

Intended or unintended? Issues arising from the implementation of the UK Government's 2003 Schools Workforce Remodelling Act

RICHARD BLAIR AND SUSAN CAPEL



***RICHARD BLAIR** is currently a lecturer in the School of Sport and Education at Brunel University, West London. He has worked as a physical education teacher in a number of West London schools occupying several different roles from school sports coordinator to manager of teaching and learning for physical education. His research interests are physical education teaching, initial teacher training of physical education and the sports coach as an educator.*



***SUSAN CAPEL** is a professor and Head of the School of Sport and Education at Brunel University, West London. She has worked as a physical education teacher and in teacher education for nearly 30 years in England, Wales, Hong Kong and USA. Her research interests are in: physical education teacher education; physical education teaching; and physical education in schools.*

Abstract

The United Kingdom (UK) Government's 2003 Workforce Remodelling Act (DfES, 2003) contained nine key points aimed at supporting teachers and schools to raise educational standards without adding additional workload responsibilities. In September 2005 planning, preparation and assessment (PPA) time was introduced. This allows for all teachers to have 10% of their timetable to plan lessons, prepare resources and assess pupils' work. This raises issues of what 10% of their time, with pupils, teachers relinquish for PPA. One common solution in primary schools seems to have been to employ coaches (particularly football coaches) to teach Physical Education (PE) lessons. The purpose of this study was therefore to identify the knowledge, skill and understanding of a group of community-based football coaches working in PPA time in primary schools and to understand the implications for schools, coaches and coach educators.

Results showed that these coaches had very little knowledge of the National Curriculum Physical Education (NCPE) and used a narrow range of teaching methods. Some of their pedagogical decision making had a negative consequence on pupils' learning. Thirteen of the twenty-one coaches studied did not plan in the short, medium or long term. There was

evidence of routine action (Dewey, 1933) although there was some evidence of reflection. These findings are discussed in relation to the implications of employing coaches to teach the NCPE in schools and also in relation to what Continuing Professional Development (CPD) coaches need to develop the necessary knowledge, skills and understanding for working in schools. Although there is a clear PE focus to this current study, there are implications for the teaching of other subjects in primary schools in England and for the use of sports coaches within education in other national contexts. Despite differences in government policies and practices in schools, in many countries there are likely to be issues with the status, delivery and resourcing of PE.

Keywords: Coaching; continuing professional development; workforce remodelling; educational standards; primary schools.

Introduction: The context

The UK Government's 2003 Workforce Remodelling Act (DfES, 2003) contained nine key points aimed at supporting teachers and schools to raise educational standards without adding additional workload responsibilities. In September 2005 PPA time was introduced. This makes provision for all teachers to be released from 10% of their timetable to plan lessons, prepare resources and assess pupils' work. Whereas this act has had an impact on teachers' workloads, as illustrated by Yarker (2005, 170) who stated that 'an afternoon per week of PPA time had enabled teachers to achieve real progress in dealing with their workload', particularly in primary schools where non-contact time for teachers is very different from that in secondary schools, this raises immediate issues. These include what 10% of their time with pupils teachers will use for PPA and the question arises who will teach the pupils while their class teacher is planning, preparing and assessing their work. Initial observations suggest that many primary school teachers are relinquishing the teaching of PE lessons. There are a number of possible reasons for this.

In secondary schools in England PE is taught by specialists, but in most primary schools the class teacher teaches all subjects, therefore PE is taught by general primary teachers. The initial (and continuing) education of primary teachers might not prepare them adequately to teach PE. Although there is some specific PE-related input in Initial Teacher Education (ITE) courses for primary general teachers, research has found that many courses provide a minimal amount of input within the specific curriculum area of PE, with nearly half (40%) of all newly qualified primary school teachers having received only six hours for PE in their ITE (Kelso, 2008; Skyes, 2007; Talbot, 2007, 2008).

Carney and Armstrong (1996) found that the time allocation for PE varied among 49 institutions that offered either undergraduate or postgraduate primary courses. The minimum time allocated for PE in an undergraduate course was 12 hours, whereas in postgraduate courses one institution allocated only four hours for PE. The overall mean time allocated to PE in undergraduate courses was 33 hours 40 minutes and for postgraduate courses 21 hours 26 minutes. They also found that 93% of the respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the time allocated to PE in their course (whether undergraduate or postgraduate). For example 79% expressed dissatisfaction with a postgraduate course; specifically 49% stated that far too little time and 30% that too little time had been allowed for PE. In terms of course content, 100% of undergraduate courses and 96% of postgraduate courses covered games, whereas a lower percentage of courses included Athletics Activity, Dance, Gymnastics, Outdoor and Adventurous Activity (OAA) and Swimming, the other five areas of activity in the NCPE. Thus, primary general teachers enter the profession with limited preparation specifically for teaching PE.

Combined with different challenges regarding class management, increased physical risk and specific content knowledge, this contributes to PE being perceived as one of the most challenging areas of the curriculum for primary teachers to deliver. It is also likely that primary teachers undertake limited CPD specifically focusing on PE.

