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Abstract (2)

Physical education and health [PEH] is a popular school subject, but the aims and purposes of the subject are not so evident. How do the students experience the subject? In this study ten female students who passed their mandatory PEH program are interviewed regarding how they experienced the subject and what they learned after twelve years of mandatory lessons in PEH. The interviews are analysed using Merleau-Ponty’s (1997) theory of the lived body. The results show that PEH is experienced as two distinct subjects: physical education and health education. The physical education part is mainly sport activities and is considered not serious, in comparison with club sports. Health education is taught as a theoretical subject and is rejected because theory does not belong to PEH. When the subject is taught in a dualistic knowledge tradition, the learning of PEH is neither theoretically nor practically satisfactory. The students vaguely suggest a more integrated approach to learning.
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Physical education and health [PEH] is a popular school subject. The majority of students have a positive view of the subject. PEH is fun is a common discernment (Larsson, 2004; Meckbach & Söderström, 2002; Redelius, 2004; Sandahl, 2005; Skolverket [The Swedish National Agency for Education], 2005). The subject is dominated by an activity discourse (performing physical activities) and a social fostering discourse (cooperation and caring for one’s schoolmates) (Quennerstedt, 2006). The students as well as the teachers have however problems defining the aim and purpose of the subject (Kirk, 2010; Redelius & Larsson, 2004; Skolverket, 2005). What is learned in the subject is therefore not so evident: ‘Evidently there are learning processes and knowledge acquisition concepts that the students never or very seldom have heard about in connection with PEH’ (Larsson, 2004, p. 133).

The students’ experiences and their notions of the subject are important aspects that are not often researched (Dyson, 2006). Because “Physical education is defined by what is said, done and written in its name” (Kirk, 2010, p. 1), how students understand and interpret the subject is a valuable aspect of the subject. Their understanding might serve as a point of departure for developing the subject in a direction that increases students’ learning (Larsson, 2004). Some of the findings that Dyson (2006) reported in his overview of the international research on the subject seem universal, such as physical education is fun, it provides a break from more important subjects, its purpose is to play, it teaches certain skills, and students do not have a clear understanding of the goals of

---

1 Sport and Health is the Swedish name of the subject but in this paper Physical Education and Health [PEH] will be used.
different activities. Dyson (2006) also stated that, even if most students have a positive attitude, there is usually a group of students who do not appreciate the subject (Dyson, 2006; Larsson, 2004, 2008a).

Background (2)

Since elementary school was established in Sweden in the mid-19th century, PEH has been a compulsory subject both in mandatory and voluntary school. At that time, the main content of PEH was Linggymnastics and this very structured gymnastics exercised hegemony over the subject until the beginning of the 20th century. The movements in Linggymnastics were based on human anatomy, and every movement was described in detail. It was executed in classes of more than 100 students and was lead by command of the teacher. In the mid-20th century, Linggymnastics’ dominance in the curriculum was replaced by that of sports activities (Blom & Lindroth, 1995; Lundvall, 2004). Sport was also the name of the subject until the end of the century, when it was changed to ‘Sport and Health’. Studies show that the health aspect mostly occurs as physical activity and occasionally as theory lessons (Sandahl, 2005; Skolverket, 2005; Thedin Jakobsson, 2004). In national and local policy documents, the health content is constructed on a biomedical basis; a dualistic view of the body and a pathogenic view of health dominate (Swartling Widerström, 2005; Quennerstedt, 2006).

Parallel with the development of PEH as a school subject, the Swedish voluntary club sport organisation developed. After the Olympic Games in Stockholm in 1912, different sport activities became more and more popular. The establishment of the Swedish Sport Confederation [Riksidrottssförbundet] made it easier to establish new sport clubs first in the cities but later also in the countryside. Club sport spread all over Sweden. Today, sport is the most
frequent leisure activity among Swedish children and youth (Peterson, 2000; Riksidrottsförbundet, 2005).

Sport activities have been the main content in the subject since 1962 and still are. To do sport activities is what students as well as PEH teachers prefer and expect of the lessons (Ekberg, 2009; Larsson, 2004, 2008b; Londos, 2010; Sandahl, 2005). The Swedish Sport Confederation has also served as PEH teachers’ in-service training (Annerstedt, 1991). Since the paradigm shift from gymnastics to sport, there has been a strong connection between voluntary club sports and the school subject (Londos, 2010). Olofsson (2007) summarized that “All in all this research survey shows that compulsory PEH teaching has been strongly influenced by voluntary (competitive) sports, both in Sweden . . . and in other countries” (p. 166). Schools also use sport to attract students, and some upper secondary schools have programmes on the national level for different sports (Eliasson, Ferry, & Olofsson, 2010).

