

John Johnson, Peter Ha

Elucidating pedagogical objectives for combat systems, martial arts, and combat sports

Ido Movement for Culture : journal of martial arts anthropology : theory of culture, psychophysical culture, cultural tourism, anthropology of martial arts, combat sports 15/4, 65-74

2015

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

PEDAGOGY

JOHN A. JOHNSON¹ (ABCEF), PETER HA² (DG)

¹ Humanitas College, Kyung Hee University, Yongin (South Korea)

² College of Physical Education, Kyung Hee University, Yongin (South Korea)

Correspondence: Prof. Dr John A. Johnson; Humanitas College, 1732 Deokyoungdae-ro, Giheung-gu, Yongin-si, South Korea, 446-701; tel.: 81-01-2209-0704

e-mail: mudoknowledge@gmail.com

Elucidating pedagogical objectives for combat systems, martial arts, and combat sports

Submission: 5.02.2015; acceptance: 24.05.2015

Key words: martial knowledge, physical education, self-cultivation

Abstract

To date, the varied purposes of studying martial knowledge have been lumped together under the ubiquitous term *martial arts*. Combat systems, martial arts, and combat sports are commonly assumed to be identical, because their physical skills all stem from using the body or weapons for combat purposes. As such, instructors of these systems tend identify their skill sets under one term. However, from a pedagogical viewpoint, these three systems possess unique learning objectives. This paper thus defines combat systems, martial arts, and combat sports according to their final learning objectives to emphasize their distinctive educational qualities. Combat systems are for use in combat or self-defense situations, otherwise understood as when all social rules give way to violence. Martial arts offer a means of mental and social self-cultivation through a physical education curriculum based upon self-defense techniques. Combat sports are reformulated martial arts with a focus on competition. Consequently, these systems' learning objectives, or the purposes of studying, differ profoundly. Numerous positive repercussions will occur when these learning systems are properly labeled. For instance, instructors will be able to establish more effective training programs that work effectively toward these goals. Students will additionally understand their learning process and be able to determine their progress in relation to their educational goals. Most importantly, instructors and students will better determine their progress in relation to their personal educational goals.

Introduction

For the purposes of this paper, *martial knowledge* will be classified as any collected body of knowledge of physical skills designed for the purpose of self-preservation and/or self-defense, which appears to be what previous researchers have defined as *martial arts*. It is believed this is the current research is the first such attempt to delineate combat systems, martial arts, and combat sports. As such, no previous research – pedagogical, philosophical, or otherwise – has been performed on this topic. It is hoped this paper shall be the impetus for further delineation of these three very distinct educational systems. Delineating these three terms will facilitate more accurate pedagogical and educational research in the future.

Each martial knowledge system possesses unique skills and methods of moving the body for self-persever-

ation. These skills are governed by either philosophical or practical rationales. As each system uses the body differently for different reasons, the learning objectives of each martial knowledge system will vary from system to system. Learning objectives are a martial knowledge system's "key intents" [Phillips 2008]. For instance, Krav Maga, a system of martial knowledge created for the Israeli military, is learned typically for survival during wartime, while Olympic Taekwondo focuses on competition.

Asian martial knowledge systems such as Taekwondo, Karate, Kung Fu, and a host of others have gone beyond their respective countries to become global phenomena. These systems often compete for students with western exercise and sports programs while arguably offering many similar benefits. A consequent research trend is to compare martial training with established

modes of physical exercise such as western sports and dance [Allen 2013: 242-252]. Under the term "martial arts," previous researchers defined martial arts in relation to more established means of Physical Education.

Yet, Asian martial knowledge systems are as different from one another as they are from Western sports. While Allen and others such as Cynarski, Obodynski, and Zeng [2012] compare martial arts to exercise, sports, and dance [129–152], a conclusive delineation of what constitutes a martial art has not yet been made. There exists one clear distinction between learning martial knowledge and learning sports, dance, and other means of organized physical activity, however. That is, martial knowledge teaches students to defend themselves in violent confrontations, which provides them with practical knowledge applicable to areas beyond the dance studio or playing field. Thus, the crucial distinguishing characteristic between martial knowledge and sport and dance is the former's unique capability of offering practical knowledge and skills. Comparing martial knowledge to dance and sports is therefore akin to doing the same to the proverbial apple and orange.

