

7 ‘*Masculinisation*’, ‘*sportification*’ and ‘*academicisation*’ in the men’s colleges

A case study of the Carnegie curriculum

David Kirk

Introduction

The dominant narrative flowing through much of the historical writing on physical education is that the men and women existed, as the 19th century ideology had it, in ‘separate spheres’ (Rosenburg 1982). In England, as Fletcher (1984) argued, women led the field from the late 19th century until the middle of the 20th century. When the men began to arrive on the scene in large numbers in the post WW2 period, in earnest from the late 1940s on, there began a ‘gender-war’ in physical education which the women, so the narrative tells us, eventually lost. But in fact professional training for men in physical education began much earlier than the 1950s and the input of men into the physical education profession starts even earlier than this date. Dunfermline College accepted male students from the 1910s, the Scottish School of Physical Education based in Glasgow opened its doors in 1932, while Carnegie Physical Training College in Leeds had its first intake of students in 1934, with Loughborough College close behind in 1936. Like those for the women, the colleges for men were initially strictly single-sex, seemingly confirming the separate spheres aspect of the narrative.

Fletcher (1984), Hargreaves (1994) and many of the chapters in this book provide insights into the ways in which the women’s colleges maintained their separate gendered identities, from their origins in the late 1880s and early 1900s. This chapter seeks to provide insights into if and how the men contributed to the separate spheres narrative by focusing on the curriculum developments at Carnegie College from its inception in 1934 up until the late 1960s. While many factors contributed to the construction of gendered identities in physical

education, the curricula of the early male colleges provide useful points of comparison into how the field of physical education itself was constructed and constituted by the men and the women.

By focusing on curriculum developments at Carnegie, I seek to show something of the particular contributions male physical educators in England made to shaping the field, in particular through the ‘masculinisation’, ‘sportification’ and ‘academicisation’ of physical education. The chapter begins with an overview of the early curriculum of Carnegie College during an era in which gymnastics and physical training were synonymous, and it focuses in particular on the curriculum for the 1937–8 academic year. The next section discusses the end of this dominant period for gymnastics and considers in some detail the curriculum two decades later in the 1954–55 year where games and sports played a more prominent part. We then consider the ‘sportification’ and ‘academicisation’ of the Carnegie curriculum. These processes were already well under way by the mid-1950s, and they suggest, on the face of it, two contradictory trends, one towards the playing of sports and games and the other towards increasing academic rigour. I explore how the tension between these apparently contradictory trends was managed through a discussion of the degree decades of the 1960s and the 1970s and the arrival of the Bachelor of Education degree. Although each of these key moments in the construction of the curriculum is dealt with chronologically in this chapter, it is important to note that the process of change is not as linear or as sequential as this structure would suggest. For example, as this chapter will seek to show, while the subject of gymnastics was displaced from the centre of the curriculum sometime during the late 1940s and mid-1950s, it retained a powerful residual influence on the culture of the College for many years beyond this period.

Sources of evidence

There are two principle sources of primary evidence on which this chapter is based; College archival records and interviews with former staff. The archival material at the time it was gathered and analysed was not indexed, and indeed had only been retained through the interest of one of the librarians of Leeds Beckett University at the Headingley campus Library. These records are listed at the end of the paper and include annual reports, handbooks and other written records relating to curriculum development. Interviews were carried out with a number of former staff of the College from the 1960s to the 1980s. The interviews were undertaken to support a number of studies within a larger project prompted by Carnegie's 75th anniversary in 2009.ⁱ A number of secondary sources have also been very useful for this chapter, particularly the short but well-researched book on Carnegie by former Principal of City of Leeds Training College Leo Connell (1983) and the paper by Ernest Major (1966), First Warden of the College.

The physical training-as-gymnastics era, the 1930s and 1940s

Writing in retrospect in the Carnegie Research papers series in 1966, Mr. Major observed that

During the period 1919–1939 the scope and conception of Physical Education in the schools were considerably broadened to include not only Physical Training in the narrow sense, but also games, swimming, dancing and athletics, and in many areas camping was also introduced. (Major 1966: 5)

Physical Training ‘in the narrow sense’ was a form of drilling and exercising that had dominated physical education for boys and girls in government elementary schools from the 1880s. This form of physical training persisted despite the publication in 1909 of a new *Syllabus of Physical Training* which made Swedish gymnastics the official curriculum in

government schools. While the first curriculum for Carnegie was constructed within the spirit of this expanding notion of physical education, it nevertheless remained rooted in gymnastics as the core subject matter. At the same time, as historian of both Carnegie and the City of Leeds Colleges Leo Connell (1983: 22) noted, this curriculum aimed to produce teachers of physical training who had been co-educated in mind, body and soul, who were not, as Sir George Newman put it, mere ‘acrobats’ nor, in the words of the President of the College Board of Education, ‘super-experts’, but who were instead rounded exponents of ‘cultural physical education’.

