Conceptual diversity and future directions of physical education in the global context

Roland Naul
University of Duisburg-Essen

Introduction

Conceptual diversity in PE is a typical feature of our time, although it was much more common between the continents of the world 30 or 50 years ago. Some aspects of globalization with its benefits and losses have also reached the ground in school-based physical education today. Conceptual diversity is a typical item in the developmental process of the concepts of physical education and its teaching approaches. It is not only linked with a single cultural setting like Europe or Germany – it is far more typically a feature of different culturally-related assimilations and accommodations of educational concepts and teaching approaches in many countries around the world (cf. Naul, 1999; 2003; 2007).

In some respects, conceptual diversity has become a global item of development in PE because, in many countries, we are seeing an ongoing process of de-centralization of national state education policies to a more regional and local curriculum development in PE (cf. Naul & te Uhle, 2001). Conceptual diversity can be seen as a global item in the historical development and formation process of national PE concepts to be found in each country, for instance here in Japan.

1. The export of global concepts to Japan

During the Meiji period, the German school gymnastics of Spieß reached Japanese soil in a similar way to the Swedish gymnastics of Baron Nils Posse. Posse, graduate of the CGI of Stockholm, exported his style of Swedish gymnastics from the famous Boston Normal School in the late 1880s and early 1890s to Japan. However, with the invitation of George E. Leland from the USA, military drill and early Swedish elements had already been taken in Japan in 1878. In 1913 PE became a subject at a compulsory level in Japanese secondary schools with a first curriculum guide book which was much influenced by the Swedish concept alongside other military drill items (cf. van Dalen & Bennett, 1971, p.629). Also the games of basketball and volleyball were exported to Japan by the influence of the American YMCA movement. So around the middle of the 1920s, when the Meiji period finished and the new reform period of “Showa” (1926-1935) started in Japanese education, the police and military system, all three major concepts of teaching PE were already more or less assimilated: German Turnen, Swedish Gymnastics and American-style games and sports. However, a more long lasting visible impact on Japanese PE started during the period after 1930 when two new waves of reform gymnastics were brought to Nippon from Europe. These two new waves are the so-called Danish or Bukh gymnastics (cf. Hansen, 2006) and the Austrian or so-called “natural gymnastics” of Margarete Streicher and Karl Gaulhofer (cf. Kimura, 1992).

The concept of Austrian natural gymnastics, by the works of Teijiro Mori and Buichi Ohtani, was assimilated in Japan (cf. Kimura, 1992, p.106). In 1931 the Dane Nils Bukh, together with his gymnastic team, stayed for a time at various places in Japan with gymnastic exhibition events at some colleges to demonstrate the new type of swinging and competitive gymnastics with a high endurance impact on the body. The Bukh

gymnastics strongly influenced Japanese PE development (cf. Bonde, 2006). Relics can still be seen today in the various kinds of physical morning exercises at schools and factories.

In the early 1930s a comparable development regarding the assimilation of Danish and Austrian gymnastics was visible between Germany and Japan: at the same time in both countries a reconstruction of the old school physical education system took place with similar concepts of natural approaches to gymnastics in teaching PE (cf. Naul & Jonischeit, 1992; Naul, 1999).

There were very close ties indeed, for example between the Berlin Humboldt University and the Tokyo University, when the famous German pedagogue, Eduard Spranger, became visiting professor at Tokyo in the years 1936/38 (cf. Spranger 1940/41; Horn et.al., 2006) and physical educators like Christian Hupfer, a graduate of Hermann Altrock, one of the first elected PE professors at a German university (PE department of Leipzig University), sent Hupfer and other gymnasts as exchange students to Japan (cf. Ichiba, 2002). But there was already a strong sporting link between Japan and Germany, when Carl Diem travelled to Japan in September 1929, giving lectures at different colleges and at the Imperial Research Institute for Physical Education in Tokyo (cf. Diem, 1982, vol. 3, pp.51).

