

# POWER, CONTROL AND STATUS IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION

IAN THOMSON

---

## ABSTRACT

For most of the twentieth century physical education was a low status subject in Scottish secondary schools. Opportunities for enhanced status arose from two separate systems of national courses and examinations. The first conferred Degree status on graduates of the two specialist colleges of physical education. The other incorporated physical education into a new national structure of Standard Grade and Higher Grade examinations. The latter served to amalgamate two conceptions of the nature and purpose of physical education which had divided the profession along gender lines. Control of the content of college Degree courses passed to the Council for National Academic Awards and the General Teaching Council. They were able to impose value judgements about academic work, teaching practice and practical performance which ran counter to the whole culture of physical education. In a political judgement, the Secretary of State terminated training at one specialist college and merged the other with a larger institution.

## INTRODUCTION

This paper traces the development of courses in physical education, sport and recreation in Scotland. It is set in a context of a subject divided by gender, and philosophy. However, the primary focus is on the Secretary of State for Scotland's decisions to centralise training of men and women teachers of physical education at one site and to merge the resulting Scottish Centre with Moray House College in Edinburgh. The arguments and counter-arguments of those most closely involved are summarised and evaluated. It is shown that the process of merging two colleges with quite different institutional cultures created profound insecurity in the early years of the Scottish Centre. Power and control shifted from the relatively self-contained world of physical education to national agencies with a consequent loss of identity.

## CREATION OF DEGREE COURSES IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND HUMAN MOVEMENT

In 1964 James Scotland, Principal of Aberdeen College of Education, made reference to the low status of teachers of physical education. He described them professionally as second class citizens (Scotland, 1964). The Robbins Report on Higher Education (1963) appeared to offer two routes to academic respectability for low status professional groups. One recommendation was that colleges of education should, in co-operation with universities, develop 4-year courses leading to a new Bachelor of Education (BEd) degree. A second recommendation was that a new body should be set up to validate courses and confer awards offered by higher education institutions other than universities. The Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA) was established by royal charter in 1964 and was instrumental in developing a rigorous system of degree courses in parallel with universities over the next thirty years.

There were only two colleges of education which dealt with the training of teachers of physical education. These were Dunfermline College of Physical Education (DCPE) for women and the Scottish School of Physical Education (SSPE) for men, which was part of Jordanhill College. DCPE approached Aberdeen University about a BEd degree in physical education in 1963. There is evidence

that if the Secretary of State had not decided that the new college should be built in Edinburgh, a degree course would almost certainly have been approved by Aberdeen University. After the new premises were opened at Cramond in Edinburgh in 1966, an approach was made to Edinburgh University. This was rejected initially on the grounds that the University wished to establish a BEd with Moray House College before considering a submission from DCPE. Two more attempts were abandoned by the College when it became clear that unacceptable concessions in the course content would have to be made to satisfy the University<sup>1</sup>.

The SSPE benefited from the agreement between Jordanhill College and Glasgow University to establish a BEd degree, starting in October 1966. Candidates were required to take seven university subjects plus a college study in physical education in the fourth and final year. It was a course modelled on the traditional Scottish Arts Degree. The units were not tailored to the needs of intending teachers of physical education and the University was not willing to accept physical education as a graduating subject, equivalent to the other course units. It was a fairly rigid 3+1 structure somewhat similar to the system in England whereby university graduates undertook a one-year postgraduate certificate in education course. This was the sort of course which Edinburgh University had offered to DCPE and which the College rejected. An editorial in the *Scottish Bulletin of Physical Education* (1966) raised substantial doubts about the greatly reduced time allocation for practical training and teaching practice in schools.

In September 1970, the Principal of DCPE, Miss Blunden was succeeded by Mollie Abbott, an HMI for physical education. Within weeks of her appointment a meeting was arranged between the college authorities and representatives of the Scottish Education Department (SED). It was agreed that a submission should be made to CNAA. Abbott made several appointments geared to the production of a BEd degree course. She broke with tradition by appointing two men as heads of academic departments – Education and Science. The other three new heads were women, responsible for Social Studies, Movement and Teaching Practice. The three individuals who were recruited from English specialist colleges of physical education were experienced in dealing with CNAA either in developing degree courses or serving on CNAA panels. It was no surprise when BEd and BEd (Honours) courses were approved in time for a September 1973 entry.

The SSPE was working along similar lines. The new Director, Bernard Wright, was recruited from England and initiated the appointment of highly qualified academic staff as part of the build up of a CNAA submission. Discussions began with CNAA in September 1974 for BEd and BEd (Honours) degrees in Physical Education and Human Movement. The courses were validated in June 1975 and the diploma course was discontinued immediately. No new entrants were accepted for a diploma but students entering their second and third year completed their course as planned. This contrasted with the situation of the diploma course at DCPE. The SED insisted on retaining the 3-year diploma course, articulating with a fourth year for those who were deemed capable of degree level work. The diploma course remained popular until it was discontinued in 1976.