The importance of gymnastics in the early years of Carnegie’s existence, up to the commencement of the Second World War in 1939, is inescapable. We can see from the timetable for the summer term of 1934 that students participated in six practical sessions of gymnastics per week of just under one hour each, in addition to three sessions of the ‘Theory of Gymnastics’, two ‘Group Gymnastics’ sessions, and one session of ‘Voluntary Gymnastics’, compared with only two sessions of games, two of swimming and one of dancing. Additional lectures included Anatomy, Physiology and Hygiene, History and Philosophy of Physical Education, Teaching Practice, Speech Training, School remedial gymnastics and (for non-certificated teachers) the Theory and Practice of Education.

Perhaps the curriculum for the 1937–8 academic year clarifies the nature of the curriculum for Physical Training and of gymnastics in particular, since by this time Carnegie had begun to stabilise its student numbers, staffing and courses. The College offered two courses, a Supplementary Course for teachers holding a two year teachers’ certificate, and a postgraduate course for students who possessed a three year degree from a British university or equivalent. Both courses were of one year’s duration and differed only insofar as the postgraduates needed to complete additional work in education to gain their teaching certification.

Gymnastics retained its central place in the curriculum, and was explicitly described as being based on the Swedish system, though ‘modified and adapted to suit British conditions’ (College Handbook for 1937–8, p.9). This is a curious qualification which perhaps hints at a degree of ambivalence about the values of the Swedish system, a matter to which we will return shortly. Before doing so, there is one other matter worthy of note in the detail of the Course of Study, which is the appearance of the term ‘educational gymnastics’. On this point, use of educational gymnastics here did not signal a very early allegiance to the educational gymnastics inspired by the work of Rudolf Laban, which was to replace Swedish gymnastics in women’s physical education during the late 1940s and early 1950s and to form the basis of physical education in the primary schools following the official government approval given by the publication of *Moving and Growing* (Ministry of Education 1952) and *Planning the Programme* (Ministry of Education 1953). It was, rather, to emphasise the point that the gymnastic work in Carnegie was aimed at providing students with the expertise that would fit them to be excellent teachers rather than ‘acrobats’. In the immediate post-Second World War period, the term ‘school gymnastics’ was used instead of educational gymnastics to make this same point and avoid confusion with the radical new notion of educational gymnastics that transformed women’s physical education from the 1940s on but that did not impact the Carnegie curriculum until the early 1970s.

What the qualifier ‘modified and adapted to suit British conditions’ meant precisely can only be guessed at since there is little surviving evidence of the actual practice of gymnastics from this era. It is important to make an informed guess, though, since the Carnegie concept of gymnastics from these early years was an important influence on later developments of the curriculum. The Swedish system of free-standing exercises with some apparatus work was developed by Ling in Sweden (as Suzanne Lundval discusses in her chapter) and following this in the women’s colleges of physical training in Britain as a

therapeutic form of training, aimed as much at correcting defects in posture and bodily functions as enhancing physical capability. This concept of gymnastics and therefore of physical training was reinforced by the adoption of the Swedish system as the official curriculum of physical training by the Board of Education in 1909 and the location of the Inspectorate of Physical Training within its School Medical Department. An informed guess might be that the modifications and adaptations to Swedish gymnastics included elements of Archibald Maclaren's appropriations of the German form of gymnastics (*Turnen*) dating from the mid-1800s. Maclaren in Oxford had done much to popularise *Turnen*, a development that was later, in the twentieth century, to form the basis of gymnastics as a competitive Olympic sport (Smith 1974: 80). While World War One caused a serious set-back in the acceptance and popularization of this form of gymnastics, in part due to distaste for its German origins, it nevertheless remained ever-present in boys' grammar schools between the wars (Major 1966: 2). The photograph of one of the gymnasia from the 1937–8 Carnegie Handbook provides some evidence of the nature of the gymnastics work in this era. In addition to wall-bars for strengthening and stretching exercises and ropes and benches for climbing and balancing which were common-place in Swedish gymnastics, there are bars for swinging, pommels and two vaulting horses. This is not to suggest that gymnastics was viewed as a competitive sport activity at this stage, but it may be that elements of *Turnen* were being practiced alongside Swedish gymnastics as a core part of the Carnegie curriculum.