However, the American-based re-education policies in Japan and Germany after WWII became quite different: In Germany, the lost tradition of harmonious education of body and mind of the reform era of the 1920s were re-invented in PE curricula in schools with the teaching of various kinds of natural gymnastics, athletics, folk and sport games, up to the mid 1960s, whereas in Japan, the American sport games model, known after 1957 as the “fitness model” had already started to shape Japanese PE prior to the Tokyo Olympic Games (cf. Sasajima, 1972, p.222; Maeda & Hardman, 1991).

If we look to the broader European theatre after WWII, different traditional PE concepts continued and new concepts of PE emerged up to the mid 1970s.

2. Diversity of European PE concepts after WWII

After WWII lots of continuity regarding the purpose and structure of physical education programmes emerged, though not in countries liberated from fascist government. Re-education policy in these countries highlighted physical education with British and American social and moral perspectives particularly in West-Germany (FRG). But also the process of Sovietization with the “physical culture” concept started in the early 1950s in East-Germany (GDR) and other countries under Soviet control in Eastern Europe.

For about 40 years up to the 1990s Europe has not only been politically divided by the iron curtain but also by two completely different basic concepts - in the west “physical education” versus “body education” in the east.

In the early 1960s a first wave of Europeanization in the West became visible by political and cultural developments of the European Economic Community (EEC). Concepts of Physical Education in the early 1960s seem to have some cross-cultural similarities in Western Europe in terms of the major purpose of the subject, aims and objectives and structures, although the school subject was embedded in very different school systems and national education systems. Nevertheless, beside some national differences of PE concepts in the West, it seems to be possible to identify a traditional European structure and nucleus of PE up to the mid 1960s.

The nucleus of the concept of Western-European PE in the 1960s seems to be that PE as a compulsory school subject was assessed to be of a general educational value for the development of an individual, sometimes to balance and harmonize general education, either by compensating or supplementing general education by physical education.

Benefits of compulsory PE were expected and assessed as a part of physical development, psycho-

Fig. 1 Concept of Traditional PE in the 1960s

social learning, and character building. Therefore it is not surprising that new physical education curriculum developments in the late 1960s and early 1970s across Western Europe, considered PE with a motor, social, and cognitive domain for curriculum development which were frequently linked with a set of five major physical activities (gymnastics, sports, games, swimming, outdoor activities).

The three domains of the traditional PE concept can be identified as development of “motor abilities” and “technical skills”, learning of “psycho-social attitudes” and “moral values and virtues”. The traditional content areas of PE included gymnastics, games, sports, swimming and other outdoor activities. All five types of physical activities showed their national heritage in European countries as well as in North America in the 1960s which were still diverse across Europe in types of school gymnastics, kinds of games, range of sports, techniques of swimming, and collection / selection of outdoor activities.

Emphasis put on kinds of physical activities differed between European countries, and similarly the importance of the motor and social domains for development and learning in PE did not coincide across the countries. “Technical skills” were of more importance in England, Germany, Australia, Canada and the USA than in countries like Austria, the Netherlands, Belgium, France, Spain and South America where “basic movement abilities” still dominated the PE curriculum.

“Sports” for example were already included less in PE programmes in Scandinavian countries in the 1960s than in central Europe and Japan, whereas “games” did not play the major role in the German PE curricula of the 1960s compared to the UK and other Commonwealth countries or the USA. “Outdoor activities” played a major role in Scandinavian PE curricula as well as in the UK but the “frislufft-movement” in Sweden was quite different to outdoor activities in the “open air” in England and other countries inside and outside Europe.

Despite all these differences and diversities a comparable core structure of PE with comparable legitimization aspects for the subject, and with comparable aims and objectives for teaching physical activities seems to exist in some Western European countries as well as in North America and some Asian countries at the beginning of the early 1970s were demanded by strategic policy making. At least four diverse theoretical concepts developed in the social-political context of schooling and physical education (Naul, 2003, p.37):

- “1. justification and legitimation of PE as a school subject,*
- 2. aims and objectives of PE curricula,*
- 3. methods of instruction and strategies of teaching PE and*
- 4. evaluation and assessment of PE as a school subject.”*

3. The Sportification Process of Physical Education

A real change of “sportization” of the whole PE curriculum started within the cold war and the “battle of the sport systems” in Germany and Europe around the middle of the 1960s.

