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Editorial

IJPE issue 3/2012 with the topic ‘Sports Curriculum Theory’ deals with physical education curricula, which are of integral importance for developments and changes of physical education and sport in school contexts.

This issue contains one extensive review article by the German research group lead by Prof. Dr N. Fessler, dealing with physical education as an object of disciplinary, interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary observations.

In addition, the results of an European study – conducted by the EUPEA research group and coordinated by Prof. Dr M. Onofre (Portugal) – are presented in the research article ‘Physical education and sport in Europe: From individual reality to collective desirability’ (part 2). Due to space limitations it was not possible to print the complete article in IJPE 2/2012, and therefore the article was split into two parts. The second part of that article is printed in this IJPE issue.

Issue 3/2012 is rounded off by a contribution of the international research group around Prof. Dr C. R. Edginton (United States of America) relating to the ‘Global Forum for Health and Physical Education Pedagogy’.

In addition to the sections Book Information / Book Review, IT News and Information, issue 3/2012 contains news of five further organisations: ICSSPE, ISCPES, EUPEA, ENSEE and FIEP. The Upcoming Events section provides an outlook on conferences from the end of 2012 to summer 2013.

IJPE 3/2012 is again available either as a print or online version. Access data for the online version: Fta7pLNQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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</tr>
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Physical education as an object of disciplinary, interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary observations – An overview of publications in German from 2010 - 2011

N. Fessler¹, M. Knoll¹, & G. Stibbe² (¹ Karlsruhe/² Cologne, Germany)

Introduction

German language monographs, anthologies, as well as articles from professional journals published in the years 2010 and 2011, present the basis of this overview of current topics being discussed in the field of physical education in Germany. The professional journals Sportwissenschaft, Sportunterricht/Körpererziehung, Sportpädagogik, Bewegungserziehung and Motorik were systematically examined, as well as relevant anthologies, such as that from the Sport Pedagogy section of the German Society of Sport Science (dvs). This article builds on previous reviews published in issues 3/2000, 3/2002, 2/2005, 3/2006, 3/2008 and 3/2010 of the International Journal of Physical Education on the topic “Curriculum Theory of Sport”. As several of the pedagogical topics addressed in this article are ongoing, publications before this reporting period will also be included.

The examination of the numerous articles pertaining to physical education considered for this review requires much concentration. Without a doubt, health promotion is an important topic in schools. Since this topic is addressed by Knoll and Fessler (2012) in the previous issue of this journal, we have not included such related articles in this review. Publications related to extracurricular activities will also not be expanded upon in this issue. For further reference to topics on extracurricular activities, refer to the overview articles by Balz (2010a) and Fessler (2010a/b) as well as relevant articles on performance sport and school (among others, Bohn, Brach, Krüger & Pfitzner, 2010; Borggrefe & Cachay, 2010, 2011; Emrich & Flatau, 2010; Hummel & Brand, 2010; Scheid & Creutzburg, 2010). In relation to different types of schools, articles addressing physical activity and sports in all-day schools, as opposed to the more common half-day school in Germany, continue to be popular. Representative to this topic is the anthology by Naul (2011), in which various empirical studies (14 articles
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by 21 authors) are used to thoroughly discuss balance and future prospects of an all-day school.
In relation to physical education instruction (chapter 1), we have concentrated on conceptions (chapter 1.1) and sport didactical approaches (chapter 1.2). In chapter 2, physical education, we have concentrated on the premier edition of the publication, ‘Handbook of Physical Education’ (chapter 2.1) and areas of current and future research pertaining to physical education (chapter 2.2).

1 Physical education instruction
1.1 Conceptions
Questions regarding the conceptual direction of the physical education instruction have also been controversially discussed in this review period (cf. Volkamer, 2011; Krüger, 2011; Kuhn, 2011). Thiele and Schierz (2011) advocate for a renaissance to reintroduce the leading concept that prevailed in the 1980s and 1990s: “Ability of action within physical activity and sports”. This concept was replaced at the turn of the century by a so-called 'dual commission', i.e. 'nurturing' towards and through sports'. In returning to external theory discussions on 'ability of action', the authors attempt to bring new life to this main concept.

With the curriculum reformation at the turn of the century, 'nurturing physical education', (i.e. a broader understanding of physical education, not only focusing on sport-related movement skills) along with the corresponding pedagogical expectations, have been brought into discussions regarding educational policy (Krick, 2010, p. 185-188; Prohl, 2010, p. 176). The central characteristics to mention are 'dual commission' and 'pedagogical prospects' ( Ibid.; sceptics of this view – Laging, 2010; 2011). Meanwhile, various 'basic directions' (Balz, 2010b, p. 99) of a nurturing physical education can be identified (cf. Böcker, 2010, p. 126-172; Stibbe, 2011a, p. 29-30); for example, a differentiation can be made between 'education in movement lessons' (Funke-Wieneke, 2007), educational theory for further development of a more nurturing physical education instruction (Prohl, 2010; 2012) and physical education oriented on multiple functions and meanings of physical education instruction (Neumann & Balz, 2010; 2011). While Prohl (2010; 2012) attempts to legitimize nurturing physical education instruction by referring to Klafki (2001), Neumann and Balz (2010; 2011) promote practically relevant pedagogical recommendations for implementing physical education based on multiple functions and meanings of physical education.

The consideration of multiple perspectives, i.e. multidimensional instruction, represents a widespread attribute of contemporary physical education. This concept centres on presenting various objects from differing perspectives with the purpose of empowering the students with multiple avenues for physical activity and sport (cf. Neumann, 2011, p. 9). This multidimensional approach virtually plays a mediating role between a (one-sided) single perspective and a (more confusing) multiple perspective physical education lesson (cf. Balz, 2011a, p. 26). Nevertheless, the pedagogical perspectives in this design can be understood as a 'variable, situational lesson plan', which is essentially open for alternative views (Balz, 2011a, p. 27). While using the example of ‘competence-oriented’ lesson plans for students in first level secondary grammar school2, Stibbe (2011a) addresses how this concept of ‘nurturing physical education instruction’ is adopted into curricular development and

---

1 To “nurture” in this context means to provide guidance and encouragement towards and through a positive physical education experience.
2 In the German school system, this refers to students at junior high and high school levels preparing to enter university.
implementation processes. The author points out that reinterpretations and simplifications of the concept take place at the lesson plan objective setting and lesson plan implementation levels, often resulting in compromising pedagogical standards that are oriented on didactical concepts. In addition, nurturing physical education instruction can only be implemented with difficulty according to verifiable and observable standards (Aschebrock, 2010).

In recognition of the numerous and therefore hard-to-follow concepts categorized as ‘experience’ (cf. among others, Neuber, 2011), Giese (2010; 2011) and Lange (2010) in particular attempt to provide reasons for the adaptation and inclusion of ‘experience-oriented learning’ in physical education curricula. Therefore, ‘experience’ is understood as an 'attractive self-education process' for the learner; hereby, the learning objective must stem from the students’ previous experience, as well as introducing a certain degree of dissociation (newness) to the learning objective in order to allow learning to take place (cf. Giese, 2011, p. 3).

1.2 Sport didactical approaches

The discussions on the development and quality of physical education remain concentrated on the following four topics: 'Standardization', 'Profiling', 'Professionalization' and 'Evaluation' (cf. Stibbe, 2010a/b). The focus of these discussions, however, lies on the problem of orientation of standards and competencies. Aside from the fundamental articles on the possibilities and problems of physical education (Aschebrock, 2010; Balz, 2011b; Gissel, 2010; Hartmann, 2011; Kurz & Gogoll, 2010; Laging, 2010; Prohl, 2012, p. 84-88; Stibbe, 2011b/c) and specific thoughts on self-competence in physical education class at vocational schools (Brauweiler, Elfen & Klinge, 2011; Stibbe, 2011d), various didactical standpoints are questioned in relation to orientation of standards, which also document the lack of an acceptable domain-specific competency model (cf. Stibbe, 2010a/c). For this reason, Gogoll (2011a/b) advocates the development of a cognitive-oriented model – 'sport and movement culture competencies'. In contrast, Balz (2011b) pursues a more pragmatic path with his future perspective competency model, in which the areas of competency are based on didactically acceptable pedagogical aspects (cf. similar, Aschebrock, 2011; Schumacher, 2011).

Nevertheless, a competency-oriented curriculum in physical education has also gained importance in recent years (cf. Neumann, 2010; Stibbe, 2011a, p. 30). In view of competency models rooted in curricular content, a creative variety can be observed: along with widely used models that differentiate between professional, self, social and methodological competencies, there are curricular concepts which offer an individualized, subject-specific model (cf. Aschebrock, 2010, p. 196-199; Wagner, 2011). In this regard, not only are different competency structural models being applied in the curriculum of different German states, but also within the same German state, i.e. North Rhine-Westphalia (cf. Stibbe, 2011e). Despite these problems, physical educators are currently being challenged to design competency-based lesson plans. For this purpose, however, only few practical suggestions and ideas are available (cf. Aschebrock, Edler-Köller & Maß, 2010; Balz, 2011b, p. 54-55; Heidelberger Sportpädagogen, 2011).

As the standard debates are still young, it is not surprising that there are hardly any specific scientific findings, such as how physical educators view competence orientation and how they approach it. Primary findings through a survey of physical educators in Luxembourg suggest that teachers are quite sceptical as to this approach, at least when it comes to lesson evaluation and standard and competency orientation in physical education. Nevertheless, competency-oriented lesson concepts win overall
approval in the Luxembourg curriculum (cf. Stibbe & Ingelmann, 2011). In their explorative interview study, Miethling and Volkamer (2010) address the question of how physical educators view standards. Results demonstrate contradictory argument patterns of the physical educators who were questioned. This can likely be attributed to how an individual copes with everyday responsibilities at work (cf. ibid.). In a study on competency orientation in elementary schools across several German states, educators were surveyed as to how well they know the competency expectations that exist in the curriculum, their acceptance of these expectations and to what extent they are applied (cf. Balz, 2011b, p. 54). The noted interview passages indicate that elementary physical educators seem to be overwhelmed with competency orientation, especially since there is a lack of practical support (ibid.).

An important focal point during this reporting period is the topic of ‘heterogeneity’ in physical education (cf. special issue sportpädagogik, 1/2011; Frohn & Grimminger, 2011; Frohn & Pfitzner, 2011), in which three topics are discussed at length: Gender (cf. Sobiech, 2010; Frohn & Grimminger, 2011, p. 157-164; Zipprich, 2011), interculturality (cf. Gieß-Stüber & Grimminger, 2010; Frohn & Grimminger, 2011, p. 164-173; Grimminger & Gieß-Stüber, 2011; special issue Sportunterricht, 8/2011) and inclusion (cf. Fediuk & Knoll, 2010; Höltner, 2011, p. 16-20). From a didactical point of view, three responses to heterogeneity in particular are identified: To ignore it by characterizing a heterogenic school body as ‘normal’, to reduce discrepancies through compensation (e.g. classes for advanced students) and oppression (e.g. banning cultural head scarves) or acceptance of heterogeneity in which differences are recognized and viewed as fruitful learning possibilities for the whole student body (cf. Frohn & Grimminger, 2011, p. 155; Frohn & Pfitzner, 2010, p. 3-4).