The connection between club sports and the school subject, as well as the name ‘Sport and Health’ is both a strength and a weakness of the subject. Sport activity was the content in the policy documents from 1962. Gradually the commission of the subject has increased, the sport influence has decreased (Ekberg, 2009; Lundvall & Meckbach, 2008) and fewer concrete directives on what the subject should contain have been given in the national policy documents (Annerstedt 1991, 1994; Jagtøien, Hansen & Annerstedt, 2004). The lack of directives has lead to a discrepancy between the directives given by the national policy documents and what actually happens in the lessons (Ekberg, 2009; Karlefors, 2010; Londos, 2010; Lundvall & Meckbach, 2008). PEH appears as an activity subject, with team ball sports as the principal activity (Carli, 2004; Ekberg, 2009; Öhman, 2007; Quennerstedt, 2006; Skolverket,
2005, Swartling Widerström, 2005) while it has a broader aim and content according to the policy documents (Ekberg, 2009; Lundvall & Meckbach, 2008). The subject has in Bernstein’s (1977) terminology a weak classification and is affected by other agents (Lundvall & Meckbach, 2008) “mainly through a dominant sport discourse” (Ekberg, 2009, p. 79). This situation favours those pupils who are engaged in organised sport in their leisure time (Sandahl, 2005), called “the dominant ones” (Londos, 2010). The other group of students, with little or no experience of club sport, is called “the dominated ones” referring to their respective influences on the lessons (Londos, 2010). The dominant ones are chiefly boys, which results in the girls’ interests being pushed into the background (Carli, 2004), and boys receive higher marks in the subject than girls (Redelius, Fagrell, & Larsson, 2009).

Despite the sport influence, PEH is a school subject and should be steered by national and local policy documents. However, there are several aspects in the organisation of the subject that separates it from the rest of the school (Karlefors, 2002). The subject of PEH is oriented more towards organised sport than towards school teaching (Londos, 2010).

Aim and Theoretical Framework (2)
The aim of the study is to obtain a student perspective of the subject PEH and what learning the subject mediates. Ten female 17-year-old students have been interviewed about their lived experiences of PEH. The history of PEH, the biomedical dualistic view of the subject and the health content, and the connection to organised sport make Merleau-Ponty’s (1997) theory of the lived body a conceivable, interesting, and relevant theoretical approach. Merleau-Ponty (1997) denied the Cartesian view that the body is divided in two parts, the mind and the body, and argued that mind and body never can be separated. We always occupy our bodies, and we explore the world through our lived bodies
while moving and using our senses. Moving and learning go together and are important for our existence and our learning. (Bengtsson, 2001; Merleau-Ponty, 1997; Torstensson-Ed, 2003). A movement, a skill, can be integrated into the lived body by repetition and a habit can be acquired.

When a skill is acquired, a habit, or more precisely, a habitual field of practice is integrated with the own lived body. When the skill once is acquired it can be repeated with the same precision without thinking again and again. (Bengtsson, 2006, p. 124)

This habitual movement is both motoric and perceptual; it is both thought and body; it is the lived body as the conveyor of the life-world (Merleau-Ponty, 1997). A habit may also involve a ‘thing’, such as a bicycle or a ball. By repeatedly using it, a ‘thing’ can be incorporated into the lived body, a new habit is established and you do not have to think when using it (Bengtsson, 2005). To establish a habit is constituted by ‘I can.’

Doing research of a lived experience implies looking for meaningful structures in the lived experience and trying to find the core of it (van Manen, 1990). The phenomenologist asks, “What is this or that kind of experience like?” (van Manen, 1990, p. 9). It wants to find insights into how a part of the world or a phenomenon has been experienced. This study will describe the subject of PEH with the help of ten female students’ lived experiences. “The aim is to construct an animating evocative description (text) of human actions, behaviours, intentions and experiences as we meet them in the life world” (van Manen, 1990, p. 19).

The study is retrospective, which means that the interviewees describe experiences that are transformed into reflections when they answer the interview questions. The experiences are then processed by the researcher, who analyses them and communicates her/his results in a text (Bengtsson, 2005; van Manen, 1990). For this reason, the results cannot be generalised, but they can give us
insights into how the subject of PEH can be experienced, understood, and interpreted from a student perspective.