In 1964 for the last time a joint West and East German Olympic team participated in the Tokyo Olympics. In 1965 the GDR National Olympic Committee was accepted by the IOC after many international sport bodies like UEFA recognized national GDR sport associations on an international level beside the West German sport federations. West Germany won the bid for the 1972 Olympic Summer Games for Munich in 1966. The promotion of sports and the shaping of all elements of physical education with the spirit of sports (intensification) started in the GDR school system much earlier than in West Germany which finally led to the re-naming of the subject into **sport** in the GDR in 1965 (cf. Hardman & Naul, 2002).

The changes in Germany with the new “sport model” for physical education influenced further developments in other European countries. In France the assimilation of the “sportification-concept” had already started in 1967 by socialist groups highlighting the GDR developments (cf. Liotard, 1994). France was the first Western European country which officially implemented the term “sport” by adding it to the name of the subject “l’éducation physique et sportive”.

The 1970s then really became the decade of “sportification” in many other European countries when the spirit of competition was promoted further in teaching physical education with new types of sports like racquet games and various kinds of martial arts.

However, the late 1960s also held new directions for further developments in PE in other directions than sports. At the same time another physical education concept was developed in the Netherlands, (Gordijn, Tamboer) which derived from relicts of the “Austrian School of Natural Gymnastics” and which may be called a concept of “personal-interactive movement education” (cf. Stegeman, 2000). Also, in the 1970s, in Nordic countries like Sweden and Finland, their traditional Lingian approach was not only supplemented by the “sports concept” but developed as a first step to a new integrated model of “health education” (cf. Annerstedt, 2001) in which the spirit of intensification within physical education became dominant.

At least three new roots of PE concepts emerged in the late 1960s and early 1970s in Europe, which spread out of the former traditional PE concept of the previous years: the sport education concept developed in Germany, the movement education concept developed in the Netherlands, and the health education concept developed in Scandinavian countries. However, the traditional “physical education concept” of the 1960s (with a stronger sport orientation in the UK) also continued in some countries (in particular in the South) regarding the educational purpose and terminology but with assimilation of some new elements in terms of aims and contents coming from the sportization process.

The spread of the sport model to PE also reached countries whose heritage focussed either on health related gymnastics like Sweden or on traditional PE like the UK and the USA. In Sweden for instance the name of the PE subject was added with the term “idrott” which means sport. Today the name and concept is “health and sport”. In England, Wales and Northern Ireland at the end of the 1980s a new National PE Curriculum was launched by the Thatcher administration in which sports became more dominant as a subject. Finally, in the USA Daryl Siedentop elaborated his new teaching model of “Sport Education” in the early 1990s which reached

Japan, Australia and New Zealand at the Pacific Rim in the mid 1990s. In Japan Takahashi (1995) became a strong promoter of the Siedentop school sport concept for regular PE lessons. For Siedentop the sport education concept documents some new aspects compared to the traditional PE teaching:

“... sport education has a potential to revolutionize PE. Sport education provides experiences that are more complete and authentic than typical PE sport. In this model students not only learn more completely how to play sports but also to coordinate and manage their sport experiences. They also learn individual responsibility and effective group membership skills” (Siedentop, 1994, p.3).

The new goals of sport education beside the traditional aims to develop motor skills and techniques and strategies to play include “to develop competent, literate and enthusiastic sportspeople” (Siedentop, 1994, p.4). Major characteristics show the difference to physical education:

Fig. 2 Sport education model (Siedentop, 1994, p.8)

Alongside and within the sportization process of PE and the development of the sport education model a new term emerged as well: Olympic education. Indeed, some elements of Siedentop’s concept coincide with core elements of the teaching approaches of Olympic education: formal competition, culmination, event, festivity and keeping records (cf. Naul, 2010, pp. 98). Siedentop himself briefly designed in his last chapter of his sport education book “The Olympic Curriculum” an extended sport education. In the context of globalization in PE the concept of Olympic education has recently become a concept which documents today most of the cross-cultural border similarities between our continents (cf. Binder, 2010; Culpan & Wigmore, 2010).