For instance, taekwondo practice has been delineated into three broad categories: utilitarian, philosophy, and pragmatic practices [Wasik 2014: 22]. While informative, these terms are too vague to determine the educational purposes of martial arts in general. Researchers additionally have not discussed the fact that martial arts have different training regimes, curricula, and educational goals. Proper examination of and research in martial skills cannot begin until they are fully defined along the lines of their final learning objectives. While martial knowledge systems and other forms of physical exercise, self-expression, and play may typically share some characteristics, they are nevertheless a unique means of Physical Education.

Individual participants will learn martial knowledge for a plethora of reasons [Allender, Cowburn, Foster 2006: 829-831; Jones, Mackay, Peters 2006: 28-34; Kano 2005; Stefanek 2004]. Indeed, there are as many varied reasons for studying martial knowledge as there are students. What this paper focuses on, however, are three of the top seven reasons for studying martial knowledge; e.g., combat, self-cultivation, and sport [Jones, Mackay, Peters 2006: 28-34]. As a consequence, this article elucidates what constitutes a combat system, martial art, and martial sport regardless of national origin according to their individual educational goals.

Instructors decide what the purpose of his or her teachings are, and they are consequently responsible for how martial knowledge is interpreted by students. This paper takes the viewpoint of the educator rather than the student, so students' impetuses for attending class are not pertinent here. For this reason, this paper is unique as it considers the martial knowledge educator's general learning objectives (i.e., how their knowledge should be

viewed and used by students) rather than the students' motivation for attending class.

When considering the role of learning objectives in any class, one must remember it is the instructor or institution that establishes them, and not the students. Thus, while students' personal motivations for learning a particular martial knowledge system lie within their minds alone, the key factor here is the purpose for which the system was created and for what reasons it is taught. Undoubtedly, a Canadian student may take Krav Maga classes primarily to improve his/her cardiovascular fitness; however, the educational objectives for that particular knowledge system remain fundamentally based on survival during warfare. If an instructor changes the learning objectives to meet students' demands for physical fitness, the purpose of that martial knowledge system changes and a new knowledge system is created. Thus, assuming all systems of martial knowledge are taught with identical learning objectives is akin to believing American football, soccer, and rugby are indistinguishable because they share common skills and tactics.

When the fundamentals of a system of martial knowledge are taught differently from other forms of physical exercise and sports, they must be examined in a different light. Precedence exists for classifying the various modes of martial knowledge systems. Draeger [2007a] stated ascribing "all Japanese martial skills under one classification" was careless. He also took great pains to distinguish the uniqueness of Japanese martial arts through their evolution from systems of combat to means of mental and social self-cultivation (hitherto referred to only as "self-cultivation") [Draeger 2007a] and finally on to modern systems of combat sports [Draeger 2007b]. Through his work, it is possible to see three distinct learning objectives for martial knowledge: combat survival, self-cultivation, and sport. However, his use of Japanese terminology and focus on Japanese systems of martial knowledge prevents his labels and concepts from being applied to non-Japanese martial knowledge systems (e.g., Taekwondo, Kung Fu, Krav Maga, Muay Thai, etc.). Moreover, his texts do not address the learning objectives of martial knowledge systems specifically; they instead focus solely on explaining Japanese martial knowledge in its various historical forms. Therefore, when it is realized that martial knowledge systems can be classified according to their original educational objectives, and they differ from sports and other modes of exercise due to their mental and social self-cultivation, separating the practice and education of these martial knowledge systems from that of sports and dance for clarification and edification purposes is more than justified.

Methods

A literature review focusing on martial arts education and philosophy was conducted to determine what, if

any, types of martial arts knowledge exist. English texts were primarily consulted. No sources discussing the differences between the various purposes for studying martial knowledge were found other than the aforementioned Draeger text.

The primary reason for pursuing martial knowledge was identified: self-preservation. Yet, to group all of the reasons for learning this type of knowledge is pedagogically unsound, because doing so ignores their fundamental differences. Thus, a new term, *combat systems*, was coined for systems used solely for self-preservation purposes (i.e., self-defense, military tactics, policing actions, etc.). Two terms commonly used in martial knowledge literature, *martial arts* and *combat sports*, were then further defined according to their most obvious educative aims. The literature review provided evidence and support for all three definitions.