In addition, the collection of articles edited by Lange and Sinning (2010a) is dedicated to topics on teaching and learning in a variety of settings (schools, sports clubs and physical activity programs). In this publication, various methods are introduced and categorized according to three focal points – ‘movement learning’, ‘physical activity’ and ‘movement experience’. In the introduction, the authors inform the reader of their functional perspective towards movement (cf. Lange & Sinning, 2010b, p. 27). Overall, the authors present selected content, reflecting a didactical structure of themes in which the influencing factors between goals, content and methods are taken into consideration (cf. Lange & Sinning, 2010b). In regards to the instruction of theoretical aspects during physical education class (e.g. physiological processes), Krameczynski (2011) and Kastrup (2011) discover sobering findings in their empirical investigations: physical educators do not seem to be convinced of the necessity of relaying theoretical information in a primarily ‘movement-related subject’. In addition, difficulties arise in the methodological design of a well-conceived lesson plan (cf. Rix & Schulz, 2011).

2 Physical education as an object of disciplinary, interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary observations

2.1 Handbook of Physical Education

In the many volume series of sport scientific handbooks published by Hofmann, the edition “Physical Education” (Fessler, Hummel & Stibbe, 2010) was brought forth, filling the need in Germany of a scientific, theoretically based and systematically structured handbook on physical education.

With the focus on physical activity within the societal institution of schools, this almost 600 pager is designed as a textbook and addresses physical education as a component of schools, the education system and scientific research; therefore giving authors, who are not only involved with pedagogy and didactics related to physical
education, the chance to contribute, but also those who have placed their focus in other scientific disciplines (e.g. sports sociology or education science). Based on this objective, important physical education-related topics are intended to be developed for this volume as a condensed overview that should provide insight into fundamental questions, problems and developments. Therefore the chapters of this handbook, including 43 articles by 55 authors, are structured as the following:

- Developments and transitions of physical education as the basis of current and future planning in the various application fields.
- Representation of the potential and the findings to date of various sport scientific sub-domains, while focusing on their practical effects on physical education.
- Reasons, conceptions and orientations of the constitutive parts of physical education.
- Articles on physical education at various school levels and as part of different types of schools, while also including nursery school education.
- Physical education profiling in consideration of various school levels and different types of schools.
- Systematic outline of physical education research in view of various investigation standards and the representation of the corresponding areas of research and approaches.

In his critique regarding this textbook, Geßmann (2012) describes the main points as follows: “One recognizes without a doubt that this handbook’s purpose is to promote the network of physical education with its systematic partner areas, may it be the individual areas of sports sciences […], the overall didactic and research relating to both instructing and learning […], may it be school development, extracurricular physical activity programs or education research […]. In this regard, tiered models are being used more often to depict the basic problem at a micro level leading up to a macro level. This trend can also be accredited to the efforts of connecting physical education with other professional fields. It is also interesting that, in many articles, a deficit is indicated by the authors, in which the results challenge the overall profiling of physical education. Therefore, the legitimacy crisis surrounding the subject of physical education is still present as well as the difficulty in overcoming concerns regarding the variety of lesson concepts (core to identity!). The (subject-related) scientific depth of physical education does not appear to be adequately developed, as physical education has remained an isolated subject and field of study in the past. The significance and effectiveness of physical education curricula is also addressed in multiple articles.”

2.2 Physical education research

When looking at the more recent history of physical education research, the area of 'instructional research' most certainly should be mentioned as an area of empirically directed pedagogy (cf. in overview Wolters, 2010). This field is also cited in common sport scientific lexicons as either 'instructional research' or 'teaching research' (cf. Hanke, 2003, p. 634). Unfortunately, as is the case with the leading Sport Scientific Lexicon by Röthig, Prohl et al. (2003), the term 'physical education research' with the corresponding adequate translations into English is neglected. This is also a consequence of the traditionally narrow understanding of physical education of the well known representatives of physical education pedagogy in Germany, which almost exclusively address the topic of 'physical education instruction'. In this regard, the 2011 'Empirical Evidence of Physical Education', edited by Balz, Bräutigam, Miethling and Wolters, accounts for four main 'instructional' research fields: 'Instruction', 'Students' and 'Teachers'. At least 'physical education development' is
acknowledged as its own field! However, topics related to extracurricular physical education that also exhibit research traditions in the area of physical education are not taken into account. On the other hand, Buhren and Wagner (2010, p. 473) indicate that the Federal Institute for Sports Science in Germany (BISp) alone accounts for more than 200 research projects between the years 2000 and 2009, focusing on physical education and going beyond the traditionally narrow limits of physical education instruction. In this regard, it is necessary to structure areas of physical education research and the respective fundamentals, principles and prospects according to systematic approaches, and especially according to various disciplinary perspectives. The founding of the Research Centre for School Sports and the Physical Education of Children and Young Adults (FoSS) in 2004 in Karlsruhe as well as the coalition of various sport scientists in the Dortmund Centre of Physical Education Research and School Sport Research in 2008 is an indication that a more comprehensive physical education research is emerging, in which the traditional 'instruction research' continues to play an important role. Exemplary in this regard are two noteworthy publications on physical education research (cf. Kolb, 2006; Dortmund Zentrum für Schulsportforschung 2008).

In this reporting period, Buhren and Wagner (2010), Friedrich (2010), Hummel (2010) and Balz (2011c) in particular addressed the systemization of physical education research in Germany. According to Friedrich (2010, p. 50), an overall differentiation can be made between horizontal and vertical research dimensions. The horizontal dimension encompasses a spectrum beginning with 'normative-constructive' processing of physical education related topics to 'empirical-descriptive' approaches. The vertical dimension differentiates physical education research at micro level which, for example, would address physical education instruction or topics related to extracurricular activity and, at macro level, which researches the 'system' (e.g. curriculum research). Various authors (cf. Buhren & Wagner, 2010, p. 472; Fessler, 2010b, p. 451) take on a middle third step more common in sociology, the 'meso level', which involves topics at the single school level; for example schools with physical activity programs such as the ‘school in motion’ or schools with sport profiling.

The ‘Handbook of Physical Education’ (cf. Fessler, Hummel & Stibbe, 2010) as well as the anthology by Balz, Bräutigam, Miethling and Wolters (2011) both clearly demonstrate the extent to which physical education research has been differentiated in recent years and that justifiably, a 'physical education research program' is beginning to be established. In view of the research levels (macro, meso, micro) and research approaches (transdisciplinary, interdisciplinary und disciplinary), the following important fields of application can be differentiated:

- **Macro level - Physical education research as education research; physical education development research; curriculum research**
- **Meso level - Qualities and quality measurement of physical education**
- **Micro level - Instruction research, teacher and student research**
- **Disciplinary approach - Sport scientific observations of physical education**
- **Inter- and transdisciplinary approaches - Systematic research approaches to physical education and research on the effects of physical education.**

Physical education research as education research - With the use of key points in a historical background, Meinberg (2010) shows which questions arise and which problems are associated with the central concept of education research. This helps to clarify the connection between the types of sports chosen for physical education in schools and educational processes (e.g. consideration of students who are less
athletically inclined). Starting points and types of education research are presented and clarified – since development is fundamental for a consistent design principle for physical education lessons in schools, it is thought of as a main concept or as a scientific-theoretical anchor. In a second approach, empirically influenced education research is addressed. Meinberg seeks, if not a paradigm shift, then at least a new orientation towards education research that counters a normative-oriented, anthropologically influenced education tradition against a qualitative as well as quantitative, empirical interest.

Physical education development research - Buhren and Wagner (2010) pursue the question as to how research regarding school development and studies on physical education development can be interconnected. The indications are increasing that, for instance within the framework of the overall development of schools, the deductive-hierarchical dependence of physical education development with school development is being replaced by an interdependent relationship. Typical research formats as well as fields of application are brought together in a national study, including various types of schools, addressing the current status of physical education. In this regard, the SPRINT study (Deutscher Sportbund, 2006) is worth mentioning, as well as studies which indicate that physical education can contribute to overall school development. Examples of the latter are studies on the implementation of additional movement times, i.e. ‘school in motion’ (e.g. at primary level: among others, Thiele & Seyda, 2010).

Curriculum Research - Stibbe (2010d) states that subject-specific curriculum research has received growing appreciation in recent years. The author sees three significant tasks for curriculum research in physical education in the conception of the structure analysis, formation and implementation as well as reception and application of curricula. For future prospects, an intensification of historical and (international) comparative curricula studies, the development of empirically-based lesson plans and a stronger networking with general curriculum research are called for.

Qualities and quality measurement of physical education - By no later than the publication of the results of an international study comparing school performance, the topic of ‘school quality’ advanced to a central guideline of education research and the educational system (Thiele & Serwe, 2010, p. 485). With the doctoral thesis by Serwe (2011), the attempt is made for a theory-based quality model of physical education. While referring to the quality model in schools by Ditton (2000), the author is successful in depicting a comprehensive understanding of quality, which not only encompasses various levels of action in the school system, but also factors of quality: input, output and context. In relation to a subject-specific quality research, the model can adopt an ‘orientation function’ in order to differentially recognize research accomplishments as well as research needs in physical education development (Serwe, 2011, p. 202)

The quality debate in physical education is also discussed in the context of education policy and education science. In this regard, a ‘systematic’ and ‘single school’ directed perspective is adopted (Thiele & Serwe, 2010). At the level of a single school, school programs (i.e. physical activity programs) and their evaluation are increasingly becoming the focus for the basis of quality development and quality assurance in schools. Fessler (2010b; cf. also Fessler, Müller & Woll, 2010; Fessler & Stibbe, 2010; Fessler, Knoll, Müller & Hohmann, 2011) addresses this currently and prospectively important topic and, in view of various evaluation methods relevant for schools and physical education, presents strategies and approaches for self-evaluation at the single school level. The quality debates in physical education provoked further studies in this reporting period that discuss current topics of physical education
development (cf. Serwe, 2011, p. 73-99; Stibbe, 2010a; special issue *sportunterricht* 2/2010).

Instruction research - In her systematic discussions, Wolters (2010; 2011) brings up a significant and traditional segment of physical education research, namely (physical education) instruction research. Instruction research is acknowledged and classified as a specialized field of teaching and learning research. The meaningful influence of leading areas of interest in research is also reflected, as well as the strategic demand of interdisciplinary and paradigm variety. Reasons are given for the use of a wide spectrum of qualitative and quantitative research methods and moreover, a recommendation is put forward that instruction research should place a focus on instructional processes as well as on the effects of the physical education lesson itself.