4. The De-Construction of Sport in Physical Education

Although a strong development to sports in PE and the impact of sports on the whole PE curriculum is visible today by the sport education model and the more extended model of Olympic education across the globe, this was not a common feature of development in general. In the two Germanys the name of the subject changed into sport, in France it was added to the name and a native version of the concept of sport (idrott) was implemented in Denmark and Sweden. But in Austria the inclusion of sport activities did not change the

terminology for 30 years (physical exercises) like the native versions of “*lichamlijke opvoeding*” survived in Flanders and the Netherlands up to the present day. Another vector of development must be identified which can be labeled as the “De-construction of the sport concept”.

It started in West-Germany of the late 1970s as a real alternative to the sports model. The most popular PE concept which occurred in West-Germany in the 1970s and was promoted in the 1980s was the one of Dietrich Kurz (1977) which became the baseline for the new PE curricula in the state of Northrhine-Westfalia in 1980/81. The approach of “*Handlungsfähigkeit*” is linked with nine educational tasks which include the de-construction of the sport disciplines by general movement activities (e.g. running, jumping, throwing and non-competitive games). Assimilation of this German model was promoted in the Japanese writings of Yoshinori Okade.

A total de-construction of the sportization appeared in the 1980s when so called “student centered” teaching approaches (Hildebrandt & Laging 1981) were promoted, and two very alternative PE concepts appeared: the “body education” concept of Funke (1983) criticizing lost body experiences by sport socialization, and the critical “Frankfurt Group” concept (1982) which criticized the development of sport in society generally as a technological reduction of human movement abilities which coincided with the losses of natural motor abilities by skill oriented sport education. The so called “alternative concepts” to the sport education model became very popular in Germany in the 1980s and early 1990s in particular for physical education in primary schools.

5. Current Concepts of Physical Education

Not only in Germany do the 1980s seem to have been a decade of transition for the physical education curriculum and concepts of teaching PE. Deep budget cuts, higher unemployment rates of PE teachers, reduction of time allocation, are three major items which occurred across many European countries. These different processes of postmodernism were “soft changes” in values and virtues in society with modern lifestyles, new types of child-parent relationships and for education at all. “Teachers, leave your kids alone” became not only a popular refrain of a pop song, it also characterized the change to de-schooling, de-education, de-sporting activities, de-moralization in PE and de-evaluation of former standards in physical education and sports. Disagreement of former common shared concepts of “good practice” in physical education teaching occurred in many countries as it has been discussed as an example for the state of Germany. It clearly demonstrates an important shift in PE concepts from a former “performance orientated mission” to a new “participation orientated mission” (cf. Tinning 1997) which goes alongside the new social context of post-modernism.

The transition to “anything-goes-concepts” in PE since the mid 1980s has resulted in the crossing of former strict borders of concepts in the 1990s in each European country. A Danish colleague has compared this process of transition of former PE concepts to a “supermarket” where everyone may take what he or she wants to take for teaching physical education (cf. Jorgensen 1999). Obviously, post-modern individualization in practicing and teaching PE goes alongside more individualization of subjective and ideal-typical PE concepts.

Hence, Europeanization after the Maastricht Treaty of 1991 did not cause more integration of and convergences between national PE concepts, instead, it caused more national divergences of PE concepts because different national perspectives and assessments of the role and function of the subject of PE have been diffused across Europe.

After the transition processes of the late 1980s/1990s it seems to be impossible today to summarize world-wide concepts by only the traditional physical education, the sport education concept, the movement education concept, and the health-enhanced physical education concept. All four major concepts have become very diverse

regarding their borders and their comparable sets of constitutional criteria. Non “harmonization” of concepts seems to be the outcome while more “diversification” seems to be the feature.