A number of other factors may contribute to this situation. These include the focus on academic achievement in making judgements on the success of a school (or teacher), resulting in the prioritisation of academic curriculum areas, the lack of understanding of the role of PE in schools and confusion between PE and sport (Capel, 2000). These may all contribute to PE being regarded as a curriculum area that is less important and hence more likely to be covered by someone else, thus releasing the teacher for PPA time. Others who could take the class during this PPA time include other teachers, or more likely, adults other than teachers (AOTTs). AOTTs include Higher Level Teaching Assistants (HLTAs). In order to qualify as an HLTA a set of standards must be achieved. These set out what an individual should know, understand and be able to do to before being awarded HLTA status. The Standards are organised in three interrelated sections: Professional values and practice (the attitudes and commitment to be expected from those trained as HLTAs); Knowledge and understanding are necessary (the knowledge, expertise and awareness of the pupils' curriculum to work effectively with teachers as part of a professional team and demonstrating that they know how to use their skills, expertise and experience to advance pupils' learning); and teaching and learning activities (ability to work effectively with individual pupils, small groups and whole classes under the direction and supervision of a qualified teacher, so that they can contribute to a range of teaching and learning activities in the areas in which they have expertise). The standards require all HLTAs to demonstrate skills in planning, monitoring, assessment and class management, and are designed to support smooth progression to Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) for those HLTAs with the potential and interest to go on to qualify as teachers. Thus, if HLTAs teach PE lessons which teachers relinquish to cover PPA time, they have reached a set of standards to prepare themselves for the role. However, the same issues for many primary teachers are that they lack the knowledge and confidence to teach PE.

Some schools may perceive it easier to find someone who is able to come in and teach PE lessons as opposed to other subjects. It would be much harder to identify a group of people to cover other subjects, with the exception perhaps of music, art and foreign languages. AOTTs who might, and are, being used to cover PE in PPA time are sports coaches. There are several possible reasons for this. First, 'PE teaching and coaching are regarded as synonymous' (Lyle, 2002, 10). This view is reinforced in Government documents and recent initiatives which use the words PE and sport synonymously. These include the Physical Education, School Sport and Club Links (PESSCL) project, the overall objective of which is 'to enhance the take-up of sporting opportunities by 5 to 16-year-olds, with a target of increasing the percentage of schoolchildren who spend a minimum of two hours a week on high-quality PE and school sport within and beyond the curriculum to 75% by 2006 and 85% by 2008. The longer-term aim is to offer all children at least four hours of sport every week by 2010. This can be made up of: at least two hours of high-quality PE and sport at schools, with the expectation that this will be delivered totally within the curriculum; and an additional two or more hours beyond the school day delivered by a range of school, community and club providers' (Teachernet, 2007).

One result is that, in an attempt to address the time issue involved in allocating 10% of teachers' time for PPA, many head teachers are turning to a pool of willing sports coaches who, for an hourly rate of pay, 'coach' pupils within their curriculum PE lessons. A further issue here is that even within this group there is considerable difference in the number and availability of coaches in different sports. Football has the largest number of coaches available to teach in PPA time. Therefore there are likely to be more football coaches employed in primary schools

than coaches for any other sport. If HLTAs, who have achieved a set of standards, could cover this time, it would be reasonable to expect that other AOTTs (including sports coaches) employed to teach PE in PPA time have also achieved a set of suitable standards.

Research on 'grass roots' coaches (those working at participation and developmental level) has shown that they are normally volunteers (Albinson, 1973; Barber *et al.*, 1996; Gould & Martens, 1979; Gray & Cornish, 1985; Salminen & Liukonen, 1996; Weiss & Sisley, 1984: all cited in Trudel & Gilbert, 2006). Trudel and Gilbert (2006) describe a participation level coach as someone who supports athletes, players, students etc. to develop basic skills with an emphasis on taking part rather than competition and a developmental level coach as someone whose support is more formal and includes a competitive structure, which requires an increased commitment on behalf of the coach and the athlete. Lyle (2002, 49) describes the profile of participation level coaches as 'involvement irregular; formal organisation but loose membership; some improvement objectives but participation emphasised over practice'. Lyle provides additional support for this through what he terms 'boundary notes' and states there is 'little formal progression in a very limited preparation programme. Short-term goals. Intensity low even if long term involvement, not all performance components given attention' (49). Research on the educational backgrounds of these coaches has shown that on average 50% or fewer had completed any formal coach education (Bratton, 1978; Corso *et al.*, 1988; Weiss & Sisley, 1984; all cited in Trudel & Gilbert, 2006). Trudel and Gilbert (2006) also cite other research which has shown that fewer than 60% of coaches have college degrees (Gould & Martens, 1979; Hanson & Gauthier, 1988; Lee *et al.*, 1989; Ubbes, 1991).

Lyle (2002) considers sport coaching to be a good example of how professional work classifications change over time. The Registrar General's social class index interpretation of sports coaching as 'sports instruction' classifies coaching as a 'skilled manual occupation for which a university degree is not required' (200). This interpretation does not fit in with Lyle's view of the sports coach and, indeed, the professional classification of coaches has changed over time. Lyle (2002) pointed out that an 'updated standard occupational classification' (Office for National Statistics, 2000) classifies sport coaching in Major Group 3 – associate professional and technical occupations' (200). He continues that the education and training characteristic of an associated profession demonstrates a lengthy period of full-time training and usually a formal period of induction.

Coaches who might be employed in curriculum time are qualified through National Governing Body (NGB) awards in specific sports, mainly at levels 1, 2 and 3. Levels 1 and 2 are both open entry courses (i.e. no formal qualifications are required for entry). For football coaches, both courses consist of theoretical and practical components that include at level 1: Football Association (FA) child protection (3 hours attendance), FA emergency aid, distance learning including soccer parent, laws of the game, player and coach development, club administration, review of practical sessions and assessment preparation. There is a practical assessment, with each coach using a practice from the course handbook. The level 2 qualification covers skill practices, 1 v 1, 2 v 2 and 3 v 3, plus small – sided games, 6 v 6. At level 2 the coach is required to conduct a minimum of 16 hours of verified coaching, supported by session plans and evaluations plus work on an action plan as discussed with their course tutor. The theoretical input at level 2 includes FA child protection (3 hours attendance), FA emergency aid, distance learning comprising completing a candidate pack. The level 3 qualification also contains both theory and practical elements. The theory consists of FA safeguarding children, FA emergency aid, distance learning including completing all course tasks and formulating coaching plans for assessment. Coaches also have to conduct a minimum of sixteen hours of verified coaching, supported by session plans and evaluations. They also have to produce an action plan as discussed with course tutors. The practical content of Level 3 includes functional practices,

phases of play, small-sided games (9v9). In addition Level 3 offers support sessions aimed at assisting candidates in preparing for their final assessment. All qualifications include a final practical assessment.

