

Len Almond Keynote Transcript- 2001 International TGfU Conference

Good morning ladies and gentleman

As the first speaker I feel very honoured and proud to be able to do that, but I want to do for another reason as well, and that another reason, much of what I say has never been written before, it goes back to the early days when we were starting to rethink the perspective on teaching games, and so what I'm trying to give you a flavour.....(talks to colleague).

I will go through my introduction, and if the thing goes on fine, but I won't worry about it.

Introduction

Within the evolution, I am going to speak, I prefer not to use because I wanted to be precise that's why I decided to use the text, so please excuse me... , I will deviate from it, but will try and stay close.

Within the evolution of teaching games for understanding, now called TGfU, very little attempt has been made to relay how this will shape, and what inspirational sources influence both shape and content of TGfU.

This conference represents, 21 years later, a golden opportunity to address this.....

In my presentation I shall outline some of the events in this evolution and identify the roles, key people in the shaping of an idea. Finally, I shall challenge this conference to move forward and develop a more coherent, theoretical and practical perspective to games that can better inform. practice/

In 1977 (??) I watched teaching Rod Thorpe students teachers at Loughborough College of Education..... teaching them badminton and tennis in exactly the same hall at the same time, and that seemed very strange to me. I was at the time a research fellow engaged project with teachers Leicestershire.

This approach to games, and my need to find something that would engage teachers... for teaching in effective practices. My previous attempts, had been far too theoretical and far too only a few teachers could sustain a thorough analysis of their teaching. Therefore I wanted something practical that would influence all teachers, and my ideas were....debate.... Rod's ideas were ideal.

Len Almond Keynote Transcript- 2001 International TGfU Conference

However it wasn't until 1979 when I returned from New Zealand, to form a partnership with Rod and later David Bunker that a clearer theoretic perspective of TGFU began to take shape.

The early 1980s was a productive period at Loughborough University of Technology forming a merger with college..., and other higher education institutions together with physical educators and advisors began to work together to develop the basic ideas of TGFU. Our concern was pedagogy, not games at this time. At this point, before I outline how this science worked, it is important to identify what the central games team at Loughborough brought to the table.

Rod Thorpe and Dave Bunker had been students of the early 1960s and exposed the number of games staff who were very creative and innovative in games teaching, most of them were national coaches at the time in some game or other..... teaching and also coaching at the very highest level, When Rod and Dave went into teaching they became dissatisfied with traditional teaching approaches, because they seemed unproductive, and so they sought ways to motivate young people and make games more relevant to children with different levels of ability.

When Rod Thorpe returned to Loughborough college as a member of staff in the late 1960s, and Dave Bunker at the beginning of the 1970s, this reflective practice was encouraged and reinforced by the members of staff..

Rod was particularly influenced by a man called Eric Worthington who went on to Australia and was very influential in Australian soccer. Eric Worthington taught tennis and badminton, at Loughborough this was the first starting point for rethinking games teaching. Whereas David Bunker was interested in association football and soccer and his interests were mainly influenced by a man called Alan Wade who was a national coach at the time in association football. What was interesting, the football association in England at the time had developed a set of principles, principles of play, but they abandoned those principles of play in the, more or less, the late 70s, early 80s, because they found the coaches were simply not bright enough to handle them. What's interesting is 30 years later they are still saying the same thing. That's why we are 39th in the world at the moment.

On the other hand, I came from a background of teaching physical education and experience of working development in the amount of... particularly ??? "Man a Course of Study" developed by a man called Jerome Bruner which was a social studies curriculum. I would say that MACOS or "Man Course of Study " is probably the best curriculum model that was ever written, probably ever has been written. I recommend it to you. Now let me read it to you, though it's only social studies, it is a very, very influential curriculum.

Aso, in terms of background it's important to recognise the 1960s and 1970s in England, physical education was developing rapidly, because teacher training colleges were increasing in numbers, and there was a need to start in these new institutions to obtain more advanced qualifications, advanced diplomas and masters degrees.