Discussion

Most individuals in pursuit of martial knowledge as well as the layperson assume they are learning a method of fighting, developing a martial spirit, and participating in a sport simultaneously. In metaphoric language, this equates to the assumption that studying mathematics for an exam, learning mathematics to improve one's knowledge of the subject, and preparing for the Math Olympiad are one and the same. Each of these reasons for learning math are distinct even though the fundamental skills and knowledge are the same. Instructors must accordingly teach each endeavor dissimilarly, because each pursuit possesses a learning objective unique from the others.

Martial knowledge systems are similar, since they can be taught for a wide range of purposes. The confusion surrounding the definition of *martial art* stems from the fact they all offer physical education in the form of using the body as weapon. Unlike the mathematics education examples above in which educators train their students for each individual goal differently, martial knowledge instructors often assert training in their systems will produce exceptional fighters, moral students, and excellent competitors simultaneously. These educational goals cannot be achieved concurrently as each possesses distinctive educational learning objectives.

Respective examples of martial knowledge learning objectives can be 1) fighters must learn to defend themselves in combat; 2) moral students must question how to become better human beings; and 3) competitors must, on one end of the competition spectrum, play for enjoyment, or, at the other end, strive to win at all costs. No singular educational path for all three is possible. Thus, the martial knowledge systems commonly grouped together under the term *martial arts* should be viewed as separate educational pursuits.

For the purposes of this paper, the three most common reasons for pursuing martial knowledge are defined as combat systems, martial arts, and combat sports. In the most succinct language possible, combat systems are for self-defense or killing on the battlefield; martial arts are for self-cultivation; and combat sports are for competition. It is each system's unique rationales for training (i.e., their educational objectives and goals) which influence their physical practices, modes, reasons for training, educational practices, and philosophies. It should moreover be noted that other purposes for teaching martial knowledge exist, so these three categories of martial knowledge do not encapsulate all of types of martial knowledge. This paper aims to illustrate the diversity of martial knowledge by defining three of its variants. We only aim to elucidate the one aspect which differentiates one from the other: their final pedagogical learning objectives.

Combat Systems and Killing

Combat systems are organized systems of self-defense or fighting that may or may not incorporate weapons, which possess the ultimate objective of protecting one's country, property, or self. They "must be understood primarily as military skills, not methods of self-cultivation or religious activity" [Lorge 2012]. Draeger [2007a] adds combat systems are created for and by the individuals engaging in combat activities. Self-designed systems are apropos since the combatants whose lives depending on the effectiveness of these systems have firsthand knowledge of what is needed on their battlefields.

Nations throughout time have possessed the weapons and organized means of self-protection as well as the right to do so [Kano 1989]. Combat systems are thus employed for either personal self-defense or aggressive purposes, but can be applied and/or modified for other means such as peacekeeping (i.e., the self-defense techniques police officers learn). These martial knowledge systems preserve what is valuable: life, family, culture, national stability, and other cherished tangible and intangible treasures. They focus typically on the physical forms and strategies of combat and tend to lack esoteric philosophies. Examples of combat systems are Krav Maga, Japanese Jujutsu, and the U.S. Marine Corps Martial Arts Program (MCMAP). The learning objectives of a combat system are therefore to provide soldiers and fighters the necessary physical skills needed to survive at all costs.

The lessons acquired from combat systems are finite, however. As their primary purpose to learn survival skills, the motivation to learn anything else is stifled. Once the student has learned combat skills, they are only required to practice those skills until they are no longer needed. There is no need to find other knowledge as the system's ultimate learning objective has been met.

Yet, the fact remains the lessons learned from combat systems can possess non-violent applications. While most combat systems do not intend to help learners become better human beings, it is possible to discern ethical or moral lessons from them. Kano stated self-defense lessons can be applied to other areas of life [2005]. This is exactly what he did when he reformulated the samurai systems of hand-to-hand combat known as Jujutsu into Judo. He found lessons in the warlike techniques of old that guided him throughout his personal and professional life effectively for decades [Stevens 2013]. Today, we see this same process when business colleges apply Sun Tzu's *The Art of War* to various commercial strategies [Kaufman 2015]. Combat systems are consequently not devoid of philosophies; practitioners only need to extrapolate martial knowledge from a combat system's technique or strategy and apply it to another situation outside of combat. The onus to do so is in fact on students and not instructors.

