

Physical Education in Gauteng schools, South Africa: A case study

ANNELIESE E. GOSLIN

*Department Sport and Leisure Studies, University of Pretoria, Lynnwood Road
Brooklyn, Pretoria 0002, South Africa. Email: Anneliese.goslin@up.ac.za*

(Submitted: 20 June 2019; Revision accepted: 18 August 2020)

ORCID no.: 0000-0002-2312-7931

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37597/ajphes.2020.s.6>

Abstract

The global survival and revitalization of physical education (PE) in schools have been the priority of experts and lobbyists for decades. On the African continent, especially, efforts to reawaken PE escalated in the recent past. A qualitative, exploratory study with comparative case study analysis was used in a purposive sample. Gauteng public schools were used as units of analysis across geographic area (rural, township, urban) and socio-economic categorisation (Quintiles 1 to 5). The study was based on the research methodology described in the national analysis of the state and status of Physical Education in South African public schools (Burnett, 2018) replicated in all nine provinces of the country. Results were analysed according to the policy framework and curriculum documents used, positioning of PE in schools, methods of delivery, resources and perceptions of teachers, learners and parents. A significant conclusion which emerged from this study is the stark contrast in the status and perceptions of PE between primary and secondary schools. An alarming finding is the sportification and conceptual confusion of PE. It is recommended that the Department of Basic Education (DBE) revises the PE curriculum in the CAPS policy document, especially in secondary schools and in schools for learners with special needs. Generalist teachers should also be orientated to the unique aspects of teaching PE. Assessment practices must be monitored and evaluated.

Keywords: Gauteng, learners, perceptions, schools, Physical Education.

How to cite this article:

Goslin, A.E. (2020). Physical Education in Gauteng schools, South Africa: A case study. *African Journal for Physical Activity and Health Sciences*, Supplement (December), 82-96. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37597/ajphes.2020.s.6>

Introduction

The global survival and revitalisation of Physical Education (PE) in schools have been the priority of experts and lobbyists for decades. On the African continent, especially, efforts to reawaken PE have escalated in recent past. The African Union (AU) Agenda 2063 adopted in 2015, advocates the vision and action plan to make Africa a peaceful and prosperous continent under the theme *The Africa We Want* (African Union, 2015). Several AU Treaties directly and indirectly refer to the contribution of PE and health to the life of the African child. Article XI on Education in The African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child (African Union, 2019b), refers to the promotion and development of the child's personality,

talents, mental and physical abilities as well as understanding of primary health care through free and compulsory basic education. Similarly, Article XII of the Charter acknowledges the right of the child to engage in play and age-appropriate recreation activities. Articles 22(1) and 24(1) of the African Youth Charter (African Union, 2019c) also address the right to access and opportunity in PE.

Synergy between treaties, charters, policies and agendas strengthens advocacy. The Continental Agenda 2063 of the AU, therefore, aligns its vision, aspirations and action plans with the Kazan Action Plan (KAP) (UNESCO, 2017) and the UNESCO Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (UNESCO, 2015). The AU acknowledges the substantial contribution of the KAP to the realisation of the AU Agenda 2063, and aligns the specific Policy Areas of the KAP aimed at fostering Quality Physical Education (QPE) and active schools as well as providing quality education and promoting lifelong learning for all; with Aspiration 6 (People driven Africa, relying on the potential of African people, especially its women and youth) of the AU Agenda 2063 (African Union, 2019a; 2019b; 2019c).

Regional advocacy for PE in Africa maintained momentum through the Cotonou Declaration (African Union, 2018) of the Francophone AU Member States and Governments. The Cotonou Declaration signifies confidence that PE is the most effective way to provide all young people with the skills, attitudes, values, knowledge and ideas necessary for a lifelong participation in social life. The Cotonou Declaration committed to revive the teaching of QPE and the practice of sport at the political, management and professional levels in African countries.