Teacher and student research - This research profile has manifested itself quite differently in contrast to the area of instruction research. It is not only dependent on the interdependence of views of teachers vs students in the context of a physical education lesson or teachers’ actions vs students’ experience, it also includes the relatively independent fields of research 'students' and 'teachers'. The 'students' area of research attends to student attitudes towards physical education and student behaviour during the physical education lesson. A network with additional areas of research is recognized with topics such as 'students in everyday teaching', 'gender construction in physical education' or 'students’ perspective in physical education studies'. A review on related studies is presented by Bräutigam (2011). On the other hand, research related to physical educators as a part of teacher profession research includes topics such as the transition of professional expectations of the job responsibilities as a physical educator or also the orientation of content, attitudes and stressors involved in working in the field of physical education (cf. in overview Miethling, 2011; Weiß & Kiel, 2010). This area of teacher profession research also addresses questions related to professional training and further education of physical educators. Within this reporting period, the doctoral thesis by Weigelt (2010) on 'physical touches' is noteworthy in this research profile. Weigelt addresses an interesting, albeit also sensitive topic - the connection of touching by physical educators during a lesson as overstepping the bounds towards sexual abuse. Case studies based on videos that reveal touching by a teacher as well as the problem-centred interviews with the purpose of gathering information towards typical behaviour patterns of physical educators made up the basis of this empirical investigation. Results from the study show that “students’ experiences of touching from physical educators is not without concern” (ibid., p. 192).

Sport scientific observations of physical education - Korsten-Reck and Dickhuth (2010) address sports medicine fundamentals of physical development and performance ability in various age groups. Not only is this part of the knowledge repertoire for potential physical educators, but must also be the basis of a didactically and methodologically demanding physical education lesson. The authors clearly show that the degree to which age-related biological characteristics are manifested corresponds with processes of motor, emotional, social and intellectual development and maturity.

Hohmann (2010) discusses the meaning of exercise science approaches in relation to physical education. He demonstrates that, besides performance, fitness and health-related sports, physical education also represents a traditional field of application for the area of exercise science. Based on an “open understanding of the term training” for physical education, Hohmann emphasizes possibilities for education goals external to sport itself, such as including weight reduction, relaxation or creativity – meaning the implementation of physical training in the various 'movement fields' and with
differing perspectives or in the sense of the 'dual commission' of sport mediation development advancement. This is a broad field which leaves much room for improvement; to mind spring topics since neglected by sport science field, such as relaxation training for children and adolescents – a growing area making its way with force into the newly designed curricula within schools and physical education (e.g. in the context of physical activity programs in schools) (Fessler, 2006; 2011).

Mechling, Effenberg and Bös (2010) clarify connections of physical education with human movement science approaches. They emphasize that human movement science is a significant component of a physical education lesson, in which the instruction and learning of a movement skill remain at the centre of the lesson. In view of the current didactical orientation of physical education, the authors outline ‘product-oriented approaches’ of human movement science. This type of approach targets the external movement execution as the result of endogenous structures and processes. Differential analysis of motor skills and the morphological and functional approaches are used to describe sportive movements, to classify as well as to name general structures involved in the movement. An additional chapter addresses research approaches to coordination abilities that are oriented on the motor requirements of the type of sport and out of which, based on inductive evidence, the optimization and expansion of various methods in the area of ability and skill training can be derived. Finally, process-oriented approaches are presented and the controversy between ‘motor approach’ and ‘action approach’ are described in more detail.

Woll, Mess and Wäsche (2010) describe physical education topics influenced by the social sciences, which therefore have a focus on psychological and sociological approaches. In general, the authors demonstrate that a systematic 're-working' of this group of topics for physical education is still necessary. On the other hand, the authors cite and summarise various individual studies as being representative for this group of research topics. In the area of sports psychology, topics are listed at the individual level, such as teacher and student perspectives. Prospective topics are, for example, ‘motor and cognition’, i.e. effects of physical activity on cognitive development and performance (cf. Haberer, 2010; Krüger, 2010; Kubesch, Emrich & Beck, 2011; Schneider & Guardiera 2011; Windisch, Voelcker-Rehage & Budde, 2011) or the question regarding the promotion of self-concept in physical education (e.g. Schmidt & Conzelmann, 2011). In the area of sport-sociological physical education research, the defining influences and socializing effects, for example, were and continue to be important areas of research both at an individual's micro level and that of a group; including the meaning of intellectual competence (e.g. Gieß-Stüber & Grimminger, 2010), gender competence (e.g. Sobiech, 2010) or inclusion competence (e.g. Höltel, 2011; Fediuk & Knoll, 2010; Teubert & Kleindienst-Cachay, 2010) of physical educators.

Systematic research approaches to physical education - In view of current developments, Friedrich (2010) discusses systematic approaches to physical education research as a still relatively new interdisciplinary field of research. With the support of exemplary research projects, the author depicts various forms of physical education-related research activities, which could boast four typical ideal research dimensions – instruction vs. systematic level, normative-constructive vs empirical-descriptive analysis. The author calls for stronger transdisciplinary orientation of future physical education-related research projects. According to Friedrich (2010), research efforts towards physical education research projects indicate “an independent direction of research at the system level of physical education.” (p. 51) that is determined by aspects of general school development as well as by societal sport development (cf. Hummel, 2010).
Research on the effects of physical education - Gerlach, Bund, Bähr and Sygusch (2010) develop their article around the question as to why convincing evidence on the postulated effects of physical education in schools is still missing, although this subject is considered to be the ‘third largest’ of the main subjects in schools. The authors call for a more systematic approach to research on the effects of physical education (cross-sectional, longitudinal, intervening), which they explain with prospective examples.

To conclude we can say that, without doubt and based on the necessary multiperspective orientation of school and physical education-related research, the problem of the structure of a research concept, let alone a research program arises. Balz, Bräutigam, Miethling and Wolters (2011) recognize a gradually self-constituting area of physical education research. However, despite promising approaches, this field of research has not yet reached a “theoretically founded and empirically structured discourse of quality development,” (Thiele & Serwe, 2010, p. 492).
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2.2 Status of PE in the curriculum
PE is mandatory for nursery school in 63.6% of the countries that responded to the questionnaire. Teaching of PE is not mandatory in the other countries; nevertheless the instrument of research failed to ascertain whether or not discipline was taught. Where Europe is concerned, 72.7% of the countries consider that it should be mandatory. Despite not having PE as a mandatory subject for this level of education, Bosnia, Croatia, Sweden and Switzerland agree that it should be made mandatory in Europe. Denmark and Finland, on the other hand, believe it should be the same for all of Europe, although it is not compulsory there.

Regarding the status of PE at other levels of education, all respondents replied that it was compulsory, corroborating the results of Professor Ken Hardman’s report on the state and status of PE in Europe (Hardman, 2008). Apart from the countries that did not respond, the others stated that PE should be a mandatory subject in Europe, which seems to imply that they consider PE to play an important role in the curriculum.

Looking at Table 6, it seems that PE is currently undergoing a good period, since it is mandatory in all countries that took part in the study. However, attention should be paid because there is a gap between statutory policy and delivery. Hardman (2008) observed that the European region with the most marked shortfall in statutory policy implementation is Southern Europe. The economically developed countries within Europe are less affected, but, nevertheless, significant gaps between policy requirements and practical implementation still could be identified.
Table VI

The status of PE in the curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th></th>
<th>Primary school</th>
<th></th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th></th>
<th>University/College</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>situation</td>
<td>for Europe</td>
<td>situation</td>
<td>for Europe</td>
<td>situation</td>
<td>for Europe</td>
<td>situation</td>
<td>for Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium II</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Evaluation

In almost each country, PE is not evaluated at kindergarten, with the exception of Belgium, Italy, Luxemburg, the Netherlands and Portugal. The majority of countries that have no assessment believe that this situation should be the same across Europe, with only three countries of a different opinion (Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom). Among those that said that PE should be assessed from kindergarten, only Luxembourg and the Netherlands responded that this should apply across the whole of Europe.

The situation is different when we take a look at primary school. In almost all countries students are assessed in PE. The exceptions are Cyprus, Denmark and Finland, and these countries assumed that this situation was the same throughout Europe, unlike other countries.

At the next level of education, secondary school, Cyrus and Denmark still do not have student evaluation in PE; however, the Cypriot representative defends that evaluation should be part of PE.

At university/college, PE is evaluated in all countries and those who responded to the question regarding Europe replied that students should be evaluated in PE.
Nonetheless, it was interesting to see that four countries did not respond to the question.

Table VII

**Assessment in PE at different levels of education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>Primary school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>University/College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual situation</td>
<td>Desirable situation for Europe</td>
<td>Actual situation</td>
<td>Desirable situation for Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium II</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment in PE should not be taken lightly, because nowadays evaluation is an important aspect that characterizes the subjects considered to be essential for the school curriculum. Evaluation in this context is vital not only for classifying students, but fundamentally for controlling the teaching learning process.

2.4 **Main aims of PE**

Respondents were asked about the main goals of PE in the school curriculum. There were five possible answers, including recreation, exercise and health, learning PA, competitive sport, social and personal development. The results showed that exercise and health, learning PA, and social and personal development were cited the most often (Table 8). Moreover, it became clear that competitive sport and recreation were considered to be less important goals.

In some countries there is only one main goal for PE (e.g. Belgium, Croatia, Cyprus, Italy, Latvia, United Kingdom), and in other countries there are several goals (France,
Portugal and Romania). Luxembourg is a peculiar case, because all possible answers were considered to be important (recreation, exercise and health, learning physical activities, competitive sport, social and personal development). Respondents from four countries said that PE should have more than one main goal (Latvia, Luxembourg, Portugal and Romania).

Table VIII

**Main aims of PE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Main aims of PE in each country</th>
<th>Desirable situation for Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Social and personal development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium II</td>
<td>Exercise &amp; health</td>
<td>Exercise &amp; health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina</td>
<td>Exercise &amp; health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Learning PA</td>
<td>Exercise &amp; health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Learning PA</td>
<td>Exercise &amp; health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Exercise &amp; health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Social and personal development</td>
<td>Social and personal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Exercise &amp; health / Learning PA / Social and personal development</td>
<td>Learning PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Exercise &amp; health</td>
<td>Exercise &amp; health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Social and personal development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Exercise &amp; health</td>
<td>Exercise &amp; health/ Social and personal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Recreation / Exercise &amp; health / Learning PA /Sport competition/ Social and personal development</td>
<td>Recreation/ Exercise &amp; health/ Learning PA/Sport competition/ Social and personal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Learning PA</td>
<td>Learning PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Exercise &amp; health</td>
<td>Exercise &amp; health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Exercise &amp; health / Learning PA / Social and personal development</td>
<td>Exercise &amp; health/ Learning PA/ Social and personal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Exercise &amp; health / Learning PA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>Exercise &amp; health</td>
<td>Exercise &amp; health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Exercise &amp; health</td>
<td>Exercise &amp; health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Exercise &amp; health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Learning PA</td>
<td>Learning PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Learning PA</td>
<td>Learning PA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Europe, most countries inferred that exercise and health should be the most important goal for PE. This is in agreement with literature, stating that PE should provide opportunities for students to be physically active and to develop a healthy lifestyle (Sallis & McKenzie, 1991; Shephard & Trudeau, 2000; Tappe & Burgeson, 2004).