Martial Arts and Self-Cultivation

A *martial art* is a system of self-defense with the ultimate goal of self-cultivation. The term *martial art* is used in this research, because these systems offer self-defense knowledge and are for self-cultivation purposes. However, the self-defense systems they learn may not be practical, especially if outdated weaponry is used.

Martial art practitioners often express feelings of artistic or self-expression while performing them [Dziwenka 2014]. These systems thus offer much more to learners than fighting prowess. They provide lessons in physical education and self-discipline through the process of learning combat skills as well as a means of improving one's self mentally, socially, and (potentially) spiritually. Draeger describes *classical budo*, or classical Japanese martial arts, as "trials of intelligence and moral courage" [Draeger 2007b]. They consequently also allow for personal and artistic expressions of combat skills in manners that may not be effective on the battlefield. For instance, rarely—if ever—has a soldier been able to run and then spring off another person's back in order to kick four stationary targets before landing as is commonly displayed in martial arts demonstrations. Such displays of physical skill are better use for cinematic rather than battlefield purposes. Nonetheless, some students may feel such displays of athleticism are self-expressive, and thus these martial knowledge systems fall within the realm of art.

Chozan [2010] proclaimed martial arts are "not something you persevere in just to achieve victory over others" [21-22]. Consequently, one of the many paradoxes in martial arts training is that students should be unconcerned with what their opponents do. In combat systems, the fighter must be utterly focused upon their enemy because their every lives may hang in the balance.

However, concentration on overcoming an opponent is a separate concept than working toward improving the self. The impetus to win is again the variable here; martial arts are not concerned with winning or losing over an opponent [Takuan 1987] as combat systems or combat sports are (see below). The opponent (or enemy) in combat sports is external while martial arts teach it is within. For martial artists, it is their ability to act rather than defeat the opponent. In this way, the martial artist is attempting to defeat their fear [Back, Kim 1984: 12].

Staying focused on self-defense perpetuates this fear, since the learning objective of that type of martial knowledge is to defeat a physical threat. Webster-Doyle [1989] states that a martial art teaches the understanding of the self:

When we are confronted by a challenge, by someone threatening us, we usually react to the situation. *Reaction*, as it is used here, is a psychological movement to defend, either physically or with words, that which is perceived as being threatened – which is ourselves. It is easy to understand defending oneself from physical assault, but psychological assault is another type of threat. In being attacked physically, the body is being threatened. In being attacked psychologically, what is threatened? If we could actually be aware psychologically at the moment of attack, we could see what is defending. Isn't it our self, an image that thought has created? It seems that the real work of the Art of Karate is in understanding this "self", for it seems that this self is the root of the psychological reaction, and therefore is the seat of conflict.

Thus, whereas combat systems are intended to overcome a physical threat, martial arts are intended to look introspectively in order to become a stronger person.

Indeed, many martial traditions have the objective of helping practitioners become better people. Morihei Ueshiba [2010], the founder of Aikido, said a true martial art is "not a fighting technique based on rash use of force against another in order to determine who is stronger or who can win in a contest; rather it is a path centered on daily training with other kindred souls, mutually working together to polish and refine their individuals characters" [Ueshiba 2010: 15-16]. Education in the martial arts thus offers more than physical skills to be used in combat. Practitioners of martial arts are (or at least should) improving their bodies and characters simultaneously. They are, in effect, working to becoming a better person as a whole rather than learn how to kill an enemy combatant. This ideal was also in fact paramount to the founders of Taekwondo [Choi 1985: 45-68].

To achieve the goal of self-cultivation, martial artists study a system of self-defense to build self-confidence. As practitioners advance their physical prowess in their martial art system, they transfer their incurred self-confidence in their ability to perform the art to other areas of their lives. As a result, the learning objectives of martial arts are to train practitioners to weather the trials and

tribulations of life; to arm individuals with the mental and physical stalwartness needed to overcome all types of hardships whether physical, mental, or spiritual in nature; and eventually thrive because of difficulty. These skills are in turn used to become more useful members of society [Draeger 2007a; Lee 2011; Sakai, Bennett 2010].