These awards cover mainly technical, tactical, physical and in some cases psychological content knowledge for coaching football. However, increasing research and academic hypothesising regarding large-scale coach education programmes are resulting in increased criticism of these awards (see, for example, Abraham & Collins, 1998; Cassidy *et al.*, 2004; Douge & Hastie, 1993; Gilbert & Trudel, 1999a). Some of this criticism, which includes how the knowledge and skills gained from de-contextualised role-play environments can be transferred into the highly bespoke context in which each individual coach works, questions the ecological validity of these awards.

Additionally, Cushion *et al.* (2003) and Gilbert and Trudel (1999a) both present an argument that current coach education programmes are having a limited impact on actual coaching practice. In an extensive review of literature on coaching and coach education, Trudel and Gilbert (2006) conclude that coaches learn to coach through two main pathways: large-scale coach education programmes and personal experience. Significantly, when coaches have been asked to comment on the value of formal coach education they do not seem to favour it as much as more informal highly contextualised learning that invariably takes place through actual coaching and observation of coaches (Fleurance & Cotteax, 1999 cited in Jones 2006; Jones *et al.* 2004; Sammela, 1995).

Coaches who have learnt to coach through NGB awards, including FA coaching awards and through their own experiences may not have the background, experience or knowledge, skill and understanding in relation to working within the NCPE. The knowledge, skills and understanding coaches need to work in curriculum time may be open to individual interpretation (after all coaches have been employed in many private schools to coach PE in curriculum time over many years). The emerging literature in coach education and ITE on pedagogy and reflection (e.g. Attard & Armour, 2006; Cassidy *et al.* 2004; Gilbert & Trudel, 2001; Jones, 2006; Jones *et al.* 2004; Leach & Moon, 1999) suggests that pedagogy and reflection support the role of the 'professional' (Schon, 1983) educator, enabling them to be critically aware of the consequence of the planning, delivery and evaluation choices (Cassidy *et al.* 2004; Jones, 2006; Jones *et al.* 2004, 2008; Leach & Moon, 1999; Schon, 1983; Trudel & Gilbert, 2006) and are therefore important in being able to work in schools. However, pedagogy and reflection are missing in current coaching awards. Furthermore coaches working in schools would be expected to meet the requirements to carry out 'specified work' within PPA time as identified by DfES (2003). 'Specified work' (Baalpe, 2005, 4) in schools, is defined as part, or all of:

- Planning and preparing lessons and courses for pupils
- Delivering lessons to pupils – including distance learning or computer-aided techniques
- Assessing the development, progress and attainment of pupils
- Reporting on the development, progress and attainment of pupils.

Furthermore, Baalpe (2004, 29) states, 'Anyone teaching PE needs to be competent (i.e. to have the skills, knowledge, understanding and expertise necessary to plan, deliver and evaluate the pupils' work in a context of appropriate challenge and a safe working environment'). At least some of the components of this are identified in the requirements for undertaking 'specified work'. The triangulation of literature from Coach Education, CPD and ITE, course content on NGB awards and the definition of specified work all identified the key knowledge, understanding and skills required for working in PPA time in schools as:

- knowledge of the curriculum;
- planning in the short, medium and long term;
- pedagogy; and
- reflection.

Knowledge of the curriculum not only includes PE specific content, including being physically educated, understanding of fitness and health, long-term participation in physical activity and sport, but also the contribution PE makes to the broader education of pupils, including an understanding of development of citizenship, key skills and thinking skills.

Thus the purpose of this study was to identify whether, and to what extent, a group of football coaches working in PPA time in primary schools in England had the knowledge, skills and understanding required to enable them to work as educators within the NCPE.

Method

The sample for this study was Football in the Community Coaches employed by one English Premiership Club during the 2006/07 school year. The coaches were selected by the community scheme managers at the club as a representative cross-sample of coaches. Part of their work involved taking PE lessons to cover primary teachers' PPA time. They all received payment for their service as a coach, either through a full-time position or paid on a part-time hourly rate.

These coaches were undertaking a year-long coach education programme for the calendar year 2007. The data reported in this paper were collected at the beginning of the coach education programme in January/February 2007 to find out what knowledge, skills and understanding they had to enable them to work as an educator within the NCPE (specifically knowledge of the curriculum, short, medium and long-term planning, pedagogy and reflection). Although there were 23 community coaches in the programme, due to extreme weather conditions there were two coaches who were not present on the first day of the project, meaning that data were collected from 21 coaches.

Data were collected using a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. Background data relating to previous experience and qualifications, along with other factual data (Cohen *et al.*, 2000) regarding individual knowledge, understanding and opinion on a number of key issues were collected via questionnaire. There were also questions related to how coaches viewed their role as a community coach, their knowledge of teaching and learning definitions, of planning and their view on their own personal development.

The coaches also completed a short set form on their knowledge of the NCPE within which they were already working or were about to start working. An interview was used to gain a clearer understanding of the coaches' knowledge, understanding and opinions. A semistructured interview format was used to provide a clear focus on specific areas of content, while allowing flexibility to deviate and explore answers in more detail, meaning the interviewer did not have to follow a prescribed schedule (Bryman, 2001).