Method
The students had completed their mandatory PEH programme at the time of the interviews. The ten female students have known each other since they were young. They grew up in the same village, attended the same schools, and played on the same sport team. Due to their common background, possible variations in their experiences can contribute to a multifaceted picture of the subject.

Even if all the informants are girls, no gender perspective is placed on the analyses. The subject of PEH is the phenomenon being studied based on the students’ experiences of the subject and their learning experiences. Their experiences are consolidated in themes that emerged during the analysis (van Manen, 1990).

The interviews lasted about 60 minutes each, were semi-structured, and dealt with the interviewed students’ experiences of club sport, physical education, and their views of themselves as physically active in a lifelong perspective. This article is about the part of the interviews that dealt with the school subject of PEH. The ten students have known the interviewer for many years, so the interviews were carried out in a safe atmosphere. The students were informed of the aim of the interview, that their participation was voluntary, and that they were able to stop their participation at any time if they so wished. They agreed to the use of a tape recorder. The interviews were transcribed and sent back to them for approval.

The analysis is based on Merleau-Ponty’s (1997) theory and set of concepts and had two questions as the point of departure: How is the subject of PEH
experienced by the students and what have they learned in the subject? The interviews were read through in order to find shared structures, ’themes’ of the subject PEH. When they were found, Merleau-Ponty’s (1997) theory and concepts were used in order to analyse, describe and understand them.

Results 2
The interviewees express that the subject consists of two parts: one practical physical education part and one theoretical health education part. The results will be presented under these two themes “Experiences of physical education” and “Experiences of health education”. The third theme is ”Learning in Physical Education and Health”.

Experiences of the physical education (3)
The general consensus is that PEH is not like an ordinary school subject. It is more like a break: It is fun, relaxing and it is physical activity. A contrast to ordinary lessons where the pupils are sitting still and listen to the teacher.

For one thing you get up from the desk, there’s a lot of just sitting and reading and writing and drawing, and it’s nice to get away and move when you’ve been sitting still . . . so it’s nice that there’s a lot of play in what we do, and it’s nice to let go of school (Student 6).

Lessons in PEH are something outside ‘real’ school lessons: They are physical activities that are performed in fun but not in earnest. PEH is experienced as a necessary break in the school day that does not require a great deal of mental activity. PEH is intended to help students to concentrate for the rest of the day, according to one of the interviewed students.

As an activity, a break, the subject is experienced as important, even as the most important subject. The importance is however related to the physical activity, to
‘doing’ not to learning. The playfulness, the variation of activities, is a way to disengage from ordinary schoolwork.

Precisely this, to be able to do something else, to get exercise and try new things, then we often have things like aerobics and Body Pump and such things. So there’s after all good variation in the physical education. So I think PEH is fun (Student 5).

But the fact that an activity is fun does not self-evidently imply that a student likes to continue with that activity outside school. “Yes, I think climbing was rather fun, but I would never manage to start doing it” (Student 9). Something more ‘than fun’ is needed in order to continue a fun activity outside school.

The interviewees regard themselves as physically active, although only the four who are still active in organised club sports devote themselves to regular physical activity outside school. While PEH is just fun for the interviewees, they think that PEH is really important for students who do not get much exercise in their leisure time, the dominated ones (Londos, 2010). The dominated ones need to learn sport, need to be physically active to stay healthy and avoid obesity.

Because it’s good for young people, for those who are not active in their leisure time. And it is good, it’s not only learning to have ordinary lessons but having sport, so they can learn things about sport and run and . . . . (Student 10).

The activity discourse is dominant in our interviewees’ expectation of the subject. They stress that PEH as physical activity is important during the school day, but they are not aware that daily physical activity is recommended in the policy documents in addition to lessons in PEH. The subject PEH should and could be something more than just physical activity. The aims and purposes of the subject as they are expressed in the policy documents are not steering our interviewed girls’ expectations of the subject.

The physical education part of the subject is mainly sport activities. Sport activities come naturally to these interviewed girls, who have spent many hours
in their younger years playing sports. The interviewees use the skills they have learned in sport clubs to have fun and this is not considered serious. The physical activity conducted in club sport, learning these skill, is however described as serious.