Len Almond Keynote Transcript- 2001 International TGfU Conference

This is the period in the late 60s to 1970s that degree status qualification emerged became. This is actually very very important. In curriculum development at the time student centred teaching and learning approaches, mainly gymnastics, but not games, were at the forefront. Men and women pursued very different paths in educational gymnastics, which is well established to this day.

Both Rod and I believe that the whole philosophy of education in gymnastics, they chose gymnastics they chose the wrong medium... they should have chosen games at the time. But that's a personal thing.

The debate about educational gymnastics, its philosophy and practice, created a climate that provoked both discussion and argument, and in this context the climate formed a background to an emerging interest in developing games teaching, representing the roots out of which TGfU would emerge.

Now this, I think, is a very important point. Within the games team at Loughborough, Rod Thorpe and Dave Bunker and myself brought very different skills to the table. Rod and Dave were practitioners, with a very deep passionate commitment to practice and they were extremely knowledgeable about all kinds of games. They watched Australian football on television and within fifteen minutes they could tell you exactly how the game was played, what the main rules were, the tactical considerations, and it was the same thing in any sort of game, watch it for a few minutes and do an analysis. So they came to it with both strong practical and theoretical perspective. Rod and Dave were immersed also in skill acquisition and social psychology because they taught these areas on undergraduate degree courses.

On the other hand, I was more concerned with curriculum development and my interest really was in philosophy and in cognitive psychology, and this interest was particularly influenced by Piaget, and Jerome Bruner. Jerry Bruner was working with us in a place called University of Keele in the early 70s and he was a very, very influential figure at the time, certainly for me.

Piaget influenced me largely because of the notion of adaptive behaviour. How do you assimilate and how do you accommodate knowledge, and how do you evolve equilibrium. His notion of decalage, or stage theory, was also very influential in the way I wanted to develop my ideas, and move my ideas on in terms of progression, and the whole notion of constructs, intelligent action conditions for operations. They were very, very important in our thinking of about how children learned and what kind of ways would promote learning. When I think how I learnt positively from Bruner, his notion of theory and instruction, the idea of a spiral curriculum and the most important thing, any subject can be taught to any child in any format, so long as you put it to them in the simplest form. That had a very powerful impact on us, but what should introduced me to was adopting these ideas of zones of proximal development and In layman's terms, how do you scaffold the learning process. How do you learner develops what the teacher provides for them in terms of their speech, in terms of their communication, in terms of the tasks that teachers set children.

And it's these two people that formed the critical framework and influenced my personal development in teachers. It is these experiences, which formed the theoretical perspectives to the practical ideas that underpin debates and informed an emerging model. Within this debate about practical ideas rethinking games teaching, the need to test these ideas and submit them to more critical scrutiny became a very strong focus.

Practical ideas were explored with students and teachers at summer school courses. What we tried to do is to develop the notion where any ideas needed to be done with teachers to be of any use at all and I will talk more on this later on. So what we wanted to do was support these ideas with teachers in summer schools, so there's an unfinished curriculum, with no fixed ideas, we wanted to work with teachers and see if the ideas would flow with practice.

What we also began to think was.....these ideas and what we were doing and invite reactions and critical argument with people. So in one sense we were developing games, but what we were also doing which was extremely important, was we were attempting to create a framework, but a critical framework, how do we develop a pedagogy. My interest in philosophy led to a thorough discussion about the nature of games and their problem solving capabilities. We saw games as problem solving activities, where players learned how to make intelligent decisions about what to do. Where the technical demands of the game requires tools or techniques to execute their decisions.

This admission must seem to some observers that the games team were not interested in techniques or skills, but only in the tactical demands of the game. Totally untrue.

During this discussion the notion of primary and secondary rules arose, most people in philosophy would talk about constitutive and regulative rules. We hadn't come across those in those days, we called them primary and secondary rules, and the need arose to highlight what we meant by modifying the technical demands of the game, and it's here that modification principles became very important, and along with Margaret Ellis from Canada, in Alberta was very influential when she came to us on sabbatical in the 1980s. This is important because the whole games team believed that we needed to break down games into their simplest form, and represent them in a game form that children could play with modified equipment in order to reduce the technical demands for that activity. Thus the terms, 'representation' and 'exaggeration' emerged.