In addition the coaches worked together in small groups to plan and deliver a 30-minute lesson to a group of primary pupils. This lesson was videoed. Asking the coaches to present their practical knowledge and understanding of working with children as part of a group was used for dual reasons. At a practical level the time available and the organisation of this day meant that it would be impossible for all coaches to work individually. There was also clear recognition through discussions with the community scheme managers that there were a number of coaches who would find being videoed intimidating. This was clearly something that the community scheme managers and programme leader wished to avoid at such an early stage in the programme. However, the use of video recording as an initial source of data collection was considered important as it could also be utilised at a later stage in the coach education programme as a secondary source to support coaches' personal reflection (Gilbert & Trudel, 2006).

These methods of data collection were used in order that this research might move some way to closing the gap identified by Gilbert (2002) in his annotated bibliography in which he describes the design of research into sports coaching as primarily quantitative with the data gathered mainly through questionnaires. This view is further supported by Cushion (2007) who discusses how, until recently, research on coaching practice has been heavily influenced by a positivist paradigm.

Results

Table 1 provides information on the coaches included in this study.

Table 1: Background of coaches in this study

Number of coaches		Number of coaches	
Age range			
18 – 22	5	23 – 27	8
28 – 32	2	33 – 37	2
38 – 42	4	43+	0
Gender			
Male	19	Female	2
Ethnic background			
White British	14	White Other	3
Mixed race	1	Black Caribbean	2
Other	1	Not declared	1
Number of years in which worked at a community level			
Less than 1 year	6	1 – 2 years	3
2 – 3 years	3	3 – 4 years	1
4 – 5 years	3	5 – 6 years	2
6 – 7 years	0	7 – 8 years	0
8 – 9 years	0	9 – 15 years	2
15 + years	0		
Qualifications			
FA Qualification			
Level 1	6	Level 3	4
Level 2	11	Level 4	0
Academic qualifications			
GCSE's			
1 – 5	9	5+	5
Note: 7 coaches did not respond			
A level's	7	BTEC	5
GNVQ	3	HND	1
Degree	7	MSc	3

Note: Coaches ticked all that applied, so some coaches had more than one qualification

Coaches identified their perceived strengths and areas for development as a Football in the Community Coach (Select a top 3, 1 being your greatest strength, 2 being your second strength and 3 being your third strength). These are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Coaches' perceived strengths and areas for development

Strengths	Total		Total
Enthusiasm		Technical knowledge	
Rank 1 = 10	13	Rank 1 = 2	
Rank 2 = 2		Rank 2 = 3	
Rank 3 = 1		Rank 3 = 4	
Tactical knowledge		Communication skills	
Rank 2 = 2	3	Rank 1 = 5	13
Rank 3 = 1		Rank 2 = 4	
		Rank 3 = 4	
Planning coaching session		Ability to inspire children	
Rank 1 = 1	2	Rank 1 = 1	13
Rank 2 = 1		Rank 2 = 6	
		Rank 3 = 6	
Playing background		Ability to work with other coaches	
	0	Rank 2 = 2	3
		Rank 3 = 1	
Knowledge of coaching/ teaching methods		Knowledge of how children learn	
Rank 1 = 2	4	Rank 2 = 1	3
Rank 3 = 2		Rank 3 = 2	
Knowledge of the National Curriculum Physical Education		Knowledge of the Physical Education School Sport Club Links Strategy	
	0		0
Areas for development			
Enthusiasm		Technical knowledge	
Rank 3 = 1	1	Rank 1 = 2	4
		Rank 2 = 1	
		Rank 3 = 1	
Tactical knowledge		Communication skills	
Rank 1 = 2	7	Rank 3 = 1	1
Rank 2 = 4			
Rank 3 = 1			
Planning coaching session		Ability to inspire children	
		Rank 1 = 1	1
Playing background		Ability to work with other coaches	
Rank 3 = 1	1	Rank 3 = 1	1
Knowledge of coaching/ teaching methods		Knowledge of how children learn	
Rank 1 = 3	9	Rank 1 = 3	7
Rank 2 = 2		Rank 2 = 1	
Rank 3 = 4		Rank 3 = 3	
Knowledge of the National Curriculum Physical Education		Knowledge of the Physical Education School Sport Club Links Strategy	
Rank 1 = 6	14	Rank 1 = 2	11
Rank 2 = 5		Rank 2 = 6	
Rank 3 = 3		Rank 3 = 3	

Note: The numbers in the boxes indicate the number of coaches that chose that heading and the rank order of their choice, e.g. ten coaches ranked enthusiasm as their number one strength and two coaches ranked knowledge of how children learn as their third strength.

These results show that coaches perceived areas of strength as enthusiasm, communication skills and ability to inspire children. Coach enthusiasm was a positive feature of the practical lesson taught on the data collection day.

The results in Table 2 show that coaches perceived areas for development a: Knowledge of the NCPE, Knowledge of the PESSCL strategy, knowledge of coaching / teaching methods, knowledge of how children learn and tactical knowledge.

To find out what knowledge, skills and understanding community-based football coaches possess in relation to working as an educator in curriculum time delivering aspects of the NCPE, results are presented in relation to the four specific aspects identified as the focus for this coach education programme, i.e. knowledge of curriculum, planning, pedagogy and reflection.

Knowledge of the curriculum

Responses on the NCPE proforma revealed that eight of the coaches did not know how many key stages there were in compulsory state education in England, and hence in the NCPE, and only one coach was able to identify the year groups within key stage 2 (this is the key stage in which the majority of community-based coaching is undertaken and in which all of these coaches are/will be working in schools). None of the coaches knew when pupils' attainment has to be reported to parents.