In 2019, the first regional conference of African Ministers on the implementation in Africa of the KAP occurred in Antananarivo, Madagascar. The main objective of the Antananarivo conference was to further specify and endorse recommendations related to QPE, in particular, and other areas of the KAP identified as priorities in the Africa region, as well as to initiate a mobilisation of partnerships within and beyond governments to prioritise PE and Sport (African Union, 2019a, 2019d). The Antananarivo Recommendations emerged from the conference, which recognise the opportunity to foster policy coherence in the context of Agenda 2063 with the theme *The Africa We Want*, the Sustainable Development Goals, the Sport Policy Framework for Sustainable Development of Sport in Africa, and the Kazan Action Plan. It further recognises the critical role of QPE for crosscutting development priorities and the need to enhance cooperation between ministers in charge of sport and education. Recommendations on national, regional, continental and international levels urge AU member states to prioritise the status of PE to contribute to Agenda 2063 (African Union, 2019d). The AU's continental emphasis on PE links with UNESCO's call to investigate PE from policy to practice, and aligns with similar global research endeavours.

Problem statement and aim

Physical Education worldwide (Hardman, 2009; Hardman, Murphy, Routen & Tones, 2104) is in crisis, and the situation in South Africa (Silva *et al.*, 2018; Stroebel, Hay & Bloemhoff, 2016) is no exception. The 2018 Healthy Active Kids South Africa (HAKSA) Report (Sports Science Institute of South Africa, 2018) assigns a grade of D- (21% - 40% compliance) to PE in schools. The report states that in terms of PE in the curriculum, the policy-implementation gap appears to be widening compared to the 2016 HAKSA Report. Amongst twelve countries, South Africa had the greatest percentage of learners (32%) who were not participating in PE at school.

There seems to be no clear evidence of progress in the prioritisation of PE in the school curriculum or school environment at a national level despite overwhelming international evidence that physical activity and PE in schools is positively associated with academic achievement as well as other desirable outcomes for the individual and the school (Bailey, 2017; Hardman, 2009). According to Tee (2019), PE is rapidly disappearing in South Africa. The status of PE has deteriorated from a standalone school subject in 1996, to being grouped within the subject of Life Orientation (LO) in 2002, and then to LO projected as not being a compulsory subject in South African public schools in 2023. Although scholars (Frantz & Pillay, 2008; Stroebel *et al.*, 2016; Van Deventer, 2012) explored the state and status of PE in selected provinces of South Africa, there is a scarcity of evidence-based literature on the situation in the Gauteng Province of the country. Since the last national research survey on the state and status of PE in South African public schools was undertaken in the 1980s (Burnett, 2018), it became apparent that more recent evidence is needed for Gauteng schools to inform future national policy formulation and strategic decision making by relevant stakeholders.

Continental and regional developments, and advocacies discussed in previous paragraphs provided impetus to explore the PE space (Burnett, 2018) in South Africa. In 2016/2017 the South African University PE Association (SAUPEA), in collaboration with the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the DBE, developed a national scale-based situational analysis of the status and scope of PE within the existing Life Orientation (LO) curriculum of state schools in all nine provinces of South Africa (Burnett, 2018).

The Gauteng study (Van der Klashorst *et al.*, 2018) as part of the nation-wide research, aimed to map out the current status of the PE space in the Gauteng Province. The PE space represents the intersection and interaction between the concepts of physical literacy, physical education, physical activity, sport and health education, human, physical, and financial resources, as well as methods of delivery (Burnett, 2018).

Methodology

Research design

The study followed the research methodology described in the national analysis of the state and status of PE in South African public schools (Burnett, 2018), replicated in all nine provinces of the country. An exploratory study with comparative case study analysis was used with public schools as units of analysis across geographic area (rural, township, urban) and socio-economic categorisation (Quintiles 1 to 5). A detailed explanation and discussion of the centralised prescribed research methodology is provided in the national Report on the State and Status of Physical Education in South African schools (Burnett, 2018).

Research area, sample and data collection

The study was limited to the Gauteng Province (GP) in South Africa. Gauteng has a population of 13.2 million people, which represents almost 25% of the total South African population. GP is also the largest growing province, which has resulted in the province currently having the largest population of any province in South Africa in the smallest geographical area. This study used a two-tiered, nonprobability purposive sampling technique. Schools in the Gauteng province from the City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality (CTMM) and the City of Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality (CEMM) were included. The purposive sample initially comprised eight schools (n=8), but one of the schools later withdrew from the study. A Quintile 1(Q1) primary (GPPR) and a Q1 secondary school (GPSR) from a rural area and a Quintile 4 (Q4) primary school (GPPT) and as well as a Quintile 3 (Q3) secondary school (GPST) from a township area were included. The sample also included a Quintile 5 (Q5) primary school (GPPC), a Quintile 5 (Q5) secondary school (GPSC) from two urban areas and a combined School (GPPSSS) for Learners with Special Needs (LSEN). Selected schools were coded for anonymity.