In order to represent that, take a game like badminton. The key principles that we looked at, we needed to represent the notion of long and short game. The person comes to the net, the person goes to the back of the court, where do they actually put the ball. So we

Len Almond Keynote Transcript- 2001 International TGfU Conference

introduced those notions, what we did was to exaggerate the court, instead of playing on a full court we exaggerated it by making it very long and narrow, and in such a way that we actually highlight and exaggerate the key principles we wanted them to use. Of course that was the basic, first principle game that we wanted children to play.

Of course we need to progress both the children's understanding and technical competence through more practice, and increasingly higher levels. Thus, Jerome Bruner's notion of a spiral curriculum was a major inspiration. If you want the reference for that, this was outlined in a presentation of 1984 at the Congress in Oregon and ..Maurice Pieron and George Graham were the authors of that report.

What we meant by understanding and of course, TGFU became the title, it became the slogan, all sorts of acronyms, what we meant by understanding was constantly under discussion. The whole idea of understanding and teaching was a major issue in the early 1980s, both in America and in England, furthering the notion of understanding in different subjects and different educational theories was very strong and very highlighted.

In particular, the games team were influenced by Noel Entwistle's article, written in 1976 on practical and theoretical learning. And a further elaboration of its significance was made by David Kirk who was a doctoral student I think at that time. It's here the term 'intelligent performance' emerged. Both David and Noel Entwistle were probably kind of authors of that, it's precisely what we want to do in teaching games. We want children to be intelligent performers of games.

The central games team felt it was important to explore ideas with their colleagues. In the first instance this was done through summer school courses with teachers, and a man called Terry Williamson, who was then in physical education in Suffolk... and then later went on to Wirral then went **on to Avon?** where we did a lot of case studies on his practice. They played a very, very important role in developing ideas. The team widened by increasing the whole range of people brought into Loughborough, and with other institutions at the time. These people were a set of people such as Celia Brackenridge who was a lecturer at the time in Sheffield and also a captain of the England lacrosse team, Kath Howard, who I don't think is here at the moment, who is now teaching and working in North America, was a lecturer in IM Marsh **felt??** In Liverpool and also another international lacrosse player, and **????** Brachman who was a Phd student at the time and went on Cheltenham College, and did some quite interesting work in bringing others together on TGFU. Sarah Doolittle who is here today, who spent a year at Loughborough and she was involved in the action research projects we did in Coventry. She was one of the validators and observers of that. Karen Booth who has now left teaching, but was at Loughborough who was a lecturer at the time had a strong interest in netball and played internationally. David Kirk at the time was a PhD

Len Almond Keynote Transcript- 2001 International TGfU Conference

student and David of course, is here today, and in residential tomorrow, went on to Australia and then of course returned to Loughborough as a professor in sport.

There are other people, international people and local people, who were particularly important and the first one I think is Margaret Ellis from Canada, whose notion on modifications and principles were also important. What is interesting is Linda Griffin has been organising recently, has been working in a school called Mountfield for... Margaret Ellis worked in that school in 1984 like for almost a whole year, it's almost like revisiting ideas. A man called Alan Launder from Australia who is also at this conference, who has also written a book called 'Play Practice', which I would recommend very strongly to you. Alan had a very strong special interest in practical ideas, and was very influential in terms of track and field athletics.

A man called Pepe De Vist from Spain had the honour, if you like, of being the first PhD student in teaching games for understanding, and that was in the late 80s. Pepe was a very influential figure, a very bright young man, who came and really challenged us, even though English was only his third language, he challenged us very strongly. And I remember Pepe, I gave a lecture and recommended a book, and he came to me next morning at nine o'clock with the whole book there, and something like thirty handwritten notes attached to it and he said, can I go through each one of these then with you now. Peter Werner who spent a sabbatical at Loughborough also with **Brian Werner who influenced** with Peter, who asked us to do more research on games teaching, and we had a different perspective to research over time.

