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INTRODUCTION

JUSTIFICATION

There are a number of concerning findings when considering a range of physical activity and health trends for children and young people in England. For example, just 23% of boys and 20% of girls¹ meet recommended physical activity levels.

PURPOSE

Having observed these concerning trends and statistics, the Sport and Recreation Alliance commissioned this research report to examine why the sport and recreation system around children and young people in England has not made significant enough progress towards achieving positive outcomes for children and young people between 1977 and 2018.

This research represents the foundation stage of the Alliance’s wider strategy development around children and young people, as outlined in the Alliance’s 2017-2021 strategy The Heart of an Active Nation².

AIM

To reflect on how the English (post-devolution, or UK prior to devolution) sport and recreation system around children and young people has operated in the recent political landscape.

OBJECTIVES

1. Define the sport system for children and young people;
2. Consider the role of central government and parliament;
3. Draw comparison to international case studies of best practice.

BOUNDARIES

This report focuses on governmental and parliamentary activity, though it is acknowledged that further work is needed to consider the role of the private sector and civil society contributors within the third sector. This is however, beyond the scope of this research report.

STRUCTURE AND FINDINGS

In order to achieve the research’s aims and objectives within the boundaries stipulated, this report is structured into sections around context, findings and conclusions. The context focuses on the sport and recreation sector and wider societal factors, with the findings grouped into three chapters, respectively addressing the sport and recreation system for children and young people, the political system, and international perspectives.

² Sport and Recreation Alliance (2017) The Heart of an Active Nation. Available at: https://www.sportandrecreation.org.uk/pages/heart-of-an-active-nation
Four key findings emerged from the research, namely:

- The sport and recreation system for children and young people is excessively complex, and lacks a clear and overarching purpose;
- There is a lack of clarity around how we define a child or young person, with policy confusion as a result;
- There is an accountability deficit with regards to who facilitates activity, and who reviews progress and responds to challenges within the sport and recreation system for children and young people;
- There is an underutilisation of international comparisons and examples of best practice from other sport and recreation systems around children and young people.

METHODOLOGY

This research report has been compiled through archival document discourse analysis. A list of all documents analysed can be found in the appendices, alongside a detailed methodology, with all other sources referenced within the footnotes on each page. The research considered 63 publicly accessible documents produced by government or parliamentary outlets between 1988 and 2018. Once collated, a discourse analysis process focused on scrutinising the definitions of children and young people, the roles and responsibilities of various bodies and references to international comparisons.

CONCLUSIONS AND MOVING FORWARD

The evidence and analysis presented in this research report reflects wider academic debate around the complexity of the sport and recreation system for children and young people. The lack of clarity around purpose, children and young people as a demographic and existing accountability systems contributes further to this complexity, with the underutilisation of comparative international contexts compounding this.

This complexity, and the concerning trends in young peoples’ habits, and wider indicators or outcomes around their level of activity and engagement with sport and recreation, is despite a significant level of public investment and a substantial range of programmes over the past four decades. Inherent political turbulence has seen a notable lack of consistency or long-term strategy across government and parliament – a clear hindrance to the formation of an effective sport and recreation system for children and young people. That being said, it is not the sole responsibility of one agent or influencer, and this report determines that there must be a system-wide reflection on how the system must operate moving forwards to deliver positive outcomes for children and young people.

The Sport and Recreation Alliance recognises that its own role within this debate has not been consistent or active enough over the period in question, and will be addressing this in the coming months and years.

CONTEXT

THE SPORT AND RECREATION SECTOR

The vision for developing a strong system, delivering positive outcomes for children and young people is not new, but is grounded in the history of sport and recreation in England. In 1977, the Central Council of Physical Recreation (CCPR) published a report titled Sport and Young People: the need for action now, articulating the long-term nature of the challenges around both policy-making and delivery of sport and recreation for children and young people.

On the launch of the report, Rt Hon Denis Howell MP, then Minister of State for the Department of the Environment, stated in the House of Commons:

... As I think this is the first time in the history of this country—certainly in the history of sport—that any White Paper on the subject has been produced... The White Paper, in its conclusion, states that the Government believe that sport and recreation provide enormous benefits for the individual in society, and recognise the part which they can play in the enhancement of personality. The social stresses on many young people today are enormous, especially in the big cities. If we delay too long in tackling the causes of these stresses constructively, the problems which arise from them will be magnified, and the cost of dealing with their results greatly increased...⁴

This extract from his speech, in particular the statements in bold, could be said in the present day and still ring true. However, the policies, systems and delivery around children and young people’s sport and recreation have changed since 1977, evolving in structure, style and principle alike. An example of this could be that, in 1977, success was framed in terms of the “importance of participation at whatever standard”, whereas Sport England’s 2018 strategy framed children and young people policy outcomes around specific key performance indicators:

KPI 4: An increase in the percentage of children achieving physical literacy.

KPI 6: An increase in the percentage of young people [11–18] with a positive attitude towards sport and being active.⁶

The language, measurement and framing of sport and recreation for children and young people has changed between 1977 and 2016, but the underlying objective of achieving positive outcomes is not dissimilar. As such, this research does not seek to further evidence the importance of achieving positives outcomes for children and young people.

At a national level, the current system is directed by the government’s 2015 Sporting Future strategy, with children and young people having varying needs at different life stages, but being connected through a “customer journey” as demonstrated by Figure 1. Again, the purpose of this research is not to challenge the principles at the heart of Sporting Future, but to consider how the sport sector might work more collaboratively, to deliver such a high-quality customer journey.

⁵ CCPR [1977] Sport and Young People, the need for action now. Available on request to the Alliance.
The justification for considering the sport and recreation system’s delivery for children and young people is supported by popular opinion, academic studies and statistics alike. They show, in a variety of ways, how children and young people in England are not benefitting from present strategy and policy implementation. One example is a 2018 report based upon academic and statistical data, which contended that current interventions do not work effectively, leading with the headline “School boys are ‘less fit than the generation of boys 10 years ago.’” This is a continuing trend from 2016, when it was reported that “England ranks 13th out of 16 countries in survey, with body image and school among areas of concern among eight-year-olds.” The current evidence and surrounding commentary indicates that children and young people are facing a range of issues like this, with the sport and recreation sector needing to review current trends and consider why existing systems are failing.

However, it should also be noted that there are examples of best practice around sport and recreation for children and young people, with some positive trends. Although political and policy based landscapes have not been successful in producing an effective system, the delivery of interventions and programmes by a range of organisations has been effective in some cases.

The role of the Youth Sport Trust and the County Sports Partnership Network in influencing educational, community and health-based delivery is one example of where progress has been made with a consistent government approach and sustained levels of investment. The Youth Sport Trust’s most recent Impact Report cites that 4,119 schools in England were members of the organisation in 2016/17, joining the “movement to transform PE and school sport”. Likewise, the formation of County Sports Partnerships from the turn of the millennium has seen their network grow and deliver a range of successful programmes for children and young people, with a number of School Sport Partnerships also delivering significant impact following their creation in late 2002, until their funding was terminated in August 2011. This significant policy change has had lasting impact, as has been well documented and discussed elsewhere.

---

2. iNews Online (2018) School boys are ‘less fit than the generation of boys 10 years ago’. Available at: https://news.co.uk/news/health/school-boys-less-fit-than-10-years-ago/
What is concerning, is the disjuncture between consistent and sustainable policy, delivery and outcomes for children and young people around sport and recreation. Such challenges have been central to academic debate for over three decades – see Lindsey (2010)\textsuperscript{10} or Mackintosh (2014)\textsuperscript{11} as examples – and though beyond the scope of this report, studies across a number of academic disciplines should be considered for future analysis.

The context considered above indicates that the sport and recreation sector holds a good level of engagement with, and understanding of, children and young people, but the decline in societal indicators shows that more must be done. This report contends that there are wider factors and systemic issues alongside the sport and recreation system that are hindering the collective ability to achieve positive outcomes. This report therefore looks beyond the sport and recreation sector, and also considers wider political, social and economic factors.

