school : Opportunities, issues & challenges. *ACHPER Healthy Lifestyles Journal*, 43, 2, pp.8-11.