According to these results, PE seems to be a suitable vehicle for the promotion of active and healthy lifestyle in young people. At first sight this appears to be a good strategy to promote health. However, to reduce PE to a subject for promoting health is likely not going to be beneficial for PE. The rationale for exercise and health as the
main goal for PE is based on the idea that lifestyle is a manageable risk factor that can lead to the control of chronic diseases; and PA, as a lifestyle, has been singled out as having the potential to significantly contribute to this risk reduction. Although this rationale has been endorsed as worthy of inclusion in the school curriculum, it must be emphasized that there is a self-professed uncertainty that continues to plague researchers as to the exact amount of intensity, regularity and duration of PA to be recommended for optimum health (Bouchard, 2001).

PE as a curricular subject pursues several aims (biological, psychological and educational), using PA as tools to achieve them. Thus, countries such as France, Luxembourg and Portugal provide an eclectic education in PE, with several goals to be achieved by the students.

2.5 Generalization levels of the PE program

At this point, the European situation is very complex. The political, cultural and social differences among European countries are very clear regarding the levels of the PE program. In some countries the program is uniform across the entire nation; others have a program for each state and in Denmark and Sweden there is a program for each school, which means that in the same area there may be as many programs as there are schools. This situation might not be desirable, because the representative of Denmark answered that for Europe it would be better to have a national program.

Table 9 interestingly reveals that none of the countries that have a national program would want to change their situation and they answered that they want the same for the rest of the countries, except the United Kingdom. On the other hand, the others countries would rather have a different situation, because all of them gave a different answer concerning their present situation.

The decentralization of the educational systems creates many discrepancies within countries, as it is the case with Belgium. In one part of the country the program is determined by the council and in another part it is the responsibility of the school.

The issue of centralization versus decentralization of PE programs is closely related to the policy decision-making levels in each country. For instance, if we look at Germany each federal state is autonomous, which means that each region has its own curriculum. Due to the size of the country, this seems to be a suitable model for Germany, whereas it might not be the best for smaller countries. It should, however, be mentioned that Germany has some national guidelines for PE.

Decentralization allows the curriculum to serve a specific context. But because the decisions are made locally, PE and arts usually are neglected, featuring as third in the curriculum behind the core subjects, such as mathematics, and mother tongues (including literature). On the other hand, the centralization of the curriculum allows all students to have equal opportunities. ‘this does mean, though, that local characteristics cannot be served.

With reference to the situation in Portugal, there is a two-part national curriculum. One part of which is nuclear and the other is alternative. The core curriculum is mandatory, and provides all students the opportunity to learn meaningful PA for the Portuguese culture and society. In addition, as each region has its own culture and traditions, students can learn the typical PA from the place they live in. Thus a unique and eclectic training is guaranteed for all students and, at the same time, the activities observe the characteristics of specific regions.
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Table IX

*Generalization level of the programs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Actual situation in each country</th>
<th>Desirable situation for Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium II</td>
<td>school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina</td>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>national</td>
<td>national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>national</td>
<td>national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>school</td>
<td>national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>national</td>
<td>national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>state</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>state</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>national</td>
<td>national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>national</td>
<td>national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>national</td>
<td>national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>national</td>
<td>national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>national</td>
<td>national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>state</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>state</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>school</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>national</td>
<td>national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>national</td>
<td>school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To summarize we can state that, in the majority of countries, national governments have at least some responsibility for PE curriculum. Because education is mandatory across European countries, all of them have legal requirements with regard to prescriptive rules or guidelines for PE for at least some part of the compulsory school year. In some countries there are multiple levels of decisions (national, regional, and school), and in countries where decentralised forms of government are constituted, responsibility is essentially at regional level. This data is in agreement with Hardman (2007).

**2.6 Number of students per class**

The average number of students per class ranged from 20 (kindergarten) to 30 (university/college). There is a discrepancy in the number of students per class among European countries. At all levels of education France stands out for having the highest number of students per class and Luxemburg is one of the countries with the lowest number of students. It should be noted that almost all respondents reported that a lower number of students would be desirable for Europe compared to the actual situation in their own country.

For Europe, the respondents would like to have 15 children for kindergarten, and between 21 and 23 for the others levels of education.
### Table X

**Number of students per class for each level of education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>Primary school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>University/College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual situation</td>
<td>Desirable situation for Europe</td>
<td>Actual situation</td>
<td>Desirable situation for Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium II</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a visible trend as the number of students per class increases over the levels of education, and therefore for each country and across the European ‘desirable’ situation.

Given the fact that all respondents were academics and teachers of PE with experience, it gives them a great insight into knowing the ideal number of students for a class. It is a call of attention because the number of students per class is higher than it should be, putting at risk the quality of PE for all students.

### 2.7 PE curriculum time allocation

Data gathered by the questionnaire responses on curriculum time allocation in each country revealed that there is a variable situation across Europe. For kindergarten the minimum is 1 hour a week (Bosnia and Romania) and the maximum 5 hours (Latvia). At this level of education it is clear that the time allocation is much less than would be expected. It is also important to mention that in some countries there is no PE in...
kindergarten (Belgium II, Denmark, Finland, Poland and Sweden), which means that there is still a long way to go. On the other hand, it is interesting to see that PE in kindergarten it is not mandatory in Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia and Switzerland (Table 2 and 5), but the teachers at this level of education teach this subject.

In primary and secondary school the lowest time allocation is in the Netherlands (1.5 hours) and the maximum 4 hours in several countries. At this level there are similarities among countries and most of them recognized that time allocation is less than it should be in Europe.

Table XI

*PE time allocation by educational levels*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>Primary school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>University/College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual situation</td>
<td>Desirable situation for Europe</td>
<td>Actual situation</td>
<td>Desirable situation for Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium II</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>a) 4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) There are 5 hours a week for PE and arts. These hours are managed by the teacher.

The time allocation in universities/colleges ranges between 1 (Finland, Romania) and 4 hours (Cyprus), which reflects a considerable difference among countries. At this level of education considerable attention should be paid to the students, because for
most of them PE is the only opportunity they have to practice weekly PA; and having 1, 2, 3 or 4 hours a week is far from the guidelines of PA that recommend at least 1 hour a day (Strong et al., 2005).

Taking into account the time allocation suggested by each country to be implemented at European level, it is clear that most of the students would not meet the guideline recommendation for the PA (Strong et al., 2005; Cavill, Biddle & Sallis, 2001). This seems to imply that the suggestions of several countries are not based on scientific knowledge, but merely on common sense. Nevertheless, countries such as Belgium, Croatia, France and Sweden agreed that students should have at least 5 hours of PE per week at every level of education.

The figure shows that the greatest curriculum time allocation occurs at secondary school when children are aged 9-14, which is in accordance with Hardman (2001), and the general reduction is seen in the final years of education. Paying attention to the *European* line, it can be seen that the line goes downwards, which means that teachers think that for the final years the time allocated for PE should be reduced.

*Figure I.* Average PE time allocation at each education level.

*Figure II.* PE time allocation according generalization levels of the PE program.
Crossing data from PE time allocation at primary, secondary and university/college and generalization level of the program, it can be observed that when the level of decision is upon the school (Denmark, Sweden), PE time allocation is lower (Table 2). On the other hand, the ‘decentralized’ countries where responsibility for education lies at regional level (Czech Republic, France, Germany, Poland, Serbia, Slovenia) have a higher time allocation for PE. Time allocation increases from primary education to secondary school and decreases sharply in university/college. Countries with a national PE program (Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Latvia, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Switzerland, United Kingdom) have a constant PE time allocation across different educational levels.

2.8 Facilities for PE
A widespread concern in terms of PE is the facilities and equipment as the quality and quantity of provision of facilities can affect the quality of PE. Most of the respondents said that facilities for PE are regular (Table 12). Apparently, in general, the survey portrays an acceptable scenario. Looking at the 4-point Likert scale range from 1 (bad) to 4 (very good), used to evaluate the quality of the facilities, on average the assessment of the facilities was 2.2±0.6.

This survey has revealed the appearance of three clear clusters. One cluster is represented by the Nordic European countries, the wealthiest having reported the existence of good facilities, which is in agreement with other reports (Hardman, 2001, 2007, 2008; Klein & Hardman, 2008). Another one is constituted by the majority of countries, from different parts of Europe, classified by having regular facilities. Finally, there are two countries with bad facilities.

It should be noted that these results should be read with some reservations. As European countries have many differences, both culturally and economically, infrastructural conditions classified simply as regular in one country can be considered as very good in another country. Thus, these responses must be seen in the socioeconomic context of each country. However, these results indicate that in general teachers consider that there are minimum infrastructural conditions to teach PE at schools.

2.9 PE teacher education (PETE)
In 1978 the UNESCO Charter for Physical Education and Sport stated that personnel responsible for PE should be appropriately qualified, having adequate levels of specialization.

Nowadays, many countries advocate that adequacy of teacher preparation for PE is mandatory. However, some countries still have generalist teachers for PE in primary school. Some examples are Germany, Portugal, Sweden and the United Kingdom. It is important to highlight that the generalist teachers in elementary school are often inappropriately prepared to teach PE, and this could compromise the quality of students’ learning.

For secondary schools and universities/colleges, specialist teachers are predominant across Europe, confirming the report of Professor Ken Hardman (2011). This situation is desirable, because almost all countries wanted the same for Europe. Nonetheless this issue is not without problems because each country has a different model of teacher training, which means that there are many differences among European countries, and even within the countries. For instance, some years ago Portugal had two completely different models of PETE, both to prepare teachers for secondary education.
It is interesting to observe that France and Romania consider that the training they have is not sufficient to prepare a teacher for teaching PE at schools, assuming that it would be desirable for Europe that the PETE should be completed with a master degree. On the other hand, several other countries (Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Latvia, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, United Kingdom) stated that a bachelor degree is enough.

This data shows that the European Union Bologna Declaration, which was undertaken to make higher education more compatible, comparable and competitive, is far behind of being appropriate.

Hardman (2011) stated that a PE specialist is the one who successfully concludes "a relevant PE-related programme of study including qualified teacher status with an accumulation of 240 European Credit Transfer System (ECTS)". Taking into account the definition mentioned above, a teacher can hardly achieve the 240 ECTS required to be a specialist with a bachelor degree.

Table XII

*PE teacher's qualifications*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Actual situation in each country</th>
<th>Desirable situation for Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium II</td>
<td>Bachelor/Master*</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Bachelor/Master*</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Bachelor degree is required to teach from kindergarten to primary school, and master degree is mandatory to teach in secondary school.
2.10 Extracurricular activities
Several researchers have noted that children see participation in sport and exercise as a positive experience. Extracurricular activities at school should provide PA that meets the needs and interests of all students. This may have important consequences not only for children’s participation in PA whilst they are in school, but also throughout the course of their life. This importance should be highlighted because a lot of students do not have the opportunity to practice PA outside school, and at school they have the possibility to do it on a regular basis, under proper guidance. Extracurricular sports activities at school take place in most European countries. Nonetheless there are some differences among them. Hardman (2007) identified three different models of school sport, namely: non-formal, strictly school-based and general public (societal or civil) sport. Unfortunately, the survey instrument does not allow us to identify the current model in each country. The most common name for extracurricular sports activities is 'school sport', with some sort of variation, such as federations’ school sport (Belgium), sport games (Czech Republic), school sport centre (Italy), school sport club (Poland) and sport activities (Switzerland). Just looking at the names one can see that 'school' is well identified with sports.