**BROADER CONTEXT**

**POLITICAL**

There has been huge political change and turbulence since the CCPR’s report was published in 1977, with seven Prime Ministers, and multiple changes to the government. There has also been several changes to the structure of government, affecting policy and so the delivery of sport and recreation, education and children and families more generally.

As a result, the sporting system for children and young people has been subject to continuous variations in government ideology and legislation. Whilst that might not affect sport and recreation outcomes directly, their implementation has caused a ripple effect across government and public funding agendas: the changes from the Children Act 1989 to allocate duties, safeguard and promote the welfare of children and young people, to the subsequent Children Act 2004 that established the Children’s Commissioner\textsuperscript{12} is just one example.

The UK Government has invested significant time and resource into policy focused upon children and young people, targeting a series of issues, across several government departments. This list in the last eight years alone includes:

- 2010 – 2015 – Olympic and Paralympic Legacy\textsuperscript{13}
- 2010 – 2015 – Sports Participation\textsuperscript{14}
- 2010 – 2015 – Elite Sports Performance\textsuperscript{15}


\textsuperscript{11} Mackintosh, C. (2014). Dismantling the school sport partnership infrastructure: findings from a survey of physical education and school sport practitioners. Education 3-13, 42(4), 432-449.

\textsuperscript{12} Children’s Commissioner England (2018) Webpage. Available at: https://www.childrenscommissioner.gov.uk/


• Ongoing – Children’s Health\textsuperscript{16} including the 2016\textsuperscript{17} and 2018\textsuperscript{18} Childhood Obesity: A Plan for Action in particular
• Ongoing – Young People\textsuperscript{19}
• 2017 – Children and Young People and Mental Health Green Paper\textsuperscript{20}

As such, when considering the sport and recreation system for children and young people, the political context must be recognised, particularly the melee of policy agendas in affecting wider children and young people policy in turn across Government. Further to this, it must be noted that the sport and recreation system for children and young people sprawls across a range of government departments, political agendas and public funding streams. This complexity is repeatedly referenced in this research’s findings.

SOCIAL

The UK’s population is growing, with younger age groups trending strongly across urban areas, though much of the current debate around targeting demographics focuses on the ageing population. This is despite current social and health indicators showing there is a clear need to fundamentally re-design a system in order to generate positive outcomes for children and young people and help them to establish and maintain an active lifestyle. Another generation of children with the same outcomes as young people today would mark an abdication of social responsibility, and would generate significant economic and social costs in the future.

Population estimates are often used alongside population projections to understand demand for education services or the structure of the population – for example, in mid-2016 18.8\% of the UK population were aged 0 to 15\textsuperscript{21}. Therefore, the UK will continue to need to engage a significant population of children and young people, with an ever-growing demand for education and wider social or welfare based services. The role of physical activity within these debates should be far more prominent.

It must be acknowledged that the sport and recreation sector plays a significant role in wider policy and strategy around children and young people. As such, this report considers how the population of children and young people has been defined as a target audience of the sport and recreation system, and whether this has been effective to date.

\textsuperscript{16} UK Government [Ongoing] Children’s Health policy. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/policies/children-s-health
\textsuperscript{17} UK Government [2016] Childhood Obesity: A Plan for Action. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/childhood-obesity-a-plan-for-action
\textsuperscript{19} UK Government [Ongoing] Young People policy. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/policies/young-people
ECONOMIC

Figure 2 shows public-sector expenditure allocated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer within the 2017 Autumn Budget:

Figure 2. Public Sector Spending 2018-19

Across society, children and young people will most frequently access services associated with the Education and Health sectors, with government allocating £102bn and £155bn respectively to these for the 2018/19 financial year. In contrast, the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) has a total resource budget of £1.5bn over the same period to cover all its responsibilities. In 2017, Sport England received “£308.4 million of income to invest... £105.6 million Exchequer Grant in Aid funding and £202.8 million National Lottery Funding.”

The disparity between general and sport and physical activity specific spending on children and young people emphasises the need for a clear vision, purpose and genuine cross-government working to drive optimal return on investment and to ensure a coherent, holistic policy response. The solution does not lie within the sport and recreation system alone, nor within one isolated part of government.

Most notably, Sport England has committed to a “projected investment of 20%” of their annual budget into children and young people during the 2017-21 funding cycle. The figures show that there is significant investment into children and young people in England, but as this report demonstrates, in the absence of a clear, system-wide vision, investment and isolated interventions should be expected to continue to produce sub-optimal outcomes.

FINDINGS

The context around the sport and recreation sector, and wider social, economic and political factors demonstrate that there is undoubtedly real effort and investment in the sport and recreation system for children and young people. However, the outcomes do not match the aspirations, intent or action taken. The aim, objectives and methodology of this report were therefore designed to understand why there is a fracture between vision, actions and outcomes and reflect upon this.

1. THE SPORT AND RECREATION SYSTEM AND CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

This chapter relates to objective 1 of the research – defining the sport and recreation system in relation to children and young people – with this further broken down into three key questions, against which each document was analysed:

- What key policies are referenced?
- Who are the key stakeholders? (governmental and non-governmental)
- How does the document define children and young people? (for example, using, age, environment, language)

KEY POLICIES

The policies and government strategies most frequently cited across the documents analysed, that directly relate to the sport and recreation system for children and young people, were:

Table 1. Policy Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport Raising the Game</td>
<td>Jul-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Sporting Future for All</td>
<td>Mar-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education, School Sport and Club Links Strategy</td>
<td>Oct-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Plan: A strategy for delivering Government’s sport and physical activity objectives</td>
<td>Dec-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education and Sport Strategy for Young People</td>
<td>Jan-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a Sporting Habit for Life: A new youth sport strategy</td>
<td>Jan-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Future: A new strategy for an active nation</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of the policy documents in Table 1 declared grand claims and shifts, for example:

1. "In January 2012, we and Sport England published a £1 billion, five-year youth and community sport strategy to help us meet this ambition – Creating a Sporting Habit for Life - the strategy signalled a radical change in policy." [27]

2. Sporting Future - "I hope you will agree is a new and exciting approach to sport policy in this country."\(^{29}\) Then in the Sporting Future: First Annual Report the claim was made "In December 2015 we launched Sporting Future, the first new strategy for sport in over a decade. It set out a radical change of direction in sports policy."\(^{29}\)

3. Specifically, in terms of policy change, in 2017 DCMS and Sport England declared that Sport England was "now investing more in children’s sport and physical activity outside school from the age of five rather than 14, to build strong foundations and positives attitudes from a young age."\(^{30}\)

With Government often using hyperbole when announcing perceived radical change, increased investment and changing remits, the language deployed contributes to a complex system, and directly or indirectly infers collaboration across a variety of agencies. This is further illustrated by the range of policy agendas that intersect with sport policy focused upon children and young people.

All of this would suggest both a tendency towards a ‘grand narrative’ and a significant shift in investment. However, the documents analysed detail limited strategies as to how this should be achieved, and so, individual initiatives and organisations are referenced without addressing systemic issues, or establishing a unifying vision or core purpose. For example, the 2015 Sporting Future strategy and Sport England’s subsequent Towards an Active Nation strategy extended Sport England’s remit from 14 years and above, to five years and above.

Firstly, this should have triggered a larger review of stakeholders, existing insight and understanding, but secondly, there is limited recognition that their investment and strategy prior to this point will largely have focused on adults rather than children and young people. The policy and agency change in remit is positive, however, the limited systemic considerations may limit how far this will benefit the sport and recreation system for children and young people in practice. Even the dropping of the age in scope to five, positive as this is, still neglects the crucial and most influential stage of child development in early years. This further reinforces the need for a genuinely system wide, life-long approach, starting at the earliest stages of childhood development – and indeed addressing relevant pre-conception health and related indicators.