None of the coaches knew how many areas of activity there were within the NCPE; 11 of the coaches named one area of activity – games, one coach named 3 areas, one named 4 areas of activity, and eight could not name any areas of activity.

In relation to the four strands of assessment within the NCPE (selecting and applying skills and compositional ideas, acquiring and developing skills, evaluating and improving skills and compositional ideas and gaining knowledge and understanding of fitness and health), only one coach could name any of the key words – these were evaluation and understanding. These two words are from different strands: the word *evaluation* comes from the Evaluating and Improving strand and the word *understanding* from the Knowledge and Understanding of Fitness and Health strand. This result is not surprising in relation to the results presented in Table 2 in which 14 of the coaches rank knowledge of the NCPE as an area of development with 6 of these coaches viewing it as their main priority.

Four coaches were asked individually about their knowledge of the NCPE and how this influenced how they felt about working in PPA time in schools. The following responses were made:

Not good! Little bits of key stage 1-4, the key stages that I learned on a previous job. ... I don't feel embarrassed or shy about working in school. I have been doing PPA sessions solidly for a year and there has not been a negative comment from a school, the teachers or the parents so I am quite confident going into the sessions. I love it. The kids enjoy it and there was a steady progression; their ability improved so ... The National Curriculum as a whole, I'm not as familiar with it as much as I should be maybe (c2).

None. I know what it is, but I wouldn't know in depth how to break it down. In fact I don't know what it is; I know what I think it is! ... I think if you are occupying the children in a constructive way, then the kids are reasonably happy, and if it is priced correctly then the teachers are reasonably happy (c5).

Mixed, I did a module at university in the second year; ... it was just an introduction, ... then I made a decision that I wanted to go into coaching rather than teaching. I *have several feelings* about working in PPA time in schools. ... from what I have seen in schools, the standard of teaching sports kills me as some of it is so poor. I walk in and see a teacher in the middle with a whistle and it just looks awful. ... In my view, if someone

gave me a book on the curriculum tomorrow, I feel that within a week I could have read it and probably go on and teach. That is my view, that is the way I work. I would go through it all, make notes, and I feel I would be ready to go and do it (c9).

Not a lot. I have to be honest; I don't know much about it at all. ... I feel comfortable going to do a session, but then if you ask me if that session is the same as the National Curriculum then I wouldn't know. I think some points are but then I am pretty sure I would be missing out on other points, so when you consider that we are going in, in curriculum time and that we need to be going in hitting all those areas, for us to look better and for the teachers to be happy with us doing a session. When you put it like that it's shocking (c21).

Planning

Thirteen of the coaches stated that they did not plan sessions, five stated that they did plan sessions, two stated that they sometimes planned sessions and one stated 'when in need of inspiration I use a lesson plan'. All five coaches who stated that they planned their sessions also stated that they kept their plans as a permanent record. Explanations by coaches who did plan sessions included:

I keep a book with lots of warm-up games, drill-based games, drills and match type activities to refer to when attending a session. Sometimes I will plan it prior to the session; others I will plan when I get there to see how many people I have to coach (c10).

Because it gives me a platform so that I can build on what I've already done. Say in a 10-week stint; you don't want to go over something at length you have already done in the early stages. I believe it is all about periodisation, no matter how old the children are (c14).

Explanations by coaches who did not plan their sessions included:

Because I find it easier to plan in my head. It is also easier to adapt my session when in my head rather than being regimented on paper (c1).

I coach better under pressure, so deciding a session on the spot is better for me! (c2).

... can do it in my head (c5).

I feel that for an hour's session it is adequate to mentally prepare (c6).

The environment I coach in is unpredictable so a lot of the time I need to improvise anyway (c12).

Working in the schools with a large number of children, I tend to pick a topic for the week, and coach the same topic for all the different sessions/pupils (c17).

Interestingly, results in Table 2 show that two of the coaches indicate that planning is an area of strength but none of the coaches' reference planning is in an area for further development.

Plans that were written and used as part of the group lesson planning and delivery on the day on which the data were collected were very basic. Although one lesson plan did have progressions outlined, none of the lesson plans had any information regarding teaching methods, any coaching or teaching points or assessment opportunities.

Pedagogy

To identify coaches' understanding of pedagogical approaches and reflective thinking, the questionnaire contained scenarios in which the coaches were asked to compare their practice.

Six coaches identified with the following views: "I like to be in control throughout the whole session. It is important to me that all the children listen and do as they are told. I have a great deal of knowledge and I know if the children listen and do as I ask; I will make them a better footballer". Seventeen coaches felt that a different locus best described their own practice: "I like to guide children towards developing their individual knowledge, skill and understanding. I like to ask questions and give responsibility for learning to small groups and individuals. It is important to me that pupils develop in a holistic way; it is much more than just teaching football skills". Three coaches said that both perspectives related to their own practice.

I feel I am a mixture of both, dependent of situation, age, skill /ability level of players (c9).

Both, some aspects of my coaching are in box A and some in box B. Children should have the opportunity to express themselves through whatever sport they're doing. I like to have little inputs on them, and pose questions for them to think about during practices, games. I believe decision making is a big part of what I do (c14).

As a coach I think every session has many approaches so sometimes it will be A and another time B (c16).

Coaches were also asked to consider a scenario on behaviour management:

You are coaching a class of mixed gender, mixed ability year 6 pupils within curriculum time (PPA). One of the pupils, Jack, is being disruptive, refusing to follow instructions and challenging your authority. After the lesson you seek advice from teachers at the school. Which of the two approaches would you favour? None of the coaches favoured the first approach: "Jack is an absolute pain in the neck. If he plays up again next week, send him running around the field. Then either tell him to wait outside the changing room door or make him collect the footballs. He'll soon learn". Twenty-one coaches favoured the alternative: "Jack can be quite a handful. It is important that he realises that his behaviour is not appropriate and that he understands why he cannot act in this way, so an explanation and a consequence from you is important. If possible give him a time out, say one minute, and then ask him to explain to you why his behaviour is not appropriate". It may take time but a consistent fair approach is important.