While it was certainly the case that the College was closed for the duration of the Second World War, with many of its staff and former students seeing active military service, it would be a mistake to assume that this closure was a set-back for curriculum development. On the contrary, the need in war-time to train conscripts to a level of fitness and skill for combat generated two developments which were to have a lasting impact on physical education for boys and men. The first was the development of obstacle courses which had

before the war been only a minor aspect of military training. According to historian of physical education Peter McIntosh (1968: 256), himself a Carnegie alumnus, obstacle training assumed increasing importance when it was realised by 1940 that modern warfare required soldiers to be able to take and overcome physical risks. The direct transfer of this thinking from military to civilian worlds was quick and by the end of the war schools were already adapting and developing apparatus in the gym and playground over, under and between which children were encouraged to leap, scramble and swing.

The second development was in the area of strength and conditioning training, building on techniques used in resistance training and the application of the concept of progressive overload (Kirk 1992: 137). Squadron-Leader Walter Winterbottom, a former member of Carnegie staff and future England football coach, was just one of several physical educators in uniform who made a contribution to the professional literature at this time in a *Journal of Physical Education* (1945) article titled ‘Physical training in the Royal Air Force’. This development in particular was to inform the ground-breaking work at the University of Leeds of RE Morgan (a former member of staff at Carnegie) and GT Adamson (another Carnegie alumnus) on circuit-training in the 1950s, which had a profound impact on men’s physical education and in particular on preparation for competitive sport (Morgan and Adamson 1961).

End of the gymnastics era and a broadening concept of physical education

Once Carnegie re-opened after the war, there is evidence to suggest that the core activity of gymnastics was in the process of undergoing further innovation and transformation. Certainly, the spectacle of the drilling of young people under the Nazi regime before and during the war did much to discredit mass exercising of this kind in the eyes of the British physical education community (McIntosh 1968). Physical education students from Carnegie

and Loughborough Colleges performed at the 1949 Lingiad held in Stockholm, the stronghold of Swedish gymnastics. The *Journal of Physical Education* reported that their performances ‘splendidly contrasted in type and presentation’ with the activities of the host nation, and left the Scandinavians ‘not knowing what next to expect from the British’. The report went on to say that

The Carnegie programme opened with quickening and strengthening activities all conducted competitively. It then gave four series of games skill practices and competitions. The games taken were cricket, basket-ball, soccer and rugger. Each series showed the separate skills of the game being practiced and then applied the skills in a competitive phase. Twenty-five activities were packed into fifteen minutes and the work was a good test of stamina as well as a fine demonstration of speed and skill. Cricket greatly intrigued the audience and Rugby Touch brought them to their feet.

(Reported in the *Journal of Physical Education*, 1949, p.123)

This report suggests that a movement towards what David Munrow (another Carnegie alumnus and former member of staff) would later describe as *Pure and Applied Gymnastics* in his 1955 book was already well underway in the Carnegie curriculum. Although the terms pure and applied gymnastics may not in themselves have been used in Carnegie, the demonstration reported by the *Journal of Physical Education* described Munrow’s concept of ‘applied gymnastics’ perfectly. Male physical educators had, according to Munrow (1955: 276), ‘made overt acknowledgement that other skills are as important and have ‘diluted’ the gymnastic skill content of gymnasium work so that now boys may be seen practising basket-ball shots and manoeuvres, carrying out heading practices or practising sprint starting’.

What Munrow described was a form of physical education that was soon to become the bedrock of the multi-activity physical education curriculum in schools for the next 60 years. It was described as ‘skill-drills’, where practising the basic techniques of sports such as football, rugby, cricket and hockey formed the core business of physical education lessons, often at the expense of actually playing games and sports, while relegating formal gymnastics to the margins. The inclusion of sport skills and techniques legitimated the inclusion of sport in the curriculum more generally, a move that clearly had as its reference point in the celebrated Public School games ethic and its associated values of character training, perseverance, deferred gratification and team spirit (Mangan 1981). It was this implicit association with the games ethic that provided sport with its educational attributes and the rationale for the shift from physical training to physical education.

Writing specifically about the Carnegie curriculum before the Second World War, McIntosh confirms Major’s claim that a broader concept of physical education was in operation in contrast to physical training in the ‘narrow sense’. At the same time,

A daily period of personal gymnastics and a daily lecture upon the theory of gymnastics together with afternoons spent on anatomy and physiology and teaching practice (of gymnastics) necessarily made the study and practice of the many other skills and techniques of physical education somewhat superficial. (McIntosh 1968: 236)

We should recall that while he is writing as a historian McIntosh is also drawing on personal experience of the curriculum to make this observation. It is a matter of some interest then, in light of the evidence we have of gymnastics ‘modified and adapted to suit British conditions’ and of the addition of ‘applied gymnastics’ in the form of skills and drills for competitive

sports and games, to consider the Carnegie curriculum at the time of a full inspection of the College in 1955.