A second level of the purposive sample within each school context included principals or deputy principals, Heads of Department (HODs) of the Life Skills (LS) or Life Orientation (LO) subject areas, teachers responsible for teaching LS or LO, an equal number of male and female learners in grades 7 and 11 and members of the School Governing Body (SGB) or parents of learners, according to the guidelines set by the national research methodology (Burnett, 2018). Data were collected using questionnaires, focus groups and interviews with respondents. Principals were contacted, and appointments scheduled to collect data at the schools included in the purposive sample.

Data analysis

Qualitative data analysis was done through analysing respondents' statements and comments during discussions to identify patterns and themes. The data analysis

procedures were based on the guidelines of the national study (Burnett, 2018). This investigation reports on the qualitative data.

Ethical considerations

The study was conducted according to the specified ethical guidelines set in the national study (Burnett, 2018). The Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Johannesburg, South Africa, provided ethical clearance for the study.

Limitations

No secondary school in the CTMM that was approached was willing to take part in the study although it was endorsed by the national government's DBE. Principals perceived it as a waste of time and that nothing will come of the study. Consequently, school GPSC from the CEMM later withdrew from the study. The sample was therefore restricted to only schools in the CTMM area. Given the limited timeframe before the research, no other school that was approached was willing to participate in the study. Three of the six remaining schools did not complete the study's questionnaires because of their principals' decisions that it would affect valuable teaching time. Results cannot be generalised because of the small nonprobability purposive sample.

Results and Discussion

Results presented and discussed below are from the Gauteng Report on the status of PE in public schools (Van der Klashorst *et al.*, 2018). This was embedded in the national survey on the state and status of PE in South African public schools (Burnett, 2018).

Policy framework and curriculum documents

The Curriculum Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS) policy document of DBE (Department of Basic Education, 2011) serves as a policy document for PE as part of the subject Life Orientation (LO) in the rural (GPPR, GPSR), township (GPPT, GPST) and former Model C schools (GPPC) in the urban area of the CTMM. School GPPSSS indicated that the CAPS document has no value, as it does not take the physical skill levels of learners with mental abilities into account. Respondents (GPPR, GPSR, GPST) indicated that the CAPS document is primarily used for assessment rather than guiding the teaching of PE. Teachers and learners from schools GPSR and GPST reiterated this tendency.

Learners reported that PE only takes place when evaluation is done for a symbol on a report card. GPST teachers stated that PE is scheduled once every two weeks but during an evaluation cycle, it is scheduled once a week. Textbooks and workbooks prescribed by the DBE are used and supplemented with additional resources produced by teachers. Quintile 1 schools struggle with workbooks not

returned, and learners often have to share workbooks. Lopez-Pastor *et al.* (2013) warn against the risk of focusing primarily on sporadic evaluation and assessment of school PE in favour of regular structured teaching and formative assessment. Assessment in PE does not refer to ad hoc testing of skills or sporadic fitness tests. Educational assessment is based on learners' understanding of the goals of each activity, how to perform correctly, self-regulation and ultimate behaviour change. Knowledge and competency of teachers to interpret the curriculum are, therefore, critical to effect desirable behavioural change. Unless interaction between a learning task, learning process and learning context takes place, there will be an absence of mental engagement with the kinesthetic experience and learners will not experience the activity as meaningful learning (Chen *et al.*, 2018). The status of PE as a learning area within LO depends on learners' perceptions that it provides meaningful learning experiences. Results from this exploratory study, especially at secondary school level, seem to suggest the opposite.

Strategic positioning of PE

The rural primary school (GPPR) describes PE as crucial to learner development and teachers are motivated to teach the subject. In the case of the secondary school in the rural area (GPSR), a discrepancy is noted between perceptions of the principal and parents. The principal regards PE as unimportant as *it will not get learners into university* while parents are convinced that it will keep their children away from *wrong things*. In both cases, it seems that the educational aim of PE, namely, to provide all learners with physical, emotional and social skills for a lifelong physically active lifestyle is misunderstood. In the township primary school (GPPT), PE is regarded as a crucial and important part of the school curriculum.