Thus, systems of martial art education are methods of mental and social self-cultivation. Their primary objective is not to prepare practitioners for combat survival, nor do they focus on themes such as fair play or teamwork as in sports. Instead, martial arts teach combat techniques as a metaphor of life's difficulties to prepare students for physical threats as well as mental and emotional hurdles. Martial artists receive more than physical education; they acquire life skills since they are taught to apply lessons learned during training to their everyday lives [Jones & Hanon 2010: 9].

Martial arts also have different moral and ethical lessons than combat systems possess. The ethical and moral dilemmas in combat systems are rooted in the rules of warfare or local governance which cover rules of force in self-defense situations. Martial artists, on the other hand, are often concerned with etiquette and proper behavior in society [Donohue 1998]. Ethics are also at the forefront of a martial art's education, especially in the case of Judo [Cooper, Taylor 2010] and Taekwondo [Choi 1985: 40]. Students likewise should be concerned with the ethics of their goals inside and outside their martial arts school [Choi 2001: 155-156].

Martial artists proclaim their educational process as never-ending [Lee 2011; Cardillo 2003], because lifelong martial artists never discontinue trying to achieve the ultimate goal of a life worth living. In fact, their physical training is just a means to an end. Students at every age can learn in this manner, since they can continue to explore new concepts found within the art. In simpler terms, the more students practice, the more they learn. Thus, training can never stop in a martial art, because martial artists are not concentrating only on accomplishing a physical goal (such as defeating an enemy as in a combat system).

Individuals at the highest ranks of a martial art indeed often say they are merely students and continue to find new knowledge within their art [MTAC 2013]. This is not an attempt at humility; it is a statement of fact. Martial artists should always endeavor to find new ways to incorporate lessons learned from training into their daily lives. This attitude of martial artists is most likely a holdover from samurai education [Funakoshi, Nakasone 2004] that spawned many of today's martial arts. Nonetheless, learning should never stop for martial artists, because they are (or should be) always finding new lessons in their martial arts applicable to their daily lives. The martial knowledge found within martial arts is infinite, since martial arts training should be continuous. It is the act of training that matters in martial arts, not what one can do with one's physical skills.

Combat Sports and Competition

A combat sport is a restructuring and the regularization of a martial art for the purposes of competition, hence why *sport* is used to describe this martial knowledge system. There are many examples of these martial knowledge systems, such as wrestling, Judo, Olympic Taekwondo, and mixed martial arts (MMA). In particular, a select group of martial art techniques are chosen and often adapted for use in competition. The reasons for limiting the types of techniques and altering them are for competitors' safety and for improving the chances of success in competition, respectfully. For instance, only the fastest techniques of Olympic Taekwondo are employed in competition to enhance the possibility of scoring points and none are allowed to the eyes or groin. These were necessary modifications from the original martial knowledge system in order to achieve the final objective of participating in tournaments safely.

Combat sports should be considered the competitive side to martial arts. Thus, the primary difference between martial arts and martial sports is the element of competition against another individual. Whereas a martial art is primarily a means for self-cultivation where the goal is to defeat perceived negative aspects of one's self, a martial sport exists to provide competitive activities. Undoubtedly, sports provide self-improvement opportunities for their players, too. Yet, martial arts and combat sports differ in how and to what extent that cultivation occurs. As mentioned, martial arts are for self-cultivation and are never-ending pursuits. Combat sports on the other hand are typically not practiced beyond the competitors' ability to compete.

As combat sports are inherently focused on competition (i.e., facing opponents), they teach different lessons from martial arts. Chun [2002] may have stated the difference between martial arts and combat sports best when we wrote, "You play a sport – however you live the martial arts" [133]. As stated above, martial arts are taught for moral and societal self-cultivation purposes. Conversely, combat sports focus on competing against other athletes, and since many (if not most) competitors desire to win more than simply participate, winning over others factors into the lessons they learn during play. In particular, martial athletes must focus primarily on developing the techniques and strategies that win, rather than reflect on what their training means and how lessons learned from training can be used in daily life. Thus, the learning objectives of a martial sport are to provide athletes with the competitive knowledge and skills needed to win a contest of martial skills and knowledge.