The 1955 ‘Syllabus’ (Carnegie College 1955) is presented in considerable detail, but we need to search the document to find gymnastics. In an entry under a major header of ‘Physical Education Method’ (p.17), which also includes sections on Athletics for Schools, Games and Games Training for Schools: Recreational Activities, National Dancing, and Swimming, we are referred to an earlier section of the Syllabus titled ‘Theory of Physical Education and Teaching Technique’. In this section, gymnastics is discussed in terms of its suitability for primary and secondary schools, involving for the former ‘a wide variety of small apparatus and large climbing apparatus’ and for the latter ‘the use of portable and fixed apparatus’. For primary schools, there is a study of ‘*Moving and Growing*’ and ‘*Planning the Programme*’, inspired by the influence of Rudolf Laban and educational gymnastics as replacements for the 1933 *Syllabus of Physical Training for Schools* (HMSO 1933). Nowhere is there mention of Swedish gymnastics, which we can only assume (with some support from McIntosh 1968: 262–263) was in the process of being squeezed out of a rapidly expanding curriculum. Nevertheless, ‘school gymnastics’ retained 112 hours in the 1955 Carnegie timetable in contrast to 84 hours of training in major and minor games, 56 hours each of athletics, swimming and camp-craft, and 42 hours of national dancing, supplemented by a substantial portion of time devoted to teaching practice and a growing list of theoretical subjects (Carnegie College 1955, pp. 19–20).

The residual influence of gymnastics and the masculinisation of physical education

It may seem curious that Carnegie gave up gymnastics as the centrepiece of the curriculum without any evident outcry. We have already suggested that there may in any case have been some ambivalence towards Swedish gymnastics evident in the qualification that the system

had been modified to ‘suit British conditions’. Moreover, while the 1955 Carnegie Syllabus provides strong evidence to suggest that the era in which gymnastics and physical training were regarded as synonymous had or was about to come to an end, it would be a mistake to believe that the values underpinning the curriculum could change overnight, in particular discipline and physical prowess required to master such an overtly embodied activity as gymnastics, and the particular form of masculinity such practices constructed and constituted. For one thing, the selection of students to the College remained biased towards a type of masculine physique that was required to excel in gymnastics, particularly gymnastics involving apparatus, with strong upper body, low body fat, and a good strength/ weight ratio. As Bernard White, member of staff from 1959–92 recalled, even by the late 1960s when he led a Carnegie Rugby Union tour, ‘You didn’t get many students who were of the size to play second row at Carnegie, they were mostly small chaps, gymnastic types’ (Interview, B. White, 2008). Photographs of students at work during the 1930s to the 1960s confirm this relative uniformity of physique and reflect the continuing influence of the philosophy that Carnegie students were not trained as we noted earlier in the words of Sir George Newman to be mere ‘acrobats’, but rounded exponents of ‘cultural physical education’. This notion of the well-rounded individual in contrast to the super-athlete occurs time and again in the historical evidence (see, for example, Hugh Brown’s comments in Kirk 1992: 67), although Whitehead and Hendry (1976) saw this ‘ambivalence’ about physical prowess of male student teachers across the sector as somewhat puzzling given the apparent emphasis on performative ability evidenced in practices ranging from physical tests during recruitment interviews to fiercely fought inter-college sports contests.

Other values also lingered from the gymnastics era, in particular strength of conviction and belief in the value of physical education, the importance of high standards of physical performance, and an immense pride in Carnegie as an institution. Reflecting on the residual

influence of this aspect of Carnegie culture during the 1970s and early 1980s, George McKinney, staff member from 1974–2004 and former Head of the School of Sport & Leisure Studies at Leeds Polytechnic, remarked that in his experience

New ideas tended to be viewed with distrust at Carnegie. They seemed to represent yet another way in which the existing standards were being eroded. As such, any new idea was the subject of staff-room banter and some quite serious antagonism.... It was not easy to change some staff perceptions, values and (...) the power relationships that existed were hard to confront with any academic arguments. But this was the same for the Middle School staff, you know, I mean the staff who were primarily involved with the training of Middle School teachers. The staff-room ‘banter’ labelled the students and the course as ‘Bean baggers’. I guess this is quite a good example of a change that was designed to cater for the changing needs in the profession, but, because the students and their curriculum was not what it had been for the early Carnegie students, it was seen to be a dilution of that standard and something that needed to be located firmly at a lower status. (Interview, G. McKinney, 2008)

Bev Pickering, a staff member from 1973, recalled that these attitudes towards the Middle School course were due to the influx of new ideas, some of which came directly from the women’s colleges.