The introduction of degree courses led to major changes in the balance between academic and practical activities. Year 4 students at DCPE did not undertake any timetabled physical activities and even more surprisingly they were not required to take part in any teaching practice in schools. These were not assessed components in the award of a BEd degree<sup>2</sup>. In the re-validated degree course in 1979 the assessment of Professional Studies and Physical Activities still did not contribute to the award of a degree. The breakdown of hours for a 4 year BEd course showed that approximately one third was allocated to Professional Studies but it was not an assessed element of the degree (Horne, 1993). It was possible for a student with a

low grade in teaching to be awarded a first class honours degree. The same situation applied at the SSPE.

The centrality of academic performance marked a clear shift in professional values. Prior to the introduction of degree courses, the main emphasis was on teaching ability. In a memorable address to an international conference in 1958, the Director of the SSPE stated unequivocally '*the emphasis at the Scottish school is, first, last and all the time on "TEACHING"*' (Brown, 1958:43). He went on to stress that the role of the college was to train teachers, and everything else was of secondary importance. A distinction award for teaching guaranteed a job for the recipient. He spoke of eliminating those whose progress in any aspect suggested that they would not make good teachers. It would have been inconceivable for him that teaching ability would not figure highly in the final award.

Perhaps the explanation for the undue emphasis on academic studies is that the colleges felt the need to fend off criticisms from universities that professional degrees in education were not intellectually sustainable (Humes, 1986). The credibility of the degree might have suffered if attempts had been made to include performance in physical activities as part of the assessment. Even within the profession it was recognised that judgements about potential teaching ability were highly subjective and based on short periods of observation. Particularly in the early years of CNAA degrees, professional skills were traded off for academic respectability.

#### CURRICULUM ISSUES

Debates about the nature and purpose of physical education during the 1960's and 1970's were contained largely within the profession. For the first half of the century the Inspectorate kept tight control of the subject, but from about 1960 its role shifted towards advice rather than prescription. In the absence of a national system of assessment, local education authorities and schools were free to develop the curriculum in physical education as they wished. The HMI's for physical education exercised influence through their relationship to the specialist colleges and the separate professional Associations for male and female teachers of physical education. The male version staged their annual conferences at the SSPE and the women held their conferences at DCPE. It was on those occasions that professional issues were debated. The Inspectorate played a prominent role in the proceedings.

Kirk (1990) has summarised the emergence of two distinct versions of physical education from about 1955 to 1975. Both north and south of the Border a divide opened up between male and female teachers, colleges for men and women, and the Inspectorate. The debate polarised between an aesthetic/expressive account of Human Movement favoured by women and a skill-centred, scientific approach by men, (Kane, 1977). In an influential paper entitled 'The Concept of Physical Education' Carlisle (1969) concluded that physical education was primarily an aesthetic activity. His paper spawned a number of contributions to the literature (Kane, 1976). In 1972 the SED issued a curriculum paper on physical education which sought to bring the two versions together in a balanced programme but it had little effect.

The curriculum of physical education in Scottish schools was dominated by games. The vast majority of principal teachers were men and it was exceedingly difficult for women to express or impose their views. Change came about because physical education was carried along on a tide of national initiatives. In this process the colleges of physical education were gradually marginalised and the fulcrum of power and influence shifted to the SED and the Inspectorate. The impetus for reform was the reports of the Munn and Dunning Committees which led to the appointment in 1983 of a SED Joint Working Party for physical education. It produced an ingenious system which provided flexibility and choice for a Standard Grade 160 hours course spread over two years. Teachers were able to select components according to teaching

strengths and the interests of pupils. The system brought together the two concepts of physical education which had previously divided the profession.

Mid-way through the deliberations of the Joint Working Party, conflict between the government and the teaching profession erupted into industrial action. Extra-curricular school sport came to a standstill in 1986. Nevertheless Standard Grade physical education was embraced enthusiastically by schools. Between 1990 and 1992 the number of registrations grew from 6700 to over 18000. From this it was a short step to introducing Higher Grade physical education and National Certificate courses.

The content of the subject was controlled by central bodies. The SED had taken over the leadership role formerly held by the specialist colleges. Hoyle (1986) argued that examinations might not bring the status which physical education sought. He described it as 'the pursuit of a chimera'. He was supported by David Hargreaves, (1982) then the Chief Inspector of Schools for ILEA, who preferred a non-examination route for physical education. However the die was cast and control shifted inexorably towards the centre.