In a time of change it may only be appropriate to identify the trends and current developments of former structured PE concepts by a “vector model” (VM). The different vectors may summarize what legitimation, purpose and aims of a concept is. However, beside the four major vectors, because of the European diffusion processes since the 1990s, there seem to be four other *minor vectors*, which are located between the major cross-roads, just to balance new PE programmes “in-between” the four major strands.

Fig. 3 Current Major Concepts of PE

The four main vectors of PE concepts can be explained as: the vector of cultural heritage of physical education to build a physically, socially and mentally well-rounded individual through exercising a traditional syllabus of balanced items of gymnastics, games and sports. A typically focussed sport education vector including a variety of sports with authentic elements of practicing and celebrating sports to achieve boys’ and girls’ personal best records according to Siedentop’s model. A new type of a movement education vector, which derives from former different natural gymnastics concepts, can be found particularly in Austria, the Netherlands, and parts of Germany. Finally a new health education vector, which was already developed in Northern European countries by the traditional Swedish and Danish gymnastic systems, but which became more strongly supported as a “Health-enhanced PE” concept in the last 20 years in some central European countries, also in Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the USA because of the increase of overweight, obesity and other social problems in well-being during childhood and the decrease of physical activity behavior patterns in children and youth.

One of the strongest developments into the direction of health education in Europe is visible in Finland of

the 1990s. The health vector has been much more focused than it already had been considered previously in Finnish PE curricula (cf. Heikinaro-Johanson 1998). Currently in Europe, the Finnish PE curriculum has been split into two school subjects: physical and health education both as separate subjects of teaching as we have in some provinces in Canada and states in the US.

Deriving from the traditional “physical education” concept two other minor vectors are visible in some European countries. The renewal of physical education in the Czech Republic as in some other Eastern European states after the “velvet revolution” turns into the health-enhanced education direction (cf. Muzik 1999) whereas the former physical activity concept in Austria currently turns into the “movement education” direction (cf. Redl, 2000; Grössing, 2000).

In summary, the two major PE concepts of the so called golden 1970s about “physical education” and “sport education” have been transformed to get more balanced in their countries as well as traditional types of natural gymnastics from Scandinavia, France and Austria became reshaped as “movement education” and “health education” which have been focussed even more in their respective countries.

6. From the golden ages of PE to the world-wide crisis in PE

Well, coming up into the 21st century, the current features of the diversification processes in PE concepts is only one item. Another important item of today is the manifold transformation process between the so called “golden ages” of PE development in the 1970s regarding time allocation in new PE curricula, increase in employment rates of qualified PE teachers and new efforts in building modern styled PE facilities at schools within local community sport areas. The ICSSPE commissioned the ICSP to prepare a world-wide audit on the status and allocation of PE at schools. My colleague Ken Hardman was inaugurated by the ICSP to become the lead partner to conduct this audit. The first results were presented at the so called Berlin PE Summit in 1999 (cf. Hardman & Marshall, 2001) before the first final report was published (cf. Hardman & Marshall, 2000). Within one decade (1999-2009) Ken Hardman, Joe Marshall, Gilles Klein and other colleagues conducted two world-wide surveys and three special European reviews on the status of PE at schools, highlighting many times at many conferences with different items the “falls” of the subject labeled as a crisis of PE in the global context (cf. Hardman & Marshall, 2000, 2009; Hardman 2002, 2007; Klein & Hardman 2007). Although one can challenge the methodology of the two world-wide audits by asking only a handful of individuals with personal questionnaires it seems to be right and also visible by other sources that the so called golden ages of PE have fallen down and a scenario of critical items in fact is visible in many countries around the world. It underpins the weakness of our subject and the many discrepancies which exist between what is promised on paper in policy making about PE and what is less implemented for various reasons on grass-root level at schools. Hardman’s results of the first and second world-wide survey are like this:

Table. 1 Implementation and status levels of PE work-wide 1999 (in %) (Hardman & Marshall, 2000. p. 205 and 211, Hardman & Marshall, 2001, pp.18 and 21)