Table XIII

Number of hours of extracurricular participation by educational level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Belgium II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Taking a look at the answer that is desirable for Europe, only three countries (Finland, France and the Netherlands) said that extracurricular sports activities should still be optional. This is interesting, because eleven countries reported that it should be mandatory, even though it is not part of the formal school curriculum. It seems that teachers recognize that PE is not enough for the students to learn sports skills and promote health-related fitness. This argument could be corroborated by the answers of the representatives of Cyprus, Germany, Luxemburg, Sweden and Switzerland. In three countries (France, Poland and Sweden) school sports are not free of charges. Unfortunately this situation is not common in Europe countries and in these three countries this may be a factor which prevents many students from participating.

Unfortunately, pupils’ participation in extracurricular physical activities is not common in several countries, as can be seen in Table 13. In kindergarten, for instance, only one country provides extracurricular sports activities for kids (Croatia). In primary, secondary and university/college, the numbers of countries that provide extracurricular physical activities increases, but this is still limited. These results should be analysed carefully for two main reasons: (i) in most of the situations only the countries that offer extracurricular PA want the same for Europe (e.g. Bosnia Herzegovina, Croatia, France, the Netherlands, and Slovenia); (ii) some countries were not able to answer the question properly as the number of hours of extracurricular activities are not easily accounted for in their country. Because of this, a case study could be the solution to quantify and qualify accurately the extracurricular sports activities in each country.

3 Conclusion
The different conceptions of PE may be the cause of the current situation in the countries and their goals (i.e. 'desirable' situation). At present, there are many examples of missing conceptual issues that can provide different PE in countries, but according to the desirable situation described, this conceptual diversity is not so notorious. The subject's name, PE main aims and generalization level of the curriculum are good examples of that. According to the responses regarding the main objectives of PE, of the seventeen countries that gave a full answer (what is the current situation in the country and the desirable one), only three (Croatia, Cyprus and Denmark) intend to change the current situation. The remaining fourteen seemed pleased with the objectives developed within the discipline, showing to be consensual about the importance of the objective 'Exercise and Health'. 'Physical Activities' and 'Social and Personal Development' are also referred to as essential objectives of PE.

Most of the countries agree that the curriculum should be created at a national level i.e. the same for all schools (although each school could manage their curriculum according to their specificities); this is an important step towards making the discipline conception consensual between countries and in Europe. Beyond the conceptual issues regarding the fact that the discipline is mandatory, the differences in opinions were only verified in nursery school. Not taking into account the two countries that did not answer this question, PE is present in the curriculum of twelve countries, were three do not indicate what their aims are for Europe and the other nine manifest their intentions of keeping PE mandatory in nursery school. Regarding the eight countries that do not have mandatory PE at this level of teaching, two did not answer the question on the European situation, two intend to keep the discipline non-mandatory and the remaining four wished that PE was mandatory, as in the majority of European countries.
Some countries indicated that PE should be part of the nursery school curriculum as it is at other levels of teaching. Here, there is consensus that PE should be mandatory for the students’ curriculum.

Further evidence is the insufficient number of weekly hours devoted to the discipline, as well as the large number of the students per class. All countries indicated that they would like to have fewer students per class and that this should be the ideal situation for all of Europe.

Regarding weekly sessions of PE, only one country considers that at university/college the students workload should be slightly inferior (three hours per week instead of the current four), unlike most of the countries that manifested that the workload should be increased at all levels (some countries considered their situation ideal).

Be it the number of weekly sessions and class time (identified in the discipline weekly hours), the time of potential learning and the monitoring of the students practice (directly related to the number of students per class), be it essential for the development of the PE objectives identified in this questionnaire and supported by the existing literature, there is a pressing need to change the curriculum of the discipline in almost all European countries.
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Abstract
Challenges to the health and wellbeing to individuals on a worldwide basis, as a result of increased incidents of non-communicable diseases, has drawn amplified attention. In particular, the increase in obesity and overweight is focusing attention on the importance of physical activity, diet, stress reduction as well as limiting other threats such as use of alcohol and tobacco. The Global Forum for Physical Education Pedagogy (GoFPEP) was initially conceptualized as a global “think tank” organized to rethink reform, reframe physical education pedagogy. Today, we like to think of GoFPEP as a new social movement which seeks change with a focus on improving health and physical education pedagogy and the preparation of teachers of health and physical education. Social movements involve collective action directed at some societal issue or concern and often challenge existing structures, ways of thinking, norms and moral codes. Social movements work to link or network individuals as a result of a common commitment to a new mission that may come about as preexisting social relations, desire for transformation or the need to offer alternative perspectives to the established order.

Key words: social movement, physical education pedagogy, health, Global Forum for Physical Education Pedagogy (GoFPEP)
1 Introduction

The need to improve the health and wellbeing of individuals worldwide has increasingly gained attention of all of civil society. The challenges presented by increased incidents of non-communicable diseases are growing at an alarming rate on a worldwide basis. A clear call to the attention of the world of the need to address this issue was made by the United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki-moon on September 19, 2011. The Secretary General called for an increased focus on the Prevention and Control of Non-Communicable Diseases (Ki-moon, 2011). This landmark presentation was only the second time in the history of The United Nations that the Secretary General discussed health related issues to members of the General Assembly. Emphasized in his presentation was the necessity to address the challenges brought about by non-communicable diseases, especially among women and children. Exercise, nutritious diet, improving eating habits, limiting alcohol consumption and stopping smoking were among the strategies emphasized in his presentation. The importance of governments, civic groups, businesses and individuals working together in a holistic fashion as partners linked to various public health initiatives was highlighted.

A review of the literature and recent research studies confirms the fact that obesity and overweight have now reached epidemic proportions worldwide (Hossain, Kawar, & Nahas, 2007; Lobstein, 2011) and the worldwide prevalence of obesity in childhood is also increasing (Wang & Lobstein, 2006). In fact, globally there are now more individuals who are obese and overweight than individuals who are malnourished (Sanders, Baum, Benos, & Legge, 2011). The state of food insecurity in the world (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations [FAO], 2006) has reported an estimated 854 million undernourished people worldwide in 2001-2003. However, because of the increasing reliance on imported, processed foods high in fat, sugar, and sodium, 1.5 billion adults, 20 and older, were overweight in 2008 and 65% of the world's population live in countries where overweight and obesity kills more people than underweight (World Health Organization [WHO], 2011).

Children and youth today are particularly vulnerable to challenges of obesity and overweight as they currently represent the single largest cohort group of young people in history. There are 2.2 billion children and 1.5 billion youth in the world today and, of this number, 1.9 billion and 1.3 billion respectively live in developing countries (United Nations Children's Fund, 2005; World Bank, 2007). It is evident that providing children and youth with the opportunity to have a fun and active experience which reinforces their desire to make physical activity a life-long habit may be one of the key elements in addressing the epidemic of obesity and overweight. When school programs are linked with community activities including sports, there is the opportunity to amplify the efforts of both environments in addressing the challenge of obesity and overweight. Further, urban planning policies which are aimed at developing parks and open spaces where people can practice enjoyable physical activities in clean and safe spaces as well as promoting active transportation (e.g. cycling, walking paths, etc.) can be effective community strategies to support the development of a built environment which enhances health and wellbeing (United Nations Office of Sport for Development & Peace, 2008).

At the same time that obesity and overweight has reached epidemic proportions on a worldwide basis, physical education programs are being de-emphasized (Hardman & Marchall, 2000, 2009). Greater emphasis on accountability and high stakes testing has
resulted in a reduction of coursework related to health, physical education, art and music. It is clear that the public and many school administrators have not yet linked the rise of obesity and incidents of overweight to the need for physical education, physical activity and fitness programs. There has been a general decline in the time allocated to teaching physical education in the school and increase in class sizes as well as a general diminishing in the provision of physical education facilities (Dills, Morgan, & Rotthoff, 2011; McKenzie & Lounsbery, 2009).

The Global Forum for Physical Education Pedagogy (GoFPEP) was initially established in 2010 as a global “think tank” organized to rethink reform, reframe physical education pedagogy. There are two central themes to this effort. First, is to discover “best practices” in the teaching of health and physical education; and, the second is to revitalize the way health and physical education teachers are prepared. The initial focus of GoFPEP has included the importance of the application of technology, linkages between the school and the community and the building of partnerships and the establishing of networks. As GoFPEP currently is conceived, it is framed as a new social movement which seeks change.

In response to the increasing concern regarding the health and wellbeing of individuals worldwide, especially issues related to obesity and overweight, the initial GoFPEP 2010 was conceived and implemented as a way of raising awareness and sharing innovative strategies to advance the teaching of health and physical education and developing a network of concerned teachers, professors, allied health professionals, medical professionals, community leaders, business men and women, government officials, publishers and others. The event, held in Grundy Center, Iowa USA in May 2010, invited international voices in a dynamic program designed for educators, health professional administrators, policy makers, business leaders and citizens to discuss the future of health and physical education pedagogy (Edginton, Chin, Geadelmann, & Ahrabi-Fard, 2011). This event drew together 70 invited distinguished delegates from 25 countries, representing 64 universities, institutions, organizations and schools.

The WHO has called upon academics and other agencies to address the issue of obesity and overweight outlining guiding principles for policy development in a report entitled Population-Based Prevention Strategies for Childhood Obesity (2009). Two major strategies are suggested and GoFPEP has built its underlying guidelines, assumptions and program strategies to address these areas. The first is that WHO has encouraged the academic community to disseminate information regarding “good practice models.” WHO emphasizes the importance of multi-stakeholders interactions. Second, WHO recommends that global guidelines for action and/or platforms for sharing of evidence and best practice be provided through the provision of global forums. GoFPEP directly addresses both of these elements in framing its programmatic approach.

2 GoFPEP as a Social Movement

GoFPEP has framed itself as a social movement and is envisioned as a way to bring about change to address current challenges faced in the teaching of health and physical education. The movement as a network has been organized to focus on addressing the epidemic of obesity and overweight throughout the world. The mission of GoFPEP is rooted in its strong commitment to improve health and physical education pedagogy, and the preparation of the teachers of health and physical
education as well as instructors and coaches in physical activities, sharing the notion of health enhanced physical activities outside school in other settings of the community where children and youth grow up. The movement has also focused its attention on the application of modern technology support for health and physical education programs into schools and community life.