#### CONTRACTION AND MERGERS

Much progress was made between 1966 and 1976 in moving towards a graduate profession in physical education. However, threats to the long-term future of the specialist colleges north and south of the Border appeared in the mid-70's. This stemmed from fluctuations in demand for places in colleges. In Scotland the number of students in teacher training rose from 4884 in 1959-60 to 10242 in 1967-68 (Marker and Raab, 1993). Between 1964 and 1976 the number of colleges increased from six to ten but the peak demand for teachers had passed and the government set about a programme of closures and mergers. The SED (January 1977) provided proposals for slimming down the system in a consultation paper *Teacher Training from 1977 Onwards*. The main proposal was to reduce the ten existing colleges to six. It also included transferring the training of women teachers of physical education to Dundee, a new college which had been built for 1800 students in 1976 but had only 579 students at the beginning of session 1977-78.

Cope (1978) has documented the well-orchestrated campaign of resistance to the government's measures. The country was united in its opposition even through the economic argument for contraction was accepted. Over 200,000 people signed petitions and the press, radio and television were used to publicise the issue. Lord James Douglas-Hamilton, Conservative MP for DCPE's area of Edinburgh tabled approximately 100 questions in the House and put forward a private member's bill to change the name of Dunfermline College of Physical Education to the Scottish College of Movement and Education (failed to obtain a second reading). Dennis Canavan MP (Labour) persuaded the Scottish Labour Party Conference in March 1977 to adopt an emergency resolution rejecting the government's proposals. Mollie Abbott worked tirelessly to safeguard DCPE. She lobbied MPs in Edinburgh and attended relevant debates in the House of Commons as well as enlisting the support of students for public demonstrations. Finally in December 1977 Bruce Millan the Secretary of State for Scotland issued a statement that all ten colleges would be retained.

The government had been forced by public opinion to withdraw its proposals but the problem of over-capacity remained. Four of the colleges had an occupancy rate of less than 50 per cent and the student intake figures for 1977-78 were even lower than officially permitted. DCPE, with the lowest number of students looked particularly vulnerable. Enrolments for courses in physical education at Cramond fell from an average of 175 between 1972 and 1976 to just over 100 in 1978. The Conservative government elected in 1979 had to find a solution to over-capacity which would take account of the counter-arguments advanced in 1977. They responded with a

consultation paper in August 1980 (SED, 1980). Surprisingly DCPE was reprieved and allowed to continue as the only independent specialist college in Britain. It was seen as a special case because it was a national college. There was no mention of the SSPE and no comment about the single-sex nature of the two colleges.

#### SCOTTISH TERTIARY EDUCATION ADVISORY COUNCIL (STEAC)

In July 1984 the Secretary of State for Scotland appointed the Scottish Tertiary Education Advisory Council (STEAC) to consider and report on a future strategy for the whole of higher education in Scotland including universities, central institutions and colleges of education. The Government had decided earlier to review all of higher education in the UK including the universities and the public sector of higher education in England and Wales. The STEAC review complemented this work and the Council was able to take account of the Government Green Paper, *'The Development of Higher Education into the 1990s'* (May 1985) before publishing its own report in November 1985.

STEAC provided a lengthy discussion about the possibility of integrating the system of teacher training either within the university system or the central institution sector. Having weighed up the arguments the Council came down firmly in support of monotechnic teacher education colleges. This contrasted with the reality of English Colleges of Education having been absorbed into polytechnics.

The Council recognised that the Scottish Colleges of Education had been in a state of virtually continuous contraction since about 1977 in line with the decline in the school population. It could not foresee that the seven colleges would ever again be filled to capacity with teacher training. It rejected the idea of diversification into other areas simply to fill empty spaces and commented instead:

'The standard of teacher training in Scotland will, in our view, be best preserved by its concentration in thriving specialist establishments with a common sense of purpose.' (STEAC, 1985:para5.34)

It recommended that the problem of surplus capacity be solved by reducing the seven existing colleges to three non-denominational and one Catholic college. This was based on a 1984-85 SED projected need for about 5250 students, although in a House of Commons debate on STEAC in March 1986 Donald Dewar pointed out that the revised SED estimate for 1985-86 was 7380 (Hansard, March 1986).

Malcolm Rifkind (Conservative) was the Secretary of State for Scotland. He was inclined to accept the STEAC argument that there were too many colleges and that this led to high unit costs but in the year before a General Election he could not risk a similar response to the 1977 closures plan. He had to find a compromise solution. The Catholic St Andrews College was the only one of the seven which was safe although there was never any real possibility that Jordanhill or Moray House, by far the largest colleges, would close. The vulnerable institutions were Craigie, in Ayr with the smallest number of students, Dundee, still languishing with only a 40% occupancy rate, Aberdeen, and DCPE.