In those early days the male students in the Middle School Course were a little bit upset (...) they did call us the Bean Baggers which was very untrue and very unfair but it was because the Educational Dance and Gymnastics concept and the Games-Making aspect

of it which was much freer than the Secondary students we were used to. (Interview, B. Pickering, 2008)

Whether it was the source of these new ideas or simply an inherent conservatism, Carnegie was little different from the other male and female physical education institutions up until the 1970s in this resistance to innovation (Kirk 1992; Fletcher 1984). Strength of character, passion and conviction were the mark of a profession whose members saw themselves as pioneers on the margins of educational institutions that always seemed keen, at least from the physical educators' point of view, to belittle their subject's educational value (for example Morgan 1973; Munrow 1972).

There can be no question that these characteristics were further strengthened for Carnegie staff and students following their war service. Peter Morris, staff member from 1968 for 30 years, recalled

When the men came in after the war they were accustomed to discipline and had a regard for high standards. They worked hard with a clear focus on simple objectives. There was a sense of achievement through co-operation, a common purpose and identity, and a pride in membership of what was seen as a special group. They may have been 'elitist' but through their own making. The staffs at that time were ex-high ranking officers with war and combat experience. (Interview, P. Morris, 2008)

In this context, matters such as dress, for example, were of immense importance.

When the students arrived they were given an extensive list of clothing. Walking-out dress was the blazer or best 'teddy bear' (sic) suit with brown shoes to match. There

was a correct outfit for every occasion. This was strictly adhered to and the kit immaculately kept. You would be dismissed from a group session if any item was below standard. (Interview, P. Morris, 2008)

Bernard White, who joined the staff in 1959, provides an anecdote that illustrates the culture that was pervasive during and that lingered beyond the post-Second World War period.

There were some quite strong characters amongst the staff, and of course in the early years talking about John Dodd and Douglas Scott and Mr. Bouffler — they were all ex-army people. They had all done military service during the war. Scotty was a Major at some fantastically young age and won himself an MC, he had a distinguished military career, and so these were people that I think were all looked up to by the students, and you didn't put a foot wrong. I actually remember in my early years I was going out to take a rugby session. It was morning break and I'd got my rugby shorts on and I'd got a rugby shirt on and over that I'd got a cricket sweater. I thought it's terribly Public School and I thought I was being terribly proper. I went in to get a coffee and Scotty came and stood by me and said 'You want to get your bloody self properly dressed' And I thought I had done the right thing and his comments were a bit harsh but you learn. (Interview, B. White, 2008)

Harsh they may have been, but not unexpected by those who were familiar with the culture of physical education colleges up to the 1970s (Kirk 2010a). In the case of Carnegie, this culture was palpably masculine, but it may have been no less intense and self-assured as other colleges for men and for women (see Kirk 1992; Fletcher 1984). Its strong residual influence was to be felt in all dealings Carnegie had with its close neighbour, the City of Leeds

Training College, and the world at large for many years after the demise of the gymnastics era.

The ‘sportification’ of physical education and the beginnings of ‘academicisation’: the 1950s and 1960s

As gymnastics was launched on a trajectory from the core to the margins of the curriculum between the 1940s to the 1970s, two further significant processes were already in motion. The first was the ‘sportification’ of physical education, and along with it the continuing emphasis on high standards of physical performance. Photos from a Carnegie Handbook of the late 1950s give sport a prominent place, with fencing, water-polo (rather than mere swimming), athletics, rugby, and boxing all represented. Clive Bond, Head of the Carnegie School of Physical Education between 1977–87 reflected on his own training at Loughborough between 1952–55 and remarked

The PE courses were primarily practically based and you could argue that we were very well prepared on the practical elements of the traditional PE curriculum with only a modest input of underpinning theory (Interview, C. Bond, 2008).