Beyond sport-focused policy, other key government policy, legislation and initiatives were cited in the documents analysed, with many documents referring to a variety of different areas within the system – for example, school sport or health-related physical activity. Specific examples include:

- 1988 – Education Reform Act – Physical Education becomes a foundation subject
- 2013 – National Curriculum Reform – Physical Education remains a compulsory subject at all key stages
- 2012 (updated 2015) – Provision of outdoor space for schools
- Various health and social policy initiatives, directly regarding children and young people, see Figure 3.
- 2014 - Children and Families Act\(^{31}\)


The breadth of public policy and legislation affecting children and young people shows the excessive complexity of the landscape that the sport and recreation system for children and young people operates within. For example, the obesity agenda that featured in many of the documents cited the more health-related policy relating to children and young people, whilst conversely, such health-related policy was not extensively mentioned in sport specific documents.

That being said, more recent policy and funding, such as the Sporting Future strategy and subsequent Annual Reports, the language has been more cross-governmental and system wide, working across policy agendas. For example, in Sporting Future\(^3^3\), a “commitment to create a cross-ministerial group meeting regularly to drive implementation, alongside a formal annual report” was stated, but in practice this has not yet come to fruition – the Second Annual Report reported that the newly established Inter-Ministerial Group on Healthy Living “will be meeting for the first time in early 2018.”\(^3^4\) The difficult reality of delivering cross-governmental and ministerial working needs to be appreciated and considered when critiquing the system, see Figure 4 below for further illustration.

Figure 4 shows the changes to agencies, individuals and governmental structures from the leadership of Sir John Major to present, with the area of sport and recreation particularly turbulent – DCMS has had five Secretaries of State since 2010 alone. These changes to the political landscape do not cultivate an environment where politicians are committed to working across government, a contention supported by the documents analysed, where there was a lack of clarity as to who was accountable or responsible for the different areas of the sporting system for children and young people. One finding is therefore, that strategies and documents need greater clarity as to what element of children and young people policy their work contributes to – particularly important when considering the intersections of different policy agendas.


Figure 4. Changes to the Political Landscape

1990 TO 1997 – JOHN MAJOR
CONSERVATIVE PRIME MINISTER

1988 – Education Reform Act – Physical Education becomes a Foundation Subject
1992 – Department of National Heritage
1993 – National Lottery Act
1995 – Sport Raising the Game


1997 – Department for Culture, Media and Sport
1998 – National Childcare strategy
2000 – A Sporting Future for All
2002 – Game Plan
2002 – P.E., School Sport and Club Links strategy
2004 – Every Child Matters framework
2008 – P.E. & Sport strategy for Young People

2010 – DAVID CAMERON (CONSERVATIVE/LIBERAL DEMOCRATS COALITION);
2015, 2017 – DAVID CAMERON AND THERESA MAY – CONSERVATIVE PRIME MINISTER

2010 – Public Bodies Bill
2012 – Creating a Sporting Habit for Life
2012 – London 2012 Olympics & Paralympics
2015 – Sporting Future

Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport [DCMS works with 43 agencies and public bodies] – Matt Hancock, since 2018.


Secretary of State for Health and Social Care [DHSC works with 28 agencies and public bodies] – Jeremy Hunt, since 2012 (then Secretary of State for Health). Previously: Andrew Lansley (2010-12)

CURRENT RELEVANT GOVERNMENT BODIES:


This research also found that the number of inter-ministerial, or similar, groups that are relevant to the sport and recreation system for children and young people is significant, and includes the following:

- Inter-Ministerial Group on Health Living (Secretaries of State for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport, and Health and Social Care)
- Ministerial School Sport Board [Minster for Sport and the Parliamentary Under-Secretaries of State for Children and Families, and Public Health and Primary Care]
- Inter-Ministerial Group on Child Sexual Abuse (Home Secretary)
- Inter-Ministerial Group on Gang Violence and Exploitation
- Inter-Ministerial Group on Mental Health (Secretary of State for Health and Social Care)\(^{35}\)

From a systemic point of view, it is problematic because, again, it is not clear how all of these groups communicate or work collaboratively around children and young people, nor how they might each touch upon sport and recreation. Beyond this, it can be particularly difficult for non-governmental organisations to navigate, with external agencies having to engage with multiple government departments for one specific outcome. The complexity of the public sector and central government system should be addressed: it should be clearer how government and parliament are functioning across agendas, agencies and groups.

**KEY STAKEHOLDERS**

The findings around key stakeholders, must firstly appreciate the changes to the political landscape and leadership in the past two decades. As illustrated by, Figure 4, the political system has changed significantly, and so it would be false to expect the aims, messages and structures to remain the same.

Also noted above, a particular trend is that the ministerial positions within DCMS, and particularly around sport, have a higher turnover than their equivalents in health or education. A recent Institute for Government report cites a hindrance to effectively working with government is "staff turnover and institutional memory"\(^{36}\), and so the cross-governmental work that is being pursued must be managed alongside the turnover of ministers, officials, and the extent of their remits or budgets.

This also links to agendas that are prominent around the sport and recreation system for children and young people. In the documents analysed for this report, there was reference to the sport and recreation system for children and young people in multiple debates, namely:

- Competitive sport
- Physical health
- Mental health
- Obesity
- Olympic and Paralympic legacy
- Sport and recreation participation
- Play
- School sport and educational benefits

These policy agendas reiterate the reach of the sport and recreation system delivering for children and young people, but again may contribute to the notion of the system being overly complex. In practical terms, whilst sport and recreation stakeholders can absolutely contribute to all of these outcomes and

---


\(^{36}\) IfG (2018) How government can work with academia, pp.21-25. Available at: https://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/publications/how-government-can-work-academia
more, they should be grouped under a clear, overarching strategic objective, with further exploration warranted around who the dominant voices are within the above macro policy agendas.

**DOMINANT VOICES**

One finding arising from the document analysis is that there are particular dominant voices who contribute to debate, the evidence presented and approaches advocated for. Examples have been grouped below:

- **Government and Arm’s-Length Bodies**: Department for Education, Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport, Department of Health & Social Care, Department for Transport, Sport England, OFSTED, Public Health England, the Chief Medical Officers, and UK Anti-Doping.
- **Non-governmental**: Youth Sport Trust, Association for PE, ukactive, national governing bodies of sport, county sports partnerships, local authorities, schools, All-Party Parliamentary Groups, parents and carers, primary care providers, sports clubs and volunteers, young people and academics.
- **International**: the World Health Organisation, the United Nations, the European Union.

In practice this creates mixed messages and a lack of clarity - for example, in an *Inspired by 2012* report participation is framed around ‘people’ not differentiating age, then there are sections to discuss ‘youth and community sport’ then ‘school sport’. This trend of separating education-based environments with community environments needs to be reviewed, especially in light of cross-government collaboration and more collaborative funding models engaging a variety of stakeholders.

This lack of clarity is compounded when grand narratives are constructed about the current landscape for children and young people. For example, the All-Party Commission on Physical Activity made this statement around the issue of obesity in 2014:

> “The UK faces an epidemic of physical inactivity. Over the last half century, we have simply stopped moving – in our schools, our work places, our towns, cities – and how we get between them. In all human history, we have never been so inactive.”

Rather than discussion based upon a grand narrative, more nuanced dialogue around the complexity of the sporting system, issues and the future for children and young people should be pursued.

**DEFINITIONS: WHAT IS A CHILD AND WHAT IS A YOUNG PERSON?**

The research findings around the parameters of a child and young person focus upon the variety of language applied to, and definitions of, children and young people referenced across the documents analysed. The main definitions have been grouped around the bases of: health, law, education, then other categories and notable omissions. This report does not judge each definition, but seeks to again demonstrate the complexity of the system and that there is a lack of clarity, or agreed definition, around what constitutes a child or young person and as such who is accountable for delivering a targeted and engaging sport and recreation system for them.