	Implementation implemented	1999 not implemented	Status legal	1999 actual
Africa	25	75	50	14
North America	72	28	86	36
Asia	33	67	73	20
Europe	87	13	94	67
Global	71	29	86	43

Table. 2 Implementation and status levels of PE work-wide 2009 (in %) (Hardman & Marshall, 2009. pp. 25 and 41)

	Implementation implemented	2009 not implemented	Status legal	2009 actual
Africa	60	40	20	20
North America	33	67	50	-
Asia	33	67	25	25
Europe	89	11	91	70
Global	79	21	76	54

Hardman’s concluding comments and final comparative assessment about the development of PE world-wide between the years of 1999 and 2009 “reveals several areas of continuing concern. These areas embrace: physical education not being generally implemented in accordance with the policy of regulations or delivered without necessary quality and relevance to 21st century circumstances, insufficient curriculum time allocation, perceived inferior subject status, lack of competent qualification and/or inadequately trained teachers (particularly in primary school teacher preparation for physical education teaching), inadequate provision of facilities and equipment and teaching materials as frequently associated with under-funding...., large class sizes and funding cuts” etc. etc. (Hardman & Marshall, 2009, p.127).

The missing adequacy and the many lacking items for support leads me to an important question: what is the invisible yard-stick for Hardman’s measurements for the so many deficits and falls of delivery? If it will be the many promises in written documents and papers, then the concerns and discrepancies about the delivery of PE in the first decade of the 21st century is really a “historical ever green”. Although there were in many of the aforementioned items increases in development in the decade of the 1970s, there was also a certain difference at that time between what was promised on paper and was not totally released at school. Instead of permanent counting the falls and deficits, a fresh idea is needed to overcome the hurdles and a new paradigm for a successful promotion of PE is overdue. Ken Hardman’s surveys underpins the gaps between the “top” and “down” level of the traditional “top down” paradigm of governmental policy making for PE. Maybe another paradigm is needed for the new 21st century which realizes the needs and progresses the demands for quality PE better. Today, a “bottom up” paradigm is needed which links the different stakeholders for primary child care, health, education and social welfare in a common network on a local community level.

7. Future directions of PE in the global context : three combined concepts of sustainability

If new strategies for the promotion and successful implementation of PE seem to be necessary to reach a better future for the development of PE after our last decade of falls and losses, what are the global criteria for a sound and modern PE concept? I have three sets of items to offer for that.

7.1 The criteria of HEPA and FITT

HEPA is the abbreviation of health enhanced physical activities. In a community network, school based physical education is only one setting to develop an active lifestyle. To motivate and to achieve an active lifestyle for children and youth, however, their different settings have to be linked, which means curricular based PE at school should be linked with extra-curricular PA outside the school setting. Health enhanced PE at school and health enhanced PA in the local community need to be integrated by the delivery of a comprehensive programme in which teachers, instructors and coaches share their expertise and coordinate their efforts of achievements.

The reasons for this network approach are obvious: in many westernized countries, and also nowadays in Asian countries, the epidemic of obesity and physical inactivity is increasing. Not only are up to 30%, and more in some age groups in infancy, represent the overweight and obesity sup-group for PE, more than 50% are growing up in primary schools with less motor abilities and competences in basic motor learning. The more a child is behind in his or her average norms of motor development, the more the outcome is exclusion from informal games and sports. For better social inclusion a sound physical development is necessary to become a group member of a team. The better the motor competences are developed the more successful and enjoyable will be the personal sport career of children. For a sustainable health career, daily exercise is a necessary frequency of activity which demands individual doses of intensity. Different types of PA are necessary for a balanced whole of the physical development which requires at least 60 minutes per day. In summary: beside a network of settings for HEPA the FITT system is needed which means: vigorous frequency, moderate intensity, different types of sports and at least 60 minutes of time allocated each day.