Malcolm Rifkind came under powerful pressure from within his own party in favour of retaining Craigie which lay within the constituency of a former Conservative Secretary of State for Scotland, George Younger. He eventually conceded that Craigie should survive but Aberdeen and Dundee would merge to form a Northern College. This left five non-denominational colleges and Rifkind could have rested on that number. STEAC was after all an advisory body but its report was in the public domain. He therefore decided as a further economy measure that DCPE should merge with Moray House, leaving only four denominational colleges. This would allow him to claim that all existing sites had been retained but within larger more cost effective units. It was an ingenious political move but it

reduced the number of independent institutions and greatly increased the standing of Jordanhill and Moray House.

#### CENTRALISATION OF THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF TEACHERS OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION

STEAC (1985) raised an issue which affected the two specialist colleges of physical education. The Council drew attention to the need to bring to an end the separate training of men and women teachers of physical education following the enactment of section 4 of the Further Education Act, 1985. That legislation was in response to the need for integrated training to meet the provisions of the European Commission's Equal Treatment Directive.

The two specialist colleges set about framing responses to this statement. They reached quite different conclusions about the way ahead although interestingly neither contested the case for integrated provision. DCPE saw it as an opportunity to establish a single national centre with a larger student population. This would help to reduce unit costs per annum as STEAC had shown that the College had a relatively high cost per student. The College was experienced in lobbying Members of Parliament and educational bodies for support. Lord James Douglas Hamilton, the local MP, had exerted considerable pressure on the Labour government on behalf of the College in 1977. He was in a much better position now with a Conservative government in power. The Secretary of State was well aware that Lord James was in a marginal seat and any threat to DCPE could damage his prospects of re-election. The DCPE case was based on the following:

- The College was an autonomous body with its own Board of Governors and a Principal who was a member of the Committee of Principals of Colleges of Education. The post of Director of the SSPE was a third tier post within a larger institution.
- The Cramond site contained purpose-built facilities, residencies, and playing fields as well as a specialist library, and well-equipped laboratories.
- There was a critical mass of staff covering all aspects of physical education and sport. They outnumbered the relatively small establishment at the SSPE.
- The in-service course provision for teachers was delivered locally throughout Scotland on a larger scale than that of the SSPE due to the substantially greater staffing allocation.
- The sports facilities were used extensively by the local community and by governing bodies of sport. Due partially to its somewhat isolated location the SSPE could not match this provision.

There was a further educational consideration. The introduction of national courses and examinations in physical education had forced the profession to bury strongly-held philosophical differences between men and women teachers of physical education. The Inspectorate were aware of the gap between opposing conceptions of the nature of physical education held by men and women. These differences had been maintained, if not created, by the specialist colleges. There was an opportunity to unify training, rationalise differences in philosophy, and centralise preparation for physical education and sport on one campus. The judgement came down to whether this could best be achieved in the male dominated culture of the SSPE or what appeared to be a more open climate at Dunfermline College.

Brian Duffield, then the Assistant Principal (and later the Principal) recalls that he was charged with the duty of building logical arguments in support of DCPE's survival while Mollie Abbott was using her considerable lobbying techniques in other

places. Looking back Duffield doubts whether logic and objectivity determined the outcome. Abbott had built an image and identity of the college out of all proportion to its size and significance. This, along with wider political considerations certainly provided great strength to the DCPE campaign.

Jordanhill never accepted that it was necessary or desirable to centralise training at one site in order to end the separate training of men and women teachers of physical education. The College authorities consistently took the view that physical education was too important a subject to be provided at only one national centre and there should be two, one in the east and the other in the west, both with a co-educational intake. They refused to be drawn into a war of words with DCPE and concentrated instead on lobbying Members of Parliament in the west of Scotland, most of whom were Labour MPs. The College was not persuaded about the Secretary of State's idea of a 'centre of excellence' which was ill-defined. Jordanhill focused on the outstanding quality of the work of the SSPE over the past fifty years and the quality of its graduates.

#### THE GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSES TO STEAC

Malcolm Rifkind announced his response to STEAC in a Parliamentary statement (Hansard, 17 July 1986). His decision to retain a fairly wide geographical spread of provision was welcomed by all Parties as was his decision against closure of any of the colleges. He advanced five arguments in support of his proposals for training of PE teachers.