In the township secondary school (GPST), principals and teachers perceive PE as important, but learners are not motivated to participate in the learning activities. This perception aligns with the neoliberal approach and uncritical widespread belief that sport's assumed goodness rubs off on those who participate and contributes to personal success (Coakley, 2011). The urban primary school (GPPC) regards PE as part of their sporting culture and claims that learners enjoy PE. School GPPSS perceives PE as important but indicated that the special needs of the learners present unsurmountable barriers to teach the subject. The CAPS policy document is inappropriate for learners with mental disabilities and available physical spaces are not conducive for PE teaching.

As learners transfer from primary to secondary school, attitudes seem to change towards PE and it is not regarded as a viable career option. Prospective education students choose teaching as a viable career option for several reasons. According to McGaha and Burney (2014), students choose teaching because of their love for a particular subject area, to capitalise on previous positive experiences in a subject at secondary school level, for an opportunity to affect an education system,

because there is strong demand for teachers in a subject area or the perception of long-term growth in the subject area. Based on the present results, none of these conditions is reflected in the perceptions of respondents, especially at secondary school level. Resistance to consider PE as a career option could exacerbate the reality of a lack of appropriately qualified LO or PE teachers in schools.

Methods of delivery

Class teachers in school GPPR offer co-educational PE at least once a week. The rural secondary school (GPSR) has a HOD for LO as well as twelve teachers responsible for teaching LO. None of these teachers is trained specifically in PE. School GPPT indicate that academic class teachers teach one co-educational PE class once a week for 40 minutes. At secondary level, the Township school (GPST) reports that LO teachers are also responsible for teaching other academic subjects and lessons assigned to LO are often utilised for other subjects. Learners claim that PE only takes place for evaluation purposes. On rare occasions when PE does take place learners merely run around a field or play soccer. Although it can be argued that these activities could count as physical activity, its value as structured and taught PE is debatable.

The issue about who delivers PE in schools should be an area of concern for the survival and growth of the subject. Generalist classroom teachers are inadequately educated in classroom management, unique organisational settings and human movement in a PE context. It could, accordingly, be argued, that the PE learning experience is seriously compromised (Kirk, 2012). Kirk (2012) maintains that generalist classroom teachers in primary schools have a limited understanding of the nature of physical activities, progression and a weak grasp of PE assessment.

Evidence from the study suggesting that assessment is the primary focus of PE in rural and township primary schools could consequently have a profound effect on the overall learning experience in PE. Although generalist classroom teachers deliver PE, the focus should not be on quantity of sessions but on the quality of the learning experience of the learner. An unintended consequence of the use of non-specialist PE teachers could have a spillover effect on the number of students considering PE as a viable career option. Kirk (2012) claims that prospective teachers who view their own school PE experiences as negative are unlikely to consider becoming a PE specialist.

Evidence drawn from the study indicates that teachers at school GPPSSS perceive the CAPS curriculum document for PE as inappropriate for learners with disabilities. Meaningful PE experiences of learners with disabilities depend on teachers' understanding and skills in the specific learning area. Bertills *et al.*, (2018) argue that PE contributes to self-efficacy that could transfer into better socio-cognitive functional skills of learners with disabilities. The best vehicle for achieving this is PE in primary school delivered by specialist teachers as well as

an adapted PE curriculum. This constitutes a real challenge to institutions of higher learning responsible for training teachers to meaningfully interpret and implement an appropriate PE curriculum.

Resources

In general, results this study suggest a lack of financial, physical and human resources in the schools. All schools, except school GPPC, experience financial constraints. School fees are not required in Quintile 1, 2 and 3 schools. Schools GPPR, GPSP, GPPT and GPST rely on private corporations, NGOs and the innovativeness of the principal and teachers for external financial support. External financial resources are mainly used for general maintenance of school grounds and buildings along with providing infrastructure for feeding schemes. External funding, specifically for sport and PE is, however, lacking. School GPPC situated in an affluent urban area falls into Quintile 5 where school fees are applicable. Private corporations sponsor sport apparels as well as the maintenance and development of new sport facilities and equipment.