A lady called Sue Jackson was also a very inspirational teacher and was also very influential on the national curriculum. She was chosen to be on the standing committee for deciding the National Curriculum in England. She was one of the key people to ensure that teaching games for understanding was at the very heart of the games curriculum for our national curriculum.

Last and not least though is a man called Alan Wade, whose inspirational work in Nottingham and later the whole country on Association Football, I think we need to go right back to the 1960s to look at the inspirational work that they began to develop on principles of play. How do you devise the principles, how do you look at the turning moments in games, where do things change, how do they change, how do you begin to make intelligent decisions that will play, and that's why soccer players couldn't handle it.

(laughing)

Len Almond Keynote Transcript- 2001 International TGfU Conference

What was important during this period? I think the first important thing was in 1983 we decided we need to publish these ideas. So we were working for three years on developing ideas with other people, and we decided to publish at the time, I was editor of the Bulletin for Physical education and then later on we produced a book 'Rethinking Games Teaching' I think that was important. The second important point was a research project in school, the first in the world with Terry Williamson and later in Coventry and that was where Sarah went and her book work with college teachers, and later on in a county called Avon, in Bristol, and these projects represented an attempt to promote rethinking games teaching as a way to encourage reflective practice. The idea was, let's use games teaching as an opportunity for teachers to reflect on their practice. Two of these projects in Coventry and Avon were published as case studies, whereas in Wirral the teachers voted not to publish their work. They decided not to publish it because they did not want Len Almond to profit academically from their own work, probably rightly so.

Nevertheless, the experience of these projects was published in the Journal of Teaching through for Education, have a look there, the experience we had, and those from those action research perspectives were very important.

However, as Jerome Bruner's notion of a spiral curriculum and his theory of instruction, led us to identify simple game forms that represented the very essence of playing adversarial games. The complexity of game forms and the need to be represented in different ways was revisited as appropriate, so the notion of revisiting and presenting ideas in different ways, was a very strong feature part of our work.

So playing with games, the technical demands needed to be reduced, to enable the player to appreciate what the game was all about and to provide them with a game form they could play anywhere at any time.

I remember a teacher that I was working with in Sussex, and she decided on a simple experiment. She got one group playing traditional tennis, a full racquet on a full court, and with real tennis balls, and another group of thirteen boys and girls teaching modified equipment on small courts, and playing the principles of play, the difference was modified equipment. She then did an experiment after twelve weeks, it was a simple one, she simply asked the students of the first one, how many had played tennis in the previous week. I can't remember the precise figures, but it was something around 13% had played tennis and they had learned the traditional way with real tennis racquets on real courts with real balls, they had spent most of their time chasing the balls, as it happens never mind. The other group which had used modified equipment and simplified game form, 85% of children had played tennis the previous week, in their own gardens, out in the area, this is one that is just one example. In Loughborough the only tennis courts are in private clubs, if you want to

Len Almond Keynote Transcript- 2001 International TGfU Conference

play tennis as a young person you can't go and play tennis.... the school playing fields are closed anyway.

So the interesting example in this teacher from Sussex, is she was able to get young people play more often with simplified equipment. There is a strength in teaching games for understanding plus a combined a curriculum structure for representing games. I cannot underestimate that, what we are trying to do was provide a curricular structure for representing games, modifying games and we also applied a challenge to teachers to learn about games through the teaching of games.

Underpinning any theoretical perspective with essential games team, was a practical knowledge base of the wide diversity of games. Once again, I think it's important to say that the games team really did know games very well, and one of these studies from a place in East Sussex, was to go there and we had something like 120 teachers all working on developing ideas, working on how do you modify this game, how do you modify that game. It was very obvious the teachers who did not know games very well, couldn't do it because they couldn't translate games into simple sports, they couldn't do it. So I think that Alan Launder has this notion that you can't produce a model that only test pilots may fly. They may well all be right, I think, but what is important I think here, is to say that we must teach our students to really understand games. I will return to that in a minute.