Highlighting the growing engagement of physical educators with sport and the blurring of lines of demarcation between teaching and coaching that was to mark Carnegie’s approach from the 1950s, he continued

Another aspect which was very significant, lots of the PE people who were working in the colleges were involved quite independently with National Governing Bodies of Sport (NGBs); quite separately from their employment with a PE institution. For

example I was involved with the FA as a Staff Coach and every holiday would work on the FA courses; this kept me right up-to-date with the latest ideas and practices in Association Football, developing knowledge and skills that were brought back into my regular job. Similarly I was involved with the Cricket Association as a Staff Coach...It is my view that working with National Governing Bodies was very important because it kept you up to date in the major activity areas. Historically for Carnegie the coaching element was important.... The reputation of Carnegie was founded on the production of teachers and graduates who had skills and commitment to physical activity. The staffs who were most respected were those who best illustrated the importance of that personal commitment to physical activity. Whilst it was not always possible I would have wished all members of staff to be involved in some teaching of a practical physical activity to students. I tried to set an example by teaching practical sessions for around 5–10 hours per week right up to my retirement (Interview, C. Bond, 2008).

In parallel with the ‘sportification’ of the Carnegie curriculum and, over time, in growing tension with it, was the ‘academicisation’ of the field. In 1947, the College changed its name from the Carnegie Physical Training College to the Carnegie College of Physical Education. Connell (1983: 37) noted that the use of the term physical education was intended to reflect the widening of the curriculum and to put some distance between its configuration after the Second World War and the older, pre-war drilling and exercising form of the subject. Use of the term physical education in place of physical training also hinted not only at the widening of the field but also at the growing importance of its academic standing.

Whilst students who had completed the postgraduate course could if they wished apply for further postgraduate study to Masters and Doctoral levels, students who had undertaken the Supplementary Course were unable to progress their academic qualifications.

This situation became particularly problematic as the specialist physical education wings of a number of teacher training colleges began to emerge after the war and they sought to employ lecturers who had advanced levels of qualification beyond their teaching certificates and college diplomas. Carnegie provided the response to this need in the form of the Advanced Diploma in Physical Education (ADPE) which began with an intake of 5 students in 1956–7 and continued to attract up to 30 students per year until the mid 1970s (Connell 1983: 34, 87).

Bernard White commented on the course that

While Mr. Bouffler was still Principal he had organised in conjunction with Leeds University Physical Education Department, an Advanced Diploma in Physical Education which at that time was the highest qualification Physical Education teachers could get. A lot of people were recruited for the course. A lot of serving teachers came back, a lot of people who were in the administration of Physical Education, in lecturing posts at colleges and universities came back to do this particular course. It was a full-time, one year course and the students were required to complete a dissertation and I think that was influential in moving towards a more academic basis for the studies at Carnegie. Each of the members of staff at Carnegie was granted a year's leave to do that course so it went down in order of seniority you know, John Dodd, Douglas Scott, Jonnie Armstrong and so on, eventually I got my turn and did it. It was a very good course and very stimulating so I think that was another influence to make the theory part of the Carnegie course more academic (Interview, B. White, 2008).

Clive Bond also completed the ADPE.

I enlisted on the Carnegie/Leeds University Advanced Diploma (ADPE) programme. Now that was a very important course that contributed significantly to the development of Carnegie as a higher education institution ... The ADPE course run conjointly by Carnegie and Leeds University PE Department was the only advanced course available in the UK that prepared people to operate in higher education and teach the more academic elements of the newly developing BEd that gave teachers graduate status..... The new BEd courses rightly required validated academic content to give the BEd parity with other degrees. The majority of lecturers in Physical Education did not have degrees; in order to get approval to conduct and teach on a BEd (with PE) staff required further professional development (Interview, C. Bond, 2008).

The curriculum of the ADPE reflected the academic content of the one year courses, but in considerably greater depth, and included the philosophy and history of physical education, child growth and development, tests and measurements, the physiology of sport and exercise, and a topic of special interest to the student that was researched and presented in a dissertation (Connell 1983: 34). Clive Bond was just one of many physical educators who used the ADPE to subsequently gain access to Masters and Doctoral courses.

Homo Academicus: the degree decades, the 1960s and 1970s

The 1950s was the decade in which male physical educators in England, in parallel with their American counterparts (for example, Henry 1964), began a long quest to raise the academic standing of the subject in higher education. In this regard, Carnegie's role in leading with the development of the ADPE was significant. Elsewhere in the field, both in the UK and abroad, the developments of 'sportification' and 'academicisation' were ultimately to become rivals (Kirk 1992; Macdonald *et al.* 1997) though Carnegie worked hard to retain the best aspects of

both curriculum initiatives. It was during the 1960s and 1970s that the tension between these initiatives was played out.