School GPPSSS also recorded budgetary constraints regarding PE as the learners with special needs require specialised equipment. Private companies and an embassy from an Eastern European country provide financial support, but not specifically for the teaching of PE. Physical resources for PE are seriously lacking in a majority of the schools. Quintile 1 and 2 schools mainly rely on open areas for PE teaching. One learner described it as follows: “...*have you seen our netball court? There is a thorn bush in the middle. Have you seen the soccer court?*”

Appropriately educated LO and PE teachers are also lacking in most of the sampled schools. Generalist class teachers are responsible for teaching LO and PE without specialised education and struggle to interpret and implement the CAPS policy document for PE. External sport coaches, youth leaders and NGOs assist with sport coaching and life skills programmes after school hours. In school GPPC, qualified sport coaches and teachers with appropriate coaching qualifications are responsible for sport coaching. In school GPPSSS, subject teachers are responsible for life skills development and the PE segment of their assigned classes. A lack of assistants and therapists prevents meaningful teaching and learning in PE.

A common model for teaching PE in primary schools indicates a shared responsibility between generalist classroom teachers, specialist PE teachers and outsourced sport coaches (Jones & Green, 2017). Faulkner *et al.* (2008) claim that specialist PE teachers are the preferred approach as their education focuses on interpretation of curriculum content and dedicated didactical knowledge and skills. The reality of costs and scheduling of PE lessons, however, often pushes schools to either use generalist classroom teachers or outsourcing PE to sport coaches. Despite this reality, Jones and Green (2017) warn that using sport coaches could

contribute to de-professionalisation of specialist PE teachers and the transformation of delivery modes of PE.

It could also be argued that the combination of external coaches and inappropriately educated teachers contributes to the sportification of PE. Sportification implies adding a sport component; for example, an element of competition to PE to make it more attractive for learners. The notion of sportification of PE curricula is, however, not a recent development. The spirit of sport filtered into PE in the 1960s already when competition appeared in German PE curricula and new sports were included to prepare learners for future sport performances (Naul, 2002).

PE in schools is fundamental in providing learners with knowledge and skills to be physically active throughout their lives. Resources are needed to accomplish this goal. Resources provide the required infrastructure to translate policy into sustainable PE practice. PE practices in the sampled schools in Quintile 1, 2, and 3 clearly experience poor infrastructure and inadequate resources. This situation compromises the quality of the PE learning experience. Turner *et al.* (2017) pointed out that a lack of PE resources indirectly compromises the quality of education opportunities in core subject areas like Mathematics, Science and Languages. As healthy children are better learners, allocating appropriate resources to PE could, therefore, not only benefit learners' total well-being, but also their overall academic performance.

Perceptions of teachers, learners and parents

Analysing the perceptions of teachers, learners and parents revealed mixed messages. It is evident that principals and teachers in primary school value PE and understand its role in the holistic development of learners. Teachers are creative and find ways to teach PE even if they lack resources and appropriate training. Although teachers value PE, they also perceive it as a way to develop sport skills. It is evident that primary school learners enjoy PE. Comments made by primary school learners include:

“It is so nice to get out of the class and just play. I often go home and play some of the games with other children or with my little sister. We never know which game or activity we are going to do! But we have our favourite games.”

One learner suggested the importance of role models when he stated the important role of the principal in PE: *“She sometimes comes and plays with us. She is very fast!”*

Teachers are significantly placed to influence the behaviour of learners. Lumpkin (2008) emphasises the value of demonstrating a physically active lifestyle to learners to encourage them to adopt such behaviour. Given the ultimate

educational purpose of PE, namely a lifelong physically active lifestyle, role modelling of PE teachers could have a significant influence on achieving this purpose.

Parents of primary school learners perceived PE as a necessary and useful part of the curriculum, as recorded during the parents' focus group meeting with the researchers. Secondary schools, however, identify PE as less important than other academic subjects, as indicated by the principals of secondary schools when approached to be included in the study. This perception was expected as several secondary schools did not want to be part of the study, and one secondary school withdrew halfway through the study. Principals and teachers describe CAPS as overloaded and not meeting the needs of secondary school learners. Learners concur and label the curriculum as "*boring*". External service providers share the same viewpoint: "*You are working with teenagers. You cannot expect them to just run around a track.*"