- Firstly he stated, inaccurately, that he was obliged to close the SSPE because of the European directive which prohibited single sex education (col 1192). In fact he was only required to ensure co-educational provisions which could have occurred at two sites.
- Secondly he indicated that the numbers involved could not possibly justify having male and female students at both Jordanhill and Dunfermline (col 1195). There were about 300 students at DCPE and 180 at the SSPE. If current intake levels had been maintained and split between the two colleges it is likely that Dunfermline would not have been viable.
- Thirdly he referred to the educational arguments which had been put to him which pointed overwhelmingly to Dunfermline being the site for physical education (col 1190). When challenged by Donald Dewar to publish in full the facts and advice he had received he simply ignored the request.
- Fourthly he argued that by concentrating all the students on one site it would substantially reduce the under-use of capacity at Dunfermline (col 1190).
- Finally he identified the educational benefits of merging Dunfermline and Moray House – these included PE students having greater contact with other teacher trainees and being able to use the facilities at Moray House (col 1193).

Malcolm Rifkind rejected the STEAC recommendations that planning and funding of the whole sector of further and higher education should be transferred to a new body responsible to the Secretary of State for Scotland. Instead, he retained the Scottish Universities within the UK system and left the colleges of education under the paternalistic control of the SED.

There can be little doubt that any educational advice was supplied by the Scottish Education Department. The most senior member of the Inspectorate, Alec Ferguson Chief HMI was a regular visitor to Jordanhill and DCPE and his evaluation would have been a significant factor. However Malcolm Rifkind never commented on

this matter. For Dr Tom Bone the Principal of Jordanhill, the decision to merge Dunfermline with Moray House could not have been a huge surprise. He was vice-chairman of STEAC and if its recommendation for only three non-denominational colleges had been approved it was likely that Dunfermline would have faced closure. However, Bone was plainly shocked by Malcolm Rifkind's decision to terminate training at Jordanhill. Over the next eighteen months Bone held to the view that there should be two centres (Jordanhill College, 1986).

Malcolm Rifkind met a deputation from Jordanhill on 5 September and conveyed his response in a letter to the chairman of the Board of Governors on 24 September<sup>3</sup>. He confirmed that his decisions would stand. He set out, unequivocally, his arguments against two specialist centres and closed the door on any hope of survival of the SSPE. Although the Governors continued to lobby for two centres the government remained resolute. In November 1986 the SED issued target intakes for the colleges for 1987-88, which proposed an intake of 90 students for the new Scottish Centre for Physical Education (SED, 1986). This was a 50 per cent increase on the present combined intake of the SSPE and DCPE and it seemed to undermine the government's case for merging the two institutions.

#### THE MORAY HOUSE/DCPE MERGES

The decision to merge DCPE with Moray House came as a complete surprise and amounted to a rejection of STEAC's objections to split sites. Indeed if the government wished to incorporate the training of teachers of physical education into a larger institution the argument in support of SSPE grew ever stronger since it was located within Jordanhill. Faced with a merger, DCPE suggested that it should be allowed to retain its Principal and Board of Governors in a partnership arrangement. Gordon Kirk, Principal of Moray House rejected this argument and the proposals he made in September were eventually implemented<sup>4</sup>. There would be a third-tier post of Director of the new Scottish Centre and only one Board of Governors. This was precisely the situation of the Director of the SSPE at Jordanhill and it did seem to outsiders to be a case of re-inventing the wheel.

The government moved swiftly. A quadripartite working party was appointed in August consisting of representatives of the three colleges and SED. It produced an Interim Report on 21 November and responses were required by 5 December. The Final Report was published two weeks later. The professional associations representing teachers and lecturers expressed outrage at this time scale and also questioned why minutes of the working party and sub committees remained confidential.

The Scottish Universities PE Association argued that *'secrecy inevitably suggests that information is being deliberately withheld'* and the Scottish Council of Physical Education protested about the threat to the democratic process of comprehensive consultation (SUPEA, 1986). The Times Education Supplement (1986) concentrated on the recommendation that the Director of the new Centre should be open (i.e. restricted) to the higher academic staff of the three colleges.

The Principal of DCPE announced that she would retire in mid-December. The Director of the SSPE indicated that he would not apply for the post. Neither of them was prepared to serve under Gordon Kirk in a merged college. Ms Carroll from DCPE was particularly virulent about the loss of the independent status of DCPE. This left only two people as candidates, neither of whom had a qualification in physical education. The assistant principal of DCPE, whose background lay in tourism and recreation research was appointed as Director of the new Scottish Centre for Physical Education, Movement and Leisure Studies. Without regard to the personal and professional attributes of the individual, the appointment was not welcomed. In their submission, responding to the Interim Report, the Jordanhill Governors had insisted that the post



should be held by someone who had considerable experience and qualifications in the area of physical education training (Jordanhill, 1986).