There are two primary issues:

1. There is not clear agreement on a definition of children and young people, with policy confusion the result.
2. Children and young people are not sufficiently engaged in policy development of delivery in practice, with little evidence of meaningful and consistent co-creation.

---

37 All-Party Commission on Physical Activity (2014) Physical Activity. Available at: https://parliamentarycommissiononphysicalactivity.wordpress.com/
Health-based definitions

**Formal health definition: Paediatrics:** pre-conception, pregnancy and live births; Children (age 0 to 4 years), Children (age 0 to 19 years).\(^{38}\)

*Vulnerable young people are entitled to services beyond the age of 18, for example, “Local authorities in England and Wales must keep in touch with care leavers until they are at least 21.”\(^{39}\) [Children [Leaving Care] Act 2000]*

**Health life stages definition:** Life stage (pre-conception and pregnancy), life stage (early years), life stage (adolescence) (then children and young people with: neurodevelopmental differences, mental health, looked after, youth justice)\(^{40}\).

Figure 5. Illustration of a Health Definition and the Key Drivers\(^{41}\)

---


Legislative-based definitions

Statutory examples: the age of consent in the UK is 16 years old; school leaving age is 16 [with official conditions between ages 16-18]\(^2\) and current National Minimum Wage divides into age categories including under 18, 18 to 20, 21 to 24, or 25 and over [2017]\(^3\).

Education-based definitions

Cursory education definition: Early Years, Primary, Secondary, Further and Higher Education.

Curriculum or year group education definition: Early Years [up to Reception], Key Stage 1 [Year 1, 2], Key Stage 2 [Year 3, 4, 5 and 6], Key Stage 3 [Year 7, 8 and 9], Key Stage 4 [Year 10, 11]\(^4\).

In practice the use of such definitions creates gaps and confusion. One particular example of this is the Department for Education’s Primary PE and Sport Premium, which omits reception age classes as they are technically an ‘early years’ group.\(^5\)

These health, legislative and education based definitions do not have any clear homogeneity around children and young people – a finding consistent with the documents analysed for this report: there is no universal stance on what a child or young person is, or how they are defined. Furthermore, there is little clarity around how these divergent definitions, both across and beyond Government, relate either to each other or, to a wider strategic narrative around what the system is there to achieve.

Figure 6. Grouped definitions of children and young people with the variance on age and definition

---

\(^2\) UK Government [2018] Know when you can leave school. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/know-when-you-can-leave-school


\(^5\) APPG on a Fit and Healthy Childhood [2017] Physical Activity in Early Childhood, p. 5.
Other definition bases

Beyond the groupings here, the 63 documents used other sources and definitions to group children and young people, including personality types\(^\text{46}\) and international definitions. The latter includes international conventions such as the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (2005), "Article 1: definition of the child – everyone under the age of 18 has all the rights in the Convention"\(^\text{47}\), or the European Union, Commission Rights of the Child.\(^\text{48}\)

Notable Definition Base Omissions

The voice of children and young people: When it comes to the voice of children and young people, there are examples of good practice such as the Chief Medical Officer’s report\(^\text{49}\) - see figure 7 – however the significant majority of the 63 documents considered for this report did not particularly feature the voice of children and young people. The Chief Medical Officer captured the voice of young people through independently collected empirical evidence (focus groups, interviews, surveys, and art based exercises), but the relatively low level of engagement with children and young people in other documents is a concern. The voice of children and young people is a valuable asset in defining a standardised set of guidelines as to what defines a child or young person.

Figure 7. Extract from Annual Report of the CMO 2012\(^\text{50}\)

---


Generational and consumer based definitions: From the documents considered there was little to mention the generational and consumer based construction of children and young people, for example, in 2016 GfK (a market research organisation) reported that in terms of shopping and consumption:

“We are used to seeing younger shoppers lumped together in contrast with their Baby Boomer parents,” said Joe Beier, EVP of GfK’s Shopper and Retail Strategy team. “But there are some important differences between the two ‘halves’ of the Millennial cohort; in certain areas, we see Gen Y tending toward the ‘old-school’ ways of the Boomers – but in others, they seem equal to their younger brothers and sisters in Gen Z.”

The segmentation of children and young people by the private sector – with a view to more effectively marketing products and so driving profits – suggests that a more sophisticated approach is possible, and that this should happen with far more regularity when designing public systems. As illustrated by figure 8 below, the private sector differentiates between young people based on their generation and social circumstances, translating this into a consumer-focused definition – something the sport and recreation sector should consider further.

Figure 8. Major differences in the shopping attitudes and behaviours evident along generational lines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEN Z</th>
<th>GEN Y</th>
<th>GEN X</th>
<th>BOOMERS</th>
<th>SILENT/GI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social natives</td>
<td>Book smart &amp; savvy</td>
<td>Street smart &amp; sceptical</td>
<td>Education generation</td>
<td>Educational divides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun and frugal</td>
<td>Fun first, work hard next</td>
<td>Get it done</td>
<td>Break the mold – be me</td>
<td>Do what’s right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connected</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>No drama</td>
<td>Agelessness</td>
<td>Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global minder</td>
<td>“Both/And” stress</td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>Do it all – or die trying</td>
<td>Under control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends = family</td>
<td>Close to doting parents</td>
<td>Prepared, rule-setting parents</td>
<td>My self = my kids</td>
<td>Disciplined to do what’s right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>35-49</td>
<td>50-68</td>
<td>69+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


KEY IDENTIFIERS

In the documents analysed for this research, it was not standard practice to acknowledge the differences between children and young people – many documents homogenised children and young people into an assumed age or category. This is problematic when you consider other protected characteristics, and factors that call for a more comprehensive understanding of a child or young person. The research did find that some documents used a more nuanced definition of children and young people to describe, monitor or discuss, around select characteristics, namely:

- Disability
- Gender
- Pregnancy stage
- Socio-economic inequalities
- Household characteristics
- Ethnicity

The identifying characteristics and targeted definitions yielded negative and positive commentary around the children and young people sport and recreation system. For example:

Quote negative – “children with mental or physical disabilities are by-passed” and “inequities in provision for young children from poorer socioeconomic backgrounds” – APPG on a Fit and Healthy Childhood, in reference to early years and physical activity.53

Quote positive – Early years and children and young people’s physical activity guidelines “can be applied to disabled children and young people, emphasising that they need to be adjusted for each individual based on that person’s exercise capacity and any special health issues or risks.” – Public Health England, in reference to an evidence-based approach to physical activity54.

This research presents a mixed range of definitions around children and young people, and how to define or identify them: it is clear why confusion exists as to who the sport and recreation system might consider a child or young person.

SYSTEMIC APPROACHES

Having examined definitions around children and young people, the documents analysed also showed trends around the range of approaches to engaging children and young people. Again, this report does not judge each approach, but the evidence does support the contention that there is a lack of clarity around the approach which government and publicly funded programmes should use. As shown in figure 9, the documents analysed advocated five key approaches to children and young people, and their inclusion within the sport and recreation system:

Figure 9. Illustration of the range of approaches interconnected with delivery agents & influencers

Holistic or whole child approach: "Many called for wider prevention education to be given to young and amateur athletes, including in schools and gyms; and we found much support for a values-based programme, which supports a holistic approach to healthy sports participation (nutrition, recovery, and training)." 

The development and delivery of genuinely holistic, child-centred opportunities will be essential to the development a more successful, sustainable and co-ordinated sport and recreation system.

---

Targeting: used largely in an education context, further illustrated and defined by figure 10 below:

Figure 10. Targeting - An extract from: The PE and Sport Premium – an investigation in primary schools: Research Report (2015) 56

4. Targeting

This chapter reports on the extent to which schools targeted their PE and sport premium at particular groups of pupils. It looks at the reasons why schools chose to target specific groups and describes the approaches taken.