The fate of the Carnegie curriculum from the late 1950s until the late 1970s was swept up in a series of government interventions in teacher education as the numbers of school pupils surged and then contracted due to the ‘baby boom’ of the post-Second World War period and subsequent recession. Carnegie’s desire to remain independent and to retain control over the curriculum and numbers of students admitted each year was, over a period of time, taken out of its hands, a process paralleled in the women’s colleges, much to the frustration of members of staff who held strong views on the best ways to prepare teachers of physical education. One of the first decisive moves in the process of reform of teacher education nationally was the development of the three year course. After much politicking, Carnegie’s response was to offer a joint course in partnership with its neighbour the City of Leeds Training College, and the first cohort of students was admitted in 1960 (Connell 1983: Chapters 8–11).

The significance of this development was that the course followed the same format for all subject areas in the secondary school, and physical education was offered as a ‘major’ alongside other secondary school curriculum topics. The curriculum for the major in physical education followed the pattern established from the mid-1950s, grounded in practical sports and games and including swimming, athletics, gymnastics and outdoor activities, all taught with the aim of producing teachers of physical education. Increasingly, as the research base grew and more College lecturers gained higher level qualifications, the academic aspects of the curriculum, in particular physiology and biomechanics, acquisition of skill and the sociology of physical education along with the study of various education topics, vied for time-table space. While the three year course and the various one year courses remained firmly grounded in practical physical activity and focused on producing teachers, the ever-

expanding curriculum was placing more and more pressure on the timetable, a matter that eventually had to come to a head.

The Robbins Report of 1963 added momentum to the process of transforming teaching into a graduate profession with its recommendation that Colleges of Education collaborate with University Institutes of Education to offer Bachelor of Education (Honours) degrees. Entry to the BEd (Hons.) was available only to students who had successfully completed the 3 year course or equivalent and who had achieved university matriculation. The first BEd (Hons.) degrees were awarded by Leeds University in 1968. Five Carnegie students were successful, gaining upper and lower second class awards. The BEd (Hons.) curriculum consisted entirely of academic study. In addition to a paper on current ideas and issues, students took papers on the physiological and mechanical study of movement, the sociology of physical education and the acquisition of skill. The numbers of Carnegie students undertaking the BEd (Hons.) grew steadily each year to reach 31 by 1975 (Connell 1983: 87).

In 1968, and again following much manoeuvring and negotiation between the neighbours, Carnegie formally amalgamated with the City of Leeds Training College and the School of Physical Education was formed as part of the City of Leeds and Carnegie College of Education (Connell 1983). Between 1968 and 1975, Carnegie contributed to six courses that produced physical education teachers, the three year joint certificate in partnership with the School of Education of the College, the BEd (Hons.) and the ADPE in partnership with Leeds University, two one year Supplementary courses (one for overseas students), and the one year postgraduate course. By the mid-1970s, for better or worse, the ‘academicisation’ of physical education as a field was well and truly underway and might be considered, as I will argue in conclusion, the primary contribution of the men.

Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter has been to provide some insights into curriculum developments in one centrally important college of physical training for men from its inception in the 1930s through the 1970s. I have argued in this case study of Carnegie that the men's contribution to the maintenance of the separate spheres ideology was the 'masculinisation', 'sportification' and 'academicisation' of the field. With respect to the first of these characteristics, it is perhaps significant that the intake to Carnegie included men who had already completed a university degree or a two year teachers' certificate. This meant that they were likely to be both physically and emotionally mature and to already have experienced some success in the activities that made up physical education. We might add to this the arrival of the Second World War so soon after the establishment of the College, and the fact that many male physical educators experienced active service. This experience of military service could only have magnified the already hyper-masculinised culture of Carnegie. We noted that Dano-Swedish gymnastics began as the staple of the College curriculum in the 1930s but was soon displaced by a broadening concept of physical education that placed sports and games at its centre. Again, we might imagine that in this era of the 1930s through to the 1970s when university education was for a small minority of the British population, many of the men who had university degrees had also experienced private schooling, where the games ethic remained of central importance (Munrow 1958). The 'academicisation' of the field, which began as we saw in Carnegie in the 1950s with the Advanced Diploma over a decade before the arrival of degrees, was again likely to have been of considerable importance to men in an era where they were considered to be the main breadwinners in families and thus where career advancement was a necessity.

While we can note the special contribution colleges like Carnegie made to maintaining the separate sphere narrative, we might also note at the same time those aspects

of physical education culture the men and women shared. They shared a view of themselves as pioneers of a marginalised but fundamentally important subject, and expressed this identity with passion and commitment that could be for the uninitiated somewhat unnerving. They also shared in their contribution to the gendering of the field and to its ‘sportification’, though after their own fashion. And innovations such as educational gymnastics were taken seriously by the men at Carnegie even if they did not place Laban so centrally in the field as the women. To a large degree they shared the same or similar social class culture and when comprehensive schooling became a reality by the end of the 1950s they also responded with the same commitment to teach physical education to children and youth from the working classes (Kirk 1992).