R: The basketball training is a hundred times more serious.
I: And what does it mean that it is more serious?
R: It’s probably partly that I pull myself together, because this is my team and it’s us together, so we must get better. But in physical education I feel that now I just want to have fun.
I: But having fun, that’s not serious?
R: Yes, but you don’t really train everything properly, that you go through it, that you train how to play volleyball. It’s not like you drill things correctly and then . . .
I: And that’s what is serious, that you train baggers, but you play volleyball.
R: Yes. (Student 7).

So, at the same time as the interviewees have a clear expectation that the PEH lessons should be playing and having fun, it is these expectations that cause the subject to be experienced as not serious in comparison with club sports.

Physical education is not so serious; if you play basketball the teacher doesn’t go through it. If you make a wrong shot, for example it’s not the worst thing. The teacher says, perhaps you should shoot like this. But if you are training basketball, you must shoot right (Student 8).

The student expresses that the teachers’ and the leaders’ instructions are different in PEH and club sport. The same activities are used, but what to achieve is more evident in club sport for these students. This distinction seems to cause the subject to be experienced as not serious in comparison with club sport.

Experiences of Health Education (3)

The part of the subject that consists of health education is mainly theoretical, and that part is not appreciated. There is enough sitting and listening in the
ordinary school day. From the pupils’ point of view, health education is a disappointment:

R: Because we sit there and listen to a teacher as if it was an ordinary lesson and that’s what isn’t fun. We want to be there practising sport, doing ball games or whatever, but if we sit down on a bench and listen. . . .
I: It’s not the learning in itself but that you have to sit down and listen just as you do all other hours all other days?
R: Yes, that it doesn’t feel like an ordinary PEH lesson (Student 10).

The way the health education is structured does not correspond to the students’ expectations of PEH. Health education resembles ordinary school work with lectures, homework, and tests. Inactivity, theory, and exams do not exist in the students’ conceptions of PEH, which makes them adopt a negative attitude towards the health content. They object to the written tests: “Tests of ergonomics and things like that, which are completely unnecessary in my opinion” (Student 9). It is the inactivity, not the content in itself, to which they object. To integrate the theoretical content with activity is a suggested solution:

R: It is that they have put something theoretical in a practical subject. . . .
I: Could they do it in some other way then?
R: Well, we could have done the exercises although we were moving, we could have talked and then do the things (Student 3).

The interviewees emphasise that physical activity is good for their health and for this reason they think it is contradictory that they must sit still and be told that they should exercise to improve their health.

Health education is described as theoretical lessons and in this sense it resembles ordinary school work. But, whereas ordinary school work is important, health education is not. Theoretical content does not fit the interviewees’ expectation of PEH. Theoretical content belongs to the ‘real’ subjects, and PEH is something else. This distinction the interviewee’s does between ordinary school work and
PEH seem to cause the subject to be experienced as not serious in comparison with the ordinary school.

Learning in Physical Education and Health (3)

All learning requires content, and the content that is described is that which the students are already familiar with. They do not think that they have learned anything new in the PEH lessons. “I don’t think we have learned very much in the PEH at school. There is a lot we know already. It’s after all fairly simple, what we do in physical education” (Student 4). In the upper secondary school, they are sometimes allowed to choose activities, and then the interviewees choose ball games, an activity to which they devoted themselves for many hours during their childhood and adolescence. The activities are described in terms of ‘trying out’; there are no demands for learning anything special.

I: What do you learn in a PEH lesson?
R: Things like running, playing football, then we have some lessons in ergonomics and about the body, the pulse and lots of such things. I don’t really think it prolongs one’s life. I don’t think it’s terribly important. Most of what you learn in a PEH lesson you know already (Student 8).

Learning is diminished. Some think that they would have learned more, if, when choosing activities according to interest, they had chosen some other area with which they were not as familiar as ball games.

But if I had chosen something else, there is one that is called music and movement, where there is a lot of dance. If I had chosen that, it would have been entirely different. It was something I didn’t know before (Student 4).

Some students describe how they learn new things when trying out new activities. But when choosing activities with which they are already familiar, they do not experience any learning. The subject is also experienced as roughly the same over time from elementary to upper secondary school, and they cannot describe any clear progression.
In line with the rejection of the theoretical health content, a general opinion is that physical activities are learned by being physically active.