Key findings
The majority of schools reported some form of targeting of their premium funds, with only 12 per cent reporting no targeting of any kind. The least active children (51%) and disadvantaged children (51%) were the groups most commonly targeted. Targeting took the form of ‘direct’ targeting of particular groups, and ‘indirect’ targeting, whereby the conditions were created to encourage participation (e.g. costs reduced or range of activities widened) in the expectation that this would increase the engagement of particular groups.

4. Targeting

4.1 The extent of targeting

4.2 Which groups were targeted and why

4.2.1 The least active children

4.2.2 Disadvantaged children

4.2.3 Age

4.2.4 Children with high sporting ability

4.2.5 Children with Special Educational Needs (SEN)

4.2.6 Gender

4.2.7 Overweight children

4.2.8 Other examples of targeting

Another example of targeting is from Sport England’s Local Pilot funding, where the Birmingham and Solihull funded project has specified one of their target communities as:

"Under 15 years of age, sedentary lifestyle, obesity issues and lack of active participation, resulting in health risks and self-esteem."

Though there is no explicit reference here as to how this will be achieved, it does demonstrate that targeting is deployed in some interventions.

---

Community approach: used largely in a physical activity context, for example, by ukactive²⁸.

Figure 11. Outline of a community approach to children and young people

Human Capital approach: used largely in a physical activity, whole life context.

Figure 12. Outline of the Human Capital Model²⁹ approach to sport and physical activity

---


²⁹ All-Party Commission on Physical Activity (2014) Physical Activity, p.5. Available at: https://parliamentarycommissiononphysicalactivity.wordpress.com/
Life Course approach: used largely in a health context.

Figure 13. Outline of a Life Course Approach\(^{60}\) to children and young people

Socio-Health approach: used largely in a health context.

Figure 14. Outline of a Social Determinants of Health approach\(^{61}\)

---


The disparity between these varying approaches further supports this research’s contention around the lack of clarity as to what definition or approach the sport and recreation system should deploy when seeking to engage children and young people. This lack of unified thinking becomes even more clear when considering table 2 below.

This outlines this chapter’s findings and how significantly the messages, definitions, identifiers and approaches to a child or young person differed. This presents a real challenge for the sport and recreation system when delivering targeted opportunities for children and young people, and subsequently reporting engagement and impact.

Table 2. A summary of the debates, definitions, identifiers and approaches to sport for children and young people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Agendas/ Debates</th>
<th>Definition of Children and Young People</th>
<th>Key Identifiers</th>
<th>Approaches to Children and Young People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive sport</td>
<td>Formal health</td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Holistic approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habit for life</td>
<td>Health life stages</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Targeting approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical health</td>
<td>Statutory</td>
<td>Socio-economic</td>
<td>Community approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>Cursory education</td>
<td>Household characteristics</td>
<td>Human capital approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obesity</td>
<td>Curriculum education</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Socio-health approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic and Paralympic legacy</td>
<td>Personality types</td>
<td></td>
<td>Life course approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport and recreation participation</td>
<td>International definitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School sport and educational benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. THE POLITICAL SYSTEM

Having examined the sport and recreation system for children and young people, the following chapter relates to objective two of this research – considering the role of central government and parliament. This was further broken down into three key questions, against which each document was analysed:

- Is the document focused upon government or parliament?
- What is being discussed - funding, legislation, non-statutory guidelines, setting strategy?
- Is there any explicit reference to monitoring, evaluation or wider inquiry?

ROLE OF PARLIAMENT AND CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

A number of the documents analysed for this research did not clarify to the reader what their explicit position was, nor the purpose of their group or the document in question; it can often be difficult for a lay person to understand what the respective roles of central government and parliament are. In practice, parliamentary committees, All-Party Parliamentary Groups (APPG) or special interest groups have produced a significant amount of evidence and commentary around both children and young people and sections of the sport and recreation system, yet it can be difficult to understand government action and hold them accountable for this.

Take, for example, parliamentary outputs around sport and recreation for children and young people since 2013. More than 2000 pages of evidence, report and commentary have been produced, however it is not clear how this has translated into policy change, adapted delivery or who has listened to the reports and outputs. There is limited line of sight, or transparency around reporting and subsequent
decision-making, with an accountability deficit surrounding the myriad of committees, groups and departments within parliament and government.

It is also clear that the parliamentary activities need to reach and engage a more diverse set of organisations and individuals, rather than listening to the dominant voices listed earlier in this report. One example of better practice, rather than listening to what could be perceived as ‘traditional voices’, the All-Party Parliamentary Group on a Fit and Healthy Childhood’s engaged a broader range of contributors for their 2016 Physical Education report.

Figure 15. Extract of the Contributions Page

This report was prepared by a Working Group of the All-Party Group and we are grateful for the contributions of:

- **HELEN CLARK**: Chair of the Working Group
- **BEVERLEY KOTYEY**: APPG Secretariat
- **PHIL ROYAL**: APPG Secretariat
- **NEIL COLEMAN**: Outdoor Play and Learning: Play, England
- **AGNES JAVOR**: Broadcaster/Teacher/Counsellor
- **DR. ESTELLE MACKAY**: Public Health Nutritionist
- **SHARON SMITH**: The University of Northampton
- **PROFESSOR NICK DRAINER**: University of Canterbury, New Zealand
- **KATHRYN SALT MBE**: Emotional Education Academic
- **DEBORAH HOLT**: Association of Play Industries (API)
- **SHEILA FORSTER**: Fitmedia Limited
- **ALEX SCOTT-BAYFIELD**: Fitmedia Limited
- **JILLIAN PITT**: Mytime Active
- **PAUL WESTERBY**: Mytime Active
- **DR. DAVID WHITEBREAD**: University of Cambridge
- **DR. LALA MANNERS**: Activers
- **EDWINA REVIL**: Registered Nutritionist, Early Start
- **ALISON O’SULLIVAN**: London Borough of Newham
- **CHRIS WRIGHT**: Youth Sport Trust
- **WILLSWATHE**: Youth Sport Trust
- **MARK CARTER**: Ministry of Football
- **DR MARK BELLAMY**: Leisurelines
- **DYLAN BLAIN**: Leisurelines
- **HAL DYCHE-BRINTON**: Co-Editor New Jurist International, Law
- **GILES PLAINT**: Contributor, Westlaw UK, Legal Encyclopaedia
- **London Borough of Bromley, Primary PE Advisor

That being said, although there were representatives from a public health and outdoor play background, there were few contributors who could be considered truly non-sport or non-traditional, such as young people themselves. This one example is broadly representative of the general trend that contributions to government and parliamentary outlets were largely from small, select groups of individuals and organisations.

The evidence suggests that the 63 documents analysed are informed by a pattern of ‘contributions,’ ‘sources’ and ‘experts’ and that this is represented by a particular demographic and level of voice, with others, such as children and young people themselves, notably absent. Furthermore, there is no established system to collect a larger sample of responses or greater diversity of thought to enable improved insight to in turn meaningfully shape policy. Beyond this, there is clearly a series of prominent, recurring policy asks which seem to return limited outputs in practice.

---

62 APPG on a Fit and Healthy Childhood (2016) Physical Education.
A challenge to translating evidence and debate into action is the breadth of government departments and arms-length bodies that contribute to the sport and recreation system for children and young people. There is, therefore, a danger of producing a closed policy environment, which can result in ‘groupthink’ and a strong preservation of the status quo – with a lack of robust, external challenge and a limited input from, or genuine consultation of, the system’s potential beneficiaries.

**GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES**

Within sport and recreation system for children and young people, confusion over who is accountable and involved in the system is further compounded by the number of central government departments and arms-length bodies that are tasked with delivering strategy and outcomes using public money.

There has been a welcome, more recent sign of cross-governmental thinking, that was set out in *Sporting Future*:

> “It recognised that sport and physical activity touches on areas and issues across a huge range of government interests. Consultation responses stressed repeatedly how important it was to maintain this genuinely cross-government approach.”