The CAPS document for Life Orientation (LO) in the Senior Phase and Grades 10 to 12 was last reviewed in 2011 (Department of Basic Education, 2011). Curriculum content is divided into Fitness, Games and Sport and Recreation. A wide variety of games and sports as well as fitness and recreation activities are present in the CAPS document. Learners' perceptions that the curriculum is "*boring*" could be contributed to non-specialist PE teachers' confidence to teach PE due to their previous biographical experiences in PE (Morgan & Bourke, 2008). According to Morgan and Bourke (2008), non-specialised PE teachers often do not have the knowledge and confidence to implement the PE curriculum and revert to supervised play that could be interpreted by learners as *boring*. A lack of physical resources to implement PE activities in the CAPS document could also be a contributing factor.

Parents expressed their dissatisfaction with the implementation of PE in secondary schools: "*We keep on hearing that parents do not want to be involved, but when we want to come and clear the sports fields it is always said that it will be done later. Our children need PE and the life skills presented in LO as we live in a community rife with drug abuse.*"

The low number of parents attending the focus group meeting organised by the researchers is concerning. The support of parents is crucial since they can influence general educational policy and specific policies in a school. Sheehy (2006) points out that parents' active and passive disengagement from their children's school context have immediate or long-term effects. Parental perceptions and involvement in matters regarding PE teaching could be significant in the influence of PE policy and practices in schools. A fundamental requirement for parent involvement, however, is a viable communication system needed to regularly keep parents informed.

Good practices

Respondents in this study represent different geographical and socio-economic backgrounds and contexts. Some good practices are largely contextualised and should not be generalised. The CAPS policy document of the DBE serves as a guiding policy document for PE as part of LO as a school subject, implying that schools approach the teaching of PE from a common policy platform. Schools in Quintiles 4 and 5 align PE school policies with the CAPS policy documents and implemented curriculum content in an orderly and structured way. Partnerships between schools, communities, sport coaches, sponsors, private corporations and NGOs add value to in-school teaching of PE. External service providers enhance CAPS curriculum content and alleviate resource barriers. Support groups in Quintile 1 and 2 schools assist class teachers to compensate for gaps in their skill sets relevant to PE teaching.

Challenges

Schools in Quintiles 1, 2 and 3 are non-fee-paying schools and a lack of physical, human, information and financial resources present significant barriers to QPE. Extreme heat and weather conditions often prevent outdoor teaching of PE. Although schools accept the CAPS policy on a national level, PE policy at school level are largely absent in lower Quintile schools. The level and scope of inclusivity of PE curriculum content of the CAPS policy document is problematic to schools with special needs. Primary school teachers responsible for teaching PE often do not have appropriate skills set and struggle to translate policy guidelines into meaningful practice. This reality transforms PE from a teaching opportunity to merely assessment for a symbol on a report card. Secondary schools included in this case study, in general, exhibit a negative attitude towards PE.

Conclusion and Recommendations

A significant conclusion emerging from this study is the stark contrast in the status and perceptions of PE between primary and secondary schools. This could be because PE is not a stand-alone subject in schools and currently it does not offer viable career options. The lack of academic status further adds to the downward spiral of PE in schools. The situation is exacerbated by the lack of appropriately educated teachers responsible for teaching PE. Primary schools in the lower Quintiles are more enthusiastic and positive about PE despite considerable lack of resources.

An alarming finding of this study is the sportification, conceptual and terminological confusion of PE. Respondents consider PE as being in service of extramural school sport, a viewpoint that obviously degrades the educational value of PE in the holistic development of learners. Terminological confusion between teachers, learners and parents' understanding of PE is evident. It seems that teachers in rural and township-sampled schools regard PE more as physical

activity and sport. Although these concepts are related, fundamental differences exist between definitions of the two terms that could affect the teaching of PE in schools.

It is recommended that DBE revisits the PE curriculum in the CAPS policy document, especially at secondary school level and in schools for learners with special needs. DBE support on a sliding scale for schools in Quintiles 1, 2 and 3, could assist in creating an enabling environment conducive for teaching PE in diverse physical conditions. Outsourcing the teaching of PE during school hours to appropriately qualified individuals or external service providers, e.g. sport coaches, could address the challenge of a lack of human resources, keeping in mind the potential disadvantages of this practice discussed earlier. Integrating community and school resources could increase viable options available for teaching PE.