I think that physical education is not a subject you should have to sit and swot away at. Sport should be learned physically by learning to play football or to swim or to play badminton or massage or whatever you want to call sport. But not by sitting at home and trying to learn the best way to warm up. You can learn that by warming up. . . . I think that sport should be practised physically; it should be a physical activity at school (Student 2).

Physical learning is based on natural instincts, unlike other learning, which requires a great deal of mental activity.

Of course you must think in order to play football too, but it is more about utilising natural instincts when practising sport than when doing arithmetic or when acting (Student 2).

The interviewees separate the body and mind when talking about learning in PEH; at the same time, they are aware that learning a new activity requires thinking. In the PEH lessons, they would rather not perform any mental activity. They chose to play ball games in their choice of activity according to interest, an activity with which they are familiar and about which they do not have to think in order to implement it; they can just enjoy it. Or, as one the interviewee puts it:

If it’s something new you have to learn, you think about how much you have to go at it and such things, but if it’s something you have done several times, you don’t think about it. Then it is like instinctive: You don’t think so much, I don’t think about it in the same way (Student 4).

Theoretical health education, where they have lectures, homework, and written tests is not appreciated. The use of tests can be seen as a way for the teacher to help the student to consolidate the knowledge, but the result is the opposite. The students study for the test and afterwards they forget it.
Well, you learn, but most of it is swotting for a test to make a good result. No, I hardly remember anything about that. I always swot for it and then it sort of disappears (Student 9).

One of the interviewees stated however, after a second thought, that the tests are part of the learning of the subject, even if it is difficult to explicitly tell what is learned.

Well, at the same time those tests and what we do. I can’t say it’s bad, for I’ve learned something from it too, how to lift and things like that. Maybe I’ll take back that it was bad, because I probably think it’s fairly good to have it (Student 3).

Learning sport skills and sport activities are not emphasised in the national policy documents. But using the skills, the integrated bodily patterns the students already have, could be a tool to enhance learning and a way to achieve a specific aim in line with the curriculum.

I: If I ask what you aim at in physical education, do you know what goals you have to meet for a pass with special distinction, for example?
R: Yes, we have a lot to do with theory, handling stress, we have to train lifting, ergonomics—so there are lots of things in that. In the lessons we don’t have such an organisation, so today we must do this. And after the lesson the teacher asked what was the goal of the lesson and why did we do this and what did you think of it and so on. So there is after all a serious organisation . . . so there still is some idea behind it at any rate (Student 1).

Informing the students of the aim of the lesson can, even if the aim is vaguely perceived by the students, enhance their experience of seriousness.

All of the interviewees are anxious to retain the activity parts of PEH. They separate body and mind when talking about learning at the same time as they describe that combining the two is needed when learning a new skill or learning the theoretical health content. The lack of integrated learning might be a reason for this interviewee’s summary of the learning in PEH: “Maybe we don’t learn a hell of a lot in a PEH lesson” (Student 8).
On the other hand a few of the interviewees say, after second thought, that they have learned something during their PEH lessons. Still, they have difficulty giving concrete examples: “But at the same time in ordinary PEH there are some things we have learned that we haven’t thought of“(Student 4).

Analysis and Discussion 2
The students’ description of PEH as a fun but not important subject in which sports activities dominate the content and health education is the theoretical content has been confirmed by other studies nationally as well as internationally as described in the background. But how can we understand these experiences? What is it that the interviewed students are really saying about the subject of PEH and what they have learned?

According to the students’ experience PEH is taught in two separate parts. A practical part mainly consisting of sports activities and a theoretical part consisting of health education. The way that the subject is understood in the students’ narratives can be referred to a dualistic knowledge tradition that is known from the subject’s history and tradition. The separation of intellectual knowledge from the bodily/practical knowledge (Molander, 1997), has existed in the subject ever since P. H. Ling’s days (Ljunggren, 1999) and still exists in the national policy documents (Swartling Widerström, 2005).

Each of the two parts of the subject is compared with two important societal phenomena: organised sport and education. The students have a long, chiefly shared, experience of education, physical education, and organised sports. When they attend the PEH lessons, they are, due to their participation in club sports, well familiar with the gym, its fittings, its design, and the activities for which the gym is intended. To be physically active is also their expectation when they
attend the PEH lessons. When they can use the skills they have learned in club sports in PEH lessons, they can just enjoy the activity. They experience the subject’s intrinsic value through the physical activity (Engström, 2010). By means of Merleau-Ponty’s (1997) concepts, they use the habits they have developed in the club sports to play in a joyful manner in school, together with students who have developed the same habits. They experience their lived bodies, and this experience creates the feeling that Merleau-Ponty (1997) called ‘I can.’ From the perspective of life-world phenomenology, this feeling has value in itself and could be used to further explore the life-world. But the students have no words to express this feeling, and their education does not provide them with any. They have probably not experienced much talk about learning during their PEH programs (Larsson, 2004).