But this policy promise needs to actually be delivered in order to deliver real outcomes, with public funding coming from a number of government departments. This must also be communicated in a significantly clearer and more transparent manner, again, so that non-governmental organisations and individuals alike can understand and contribute to the sport and recreation system for children and young people.

**RECENT SIGNIFICANT FUNDING MOMENTS**

The documents analysed consistently referenced the funding of physical education as the largest source of funding, though there some common misconceptions around the role of the Department for Education and Dedicated Schools Grants, which are not broken down by subject or curriculum area. There are several organisations that provide additional funding streams for the delivery of sport and recreation for children and young people, and whilst this is a real strength of the system, it can conversely present real issues around duplication and wider confusion.

Beyond physical education funding through the school system and *Dedicated Schools Grants*, the following funding streams were identified as specific government funding, with some significant fluctuations, for children and young people’s sport and recreation:

---


64 In 2010, a letter from Michael Gove to Youth Sport Trust stated, “Primary, secondary and special schools have enjoyed between them some £2.4 billion of Exchequer and Lottery investment since 2003” (p. 3) but did not reference with any substantive evidence. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/refocusing-sport-in-schools-to-build-a-lasting-legacy-of-the-2012-games

• 2010 – Removal of School Sport Partnerships\(^6^6\); launch of School Games, ongoing funding. Most recently, the 2018 Games have been reviewed and renewed\(^6^5\) but there has been no specific figure around funding declared.
• 2013/14 to present – Primary PE and Sport Premium, guaranteed until 2020 and doubled from 2017/2018 to £320 million p.a. through the Soft Drinks Levy.
• 2016-20 – National Citizen Service grant funding £1.26bn.\(^6^8\)
• 2017/19 – Healthy Pupils Capital Fund (DfE) was £415 million but cut to £100 million, to be allocated through the current schools’ capital funding.
• 2017 – Families Fund (Sport England) £40 million.
• 2017/18 – Inactivity Fund for further education (Sport England) £5 million.
• 2017/18 – Potentials Fund for social action and volunteering (Sport England) £3 million.
• 2017/18 – Local Pilots funding (Sport England) for 12 local pilots receiving £100 million of National Lottery funding over four years (not dedicated to children and young people).

This list is not comprehensive,\(^6^9\) but does illustrate that there has been consistent funding for the sport and recreation system for children and young people since 2010. A difference however, is that these streams have been diversified into non-traditional funding streams, such as the Healthy Pupils Capital Fund, with multiple streams also up for renewal in the coming years – perhaps most notably the Primary PE and Sport Premium, which is only guaranteed until 2020.

The consensus is that, whilst public money is being invested, it is not fixed longer-term, and though non-traditional streams may support intermittent, local activity, without real, nationwide coordination, there will not be an efficient allocation of resources and government expenditure will not realise good value for money or optimal outcomes for children and young people. The complexity of divergent funding streams, and the limited accountability surrounding efficient, targeted expenditure is problematic – if the system remains cumbersome and more fractured, then flows of investment and subsequent monitoring and evaluation will not be effective.

The document analysis for this research found that surveys were generally deployed as the primary monitoring and evaluation tool – they were the most common data collection and measurement tool, closely followed by focus groups. With Sport England’s ‘Active Lives: Children and Young People’ survey having been commissioned and compiled on behalf of the Department for Education, Department of Health and Social Care and Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport, Government and the sporting system alike will have access to current insight around children and young people when the first results are released in early 2019.\(^7^0\) It must be said however, that gaps in data will remain – early years are expected to be excluded – and it will likely not be a sufficient tool to capture the nuances of a complex system.

The data is expected to be valuable in determining more targeted interventions, but wider monitoring and evaluation will remain an area which the sport and recreation sector must carefully consider moving forwards.

\(^6^9\) For a more substantive overview of funding and especially school sport, see House of Commons, Briefing Paper, School Sport in England, December 2017 and the Association for Physical Education ‘The Case for Physical Education becoming a Core Subject in the National Curriculum’ March 2018.
3. INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

The following chapter relates to objective three – draw comparison to international case studies of best practice – with this further broken down into two key questions, against which each document was analysed:

- What types of comparison are present?
- Are there any references to international perspectives?

INTERNATIONAL COMPARISONS

The following countries were referenced within the documents analysed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Wales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A trend that emerged was the concentration of the states being referenced – there is an obvious favouring of western, developed and more liberal countries. This continues from the previous finding around dominant voices informing policy development, with the concentration of international perspectives clearly supporting this. Wider international systems have not been readily observed and compared, whilst the depth of analysis around existing international case studies was not sufficiently comprehensive to enable the domestic system to lift and apply any real learnings. A case study of best practice was the usual pattern of comparison – often not enough to enable informed action domestically.

Figure 16. Example of an International Comparison ‘Extract from All-Party Commission on Physical Activity’ 71

---

71 All-Party Commission on Physical Activity (2014) Physical Activity, p.7. Available at: https://parliamentarycommissiononphysicalactivity.wordpress.com/
The value of such comparison is to show what others are doing and how England compares, however, there was a consistent pattern around not contextualising how the domestic system might differ to the respective international examples. As a result, though some international comparisons were applied, these are not being utilised to their full potential. They were often a static exercise and could perhaps be perceived as more tokenistic, put into a document to show that an international case had been considered, but often with little credence given to possible learnings.

CHANGING INTERNATIONAL CLIMATES

In the climate of Brexit and the locations of upcoming sport mega events (e.g. Tokyo 2020 Olympic and Paralympic Games and the Birmingham 2022 Commonwealth Games) the 63 documents considered here did not account for or include such factors as potential influencers or opportunities in terms of international perspectives or moments. Again, this demonstrates that international learning and knowledge exchange is being underutilised.

In contrast to underutilising international nation-based comparisons, the document analysis presented a series of frequently used international conventions and regulations to support their stance on children and young people and the `rights` around sport and recreation. A number of international governmental and non-governmental organisations were referenced throughout the documents considered for this research, including:

- World Health Organisation
- UN Convention on the Rights of the Child
- EU Commission – Rights of the Child
- European Parliament Resolution on Early Years Learning [2011]
- Global Strategy for Women and Children’s Health [2010]
- Copenhagen Consensus Conference 2016: ‘Children, Youth and Physical Activity in Schools and During Leisure Time’

Notably, the above organisations and regulations were significantly more cited than the domestic Children Act 2004 or England’s Children’s Commissioner. An over reliance on the UN and EU `rights of the child` can be attributed to Article 31 of the former, with this making explicit reference to the “right of the child to rest and leisure, to engage in play and recreational activities appropriate to the age of the child…” But, the Children Act 2004 does not clearly outline the rights of the child to sport or recreation, instead it outlines what agencies should be “concerned… to the following aspects of their [children and young people] well-being… (c) education, training and recreation” – this is applicable to the Children’s Commissioner and children’s services more generally. The documents considered here did not sufficiently reference this domestic legislation, but instead focused on the international convention; this research does not judge whether this should be considered problematic or not.

Finally, it should be mentioned that there was a pattern of misinterpretation of where the English system ranked in comparison with international systems, with contrasting perceptions as to the strength of the domestic system. For example, the APPG on A Fit and Healthy Childhood report stated:

72 Copenhagen Consensus Conference (2016) Consensus Statement. Available at: http://bjsm.bmj.com/content/early/2016/05/27/bjsports-2016-096325
“...we show that rather than being ‘world leaders’ in early childhood physical activity, the UK trails other countries with no cohesive approach between the devolved UK nations.” 75

Whilst Sport England conversely stated that:

“...Active Lives: Children and Young People will provide a world-leading approach to gathering data on how children engage with sport and physical activity.” 76

This lack of consensus as to how successful the current English system is in comparison to international states or standards connects back to the need for the sport and recreation system to agree a common definition for, and appropriate approaches to, children and young people. If there is no broad agreement around the currency of language defining a child or young person or the parameters of the sport and recreation system for children and young people, then mixed perceptions will continue to prevail.