I want to pay tribute now to a man called Laurence Stenhouse. Laurence Stenhouse was very influential in both my thinking and, in many cases, on how I began to interpret ideas on working with teachers. It was important for a number of points. So when I quote from some of his articles, most of the quotations here, I'll take from his 1983 publication 'Authority, Education and Emancipation' which is a review of much of his work over 20 years.

The idea to publish the work of the games team, an introduction of three research projects was inspired by the work of Laurence Stenhouse who had a profound influence on both my professional and intellectual development. I would say he was a chess player, playing with people in a world of draughts, and that's him. I can't pay him any more a higher compliment than that. He once said, teaching games for understanding has his stamp all over it, but only in the sense of our work with teachers, not in the sense of the evolution or notion of games theory, but mainly in the sense of working with teachers.

Laurence Stenhouse saw the teacher as a learner, and curriculum development was a way of learning one's art, and stimulating further development. He believed in training courses to be processes for exploring how to develop a curriculum, thus in Man a course of study, the five day training courses a training programme that ran from nine o'clock in the morning until nine o'clock in the evening, and because the discovery based learning and enquiry

based learning was what we wanted young people to be involved with, all the teachers on the course had to go through exactly the same process. How would you discover, how would you enquire into what the basic ideas ofman to base a study on, so five days to get to grips with the thinking process. Because mancos was a unfinished curriculum, he thought the skills that were acquired in those five days would allow teachers to go on and develop and rethink ideas for themselves, and that's important, I think that one of the things that we do in schools all the time is we teach dependence on us, we cannot seem to allow young people to become independent learners.

Let me have a look at some of Laurence's views. Laurence saw the process of developing a curriculum as unfinished because it inspired critique and rethinking by teachers, for their developers. He expressed it in the following way, 'curriculum if it is worthwhile represents in the core of teaching materials and criteria for teaching, a view of knowledge, the conception of education that provides a framework in which the teacher can develop new skills and relate them as he does thus so with conceptions of knowledge and of learning. We are concerned with the exercise of skills in the service of meaning. I believe that it's a sensible methodition of the practice of an art. Stenhouse exerted a substantial impact on the teaching and ways of teaching, and testing ideas on his practice, and that was important too in creating a partnership with teachers to develop curriculum'. A partnership that was an equal partnership, too often researchers go into the teaching situation and they are the researcher from an higher education institute, they are a university professor, going to schools and that authority of difference is quite informed. What Laurence said is, if you go into that, you are equals, the teacher is the expert in their own practice, in their own context. While you come in and you know little about the context, so he saw the researcher and a teacher as equals bringing different skills.

He makes the point, 'I am not however arguing that all educational thinking and doers can be teachers, that all should pay teachers the respect in translating their ideas into the curriculum, and that means enough contact from classroom reality or enough consulting with teachers to discipline all ideas with problems and practice', and I constantly use that all the time. The notion that we discipline our ideas through the problems of practice.

He goes on to suggest, that 'the curriculum is born for self-development. I am not simply being practical about ideas or say that all ideas ought to be subject to testing by teachers, and express in forms that make curriculum possible. I am claiming that the expression of educational ideas in curriculum form, provides a medium for the development, and if necessary, the autonomous self-development of the teacher as an artist. Now this point about the art of teaching that created a very powerful pull for the games team. Here is an idea quote come up from teachers in order to promote effective practitioners. Stenhouse expresses it so well. To say that teaching is an art does not simply imply that teachers are

Len Almond Keynote Transcript- 2001 International TGfU Conference

born, not made, on the contrary, artists learn and work very hard at it, but they learn through the critical practice of their art.

Stenhouse's explication of this idea is worth developing further because it fits in so well to the games teaching understanding of what they wanted to achieve. Thus in art ideas are tested in form by practice. Exploration and interpretation lead to revision and adjustment of ideas and of practice. If my words are inadequate, look at the sketchbook of a good artist, a play in reversal, a jazz quartet working together, I am arguing, THAT I am arguing is what good teaching is like. It is NOT like routine engineering or routine management.