Social movements often involve some sort of collective or group action directed at some societal issue or concern (Tilly, 2004). As Macionis (2009, p. 487) has noted, “. . . people commonly band together to form a social movement, an organized activity that encourages . . . social change.” “Social movements often challenge institutional structures, ways of life and thinking, norms and moral codes” (Renon, 1994, p. 600). As Blumer (1969, p. 199) has offered in a classical sense, “. . . social movements can be viewed as collective enterprises to establish a new order of life.”

GoFPEP as a social movement, in fact, is directed at bringing about social change in that they create new ways of thinking, perspectives and solutions to existing problems and concerns in school based physical education and networking with other physical activity settings in community life. Today, social movements are often manifested in the use of social media, technology and, in fact, network people on a global basis to bring about change. As Ibarra (2003) has written, a network of governance for an emerging social movement or critical network can focus on either issues or policies, thus emerging from a social movement can be an issue network or policy network or both. The purpose of the social movement of GoFPEP is aimed to develop into this direction.

According to Gerlach and Hine (1970) an area of concern in order to become a social movement must have several key factors:
1) units that are linked personally, structurally or ideologically;
2) recruitment by committed individuals using preexisting social relations;
3) personal commitment that results from some significant transformation that enables an individual to be identified with a new set of values;
4) a mission that codifies values, goals and provides a conceptual framework that serves to guide action; and
5) real or perceived opposition from an established order within which the movement has arisen.

From this perspective, GoFPEP is committed to advancing 21st Century health and physical education programs to inspire, motivate and prepare learners to live in an ever-changing globalized society (Edginton et al., 2011). GoFPEP is dedicated to examining new forms of physical education pedagogy which embrace technology, linking practice to theory, contextually-based and embedded in community life and to provide a way to reshape and redesign the future of health and physical education (Edginton et al., 2011). The need worldwide to rethink, reform and reframe health and physical education programs is self-evident as the need for improving the health and wellbeing of individuals is ever present.

More specifically, GoFPEP, as a social movement, is organized built upon and committed to the following guidelines, assumptions and program strategies:
1. GoFPEP is linked to best practice in physical education/physical activity and related areas including health and leisure is emphasized;
2. GoFPEP is framed as an interdisciplinary effort in nature, drawing individuals from multiple disciplines/professional areas as well as a variety of setting including schools, universities, community agencies, businesses, government organizations;

3. GoFPEP networked members include teachers, professors, allied health professionals, medical professionals, community leaders, business men and women, government officials, publishers and others;

4. GoFPEP emphasizes the application of technology and provides a venue for demonstrating its most current and contemporary forms in physical education and health;

5. GoFPEP underscores the importance for the need for a seamless relationship between physical education offered in the schools and community programs;

6. GoFPEP seeks to provide members of its network with opportunities for direct observation and demonstration of model health and physical education programs directly in a school/community setting where there are being implemented;

7. GoFPEP encourages and emphasizes opportunities for dialog and discussion among its network members in order to formulate documents relevant to promoting social policy;

8. GoFPEP seeks to build partnerships and sponsors with schools, community agencies, universities, national and international professional organizations, non-governmental organizations, allied commercial organizations and government agencies; and

9. GoFPEP is committed to identifying and advancing specific outcomes aimed at improving professional practice, influencing social policy and identifying and disseminating relevant information on a worldwide basis.

10. GoFPEP is dedicated to promulgating policies which reveal best practice in health and physical education in conjunction with leading bodies and institutions on local, regional and national levels worldwide.

The activities of GoFPEP have been manifested in the implementation of the first international forum (2010) and the crafting of a consensus statement which has been published in 30 professional journals and translated into 20 different languages. The second forum was organized in May 2012 highlighting the needs and benefits of community based networking to reshape physical education. The Global Journal of Health and Physical Education Pedagogy has been established and the first issue of volume 1 was published in spring 2012. In addition, a book series has been developed with titles focusing on: 1) Health/Physical Education: Contemporary Models of Pedagogy; 2) Model Health/Physical Education Teacher Training Programs; 3) Model Community-Based Programs with Multiple Stakeholders; 4) Health/Physical Education and Model Technological Applications; and 5) Physical Education Practices from Around the World.

3 GoFPEP 2010: Revitalizing Health and Physical Education through Technology

GoFPEP 2010 was focused on the theme of “Revitalizing Health and Physical Education through Technology” and was staged in Grundy Center, Iowa (USA). The program was organized by the University of Northern Iowa and Grundy Center Community Schools. GoFPEP 2010 received endorsements from many state, national and international organizations including the Iowa Association of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance; American Alliance of Health, Physical Education,
Recreation and Dance; the International Council of Sport Sciences and Physical Education; and affiliated organizations such as the World Leisure Organization and sport corporations such as the National Football League.

An important component of GoFPEP 2010 was the sharing of innovative strategies to advance the teaching of health and physical education and the preparation of health and physical education teachers. One of the primary outcomes of GoFPEP 2010 was the development of a “Consensus Statement” (Edginton et al., 2011) focused on teaching health and physical education and the preparation of health and physical education teachers. Each delegate involved in the GoFPEP process was asked to engage in a number pre-forum activities required to produce the Consensus Statement. Three basic questions were asked of delegates, including the identification of: 1) innovative strategies in the teaching of health and physical education; 2) innovative approaches in the preparation of health and physical education teachers; and 3) consensus statement recommendations.

The designed process of sharing involved receiving suggestions and recommendations from each of the distinguished invited delegates. In turn, these suggestions and recommendations were formatted into individual poster presentations and were available for group discussion and dialog during the forum. A draft Consensus Statement was drawn from the comments offered in pre-forum activities by delegates and presented at the conclusion of the events formal presentations. This was followed by the organization of discussion groups that included individuals from “different geographic regions of the world, interdisciplinary perspectives (academics, practicing professionals, business leaders, citizens and students) and individuals representing, varying levels of professional practice from teacher/direct service provider through senior administrators” (Edginton et al., 2011, p. 37).

Discussion groups were asked to validate the draft Consensus Statement, offering their additions, deletions or corrections and, in turn, presented to the group as a whole. Following this activity, information was analyzed using the Qualr us qualitative data analysis software package in order to sort responses into coherent themes. Analysis of information provided by the discussion groups emphasized the following themes: 1) health, 2) technology, 3) safe, enjoyable environments, 4) physical education, physical activity and exercise, 5) change, 6) community, 7) overweight and obese children and youth, 8) lifelong healthy active lifestyles, 9) physical education curriculum, and 10) parental involvement. The information gathered from the draft Consensus Statement pre-forum activities, the discussion groups and the qualitative analysis was then utilized to draft the final document (Edginton et al., 2011, p. 39-41).

4 GoFPEP 2012: Revitalizing Health & Physical Education through Community Based Networking

The second Global Forum, GoFPEP 2012, focused on the theme of “Revitalizing Health & Physical Education through Community Based Networking.” The forum was held in Velen, Germany, at the Sportschloss Velen in conjunction with three Primary Model Schools, two based in the community of Velen (HCSC Andreas and HCSC Walburgis School), one based at Winterswijk (HCSC basisschool de Kolibrie), the Netherlands. GoFPEP was organized by Willibald Gebhardt Research Institute, Essen, Germany in cooperation with the departments of sport sciences at the University of Duisburg-Essen and the University of Münster.
GoFPEP 2012 received endorsements from 40 national, continental and global organizations which include leading bodies of sport, sport science and physical education associations from North and South America, Asia and Europe including: Agita Mundo; American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance; American College of Sports Medicine; Asian Council of Exercise and Sport Science, European Fair Play Movement; European Non-Governmental Sports Organisation; European Physical Education Teacher Association; European College of Sport Science, European Fair Play Movement, German Association of Sport Science, International Association for Physical Education in Higher Education; International Association of Physical Education and Sport for Girls and Women; International Association of Sport and Leisure Infrastructure Management; International Council of Sport Science and Physical Education; International Federation of Adapted Physical Activity; International Physical Activity Projects; International Society for the Advancement of Kinanthropometry; International Society for Comparative Physical Education and Sport; the World Leisure Organization and several national Olympic Committees and Olympic Academies.

More than 80 distinguished delegates from more than 50 countries around the world attended GoFPEP 2012 representing their model schools, university departments and different PE and sport related associations. The GoFPEP 2012 program has been arranged to accentuate the theme of the event and organized in several different formats including: 3 keynote presentations; 5 workshops; 3 on-sight clinics emphasizing best practice in modern physical education with technology and cross-curricular physical education and nutrition education, including small discussion groups and poster presentation meetings. Papers send in for discussion group meetings and the poster session focused on three important items: 1) school physical education, sport clubs and other community programs that are linked to enhance frequent physical activities; 2) school physical education which is linked and networked with community partners to support healthy active lifestyles; and 3) innovative strategies in which way the GoFPEP movement can support a healthy school network in local communities.

At the final assembly of the Global Forum recorders of the six discussion groups reported on their group’s recommendations how to support networking for schools, sport clubs and communities. A second major item of recommendations were statements whether a common platform for the social movement of the Global Forum should be established: Many delegates expressed their intention to cross the borderlines of the different institutions for more “active networking”, “to build a solid platform”; “do more capacity building” and go for a “stronger team building approach” which finally leads to a short but all-in-all statement: “keep the Forum active”. Currently, all written material of the General Assembly and later submitted written reports are under investigation by a content analysis to craft a declaration how to progress with the social movement of GoFPEP.

5 GoFPEP 2014: Health and Physical Education: Promoting Best Practice

Plans are well underway for the 3rd Global Forum, GoFPEP 2014, which will be focused on the theme of “Health and Physical Education: Promoting Best Practice.” The forum will be hosted by Prof. J. Hans de Ridder, Director, School of Biokinetics, Recreation and Sport Science at North-West University - Potchefstroom Campus, South Africa. As of this date, 85 leading experts from 53 countries/regions have been accepted the extended invitations including individuals representing such countries as
Austria, Australia, Bahrain, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Colombia, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Hong Kong-China, Finland, Germany, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Korea, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Macau-China, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria, Oman, Philippines, Poland, Singapore, Romania, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, Thailand, Turkey, Zimbabwe, Venezuela, UK and the USA. It is anticipated that nearly 100 individuals who will participate in this invitation-only event with many more individuals invited from African countries to insure a strong representation from this part of the world. The event will take place on the campus of North-West University - Potchefstroom Campus in May 2014. The forum will encourage participants to exchange examples of best practices in health and physical education pedagogy as well as in the preparation of teachers at the elementary and secondary levels in this area. GoFPEP 2014 will address one of WHO’s major strategic initiative of revealing and promoting best practice as previously indicated.

6 Conclusion
GoFPEP represents a new social movement aimed at bringing about change in the teaching of health and physical education as well as the training of health and physical education teachers. Social movements involve the collective action of a group of individuals who have formulated a network to bring about change. GoFPEP has created such a network of committed individuals and institutions around the world networking together in a common concern and have directed their attention toward identifying issues and developing and promulgating social policy related to health, physical education and leisure in both the school and community setting.