Behind these basic facts there was seething discontent. It would have been hard enough to amalgamate the Scottish Centre with Moray House but the need to assimilate students and staff from the SSPE made matters doubly difficult. To start with, Moray House had developed a management system based on a large number of committees which delayed and frustrated decision making. The new Director of the Scottish Centre recalls that at one time he was a member of 32 separate committees, most of which operated at the Moray House campus several miles away from his office. Gordon Kirk's style of leadership could be abrasive, confrontational and uncompromising.

The institutional culture of Moray House was far removed from that of DCPE which was essentially consensual under Jean Carroll's leadership. It was made clear that DCPE would not be allowed to retain any separate identity within the composite institution. It would be submerged in Moray House. Any possibility that Carroll would swap the job of Principal of DCPE for a low level Assistant Principal at Moray House was eliminated during meetings of the Working Party. Her aversion to Kirk made her resignation inevitable.

The new Scottish Centre came into existence on 1 April 1987. It had been agreed that students in the present second, third and fourth years of the Jordanhill BEd course should complete their course at the SSPE. First year students at the SSPE would transfer to Cramond to follow a modified version of the present DCPE BEd course. A new BEd course should be introduced in session 1988-89. All of this was subject to CNAA approval. These changes were introduced while staff from SSPE and DCPE were deciding to apply or not to apply for posts in the staffing structure of the new Centre.

Posts of responsibility in the Scottish Centre were open to staff of the SSPE and DCPE, and interviews were conducted by Moray House. Among the casualties was the course director of the 1984 DCPE BEd course who had cast aside the 'disciplines' of science and arts in favour of an emphasis on teaching. This, a professional degree based on teaching styles was a radical departure from the skill based SSPE degree and the movement studies DCPE course. When he was passed over, his successor took the opportunity in the 1988 degree for men and women to revert to a disciplined based degree course much closer to the kind of course offered by the SSPE. Thus, within a short period of time the nature of the BEd course had swung from one extreme to another. It was a period of profound insecurity during which staff morale was at a low ebb.

#### THE AFTERMATH OF STEAC

In retrospect the colleges of physical education paid the price for not building close working relationships. The SSPE was too late in recognising the full extent of the threat posed by STEAC. A senior member of staff admitted that they were 'a bit naïve' and '*we always assumed that whatever happened to PE training we were the ones who would survive*' (Times Educational Supplement, 1986). Jordanhill stuck too long with the belief that there was a case for the two centres, one in the East and one in the West of Scotland. In an exchange of letters in the Glasgow Herald, Mollie Abbott claimed that the reason Dunfermline won was '*that it has been so much better than the SSPE*'. This brought a swift response from the Director of the SSPE. He stated that the only respect in which DCPE had been better than SSPE was Miss Abbott's skill in lobbying, a skill that had been honed in fighting off merger proposals in 1977 and 1981 (Glasgow Herald, 15 November 1986).

No evidence has come to light subsequently to explain fully why the decision was taken to centralise training on one site. Malcolm Rifkind must have been aware

that there would be a 50 per cent increase in intakes in 1987 from 60 to 90, and a likelihood of a further increase in 1988. It might have been possible to retain two centres each with a co-educational intake of 45-50 which would have maintained viability for both places. And yet, in a House of Commons reply to a question from Jim Craigen MP (Labour) on 17 July, Rifkind insisted that,

‘The numbers involved could not possibly justify having male and female students at both Jordanhill and Dunfermline’ (Hansard, July 1986: col1195).

An economic analysis casts doubt on the wisdom of locating the new National Centre in Edinburgh. The unit cost at DCPE in 1985-86 was £4,796 compared with only £3,781 at Jordanhill. The Interim Report indicated that extensive alterations would be required at DCPE to provide adequate changing room facilities and toilets for men and women; an investment appraisal should be undertaken into the provision of a floodlit synthetic pitch; the requirements of male PE students who would be based at DCPE needed to be established more clearly; and as a priority, there should be an extension to the games hall to replace a temporary air hall. Jordanhill claimed to have the capacity to cater for practical activity for 670 men and women at any one time, having already made suitable modifications to changing and toilet facilities. It already possessed a full-size, all-weather, floodlit pitch. Its outdoor pitch provision included 5 full-size pitches, 7 tennis courts and an athletics track. Jordanhill also claimed to have double the number of indoor areas compared to DCPE viz, 5 gymnasias, 2 dance studios, 2 swimming pools, 2 large games halls, a purpose designed conditioning room and squash court. The indoor areas alone could accommodate 400 students simultaneously.