Stenhouse does warn us against strict adherence to this view, but his points exemplify a way of thinking about research and learning that have much to offer. He goes on to say, 'I compare a school to a good repertory theatre, with a manager, the head, a company of actors, the staff and technical support staff, the librarians, the lab technicians, the audio/visual experts, and an audience of pupils or students. Both theatre employ the interaction of different groups of people, the artists on one hand, their public on the other, it is as intelligible for a repertory company to claim to have educated its audience as it is to for a school to have claimed to have educated its pupils. But note that a good repertory theatre is also concerned with the development of its actors as artists, and of the skills and arts and exhibitions too, and the medium of this development is the very same medium as that which entertains, motivates and educates its audience'.

I think what I would want to say is, that this notion of an artist, the teacher as an artist is very, very important. It's something that inspired us to encourage teachers to develop a curriculum themselves. I think what it does is it opens up a new conception, even though it's thirty years later, a new conception of assertive teachers. However, Stenhouse taught us also a very important point, that the games teaching that games team wanted to develop in asking teachers to research and collaborate with us. Their effective practice needed to take onboard another dimension. He wanted teachers to begin to understand what games had to offer through the practice of their teaching games, in other words, he wanted people to learn about games by teaching games. Another point that I think is important to learning. Stenhouse says, 'there is yet a deeper level at which the artist learns, he not only learns his art, he also learns through his art. Thus the actor learns about life and people, and moral dilemmas by participation in the plays. And similarly, I learnt about teaching literature and history, something of what they had to learn and something of what they had to offer me as an individual person', and that's Stenhouse writing of the future.

He was absolutely right, we want games teaching to become a way of learning what games have to offer. I think he sees the routine management too often, rather than saying, we are

Len Almond Keynote Transcript- 2001 International TGfU Conference

talking about meaning, we are talking about providing opportunities for teachers to learn what games really can offer young people.

In this curriculum perspective that informed our critical evaluation of how teachers taught games we began to develop to write a model for professional development. This was the old idea that we wanted teachers to monitor their own practice. We wanted them to write up a discussion, write a case study of what you are trying to do. I went to one meeting with teachers in a school, and in the previous session I had told them, I would like them to write down all their ideas of how they taught this, and how they taught that and we would discuss it the following week. When I turned up, only one person came out of thirteen, they were terrified of this concept. What we had to recognise is it was a new medium for them, we had to make it easier for teachers to be able to communicate what they are doing in informal discussions with other teachers. What we wanted them to do also, is this notion of a question of professional development is to explore alternatives points of view, how do you work and think about teaching, if you listen to other teachers you begin to enrich and enlighten your perspectives. Other teachers and other teachers' experience helps you to develop and learn once more about games and your pedagogy and your teaching. It's through other teachers that you begin to learn, when they challenge you, when they say, hang on a minute, I don't think that works that way. So I think what we have to do is to recognise that teachers need to evolve a way of critiquing practice, but in a safe environment, and last of all, a note of special practice to motivate the teachers to really study practice.

These ideas are supplemented by a perspective that we called Every Child. This emerged when the department of education and science, of course in Coventry, which served, which included teachers from eight local education authorities throughout the West Midlands. The reflective practitioner was the main focus of our monthly meetings for over six months. A range of ideas, very supportive workshops and lectures, when the teachers went back into schools to try them out, document their work, and come back and report their teaching results. We developed an important concept and we called this Every Child, and the Every Child principle permeated the whole course and was presented in the following way.

We wanted teachers to recognise every child was important, every child can learn, every child can choose success and progress, every child can achieve satisfaction, and every child can acquire confidence, every child can recognise their own self-worth. It is how we as teachers scaffold that learning process in working with young people, and I think in those early, well sorry, early 80s, we were anticipating the whole notion of differentiation and working with multi racial groups and ensuring that boys and girls had the same opportunities. The Every Child concept was also an attempt to promote a differentiated curriculum, just as responsive and different needs of young people and enable them to progress at different rates.