Evidence of the coaches' pedagogy was also demonstrated through the practical coaching. A number of points are presented. Common features of all coaching sessions included the following:

- All coaches asked pupils their names and used pupils' names throughout the session.
- Most of the coaches had set out a clear playing area before the session started.
- None of the coaches clearly identified the Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) of the session at the beginning. Some of the coaches gave a general introduction:
 - Going to go straight into a small activity where you are going to hopefully learn three key points. At the end of the session I want you to be able to tell me what those key points are but I am not going to tell you yet (c9). (At the end of the session the coach did ask again, but referred to four key points).
- All coaches took a part in the practice to whole game approach, i.e. skills practice leading to a game:
 - Pupil: Are we going to play matches?
 - Coach: Not today, today's all about learning (c9).

- All coaches demonstrated an authoritative tone and manner:
Stand still please and listen, so when you see or hear me speaking to you either put the ball under your arm or under your foot (c4).
For the rest of this session when the coach is talking the ball is in one of two places. It is either in two hands like this or under either one of your feet (c9).
You must stay inside the yellow square at all times (c2).
- All coaches demonstrated limited knowledge and skill in relation to class management. There were a significant number of pupils who would be deemed as being 'off task'. This was especially noticeable during sections where the coach was providing instructions:
Boys can you keep the ball still please ... (explanation of activity) 'can you keep the ball still please, shows that you are listening to me (c4).
In your square you will see there are 2 footballs. All I want you ... don't go and get anymore balls ... how come you've got three in that square now... I just put two balls in every square. OK don't kick the ball out you need that ball, you need that ball, you just kicked the ball out and you need it; you should have two balls in your square and you've just kicked both of them out! So go and get them (c9).
Guys wait there, wait there guys. This is what we are going to do. Guys wait there. Listen, listen, freeze, freeze. Right this is what we are going to do. Guys freeze, freeze where you are. OK for example pass it, dribble and pass it off there. Does everyone understand? And freeze, freeze there, freeze there, freeze where you are, freeze where you are (c6).

Where coaches gave instruction they gave very few teaching or coaching points. One coach talked about setting pupils challenges. He then linked this to a competition to see who could complete the challenge the quickest, stating the first pair to 20 points would be the winner. This was reinforced with, 'Come on girls you must do this as quickly as you can' (c4). The coach then continued to talk about accuracy and the importance of making accurate passes. This seems somewhat contradictory as generally an increase in the speed of executing a new skill usually means there is a breakdown in quality, in this case accuracy. The coach continued: 'for the ones of you that don't play football all the time just try your best, if you can get 10 done by the time someone who plays football all the time can do 20 that's your target' (c4). He continually asked the pupils how many points they had scored. At the end of the session, one of the pupils indicated that he had scored 55 points. This drew a chant of 'Cheat, cheat, cheat' from the rest of the pupils. We would suggest that this could be seen as having a negative consequence for whole class learning.

Another coach described what he had done in the session:

The reason it is quite a confidence booster of a session is because you can guarantee that at least one of your four groups ... when you say stand and you tell them ... all I am going to tell you is the first two balls throw them between you, then they will either, stand in a circle and pass the ball round or four of them will stand without moving and two of them will throw. You can guarantee within 60 seconds, someone will get the ball in the side of the head because they are not looking and then there it is your first key point (c9).

A common feature of interaction with pupils was through reinforcement, praise and asking questions. There seemed to be an overuse of strong adjectives such as *excellent* and *fantastic* when pupils were providing relatively simple answers. There is evidence from behaviourist

learning theory (Deci *et al.*, 1999, cited in Morgan, 2008) that reinforcing a child's behaviour that a child would have displayed anyway can undermine intrinsic motivation:

Good I like that excellent (c5).

Coach: When running with the ball where are we looking?

Pupil: In front of us.

Coach: Excellent you are an ace student (c5).

Coach: What do we need to use?

Pupil: Eyes.

Coach: Fantastic (c9).

Coach: What have we just been doing there?

Pupil: Dribbling

Coach: Brilliant, give him a clap (some pupils clap and cheer) (c2).

Some coaches used a commentating technique when communicating with pupils:

Well done, keep moving guys, don't stop moving, don't stop moving, don't stop moving, don't stop moving, don't stop moving, ball shouldn't be going out of the square, ball shouldn't be going out of the square, ball shouldn't be going out of the square (c9).

All coaches used open questions to gauge understanding, e.g.:

Does everyone understand? (c4)

Does everybody understand what we are doing? (c2)

Does everyone understand? (c6)

Some coaches' choice of pedagogy, language and organisation was exclusive and potentially harmful to pupils' self-esteem:

Whose got the quickest change of direction here? (c5)

The coach then asked the pupil to demonstrate:

Can we all count to three? I know some of you struggle, I know you struggle to count to three. (coach points to an individual pupil) (c9).

You will pass the ball in to Harry and then when he controls it you shut him down, shut him down. (c10).

It was evident from the video that the pupils did not understand the term 'shut him down'.

One coach used physical activity as a punishment (Slavin, 2003 cited in Morgan, 2008):

Everybody on the outside if you haven't got a ball, if I see you standing still you are going to be doing some star jumps (c2).

There were a number of pupils who started doing star jumps straightaway; this seemed to highlight that the coach's communication was not clear.