Perhaps we might argue that ‘academicisation’ was the single most important difference between the men and the women and was to prove to be the force that had, by the 1970s, completely reconfigured the field and in the process contributed to the demise of the single sex colleges. Whether this process was championed by the men and resisted by the women, as the conventional narrative has it, requires further investigation, since as we see in Margaret Whitehead’s chapter, the women too became involved in constructing their own degrees by the late 1960s. At the same time, concern about status, both in schools and in higher education, seems to have been primarily held by the men and the ‘academicisation’ of the field was their main response. While ‘academicisation’ has undoubtedly brought benefits to physical education, one unintended consequence of this curriculum development, and without question a considerable irony, is that this process has over time undermined the place of physical activity within teacher education courses (Siedentop 2002; Lee 2014) and school physical education (Kirk 2010b). We might ponder whether we may have been left with this somewhat double-edged legacy if women had continued to lead the field.

ⁱ All interviews were undertaken by Anne Flintoff, Hayley Fitzgerald and Julie Harpin throughout 2008 in person in Leeds or by telephone. Toni O'Donovan assisted with some of the retrieval and analysis of archival material from Leeds Beckett University Archive.

Bibliography

- Carnegie College Handbook for 1937–8*, Leeds Beckett University Library Archive.
- Carnegie College Handbook for 1955*, Leeds Beckett University Library Archive.
- Connell, L. (1983) *Carnegie: a History of Carnegie College and School of Physical Education 1933–1976*, Leeds: Leeds University Printing Service.
- Hargreaves, J. (1994) *Sporting Females: Critical Issues in the History and Sociology of Women's Sport*. London: Routledge.
- Henry, F.M. (1964) 'Physical education: an academic discipline', in *Proceedings of the Sixty Seventh Annual Meeting of the National College Physical Education Association for Men*, 14–17, Washington: American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation.
- HMSO (1933) *Syllabus of Physical Training for Schools*, London: Author.
- Fletcher, S. (1984) *Women First: The Female Tradition in English Physical Education 1880–1980*, London: Athlone.
- Kirk, D. (1992) *Defining Physical Education: The Social Construction of a School Subject in Postwar Britain*, London: Falmer.
- Kirk, D. (2010a) 'The "masculinity vortex" of school physical education: Beyond the myth of hyper-masculinity', in M. Keleher and M. Atkinson (eds.) *Boys and Bodies*, 51–72, New York: Peter Lang.
- Kirk, D. (2010b) *Physical Education Futures*, London: Routledge.

-
- Kirk, D., Macdonald, D. and Tinning, R. (1997) 'The social construction of pedagogic discourse in Physical Education Teacher Education in Australia', *The Curriculum Journal*, 8(2): 269–96.
- Lee, C. (2014) 'The knowledge base for physical education teacher education: a comparative study of university programmes in England and Korea', unpublished PhD thesis, Bedfordshire: University of Bedfordshire.
- Mangan, J.A. (1981) *Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public School: The Emergence and Consolidation of an Educational Ideology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Major, E. (1966) 'The development of physical education in England during the present century with special reference to gymnastics', *Carnegie Old Students Association Conference Papers*, 1: 1–9.
- McIntosh, P.C. (1968) *PE in England Since 1800*, 2nd edn, London: Bell.
- Ministry of Education (1952) *Moving and Growing*, London: HMSO.
- Ministry of Education (1953) *Planning the Programme*, London: HMSO.
- Morgan, R.E. (1973) *Concerns and Values in Physical Education*, London: Bell.
- Morgan, R.E. and Adamson, G.T. (1961) *Circuit Training*, second edition, London: Bell.
- Munrow, A.D. (1972) *Physical Education: A Discussion of Principles*. London: Arnold.
- Munrow, A.D. (1955) *Pure and Applied Gymnastics*, London: Bell.
- Munrow, A.D. (1958) Physical education in the Universities, Proceedings of the Second British Empire and Commonwealth Games Conference, Barry, Glamorgan, p.3
- Rosenburg, R. (1982) *Beyond Separate Spheres: Intellectual Roots of Modern Feminism*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Siedentop, D. (2002) 'Content knowledge for physical education', *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 21: 368–377.

Smith, W.D. (1974) *Stretching their Bodies: The History of Physical Education*, London:
Newton Abbott.

Whitehead, N. and Hendry, L.B. (1976) *Teaching Physical Education in England*, London:
Lepus. Winterbottom, W. (1945) Physical training in the Royal Air Force, *Journal of
Physical Education*, 37, 9-11.