The most contentious aspect of Malcolm Rifkind’s pronouncement was the merger of DCPE with Moray House College. His only explanation, contained in a letter of 24 September to the Jordanhill governors was that *‘it is easier to mix socially with other students on a single campus’*. It is difficult to reconcile that statement with a decision to create a merged college using two campuses several miles apart. And if he really believed in the value of a single campus that was precisely what Jordanhill offered. In terms of financial savings the Working Party considered that the only benefit would be the loss of thirteen administrative and academic services posts.

Moray House made claims about its superior computer and other resources. In fact the Interim Report of the Working Party was critical of the Moray House library facilities and ‘a number of scattered resource centres across the campus’. Once again Jordanhill emerged in a more favourable light with a new library built in 1972, regarded by CNAA as one of the best facilities for teacher training in Britain. Doug Gillon extolled Jordanhill’s contribution to Scotland’s world class athletes, particularly the computer and performance analysis resources (Glasgow Herald, 13 October 1986). One gains the impression that Moray House, as surprised as everyone else at the merger with DCPE, had to find ways of justifying it after the announcement was made.

#### CONCLUSION

In a straight comparison of facilities and resources it is hard to avoid the conclusion that Jordanhill was superior to DCPE. Centralisation at the former institution would not have involved anywhere near the expenditure required at Cramond. It had already been shown that unit costs were much higher at DCPE. The SSPE had been an integral part of a larger college for half a century and in contrast to the DCPE/Moray House merger it was contained within the Jordanhill campus.

By retaining Craige as an independent college Malcolm Rifkind undermined the arguments for merging DCPE with Moray House. Craige had only 318 students

in 1984, and, like the other students at the Catholic St Andrew's College they were isolated from other students. Therefore size and social mix could not have been decisive factors in the merger proposed. The new intake figures at DCPE suggested an overall population at Cramond in excess of 500 men and women in 1987/88. Neither Moray House or DCPE had sought or had discussed a merger. They were faced with a totally unexpected, unwanted situation brought about by Malcolm Rifkind's political skills. The Working Party seemed to provide a neutral negotiating chamber, but in September 1986 Kirk adopted a typically uncompromising stand. This would not be an equal partnership of two institutions, each with a long distinguished history. The smaller specialist college would have to give up its separate identity, its own Principal and its own Board of Governors. It was a step too far for the Principal, Jean Carroll. In retrospect it is hard to find an economic, educational or organisational justification for the merger between two colleges with such widely different institutional cultures.

Kirk (1999) has provided the most likely explanation.

'The Secretary of State's decisions were more an exercise in political calculation than a declaration of a coherent and convincing strategy' (Kirk, 1999:103).

The STEAC report defended the monotechnic colleges system and Rifkind's reconstruction followed suit. What neither of them could control was a continuing decline in the demand for teachers. The intakes continued downward into the early 1990s. The passage of the Further and Higher Education (Scotland) Act, 1992 led inexorably to the demise of monotechnic colleges.

By the year 2000 all the Scottish colleges of education had merged with universities. Moray House, after a brief relationship with Heriot-Watt, merged with Edinburgh in 1998. Kirk accepts that the evidence submitted to STEAC by the Principals of colleges (with the exception of Jordanhill) had been stridently in favour of autonomy. And yet within a few years the same individuals were embracing university/college mergers. It is likely that the motives were driven by financial pressures. This was all a mixed blessing for physical education. On the one hand it was located in a prestigious university. On the other hand its identity had been subsumed into a larger more academic body. The beautiful campus at Cramond was sold off for private housing and the Scottish Centre was re-housed in the renovated Moray House Sports Centre in the middle of Edinburgh. Ironically DCPE ended up as part of a faculty of education at Edinburgh University, the institution which had rejected physical education in the 1960s.

#### NOTES

1. In 1963, DCPE began negotiations with Aberdeen University but this coincided with discussions between the Scottish Council for the Training of Teachers and the SED resulting in the location of the new college in Edinburgh. The College also approached Stirling University but the most likely scenario, a joint degree with Moray House which was favoured by its Principal Douglas MacIntosh, also failed.
2. Four BEd degrees were designed at Dunfermline College between 1973 and 1988. It was not until 1992 that students' performance on placement in schools was accepted as an assessed element of the classification of the degree. This resulted from intervention by the General Teaching Council for Scotland.
3. M. Rifkind MP Letter of 24 September 1986 to the Chairman of the Governors of Jordanhill College. '...Only by seeking to create a single establishment can the necessary scale of operation be achieved in order to ensure that the range of course options is suitably rich and the specialist support services sufficiently broad. In management terms, moreover, two specialist centres could exacerbate the difficulties which can arise – and are being experienced, at present – from fluctuations in the demand for teachers in a single secondary subject'.