The students compare their experiences of the physical education part of the subject, with their experiences of learning skills in club sports. In club sports, they are trained in a practical pedagogical situation in which a specific skill is to be incorporated into the lived body, to use the words of Bengtsson (2006). By means of Merleau-Ponty’s (1997) concepts, the pupils’ experiences in club sports may be described as widening of their life-world: The ball is successively incorporated into the lived body during the training, and new habits are continuously established.

During physical education, they use these habits; but most likely with another aim than training new skills. The aim of the physical activity in PEH is however not clarified or not perceived by the students. They experience their lived bodies, and that is fun, but they have no words and knowledge to interpret this experience. They also feel that the demands of their performance is low and the instructions from the teacher do not enhance their performance. All together, in the comparison with club sports, PEH teaching appears not to be serious,
whereas the skill training is conducted in earnest. The feeling of ‘I can’ is reduced to a feeling of pastime and recess. This conception, which these students express, is problematic, however, because they may be said to represent “the dominated ones” (Londos, 2010). When the dominant ones do not conceive of the subject as serious, then who does?

The theory, homework, and tests in health education may be seen as an attempt to transfer the subject from the practical to the theoretical knowledge tradition (Molander, 1997). Health education is designed as a “real” school subject (Thedin Jakobsson, 2004). The students’ expectation of PEH as a practical subject is, however, an obstacle to the successful teaching of health education. The students listen, read, take the tests, and then forget. The content is not embodied. However, they express fairly unreflectingly a wish to use their lived bodies in the health education, a process that Bengtsson (1997) has designated as ‘a thinking body’. They express a wish to use both body and mind as an integrated learning experience (Swartling Widerström, 2005) when they learn a theoretical content. It seems as if the students’ experiences instinctively tell them that the thinking, lived body is necessary when learning something new physically as well theoretically, but they cannot develop these experiences any further.

The aim of the study is to get a student’s perspective of the subject of PEH and what learning the subject mediates using a life-world phenomenology approach. The analysis of the interviewees’ experiences shows that PEH has difficulty in upholding an identity of its own in comparison with the activities in organised sports and the rest of the curriculum. When the subject is regarded in a dualistic knowledge tradition, in which body and soul are separated in the learning and bodily activity is subordinated to intellectual activity (Molander, 1997), teaching PEH is neither theoretically nor practically satisfactory. The theoretical teaching
is not embodied, and the embodiment of the practical teaching is not theorised. Bengtsson (1997) argued that it is a pedagogical problem that the pedagogical practice cannot unite cognitions, physiology, and physical behaviour in teaching. If pedagogical practice in PEH was to be based to a greater extent on an integrated view of knowledge and learning, the interpretation of what is happening in the gym might be different. The situation can also be regarded from the subject’s history and tradition. It is characterised as a subject with a weak classification, allowing other agents outside school to influence the subject, such as sport clubs (Lundvall & Meckbach, 2008), and it has also been characterised with a strong classification towards other school subjects (Karlefors, 2002). What would happen if the subject had a weak classification towards other school subjects and strong classification towards club sports? It is of importance to clarify the aims and purposes of the subject to clarify and make visible the difference between the aims and purposes of club sport and the school subject PEH.

According to the latest report on PEH from the Swedish Schools Inspectorate (Skolinspektionen, 2012:5), didactical considerations need to be developed in the subject. Tinning (2012) was surprised that, despite variations in what stands for physical education across national borders, the form of its survival is remarkably similar across countries. Maybe this is due to the subject’s resistant to change (Kirk, 2010). One suggestion for improvement is to increase the awareness of the lived body and the need for a more integrated learning in PEH. Because the subject has to develop and change in order to survive. It is not satisfactory that it is regarded as a fun break among other more important school subjects. Kirk (2010) envisioned three scenarios for the subject in the future: more of the same, radical reform, or extinction. Listening to students’ voices will most likely not result in radical reform, but hopefully it can help to avoid the subject’s extinction.
References (2)