Coaches' choice of organisation created unrest and challenge amongst the pupils. One coach set up a girls versus boys challenge. This created a conflict between boys and girls. This seemed to have a negative impact on a number of pupils within the class.

Coaches demonstrated a mixed mastery of 'content knowledge'.

He got the ball under control ... if you haven't got [the ball] under control you can't start dribbling ... so make sure that you *stop* that ball and then you start dribbling (c9).

The coach clearly indicated that the ball should be stopped before the pupil should start dribbling, but this may not always be necessary/appropriate.

Coaches demonstrated a narrow understanding of a range of teaching/coaching methods. This consisted of command and a form of guided discovery (Q/A) in which most of the questions asked were lower order questions centring on knowledge, comprehension and application. This was also evidenced through the lesson plans that were written on the day.

Evidence from the video footage showed that all coaches used a narrow range of teaching/coaching methods. A direct consequence of using a narrow range of teaching/coaching methods in relation to the NCPE is that pupils cannot access the Selecting and Applying (S/A) or Evaluating and Improving (E/I) assessment strands.

Discussion

The origin of this research is the UK Government's 2003 Workforce Reform Act (DfES, 2003), which addresses workload and raises educational standards. An indirect consequence of this is that sport coaches and in this case specifically football coaches are, or will be working within the NCPE framework assuming a role that, in theory, has parity with that of a qualified teacher. At a given time both have direct responsibility for the education of the pupils in their care.

The results of this study show that football coaches do not have the knowledge, skills and understanding needed to meet the requirements to undertake specified work as an educator to teach PE in primary schools to cover teachers' PPA time. Specifically, results of this study show they have a limited knowledge of the NC in general (e.g. do not know the ages of pupils in key stages) or the NCPE in particular. Many do not plan their lessons, know little about pedagogy and do not reflect on their lessons. However, these coaches do have knowledge of a particular sport (in this case football) and there are some encouraging signs, in that these coaches recognise the need to know more about the NCPE, planning and pedagogy. They recognise appropriate pedagogy and show signs of reflection. Although it is difficult to generalise from a small sample, we suggest that coaches working in similar schemes at other premier league football clubs engaged to work in PPA time would have a very similar profile.

These results raise questions about why head teachers allow PE to be the subject which is covered in PPA time and why they allow coaches who do not have an appropriate background, experience, knowledge, skills and understanding to coach in these PE lessons. There are several possible reasons why PE is being covered by someone other than the class teacher to allow teachers to have PPA time. These include primary teachers' lack of knowledge and confidence to teach the NCPE, the prioritisation of academic subjects (particularly the core subjects of English, Mathematics and Science) where pupils' performance at the end of Key Stage 2 is an important factor in external judgements about the school, lack of understanding of the difference between PE and sport, and the availability of sports coaches (particularly football coaches). Together, these suggest that PE is given low value in primary schools, but also that the aims of PE and its role and value in the whole school curriculum for all children is not clearly understood. However further work is needed with head teachers and others in primary schools to look in more detail at the specific reasons why PE is one subject which is covered in this way.

If primary school PE is not prioritised and is going to be taught by sports coaches with limited appropriate background for teaching PE in the curriculum, this seems at odds with the importance attached to PE by government: for example, the ten outcome measure of high quality PE as described by the Physical Education School Sport Club links strategy (PESSCL) and more generally the obesity and health agendas.

It must be remembered that the UK Government's 2003 Workforce Remodelling Act (DfES, 2003) was aimed at supporting teachers and schools in raising educational standards. As the workforce reform is being implemented at present, priority would seem to be given to allowing

teachers time for PPA, regardless of whether the person covering the PPA time is able to undertake specific work to raise educational standards. If this is not the case, why are schools allowing coaches to work with children in their PE lessons with such a limited background in key educational areas and why would they employ such coaches to replace a teacher with at least four years' higher education? There are other staff who can undertake whole class responsibility, including HLTAs. Why are they not being employed instead of coaches?

However, schools are also faced with the practicalities of the situation. PPA time is here to stay and head teachers have to decide how to cover this time. Unless there is an increase in the hours spent by student primary teachers in their ITE courses specifically on PE, so that they have the knowledge, understanding and confidence to teach the subject and really understand its importance and role in pupils' learning, and want to teach this themselves, head teachers are likely to continue to employ sports coaches to work within their schools. Indeed, it was suggested by one of the coaches in an interview that the price of football coaches may be a factor. The obvious conclusion from this study is that unless there is an immediate intervention there is every possibility that we will have a coaching workforce that is not 'fit for purpose' with the potential that pupil attainment and enjoyment in PE will significantly decrease over time. If a powerful pedagogy in primary PE lessons and the wider community is not a priority for teachers and coaches then it is reasonable to conclude that lessons with limited variety and focused on sporting outcome rather than the process of becoming physically educated will be linked to lower levels of outcome attainment (Morgan & Bourke, 2008). Morgan and Bourke (2008) also report that the lower the attainment at primary level, the greater the chance of a negative experience at secondary level. It is beyond the scope of this article to discuss this in further detail but we would suggest that this could have a number of significant implications for the physical education, school sport and lifelong activity and participation levels of our nation's children.

Therefore, if the Remodelling Act of 2003 is to truly raise educational standards and if PE lessons are going to be delivered by 'specialist' coaches, it is clear that they should be able to demonstrate their competence against the definition of 'specified work'. It would be a poorly informed model to have a non-specialist in curriculum, planning and pedagogy attempting to inform someone whose ITE has covered these areas.