4. Merger of Dunfermline College of Physical Education with Moray House College. Statement from Moray House College D Mackenzie, Chairman, Board of Governors and G. Kirk Principal 8 September 1986.  
 'If an integrated institution is to flourish and if the existing assets of the two colleges are to be effectively marshalled to promote a coherent and economically efficient programme of professional activities, it will require a properly integrated management structure with a single Board of Governors, a single Principal, a single Board of Studies, a single secretariat and a single budget and staffing allocation'.

#### REFERENCES

- Brown, H.C. (1958) 'The Training of the Teacher of Physical Education', Report on the Second British Empire and Commonwealth Conference on Physical Education, p43–46.
- Cope, E. (1978) Consultation or Confrontation: The Campaign to Save the Scottish Colleges of Education. In H.M. Drucker & M.G. Clarke (eds) *The Scottish Government Yearbook*, p88–98.
- Cruikshank, M. (1970) *A History of the Training of Teachers in Scotland*. University of London Press.
- Fletcher, S. (1984) Women First. *The Female Tradition in English Physical Education, 1880–1980*, p123.
- Glasgow Herald (1986) (a) D Gillon 13 October, (b) Letters to the editor from M. Abbott 13 November and G.B. Wright 15 November.
- Hansard (House of Commons) Scottish Tertiary Education Advisory Council, 27 March 1986 col.1147 and 17 July 1986 col.1187.
- Hargreaves, D. (1982) *The Challenge for the Comprehensive School*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Horne, J. (1993) The Evolution of the BEd Degrees, at Ordinary and Honours level, in Physical Education at a Scottish Institute of Higher Education, from 1973–1993. Unpublished M.Ed dissertation, University of Stirling.
- Hoyle, E. (1986) Curriculum Development in Physical Education 1966–1985. Trends and Developments in Physical Education: Proceedings of the VIII Commonwealth and International Conference in Sports Physical Education. Dance, Recreation and Health. E & FN Spon. London p35–48.
- Humes, W. (1986) *The Leadership Class in Scottish Education*. John Donald, Edinburgh p143–145.
- Kane, J. (ed. 1976) *Curriculum Development in Physical Education*, Crosby Lockwood Stable, London.
- Kane, J. (ed. 1977) *Movement Studies and Physical Education*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- Kirk, D and Tinning, R. (1990) *Physical Education, Curriculum and Culture*. The Falmer Press, London.
- Kirk, G. (1999) The Passing of Monotechnic Teacher Education in Scotland. *Scottish Educational Review* 31.2.1999, p.103.
- Marker, W. and Raab, C.D. (1993) Advise and Construct: The Expansion of the Scottish Colleges of Education in the 1960's. *Scottish Educational Review*, vol 25, no 1, p3–16.
- MacLean, I.C. (1976) *The History of Dunfermline College of Physical Education*. Blackwood, Edinburgh, p114–115.
- Robbins. (1963) *Higher Education*. Report of the Robbins Committee Cmnd 2154 HMSO, London.
- Scotland, J. (1964) The Physical Education Teacher. *Scottish Bulletin of Physical Education*, Vol 1 no 2 p37–40.
- STEAC (1985) *Future Strategy for Higher Education in Scotland*. Report of the Scottish Tertiary Education Advisory Council, chairman D.M McCallum. Cmnd 9676, HMSO, para 5.34.
- SED (1972) Physical Education in Secondary Schools: *Curriculum Paper 12*, HMSO.
- SED (1977) *Teacher Training from 1977 onwards*. January.
- SED (1980) *The Future of the College of Education System*. August.
- SED (1986) Intake to Teacher Training Courses, Session 1987–88. 24 November.
- SUPEA (1986) Scottish Universities P.E. Association. Letter of 3 December to the chairman of the Working Party on the merger of Dunfermline College with Moray House College.
- Thomson, I. (1986) Professional Training in Physical Education and Sport within a Binary System of Higher and Further Education in England 1944-1985. Trends and Developments in Physical Education: Proceedings of the VIII Commonwealth and International Conference in Sport, Physical Education, Dance, Recreation and Health, E & FNSpon. London, p61–74.
- Thomson, I. (1983) The Training and Status of Physical Education Teachers in Scotland 1872-1939, *Physical Education Review*, Vol 6, no.1, 1983, p26-41.
- Thomson, I. (1993) Physical Education in the Government's Programme for Scottish Schools, *Physical Education Review*, Vol 6, no.2, p122–130.
- Thomson, I. (1993) Physical Education in Scotland 1973–1993. *Scottish Journal of Physical Education*, Vol 21, no 2, p4-14.