7.2 Social virtues and moral values

HEPA and FITT criteria will shape the body, and children can achieve an active lifestyle within their different settings. A sound body, however, needs a moral mind which doesn't come automatically with it or out of it. Learning and practicing PA is imbedded in social interaction processes as an individual with your own body and as well as an individual as a group member in social interactions with other persons in a group. Interactions with different social experiences are necessary to learn about social virtues and moral values and to apply the respective individual competences in different situations and group structures. I have no better sets of morale to offer than the well-known Olympic ideals which comprises fair play, mutual respect, intercultural understanding and friendship, sportsmanship and peace.

These sets of social virtues and moral values are more and more listed in national PE curricula around the world. In the New Zealand Health Enhanced PE Curriculum for instance Olympic ideals have already become the umbrella term for the social and moral domain of teaching PE at school (cf. Culpan & Wigmore, 2010). There are some more countries around the world (cf. Naul, 2010, pp. 93) where Olympic education has become either a compulsory or an optional part of the social and moral aims in school based PE. However, we still need a better link to the extra-curricular physical activities in organized sports to prolong the ethical school efforts and to counteract the development of bending rules in sports from moral standards in games and sport behavior patterns.

7.3 Community based PE partnerships - the network setting approach

In order to achieve an active lifestyle and a sound and balanced body and mind, development with social virtues and moral values, all children's and young people's environmental settings must be included as essential parts of a *common community network of partners in education, health and social welfare*.

For this *community network*, school-based physical activities should be linked with other social environments to cover all the aspects of children and adolescents that play an important role in young people's everyday life: their parents' house, their school, sports and youth clubs, living environment and the community. Beside cognitive education about the risks and consequences of sedentariness we especially need to address the emotional areas of adolescence in order to achieve self-acceptance coupled with a desire for a changed active lifestyle, i.e. with a healthy nutritional attitude, creative use of media and intensive sporting activity. It is also necessary to factor in environmental variables such as criteria for urban development and for movement spaces within urban development.

Fig. 4 Network strategy of cultural settings for active living

The network strategy is a concept for communal projects which could be used as an applied model for communities not only in westernized countries. Regardless of cultural and national peculiarities, this strategy links young people's living, education and intervention settings, which need to be linked in order to reap the benefits of a comprehensive local intervention strategy. However, cultural traditions, different national school systems, different childcare practices and different developments in communities' infrastructure should be recognized.

Carrying out this partnership network for a better local promotion of PE also means to organize cooperation between the aforementioned sectors and to exchange information and good-practice examples. Therefore, a "round table" (consisting of local authorities of the different sectors) with regular meetings has to be established. Especially the intensive cooperation of schools and sports clubs is an important aim. Besides parents, teachers and coaches that are representatives of the community, representatives of the respective community administration offices for education, health, sport and social affairs should also be involved. This approach to a network strategy needs a person we call in our EU-project "municipal moderator" (cf. Naul, Schmelt & Hoffmann, 2010).

The municipal moderator is the central figure of the local network, especially between sports clubs, schools and the different community offices. He or she is a kind of a manager. In most cases the moderator is already an employee of the municipality administration so that he or she is involved in the local structures, knows responsible persons of sport clubs, community offices etc. But what are the concrete tasks of a municipal moderator?

First of all the municipal moderator has to approach all important persons who will build up the local network. After that he has to organize the first round table with representatives of schools and sports clubs. For each school he has to find an associated sports club which will propose a coach for the additional PA activities to achieve daily PA by connecting school based PE with a strong sports club link. However, this link should develop tailored programmes addressing the real needs of the pupils, not only the needs and demands of the sports clubs. In our EU project each municipal moderator has a partner outside of his/her local network, both

are working in tandem. In Germany all municipality partners are working in Essen, in our research institute, the WGI. This partner is responsible for the scientific evaluation, has connections to the back office, to district sports club associations, to get the physical fitness test realized at schools and organize further education seminars for teachers and coaches.

Finally, my personal view on the future development of PE is this: concern about the healthy development of the next generation is spreading around the globe and there is only one international school subject that could counteract the trend: PE. However, a new revival of the subject of PE with network support in local communities must re-address its traditional purposes, which means a balanced development of body, will and mind.