If the teaching community claims to have a genuine aspiration of delivering high quality primary school PE, it is vitally important that the PE community works with the sports coaching community to develop a clear understanding of the knowledge, skill and understanding that coaches will be required to develop in order to cover 'specified work' and undertake responsibility for the PE of primary pupils. Any coach working as part of a school's workforce should then be accountable against a set of professional standards or 'licence' (Coaching Children Working Group, 2007, 2) that clearly recognises that they have the knowledge, skill and understanding to plan and deliver 'pedagogically powerful' lessons.

Therefore it is important that these coaches are prepared to work effectively in curriculum time; that they receive an appropriate educational input based on evidence and deliver at using appropriate methods. This may require that there are additional courses and/or qualifications which coaches must take before being allowed to undertake this role. This is a view also presented by the Coaching Children Working Group (2007, 2), who recommend that 'careful and serious consideration be given to a provision that would ensure that all paid coaches working in schools are licensed within a specified period of time'. It continues to suggest that Governing Bodies will lead on the sport specific qualifications. The data which have informed this paper were collected on the first day of a CPD programme designed to increase coaches' knowledge of the NCPE, planning, pedagogy and reflection. This CPD programme is attempting to create synergy between these four areas in order to support coaches in their work as educators.

References

- Abraham A & Collins D 1998. Examining and extending research in coach development. *Quest*, **50**, 59-79.
- Attard K & Armour KM 2006. Reflecting on reflection: A case study of one teacher's early career agenda. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, **11**(3), 209-230.
- Bryman A 2004. *Social research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baalpe 2005. *Workforce reform: Essential safe practice in physical education and school sport*. Leeds", Coachwise Business Solutions.
- Capel S 2000. Physical education and sport. In S Capel & S Piotrowski (eds), *Issues in physical education*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Carney C & Armstrong N 1996. The provision of physical education in primary initial teacher training courses in England and Wales. *European Physical Education Review*, **2**(1), 64-74.
- Cassidy T, Jones R & Potrac P 2004. *Understanding sports coaching. The social, cultural and pedagogical foundations of coaching practice*. London: Routledge.
- Coaching Children Working Group 2007. Report of the Coaching Children Working Group, sport coach UK, Leeds.
- Cohen L, Manion L & Morrison K 2000. *Research methods in education, 5th Edition*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Cushion C 2007. Modelling the Complexity of the coaching process. *International Journal of Sport Science and Coaching*, **2**(4), 395-401.
- Cushion C & Armour K 2003. Coach education and continual professional development: Experience and learning to coach. *Quest*, **55**, 215-230.
- Dewey J 1933. *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process*. Chicago, IL: D.C. Heath.
- DfES 2003. Time for Standards: *Guidance accompanying the section 133 Regulations issued under the Education Act 2002*. Nottingham: DfES.
- Douge B & Hastie P 1993. Coach effectiveness. *Sport Science Review*, **2**(2), 14-29.
- Gilbert W 2002. An annotated bibliography and analysis of coaching science. Report California State University. Fresno: CSU.
- Gilbert W & Trudel P 1999a. An evaluation strategy for coach education programs. *Journal of Sports Behaviour*, **22**, 234-250.
- Gilbert W & Trudel P 2001. Learning to coach through experience: Reflection in model youth sports coaches. *Journal of Teaching Physical Education*, **21**, 16-34.
- Gilbert W & Trudel P 2006. The coach as a reflective practitioner. In RL Jones (ed.), *The sports coach as educator. Reconceptualising sports coaching*. London: Routledge.
- Jones R, Armour K & Potrac P 2004. *Sports coaching cultures: From practice to theory*. London: Routledge.
- Jones R (ed.) 2006. *The sports coach as educator. Re-conceptualising sports coaching*. London: Routledge.
- Jones R, Hughes M & Kingston K (eds) 2008. *An introduction to sport coaching from science and theory to practice*. London: Routledge.
- Kelso P 2008. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2008/feb/02/uk.olympics2012>. Accessed February 29, 2008.
- Leach J & Moon B 1999. *Learners and pedagogy*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Lyle J 2002. *Sport coaching concepts. A framework for coaches' behaviour*. London: Routledge.
- Morgan K 2008. Pedagogy for coaches. In R Jones, M Hughes & K Kingston (eds), *An introduction to sport coaching: From science and theory to practice*. London: Routledge.
- Morgan P & Bourke S 2008. Non-specialist teachers' confidence to teach PE: The nature and influence of personal school experience in PE. *Physical Education and Sports Pedagogy*, **13**(1), 1-29.
- Samela J 1995. Learning from the development of expert coaches. *Coaching and Sport Science Journal*, **2**(2), 3-13.
- Schon D 1983. *The reflective practitioner*. London: Ashgate.
- Shulman L 1999. Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. In J Leach & B Moon (eds), *Learners and pedagogy*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Stafford I 2005. *Coaching for long-term athletic development. To improve participation and performance in sport*. Leeds: Sport Coach UK.

- Sykes F 2007. PE training is a national scandal. *Future fitness, sport and fitness for today's youth*. Barnsley: Wharncliffe Publishing.
- Teachernet <http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/teachingandlearning/subjects/pe/nationalstrat>. Accessed 12 December 2007.
- Talbot M 2007. Quality. *Physical Education Matters Journal of the Association for Physical Education*, 2(2) 6-10.
- Talbot M 2008. AfPE campaign had brought widespread support. *Future fitness, sport and fitness for today's youth*. Barnsley: Wharncliffe Publishing.
- Trudel P & Gilbert W 2006. Coaching and coach education. In D Kirk, M O'Sullivan & D McDonald (eds), *Handbook of physical education*. London: Sage.
- Yarker P 2005. On not being a teacher: The professional and personal cost of workforce remodelling. *Forum: For promoting 3-19 comprehensive education*, 47, 169-174.