CONCLUSION

With a series of findings discussed throughout this report, these can be summarised by four recurring themes:

1. The sport and recreation system for children and young people is excessively complex, and lacks a clear and overarching purpose;
2. There is a lack of clarity around how we define a child or young person, with policy confusion as a result;
3. There is an accountability deficit with regards to who facilitates activity, and who reviews progress and responds to challenges within the sport and recreation system for children and young people;
4. There is an underutilisation of international comparisons and examples of best practice from other sport and recreation systems around children and young people.

This research has evidenced that progress since 1977, and in particular in the recent political period, is not good enough, and that we are systematically failing to achieve positive outcomes for children and young people through sport and recreation in England. As a result, there is now an opportunity to use the findings from within this report to make a series of systemic changes to enable the sport and recreation system to make greater progress moving forwards.

More specifically, the evidence and analysis presented in this report reflects wider academic \(^{77}\) debate that demonstrates a complexity of the sport and recreation system around children and young people. The contributing elements of this complexity include a lack of clarity of purpose, a commonly held definition of children and young people and robust systems of accountability around audience targeting, effective facilitation, appropriate regulation and comprehensive evaluation. Moreover, underutilisation of international comparisons and learnings from other nation states continues to hamper progress.

This complexity and the ongoing trends of concern around children and young people’s sport, physical activity and recreation habits is despite a significant level of public investment and a huge range of initiatives over the past four decades. Political turbulence, and more specifically a lack of consistency or long-term strategy commitment across governments and parliaments, is a clear hindrance to forming an effective sport and recreation system around children and young people, however the creation of an effective system is not the sole responsibility of any one agency. This report marks an acknowledgement that there must be joint reflection across the system as to how progress can be achieved, particularly around non-sport structures.

Moving forward an honest reflection is needed as to what this evidence means for the sport and recreation sector, with the document summarising this research report clearly stating a series of decisive, immediate and longer-term actions.

# APPENDIX 1 – DOCUMENT LIST

N.B. Full list of documents considered for this report below and all other web links etc. are included in the footnotes throughout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation or Group or Department</th>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All-Party Parliamentary Group on a Fit and Healthy Childhood</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>Nov-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Party Parliamentary Group on a Fit and Healthy Childhood</td>
<td>The National Obesity Framework</td>
<td>Jan-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Party Parliamentary Group on a Fit and Healthy Childhood</td>
<td>Play</td>
<td>Oct-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Party Parliamentary Group on a Fit and Healthy Childhood</td>
<td>Healthy patterns for healthy families: clearing the hurdles to a healthy family</td>
<td>Oct-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Party Parliamentary Group on a Fit and Healthy Childhood</td>
<td>The Early Years</td>
<td>Mar-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Party Parliamentary Group on a Fit and Healthy Childhood</td>
<td>Physical Activity in Early Childhood</td>
<td>Oct-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Party Commission on Physical Activity</td>
<td>Physical Activity</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cabinet Office and the Mayor of London</td>
<td>Inspired by 2012: The legacy from the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games</td>
<td>Jul-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cabinet Office, Department for Digital, Culture, Media &amp; Sport, and the Mayor of London</td>
<td>The long-term vision for the legacy of the London 2012 Olympic &amp; Paralympic Games</td>
<td>Feb-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Digital, Culture, Media &amp; Sport</td>
<td>Child participation in culture and sport</td>
<td>Aug-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Digital, Culture, Media &amp; Sport</td>
<td>Beyond 2012: the London 2012 Legacy Story</td>
<td>Apr-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Digital, Culture, Media &amp; Sport</td>
<td>A Living Legacy: 2010-15 Sport Policy and Investment</td>
<td>Mar-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Digital, Culture, Media &amp; Sport</td>
<td>A Review of the Social Impacts of Culture and Sport</td>
<td>Mar-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Digital, Culture, Media &amp; Sport</td>
<td>2010 to 2015 government policy: elite sports performance</td>
<td>May-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Digital, Culture, Media &amp; Sport</td>
<td>Further analysis to value the health and educational benefits of sport and culture</td>
<td>Mar-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Digital, Culture, Media &amp; Sport</td>
<td>Triennial Review of UK Sport and Sport England</td>
<td>Sep-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Digital, Culture, Media &amp; Sport</td>
<td>Sporting Future: First Annual Report</td>
<td>Feb-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Digital, Culture, Media &amp; Sport</td>
<td>Sporting Future: Second Annual Report</td>
<td>Jan-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Digital, Culture, Media &amp; Sport</td>
<td>Tailored Review of UK Anti-Doping</td>
<td>Jan-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Digital, Culture, Media &amp; Sport</td>
<td>A Sporting Future for All</td>
<td>Mar-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Digital, Culture, Media &amp; Sport</td>
<td>Creating a Sporting Habit for Life: A new youth sport strategy</td>
<td>Jan-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Digital, Culture, Media &amp; Sport</td>
<td>Sporting Future: A new strategy for an active nation</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Digital, Culture, Media &amp; Sport and the Strategy Unit</td>
<td>Game Plan: A strategy for delivering Government’s sport and physical activity objectives</td>
<td>Dec-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department for Education and Skills, in partnership with the Department for Culture, Media and Sport, UK Government</strong></td>
<td>Physical Education and Sport Strategy for Young People</td>
<td>Jan-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department for Education and Skills in partnership with the Department for Culture, Media and Sport, UK Government</strong></td>
<td>Physical Education, School Sport and Club Links Strategy</td>
<td>Oct-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of Heritage, UK Government</strong></td>
<td>Sport Raising the Game</td>
<td>Jul-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department for Education</strong></td>
<td>Letter from Sec. of State to YST</td>
<td>Oct-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department for Education</strong></td>
<td>PE and Sport Survey 2009/10: Children and young people’s participation in sporting opportunities</td>
<td>Sep-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department for Education</strong></td>
<td>Schools’ and colleges’ engagement with the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games: PE and Sport</td>
<td>May-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department for Education</strong></td>
<td>Evidence on physical education and sport in schools: key findings</td>
<td>Jun-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department for Education</strong></td>
<td>Evidence on physical education and sport in schools</td>
<td>Jun-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of Health &amp; Social Care and Department for Education</strong></td>
<td>Transforming Children and Young People’s Mental Health Provision: A Green Paper</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department for Education</strong></td>
<td>The PE and sport premium: an investigation in primary schools: Research Report</td>
<td>Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department for Health &amp; Social Care</strong></td>
<td>Start Active, Stay Active: A report on physical activity for health from the four home countries’ Chief Medical Officers</td>
<td>Jul-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UK Government</strong></td>
<td>Education Reform Act</td>
<td>Jul-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HM Government</strong></td>
<td>School sport following London 2012: No more political football: Government Response to the Committee’s Third Report of Session 2013-14</td>
<td>Oct-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HM Government</strong></td>
<td>Childhood Obesity: A Plan for Action</td>
<td>Aug-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HM Government</strong></td>
<td>Government Response to the House of Commons Health Select Committee report on Childhood obesity: Follow-up, Seventh Report of Session 2016-17</td>
<td>Jan-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HM Government and Mayor of London</strong></td>
<td>RESPONSE TO THE HOUSE OF LORDS SELECT COMMITTEE ON OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC LEGACY REPORT OF SESSION 2013-14: KEEPING THE FLAME ALIVE: THE OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC LEGACY</td>
<td>Feb-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>House of Commons – Education Select Committee</strong></td>
<td>School sport following London 2012: No more political football - Third Report of Session 2013-14 - Volume 1</td>
<td>Jul-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>House of Commons – Education Select Committee</strong></td>
<td>School sport following London 2012: No more political football - Third Report of Session 2013-14 - Volume 3: Additional Written evidence</td>
<td>Jul-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>House of Commons – Education Select Committee</strong></td>
<td>School sport following London 2012: No more political football Third Report of Session 2013-14 - Volume 2: Oral and Written evidence</td>
<td>Jul-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>House of Commons – Health Select Committee</strong></td>
<td>Childhood obesity—brave and bold action - First Report of Session 2015-16</td>
<td>Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>House of Commons – Health Select Committee</strong></td>
<td>Impact of physical activity and diet on health – Sixth Report of Session 2014–15</td>
<td>Mar-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>House of Commons – Health Select Committee</strong></td>
<td>Childhood obesity: follow-up - Seventh Report of Session 2016–17</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Commons Library</td>
<td>Funding from the soft drinks industry levy for sport in school</td>
<td>Jan-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Commons Library</td>
<td>School Sport Partnerships</td>
<td>Sep-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Commons Library</td>
<td>School Sport in England</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Commons Library</td>
<td>School meals and nutritional standards (England)</td>
<td>Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Lords - Olympic and Paralympic Legacy Select Committee</td>
<td>Keeping the flame alive: the Olympic and Paralympic Legacy - Oral and Written Evidence</td>
<td>Nov-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Lords - Olympic and Paralympic Legacy Select Committee</td>
<td>Keeping the flame alive: the Olympic and Paralympic Legacy - Report of Session 2013-14</td>
<td>Nov-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFSTED</td>
<td>School Sport Partnerships: A survey of good practice</td>
<td>Jun-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFSTED</td>
<td>Going the extra mile: Excellence in competitive school sport</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFSTED</td>
<td>National Governing Bodies of Sport Survey, Competitive School Sport: Summary Report</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFSTED</td>
<td>The PE and sport premium for primary schools: Good practice to maximise effective use of the funding</td>
<td>Oct-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health England</td>
<td>Everybody active, every day: An evidence-based approach to physical activity</td>
<td>Oct-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health England</td>
<td>What Works in Schools and Colleges to Increase Physical Activity? A briefing for headteachers, college principals, staff working in education settings, directors of public health and wider partners</td>
<td>Oct-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health England</td>
<td>Child Health Profile Indicators</td>
<td>Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td>Coaching in an Active Nation: the Coaching plan for England 2017-2012</td>
<td>Dec-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td>Towards an Active Nation: Strategy 2016-2021</td>
<td>May-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td>Volunteering in an Active Nation: Strategy 2017 - 2021</td>
<td>Dec-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td>Families Fund Prospectus</td>
<td>Jul-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2 – METHODOLOGY