Let me just give you some practice teachings of TGFU. One practice of teaching games is that a rugby team believe that tactics should be taught before, and in preference, to skills. The first point to make is that skills and techniques are often used interchangeably, whereas another team use techniques to refer to routine practice of an isolated movement. On the other hand, skills refer to the appropriate application of techniques in a specific context, and so we would make quite a clear distinction between the notion of technique and skills.

A second point relates to a teacher's skill. This is to reduce the technical demands of the task so that the learner can concentrate on the decisions they have to make in the game. If the game keeps breaking down because of the lack of technical competence of the player, it would be appropriate to help them by practicing the technique without pressure. The teacher's task is to help the learner understand the game and acquire the technical competence to play as well as possible. So you might reduce a game and it might become 5v2, it could become 1v4, 6v2, six v three. So you are reducing the complexity and you make it easier for the person to practice. In some instances teaching games for understanding has been associated with discovery forms of learning, as well as problem solving. Of course our games have certainly problem solving, in the sense that games have problem solving activities and players learn to make intelligent decisions in order to pursue winning the game and outwitting their opponents. Young people aren't supposed to why questions, but their decisions in the game are not related to the problem solving that we normally associate with mathematics, design education or science experiments, of course we want young people to explore why questions and encourage them to think for themselves rather than slavishly follow instructions and order of the teacher or a coach, but discovery learning is removed from this.

We must be careful not to confuse these terms with teaching games for understanding. Games making may well be an appropriate medium to explore such forms of learning, and I would say, explore games making. Games making is not TGFU, it's quite different, quite another area. I would recommend you read that

Finally, I reflect on the last twenty years since the dawn of teaching games for understanding. I recognise a number of people, many of you in this room, have played a significant role in disseminating essential ideas in teaching games for understanding, and building a research perspective to games teaching. In Europe, Scandinavia, in particular in Finland, North America and Australia there are emerging very different schools of thought in games and in scholarly endeavours to explore games teaching. Games Sense and Play Practice have emerged also in Australia, but they represent variants of the TGFU model together with personal touches and perspectives.

Len Almond Keynote Transcript- 2001 International TGfU Conference

Nevertheless, I am not convinced that we have seen a legitimate element of teaching games for understanding as a conceptual framework. It is time that a conceptual framework for teaching games for understanding was explored in a critical context and we need to generate a thorough understanding of where teaching games for understanding can develop and flourish, and I'm hoping this conference can be the start of that.

In the same way,sport education needs to be scrutinised thoroughly, so this essence can permeate this practice in all teachers, in this way we can move towards the play that can generate intelligent and informed practice in schools and sports

I am delighted that Scott..... has invited this conference, his inspirations writings are testament to a person of stature who can guide us towards a rebirth of scholarship around games. I am saying here, as opposed to scholarship on games teaching, I make a distinction, I make a distinction between education and scholarship as opposed to scholarship on education. There's a vast difference there, and if anyone wants to challenge me but there is a very significant difference, even the ablest supporter, the many practitioners and researchers who really care about games as educational enterprises, they are here in numbers. Surely speaks an able scholar, to use this conference to stimulate a rebirth and reinstatement of games as significant educational practices.

I think what I would like to say is, that there is a definite need in terms of theory, to develop a theory of games. I think we have done that. I think what we were trying to do at Loughborough was doing that, they were also trying to develop a pedagogy at the time, but I want to make four distinctions. We need to develop a theory of games in their own right, I think we need to explore models of learning from games, and there are a number of things emerging at the moment, but we need to make those more readily available to teachers. I think what we also need is a new model of a games curriculum. In what way do they change in England, in North America, in Hong Kong, in Singapore, in China, in Botswana, in Last of all, what we need is we need principles that can help teachers become intelligent thinkers about the game, how can we use the way that our curricula and assert the teachers so they become intelligent users of their own practice.

Let us use our time together here to make the learning and playing of games an opportunity to sample the richness and the potential of our cultural wealth. Thank you for listening so patiently about teaching for games.

Thank you very much.