GoFPEP will challenge current ways of thinking, institutional structures and prevailing health and physical education programs. GoFPEP seeks to engage a broad range of individuals in such a way as to rethink and then reform health and physical education pedagogy. The effort will draw upon teachers, researchers, practicing professionals, business leaders, government officials and citizens to work holistically to frame solutions to existing problems. In addition, GoFPEP seeks to link schools and community agencies to work together to find creative solutions to the challenges presented by increased incidents of obesity and overweight throughout the world.

Social movements can, in fact, be revolutionary in nature. That is, they seek a fundamental change in power or the way in which institutions are organized or structured. GoFPEP seeks to realign ideologically and in practice the way in which health and physical education programs are offered in the schools. GoFPEP especially seeks the application of technology, as well as new curriculum designs, that are student-centered and promote greater accountability. Further, GoFPEP seeks fundamentally to create new arrangements between the schools and the communities within which they operate by building stronger partnerships and viewing the relationships as an integrated and seamless one. Last, GoFPEP seeks to redefine the way in which health and physical education teachers are prepared, accentuating a greater focus on embedding teacher preparation in the schools and reversing the theory to practice paradigm to one that emphasizes practice linked to theory.
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This is the first research methods book to focus entirely on physical education and youth sport. It guides the reader through the whole research process; from the first steps to completion of a dissertation or practice-based project, and introduces key topics such as:

- formulating a research question
- qualitative approaches
- quantitative approaches
- mixed method research
- literature review
- case studies
- survey, interviews and focus groups
- data analysis
- writing the dissertation

Each chapter includes a full range of useful pedagogical features, including chapter summaries, practical activities, case studies, dialogues with active researchers and guidance on further reading and resources. With contributions from some of the world’s best-known researchers in the field, this book is an indispensable reading for all students and professionals working in physical education, youth sport, sports coaching and related subjects.

Section 1 – Planning the research process
1. What is your research question – and why? (Armour, K., & Macdonald, D.)
2. Research principles and practices: paving the research journey (Macdonald, D., & McCuaig, L.)
3. Positioning yourself as a researcher: four dimensions for self-reflection (Fernández-Balboa, J.-M., Brubaker, N., & Madison, J.)
4. What counts as ‘good’ research? (Silverman, S., & Bernstein, E.)

Section 2 – Methodology: the thinking behind the methods
5. Thinking about research frameworks (Tinning, R., & Fitzpatrick, K.)
6. Conducting ethical research (Wright, J. & O’Flynn, G.)
7. Qualitative approaches (Hastie, P., & Hay, P.)
8. Quantitative approaches (Hale, B., & Graham, D.)

9. Are mixed methods the natural approach to research? (Gorard, S., & Makopoulou, K.)
10. Listening to young people’s voices in physical education and youth sport research (O’Sullivan, M., & Enright, E.)

Section 3 – Selecting the most appropriate method(s)
11. Reviewing literature (Templin, T. J., & Pearce, G.)
12. Experimental research methods in physical education and sports (Haerens, L., & Tallir, I.)
14. Surveys (Brandl-Bredenbeck, H.-P., & Kämpfe, A.)
15. Observational studies (Öhman, M., & Quennerstedt, M.)
16. Case study research (Armour, K., & Griffiths, M.)
17. Interviews and focus groups (Ennis, C. D., & Chen, S.)
18. Narrative research methods: where the art of storytelling meets the science of research (Armour, K., & Chen, H.)
19. Action research in physical education: cycles, not circles! (Rossi, A., & Tan, W. K.)
20. Visual methods in coaching research: capturing everyday lives (Jones, R., Santos, S., Mesquita, I., & Gilbourne, D.)
21. Grounded theory (Holt, N. L., Knight, C. J., & Tamminen, K. A.)
22. Discourse analysis and the beginner researcher (Hall, K., & Chambers, F. C.)

Section 4 – Data analysis – consider it early!
23. Analysing qualitative data (Hastie, P., & Glotova, O.)
24. Analysing quantitative data (Hale, B., & Wakefield, A.)

Section 5 – Communicating your research
25. Effective research writing (Kirk, D., & Casey, A.)
26. The dissertation (Burrows, L., McLachlan, F., & Spowart, L.)

For further information visit: http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780415618854
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GoPro® HD Camera for capturing outdoor sports movement activities

GoPro® cameras are used by more professional athletes, sports filmmakers and core enthusiasts than any other camera in the world. The HD HERO2: Outdoor Edition is the most advanced GoPro camera yet. Wearable and gear mountable, waterproof to 197’ (60m), capable of capturing professional full 170º wide angle 1080p video and 11 megapixel photos at a rate of 10 photos per second, the HD HERO2 is the world’s most versatile camera. It is the smallest, lightest, most powerful HD camera for capturing and sharing immersive videos and photos of outdoor sport activities.

Included are mounting accessories which can be used during outdoor sports like biking, skiing, skating, kayaking and so on. There are several other accessories available (compare: http://www.gopro.com).

The HD HERO2: Outdoor Edition is compatible with all GoPro expansion accessories and BacPacs™, including the Wi-Fi BacPac and Wi-Fi Remote.

For further information visit: http://www.gopro.com
AIESEP Conferences, Congresses and Scientific Research Seminars 2013 & 2014

AIESEP International Conference 2013
The AIESEP International Conference 2013 ‘Physical Education and Sport: Challenging the Future’ be held July 4-7, 2013 at the Josef Pilsudski University of Physical Education, Warsaw, Poland. All detailed information is available via the official conference website: www.aiesep2013.com

AIESEP Scientific Research Seminar 2013
The AIESEP Scientific Research Seminar 2013 ‘The role of PETE in ensuring quality PE in the classroom: Exploring best practice’ will be held at the University of Jyväskylä, Finland from 12 to 14 September 2013. The purpose of the seminar is to explore ideas around pedagogy in physical education, as well as better integration between subdisciplines, with a view to the composition of a position statement on best practice in physical education teacher education across early childhood, primary and secondary levels. For further information please contact: Prof. Pilvikki Heikinaro (AISEP President, pilvikki.heikinaro-johansson@jyu.fi)

AIESEP World Congress 2014
The next AIESEP World Congress will be held in Auckland (New Zealand) from February 10 to 13 2014. Preliminary information is available via the official congress website: www.aiesep2014.com. Regular precisions will be provided through the AIESEP Flash Newsletter as well as on the AIESEP website.

For further information please contact: Association Internationale des Ecoles Superieures d’Education (AIESEP) www.aiesep.org

ICSSPE News

www.icsspe.org / icsspe@icsspe.org

ICSSPE meetings held prior to ICSEMIS
Elections took place at the ICSSPE Board meetings held in Glasgow prior to ICSEMIS, confirming Prof. Margaret Talbot as ICSSPE President for the next four years. Prof. Walter Ho, Vice-President Education, was also re-elected. New Vice-President Programme and Services as of January 2013 is Wolfgang Baumann, Secretary General TAFISA; Vice-President Science Dr Uri Schaefer, Ministry of Culture and Sport, Israeli Sport Authority. Dr Maria Dinold, University of Vienna, has been elected Chair of the Associations’ Board; and Prof. Dr Kari Keskinen has been re-elected Chair of the Editorial Board.
Philip Noel-Baker Awards
Seven Philip Noel-Baker research awards were presented during the ICSSPE General Assembly to ICSSPE members for their outstanding contributions to sport science on an international level.
The award winners are as follows: Lauri Tarasti (2009); Prof. Dr Michael McNamee (2009); Prof. Dr Lateef O. Amusa (2010); Prof. Dr R. Scott Kretchmar (2010); Prof. Dr Tansin Benn (2011); Prof. em. Dr Ilkka Vuori (2011); Prof. Dr Steven Blair (2012).

ICSEMIS 2012
ICSSPE has recently returned from the 2012 International Convention on Science, Education and Medicine in Sport, held in Glasgow, Scotland. ICSEMIS provided a forum where scientists and academics observed and found opportunities to collaborate with other researchers in their field and also with other sports science disciplines.
ICSEMIS also promotes the development of young researchers and presented the Young Investigator Awards, recognising outstanding contributions to science from junior researchers.

MINEPS V 2013
The Programme Committee kick-off meeting for the 5th International Conference of Ministers and Senior Officials Responsible for Physical Education and Sport (MINEPS V) was recently held between member organisations. This included United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), Federal Ministry of the Interior (BMI), International Council of Sport Science and Physical Education (ICSSPE), German Olympic Sports Confederation (DOSB), International Paralympic Committee (IPC), International Olympic Committee (IOC), Standing Conference of Sport Ministers, Germany (SMK), United Nations Sport for Development and Peace (UNOSDP) and CIGEPS.
The Programme Committee will prepare recommendations to support the final ministerial document on three topics: ‘Sport as a fundamental right for all’; ‘Promotion of investment in sport and physical education programmes’; and ‘Preserving the integrity of sport’. Each topic is open for input through member organisations.
The International Conference of Ministers and Senior Officials will be held in Berlin, Germany from 28 to 30 May 2013. It is expected that approximately 500 participants including ministers and vice-ministers of UNESCO member states will attend. Please save the date.

For further information please contact:
International Council of Sport Science and Physical Education (ICSSPE)
Tel.: +49 (0)30 3641 8850
www.icsspe.org / icsspe@icsspe.org
International Sport Studies (ISS) volume 34(1)

In June 2012 the International Society for Comparative Physical Education and Sport (ISCPES) published the first issue of its 2012 ISCPES journal International Sport Studies (ISS). Issue 34(1) contains the following articles:

- Physical Education in the United States (by L. Housner and A. Taliaferro)
- The International Association of Athletics Federations (IAAF) Kids’ Athletics Program in China (by D. Yang, L. Housner, Y. Long and H. Sun)
- Effects of Physical Activity or Physical Education on Students’ Academic Achievement (by W. Ning)
- The Olympic Ideal and the Multiple Agendas of the Games (by R. Reese)

The ISS is available via the ISCPES office in Macau.

New ISCPES Executive Board

The new ISCPES Executive Board was elected at the General Annual Meeting of ISCPES during 18th Biennial Conference in Los Andes, Venezuela from 18 to 21 April 2012. The new ISCPES Executive Board (2012-2014) consists of Assoc. Prof. Dr Walter Ho (President, Macau/China), Prof. Dr Lateef O. Amusa (South Africa), Prof. Dr Keh Nyit Chin (Taiwan/China), Martin Holzweg (Germany), Prof. Dr Rosa López D’Amico (Venezuela), Prof. Dr José Prado (Venezuela), and Prof. Dr Abel L. Toriola (South Africa).

For further information please contact:
International Society for Comparative Physical Education and Sport (ISCPES)
www.iscpes.com / walterkyho@yahoo.com
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Compiled by C. Scheuer (Luxembourg, Luxembourg)

Structure of EUPEA

During the last forum of EUPEA in November 2011 in Brussels, the following team has been elected to lead EUPEA for the next three years.