Discourse analysis of documents is a form of qualitative research in which documents are interpreted by the researcher to give voice and meaning around a particular topic or context. As outlined by Sport England’s Guide to Research:

A perceived weakness of document analysis is the arbitrary nature of the selection of sources to review, consequently, as outlined below there was a clear and replicable strategy to the official document selection for this report:

---

Document Selection and Analysis Strategy

1. Define research goal and objectives;

Research Report Aims and Objectives

Aim: To reflect on how the English sport and recreation system around CYP has operated in the recent political landscape.

Objectives:
1. Define the CYP sporting system;
2. Consider the role of central government and parliament;
3. Synthesise comparisons to international contexts.

2. Review landscape and stakeholders;

Appendix 2. Figure 18. September Alliance Board Away Day 2017 – Slides

3. Key Word Search Children and Young People on: gov.uk\(^{82}\), parliament.uk\(^{83}\) (including the parliamentary archives\(^{84}\)) - produced 97,215 results;

4. First review of the relevance of the results from step 3: yielded documents in the areas of various APPGs, various committees [such as, the Education Select Committee], various strategy documents from DoHSC, DCMS, DIE, and various arm’s length government reports [such as, Public Health England and OFSTED] – produced 71 documents and were mapped in the diagram below ‘first review of sources map exercise’.

---

\(^{82}\) UK Government [2018] Main Page. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/

\(^{83}\) UK Parliament [2018] Main Page. Available at: https://www.parliament.uk/

Appendix 2. Figure 19. First Review of Sources Map Exercise

PRE 2012
- Government Department – July 1988 - Education Reform Act
- National Sport Strategy – July 1995 - Sport Raising the Game
- National Sport Strategy – March 1999 - A Sporting Future for All
- National Sport Strategy – October 2002 - PE, School Sport and Club Links strategy
- National Sport Strategy – December 2002 - Game Plan
- National Sport Strategy – January 2006 - PE and Sport Strategy for Young People
- Government Department – September 2010 - PE and Sport Survey
- Government Department – October 2010 - Letter from Michael Goole to Youth Sport Trust
- Government Department – May 2011 - Schools and colleges engagement with London 2012
- Government Department – June 2011 - Ofsted School Sport Partnerships good practice
- Government Department – July 2011 - Stay Active: a report on physical activity
- Government Department – August 2011 - Child participation in culture and sport
- 2012 - PE, School Sport and Club Links strategy
- 2014 - Every Child Matters framework
- 2016 - PE & Sport strategy for Young People

2012
- 2012 Olympics and Paralympics
- National Sport Strategy – January 2012 - Creating a Sporting Habit for Life
- Government Department – April 2012 - Beyond London 2012

2013
- Government Department – June 2013 - Evidence on PE and School Sport
- Government Department – June 2013 - Inspired by 2012
- Select Committee – July to October 2013 - School Sport following London 2012
- Select Committee – November 2013 - Keeping the Flame Alive

2014
- Government Department – February 2014 - Long-term vision of Legacy
- Select Committee – February 2014 - Keeping the Flame Alive: Government response
- Government Department – June 2014 - Ofsted: Going the extra mile
- Government Department – Ofsted: NGB Survey
- Select Committee – July 2014 - Women and Sport
- All-Party Parliamentary Group – October 2014 - Healthy Patterns for Healthy Families
- Government Department – October 2014 - PE and Sport Premium
- Government Department – October 2014 - Everybody Active, Every Day

2015
- All-Party Parliamentary Group – March 2015 - The Early Years
- Government Department – March 2015 - Living Legacy
- Government Department – March 2015 - A review of the social impact of culture and sport
- Select Committee – March 2015 - Impact of physical activity on health
- Government Department – May 2015 - Legacy policy
- Government Department – September 2015 - Triennial review of UK Sport and Sport England
- House of Commons Library – September 2015 - School Sport Partnerships
- All-Party Parliamentary Group – October 2015 - Play
- Government Department – October 2015 - What works in schools and colleges to increase physical activity?
- Government Department – November 2015 - PE and Sport Premium research
- Select Committee – November 2015 - Childhood Obesity
- National Sport Strategy – December 2015 - Sporting Future
- House of Commons Library – December 2015 - School Sport in England

2016
- National Sport Strategy – May 2016 - Towards an Active Nation
- Government Department – August 2016 - Childhood Obesity: A plan for action
- All-Party Parliamentary Group – November 2016 - Physical Education
- National Sport Strategy – December 2016 - Coaching in an Active Nation
- National Sport Strategy – December 2016 - Volunteering in an Active Nation

2017
- House of Commons Library – January 2017 - Funding from the Soft Drinks Levy
- Government Department – February 2017 - Sporting Future: First annual report
- Select Committee – March 2017 - Childhood Obesity
- National Sport Strategy – July 2017 - Families Fund prospectus
- All-Party Parliamentary Group – October 2017 - Physical Activity in Early Childhood
- House of Commons Library – November 2017 - School meals and nutritional standards

2018
- Government Department – January 2018 - Tailored Review of UK Anti-Doping
- Select Committee – January 2018 - Childhood Obesity: Government response
5. Second review of relevance (using a member checking technique): narrowed through date, purpose and relevance the document were refined further. This yielded 63 documents, see Appendix 1 – Document List. This equated to approximately 4000 pages, accordingly, for feasibility purposes an analysis framework was produced and used to synthesise the documents and findings.

Appendix 2. Figure 20. Analysis Framework

---
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