Implications for Sport Policy

In order to achieve the vision of Sport and Recreation South Africa (the national government department responsible for sport and recreation), namely a *Winning Nation and an Active Nation*, a concerted effort that includes schools and the general community is required. To this end, it is necessary to formulate a dedicated policy/position paper on PE in schools addressing at least the following issues: (i) clarify the conceptual confusion between PE, school sport and sport; (ii) articulate clearly the parameters, responsibilities and relationships between PE service deliverers in schools; (iii) establish the importance of specialist teachers delivering PE in schools according to the CAPS guidelines; (iv) indicate the accountability and responsibility of principals in the delivery of PE in schools according to the CAPS guidelines; (v) clarify the future position of PE as a learning area within LO as school subject; and (vi) address the safety of learners participating in physical activities in schools.

Acknowledgements

The contribution of the following persons in collecting data and writing the Report on the State and Status of PE in Gauteng as part of the national study is acknowledged: E. Van der Klashorst, M. Joubert, J. Botha, A. Kruger, N. Phaswana, E. Nel, K. Cyrus and B. Sumption.

References

African Union (2015). Agenda 2063. *The Africa we want*. <https://au.int/en/agenda2063>

African Union (2018). Cotonou Declaration. Conferences des Ministres de la Jeunesse et des Sports de la Francophonie (CONFEJES) held on 26 – 27 November 2018, Cotonou, Republic of Benin, Africa.

African Union (2019a). Regional advocacy towards sustainable development of a peaceful, ethical, healthy and active Africa. Working document of the First Regional Conference of African Ministers on the Implementation in Africa of the Kazan Action Plan (KAP), 10 -13 September 2019, Antananarivo, Madagascar.

African Union (2019b). Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child. Revision 2 signed on 27 July 2019. African Union: Addis Ababa. <https://au.int/treaties>.

African Union (2019c). African Youth Charter. Revision signed on 27 July 2019. African Union: Addis Ababa. <https://au.int/treaties>.

African Union (2019d). Antananarivo Recommendations - 2019. UNESCO. First Regional Conference of African Ministers on the Implementation in Africa of the Kazan Action Plan (KAP), 10 -13 September 2019, Antananarivo, Madagascar.

Bailey, R. (2017). Sport, physical activity and educational achievement – towards an exploratory model. *Sport in Society*, 20(7), 768-788. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17430437.2016.1207756>

Bertills, K., Granlund, M., Dahlström, O. & Augustine, L. (2018). Relationships between physical education (PE) teaching and student self-efficacy, aptitude to participate in PE and functional skills: With a special focus on students with disabilities. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 23(4), 387-40. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17408989.2018.1441394>.

Burnett, C. (2018). The National Research Report on the State and Status of Physical Education in South African Public Schools. SAUPEA Report, Centre for Olympic Studies: University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg. <https://www.education.gov.za/Portals/0/Documents/Reports/State%20of%20PE%20in%20SA.pdf?ver=2019-09-30-092059-613>

Coakley, J. (2011). Youth Sports What Counts as “Positive Development”. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 35(3), 306-324. DOI: 10.1177/0193723511417311

Chen, S., Zhu, X., Androzzi, J. & Ho Nam, Y. (2018). Evaluation of a concept-based physical education unit for energy balance education. *Journal of Sport and Health Sciences*, 7(3), 353-362. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jshs.2016.06.011>

Department of Basic Education (2011). Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS). Life Orientation Grades 7-9. Pretoria: South African Government Printers. <https://www.education.gov.za/Portals/0/Documents/CSE%20Scripted%20lessons/CAPS%20SP%20%20LIFE%20ORIENTATION%20%20WEB.pdf?ver=2019-11-13-103429-177>

Frantz, J.M. & Pillay, T. (2008). Introducing physical education into schools: The view of teachers and learners. *Journal of Community and Health Sciences*, 3(2), 39-43. <http://jchs.epubs.ac.za/index.php/jchs/article/view/39#.XuxTiGgzZPY>

Faulkner, G., Allison, K.R., Dyer, J.J.M. & Adlaf, E.M. (2008). Specialist or non specialist physical education teachers in Ontario elementary schools: Examining differences in opportunities for physical activity. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 54(4), 407-419. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267950225_Specialist_or_Nonspecialist_Physical_Education_Teachers_in_Ontario_Elementary_Schools_Examining_Differences_in_Opportunities_for_Physical_Activity

