

Scholarly Summary of:
Models of Games Education

Werner, P., & Almond, L. (1990). Models of games education. *JOPERD*, 61(4), 23-27.

Issue/Focus

A problem has surfaced: “physical educators cannot teach all games to all students” (23)! The purpose of this article is to encourage Physical Educators to choose a game framework and build on the information learned by playing games from the same category at a time, this way students can understand and appreciate games as a player and a spectator. The authors describe 3 different types of frameworks and assess their usefulness.

Reasoning

The three different types of frameworks include:

1. Mauldon & Redfern Framework,
2. Ellis Framework,
3. Thorpe, Bunker & Almond Framework.

All 3 frameworks contain a classification system of game/activities which have common technical elements and mechanical principles. Their differences revolve around the division of the classes and presentation of the Framework. Net game, batting games and running games are the game categories of Mauldon & Redfern’s part-whole Framework. The part-whole Ellis Framework has 3 game categories (territory games, target games and court games) and a secondary category component relating to the pre-play rules and playing rules. Thorpe, Bunker & Almond Framework has a technical-cognitive based approach which includes invasion games, net/wall games, fielding and run-scoring games and target games. This framework has a whole-part-whole approach.

Assumptions

The authors make several assumptions in this article. In terms of games, the authors assume there is transfer between similar sports skills and concepts within the classification system. In terms of the children, the authors assume all ability levels are able to learn about the problems particular to each game form and that the children know the tactics involved and appreciate good play. In terms of the teacher, the authors presume that PE teachers can:

- Select appropriate framework and implement it
- Modify framework for optimal success
- Use framework as an aid in long-range curriculum planning and day to day teaching of games.

Conclusions

The authors found that Framework 3 (Thorpe, Bunker & Almond Framework) was the most viable because:

- It had better defined strategies (than Framework 2 & 1) on offense and defense and had different strategies from individual to team sports
- It had detailed support for developing tactics/strategies within invasion, net and striking/fielding games
- It has clearer and more understandable explanation of the framework itself
- Tactical awareness was a focus

Significant Information

- Equipment, space, number of players and the like are most often modified to establish rules and game forms which set the scene for the development of tactical awareness and decision-making. (Framework 3)
- Strategies for target games remain undeveloped where as strategies/tactics for net games, invasion games, and striking/fielding games needs to be further researched. (Framework 3)
- Without a framework from which a teacher can select games, the class activities can lapse into a biased pattern of game selection which offers only a narrow perspective of education games.

Personal Comments

I think using a framework as a basic tool to guide and plan PE lessons is a great idea. I will definitely implement a framework into my future career. I do agree with the authors that Framework 3 is the best one covered in the article. However, I think it is important not to exclusively plan a PE program around one of these classification frameworks because it does not cover the entire IRP curriculum. It would be difficult to implement alternative activities such as kayaking, cardio-kick boxing, dancing, etc. under this type of framework.