Executive board
President: Claude Scheuer (Luxembourg), Vice President: Marcos Onofre (Portugal), General Secretary: Eric De Boever (Belgium) & Scientific Advisor: Martin Holzweg (Germany)

Representatives of the regions
North: Lucas Janemalm (Sweden), South: Luca Eid (Italy), South East: Hrvoje Sertic (Croatia), Central: Udo Hanke (Germany), the representative for the east t.b.d.

Board members
Jan Rijpstra (Netherlands), Ruedi Schmid (Switzerland) & Riitta Paarjarvi (Finland)
EUPEA Board Meeting in Basel, Switzerland, 6 to 7 July 2012
Ruedi Schmid welcomed the board of EUPEA for the 2nd annual meeting in Basle, Switzerland. After a visit of the Sports Institute in Basle and a presentation by Dr Mirko Schmidt (University of Bern; “Persönlichkeitsentwicklung durch Sport”), the agenda of the meeting dealt with the five topics of the EUPEA action plan 2012-2014.
- Members: The board is trying contact PE associations in countries that are not yet members of EUPEA. Therefore a promotional list of actions of EUPEA will be drafted.
- Communication Information: The 2nd annual newsletter was sent out in the month of June. It is planned to send out four editions a year of the newsletter. To subscribe to the newsletter, please visit www.eupea.com.
- Cooperation with other PE associations: The cooperation with FIEP-Europe, AIESEP and other associations will be intensified in the near future.
- Politics: EUPEA is going to develop an instrument which allows member associations to check the level of PE in their countries on different levels (such as PE lesson allocation, PE teacher training, sports facilities, etc.). This would also allow a comparison of the national level with other countries.
- Research Publication: The study Physical education and sport in Europe: From individual reality to collective desirability (Onofre et al.) will be published in the International Journal of Physical Education.

22nd EUPEA Forum meeting in Helsinki, 19 to 20 October 2012
The annual EUPEA Forum meeting will be organized in cooperation with LIITO (Association of Physical and Health Educators in Finland) in Helsinki. After the Board meetings on 18 October, the Forum will be held on 19 and 20 October. The main topic of the forum will be “Physical Education from a practical point of view – Perspectives for EUPEA”. This topic will lead the participants to express their view on the future work of EUPEA in the field of physical education, especially under the perspective of the position of EUPEA as an expert group in several European or worldwide institutions and networks. For more information on registration to the forum, please visit www.eupea.com or contact info@eupea.com.

Future EUPEA board and forum meetings
Interested member associations can now introduce their applications for organizing the board meetings (twice a year) or the forum meetings (once a year) in 2013 and 2014. Cooperation between member associations and interested institutes or faculties is welcomed. For more information please contact the secretary on info@eupea.com.

ICSSPE meetings in Glasgow, 17 to 19 July 2012
EUPEA was represented at the ICSSPE meetings in Glasgow by President Claude Scheuer (Luxembourg) and Executive Board member Martin Holzweg (Germany). On this occasion, Claude Scheuer was elected member of the Executive Board of ICSSPE for a period of four years.

For further information please contact:
EUPEA - European Physical Education Association
Tel.: +32 (0)92 189122
www.eupea.com / info@eupea.com
The European Network of Sport Science, Education & Employment (ENSSEE) is an international non-profit organisation for universities and non-universities. ENSSEE provides an ideal meeting place for debating and proposing ideas as well as common initiatives to promote education, training, and employment in sport.

“CoachNet” meets in Cologne
CoachNet – a project to further develop a co-ordinated network for Sports Coaching in Europe – has made significant progress during its second meeting in the Cologne-based coaching academy of the German Olympic Sports Confederation (viz DOSB Trainerakademie).
The 13 project partners from nine European countries came together between 17 and 18 April to discuss further steps. The focus of this meeting was on the development of a concise project vision. In order to formulate this vision as comprehensively as possible, the partners shared their views on the field of sports coaching and discussed relevant issues.
Following this step, further action will be taken within the next phase which will concentrate on research. The national bodies and stakeholders connected to coaching within the EU member states as well as some other European countries have to be identified and, in a second step, their role as well as their position in the networks of sports coaching.

Coherent and inclusive mechanisms
Under the supervision of Leeds Metropolitan University (UK), the project pursues the objective to establish a coherent and inclusive mechanism for the coordination of sports coaching at European level.
Following this objective, CoachNet aims at including stakeholders in the following categories:
- Coaches’ associations (national & European level)
- Lead national organizations in sports coaching
- International federations (European level)
- Higher education institutions
- Employers of coaches

At the first project meeting in Leeds from 25 to 26 January 2012 the partners discussed different possibilities on how to make the ‘voice of the coach’ heard best at European and national level. These ideas have now been reassessed. During the next meeting to be held in Helsinki in June 2013, evaluation will provide a first overview on the coaching sector in Europe.
For further information on the CoachNet project, please visit www.coachnet.eu.

For further information on ENSSEE please contact:
European Network of Sport Science, Education & Employment (ENSSEE)
Tel.: +49 (0)221 49825800
www.enssee.eu / office@enssee.eu
We are delighted to invite you to participate in the 8th FIEP European Congress "Children and Youth Physical Education and Sport Perspectives in Europe" to be held from 29 August to 1 September 2013 in Bratislava. It is a great pleasure and honour for all of us that Comenius University, Faculty of Physical Education and Sport, Association of Physical Education Teachers in cooperation with their partners organise under the patronage of Directorate General of Sport of Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport of Slovak Republic this prestigious scientific event in Bratislava during the year of celebration of the 90th anniversary of FIEP, the oldest and one of the biggest world international organisations in the field of physical education. The congress is focused on a very up-to-date topic: What are the current trends of physical education and sport, what are their objectives in a changing society and which role do physical education and sports professionals play in it. We believe that congress will bring answers to many questions and will indicate further trends and perspectives of physical education development in Europe, helping to provide it with a better position and role in society.

Congress Topics

- Physical education at schools
- Physical education and sports at Universities
- Economic and legal problems of PE and sports
- Leisure activities, nutrition, health and healthy lifestyle of children and youths
- Sport and PE of people with special needs
- Education and training of Professionals – PE teachers, coaches, managers
- Round table: FIEP - 90 Years of service to PE
- Workshop for physical education teachers: school in motion

Congress language will be English.

Important dates
Registration and abstract submission: 30 April 2013
Full text submission: 28 August 2013
Congress fee payment: 30 June 2013
Reduced congress fee payment: 15 March 2013

Registration and more congress information: www.fiep2013bratislava.com
Congress e-mail: fiep2013@fsport.uniba.sk

For further information on FIEP please contact:
Fédération Internationale d’Education physique (FIEP)
E-mail: antala@fsport.uniba.sk
www.fiepeurope.eu
Upcoming Events

Prepared in cooperation with
ICSSPE (Berlin)
Tel. +49 (0)30 36418850
www.icsspe.org / icsspe@icsspe.org

ICSSPE Seminar
Paths to Success. Inspiring Future Leaders
23-25 November 2012
Berlin, Germany
http://www.icsspe.org/content/paths-success-inspiring-future-leaders

17th IAPESGW World Congress
Physical Education and Sport: Promoting Gender Equality
10-13 April 2013
Havana, Cuba
www.iapesgw.org

MINEPS V
27 May - 1 June 2013
Berlin, Germany

ECSS
Unifying Sport Science
26-29 June 2013
Barcelona, Spain
http://www.ecss-congress.eu/2013/13/

AIESEP International Conference
Physical Education and Sport: Challenging the Future
Warsaw, Poland
05-07 July 2013
www.aiesep2013.com

8th FIEP European Congress
Physical Education and Sports Perspective of Children and Youth in Europe
29 August - 1 September 2013
Bratislava, Slovakia
http://www.fiep2013bratislava.com/

AIESEP Specialist Seminar
The Role of PETE in Ensuring Quality PE in the Classroom - Exploring Best Practice
12-14 September 2013
Jyvaskyla, Finland
SPORT, CULTURE AND SOCIETY

Physical activities, fitness, and sports can be considered cultural practices reflecting multiple meanings. The “Sport, Culture and Society” series deals with issues intersecting sport, physical activity, health, aging and cultural concerns. The focus of the series is interdisciplinary, ground-breaking work that draws on different disciplines and theoretical approaches, such as sociology, philosophy, cultural anthropology, history, cultural studies, feminist studies, post-modernism, or critical theory.

Helmut Digel
Sociological Aspects of Modern Sports

The book deals with the Sociological Aspects of Modern Sports and features articles on social change and sports development (e.g. the problem of doping and the responsibility of science, talent identification and promotion), on the Olympics (e.g. the Olympic idea and reality, the athletes’ village) and on athletics (e.g. on the development of world athletics, what makes athletics valuable).

c. 200 pages, b/w, 20 photos
Paperback 5 3/4" x 8 1/4"
ISBN: 9781841263571
$ 24.95 US/$ 49.95 AUS/£ 19.95 UK/E 24.95
E-Book (PDF): 9781841268248
E-Book (ePub): 9781841268231

James Skinner/Keith Gilbert/Allan Edwards (eds.)
Some Like It Hot
The Beach as a Cultural Dimension
ISBN: 9781841260983
$ 19.95 US/$ 32.95 AUS/£ 14.95 UK/e 18.90

Heather Sheridan, Leslie A. Howe & Keith Thompson (eds.)
Sporting Reflections
Some Philosophical Perspectives
ISBN: 9781841261829
$ 19.95 US/$ 32.95 AUS/£ 14.95 UK/e 18.95

Karin Volkwein-Caplan
Culture, Sport and Physical Activity
Issues, Impact and Challenges
ISBN: 9781841261478
$ 19.95 US/$ 32.95 AUS/£ 14.95 UK/e 18.90

Nick T. Pappas
The dark side of sports
ISBN: 9781841263380
$ 24.95 US/$ 49.95 AUS/£ 19.95 UK/e 24.95
Jasmin Tahmaseb McConatha and Karin Volkwein-Caplan
The Social Geography of Healthy Aging

The healthy and successful transition to later life can be a difficult experience. This book will discuss the historical, cultural, and social psychological factors that shape the quality of life of older women and men. A central premise of the proposed book is that where we live is vital to how we age. Thus, the book has a look at stories of older women and men who are from different cultural backgrounds.

176 pages, full-color print
Paperback, 6 1/2" x 9 1/4"
ISBN: 9781841263526
c. $ 19.95 US/$ 32.95 AUS/£ 14.95 UK/E 19.95
E-Book (PDF): 9781841263830
E-Book (ePub): 9781841264332

Leslie Spencer
You Can Be Beautiful Beyond Breast Cancer

You Can Be Beautiful Beyond Breast Cancer is the personal story of Leslie Spencer, a professor of health and exercise science, who trained for and competed in her first women’s figure competition during treatment for breast cancer. Following sound and practical guidelines, she provides fitness and nutrition strategies to enable cancer survivors to reach new levels of wellness.

144 pages, full-color print, 50 photos
Paperback, 6 1/2" x 9 1/4"
ISBN: 9781841263564
$ 17.95 US/$ 32.95 AUS/£ 12.95 UK/E 17.95
E-Book (PDF): 9781841268224
E-Book (ePub): 9781841268217