Hardman, K. (2009). A review of the global situation of physical education. *International Journal of Physical Education*, 46(3), 106 –116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2014.891579>

- Hardman, K., Murphy, C., Routen, C.A. & Tones, S. (2014). *World-Wide Survey of School Physical Education. Final Report 2013*. Paris, France: UNESCO. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265250705_UNESCO-NWCPEA_world-wide_survey_of_school_physical_education_final_report
- Jones, L. & Green, K. (2017). Who teaches primary school physical education? Change and transformation through the eyes of subject leaders. *Sport Education and Society*, 22(6), 759-771. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2015.1061987>
- Kirk, K. (2012). The future for primary physical education. *Journal of Pedagogic Development*, 2(3), 38-44. <https://www.beds.ac.uk/jpd/journal-of-pedagogic-development-volume-2-issue-3/the-future-for-primary-physical-education>.
- Lopez-Pastor, V.M., Lorente-Catalan, E., Kirk, D. & Macphail, A. (2013). Alternative assessment in physical education: A review of international literature. *Sport, Education & Society*, 18(1), 57-76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2012.713860>
- Lumpkin, A. (2008). Teachers as role models teaching character and moral virtues. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 79(2), 45-49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2008.10598134>
- McGaha, P. & Burney, D. (2014). Why teach PE? Factors that affect students' decisions to teach physical education. *Asian Journal of Physical Education & Recreation*, 19(1), 14-25. <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2958&context=facpub>
- Morgan, P. & Bourke, S. (2008). Non-specialist teachers' confidence to teach physical education: The nature and influence of personal school experiences in physical education. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 13(1), 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17408980701345550>
- Naul, R. (2002). Physical education in schools. In R. Naul & K. Hardman (Eds.), *Sport and Physical Education in Germany* (pp. 87-98). London: Routledge.
- Sheehy, D.A. (2006). Parents' perceptions of their child's 5th grade physical education program. *The Physical Educator*, 63(1), 30-37. <https://js.sagamorepub.com/pe/article/view/2404>
- Silva, D. A. S., Chaput, J. P., Katzmarzyk, P. T., Fogelholm, M. M., Hu, G., Maher, C., Olds, T., Onywera, V., Sarmiento, O. L., Standage, M., Tudor-Locke, C. & Tremblay, M. S. (2018). Physical education classes, physical activity and sedentary behavior in children. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 50(5), 995-1004. DOI: 10.1249/MSS.0000000000001524
- Sports Science Institute of South Africa (2018). Heathy Active Kids South Africa. HAKSA Report Card. <https://www.ssisa.com/files/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/HAKSA-2018-Report-Card-FINAL.pdf>
- Stroebel, L. C., Hay, J. & Bloemhoff, H. J. (2016). Physical education in South Africa: Have we come full circle? *South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation*, 38(3), 215-228. <https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v39n2a1643>
- Tee, J. (2019). Physical Education is disappearing fast–Are we ok with that? <https://www.sportsciencecollective.co.za/single-post/2019/08/13/Physical-Education-in-South-Africa-is-disappearing-fast-%E2%80%93-Are-we-okay-with-that>.

Turner, L., Johnson, T.G., Calvert, H.G. & Chaloupka, F.J. (2017). Stretched too thin? The relationship between insufficient resource allocation and physical education instructional time and assessment practices. *Teacher and Teacher Education*, 68, 210-219. DOI: 10.1016/j.tate.2017.09.007

UNESCO (2015). Sustainable Development Goals. <https://en.unesco.org/sdgs>

UNESCO (2017). Kazan Action Plan. <https://en.unesco.org/minpes6/kazan-action-plan>.

Van der Klashorst, E., Joubert, M., Botha, J., Kruger, A., Phaswana, N., Nel, E., Cyrus, K. & Sumption, B. (2018). Physical Education in Gauteng Schools. National research report on the status of physical education in South African public schools. A report for policy makers. SAUPEA, Center for Olympic Studies: University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg.

Van Deventer, J.K. (2012). School physical education in four South African provinces: A survey. *South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation*, 34(1), 153-166. <https://www.ajol.info/index.php/sajrs/article/view/76879>