As implied above, martial arts provide lessons applications to life outside of the martial arts school. Likewise, combat sports provide similar lessons, but the foundation of the two types of education is dissimilar. The lessons of combat sports are derived during competition

(i.e., struggle against another player), whereas lessons in martial arts are derived from personal reflection (i.e., struggle against the self). Olympic Taekwondo is then no less valuable than Taekwondo as a martial art since both provide practitioners a way to improve their lives. The two systems of martial knowledge only teach how to win over different types of opponents.

Due to these alternative motivations, athletes must ignore the higher level components of personal mental and spiritual growth offered by martial arts practice [Argyraids 2013: 11] and that are not inherently present while teaching combat systems. In more precise terms, combat system practitioners and martial sport players must focus on how to win, not how to become a better moral being as were their original intended purpose. To win in either combat or combat sports, individuals need to focus on the physical skills required to achieve their respective goals rather than how their physical exertions cultivate their minds and spirits. As the benefits of sports has been widely reported, it is unnecessary to restate them here *ad nauseam*. We do not argue against combat sports nor claim they possess any less valuable lessons for competitors. We are only stating the educational objectives, goals, and philosophies of combat systems and combat sports are dissimilar to combat systems and martial arts.

The fact many martial arts have competitive aspects [Sakai, Bennett 2010] complicates the defining of the term *martial sport*, however. For instance, it is common for some martial art curricula to require students to attend competitions as part of the requirements for their next rank exam. Other arts, such as Judo, require students to not only compete, but to win in order to be promoted to the next rank. The governing organizations of martial arts like Hapkido and Kendo organize and promote in tournaments. Consequently, one cannot claim Hapkido and Kendo are pure martial arts even though their art primary focuses are on self-defense [Morgan 2009] and self-cultivation [Ozawa 1997], respectfully. Some martial arts do not promote tournament participation of which Aikido [Ueshiba K. 1987] is the most well-known. Many *Aikido-ka* (Aikido practitioners) in fact believe competition spoils the essence of their martial art as a means of self-improvement [Herraiz n.d.: 20-25].

The overlap in educational purposes of martial arts and combat sports therefore complicate distinguishing martial arts and combat sports. It would seem a little flexibility in labeling is required. A simple solution is at hand though. Instructors who view competition as just one possible means of self-cultivation for their students should use the term *martial art* for their system of learning. Conversely, instructors who see competition as the primary means for developing their students should label their activities as *combat sports*. Instructors who delineate between these two systems and promote the educational system they provide will eliminate any con-

fusion and pedagogical ethical issues in their students which arise from ignorance of the differences between art and sport. In this way, the educational objectives and goals set instructors set for their students dictate not only the type of education provided, but the names of the martial knowledge systems as well.

Combat sports are furthermore separate from martial arts and combat systems in the amount of educational opportunities they offer. While the lessons of hard work, dedication, and humility are abundant and a natural part of competitive sports, they are finite. The combat sports player has little motivation to continue improving themselves when they stop playing as their objective of competing is achieved. When they stop competing, they typically stop training as well. There is consequently a limit of the lessons one can learn from playing sports. Once again, the lesson learned in training and competition are valuable and can improve competitors' lives, but on the occasion an athlete stops competing, the lessons stop being current; they survive only in the past. Once an athlete is no longer capable of competing, the lessons they can learn from their training and participating in competitions is finished. In this sense, combat sports are finite because their learning objectives (i.e., to compete) have been accomplished.

One point must be mentioned about the educations of martial arts and combat sports. Martial art practitioners and martial sport athletes must consciously seek the lessons which can improve their lives, because such teachings are not an innate aspect of training. If they were innate, combat systems and combat sports like boxing would have philosophies of their own. Individuals must, as mentioned above, make the decision to learn from their experiences and training. If such education is not encouraged, practitioner's efforts will become at best mere exercise and at worst a process of learning how to inflict physical harm.

Physical Education Concerns

Martial knowledge systems have existed globally for millennia. For example, soldiers/fighters trained in combat systems have conducted tribal warfare and battles since recorded since prehistoric times on every inhabited continent. Martial arts, as described in the paper, were developed in Asia, but are now being developed in North and South America, Europe, and elsewhere. Combat sports are nearly as old as combat systems and examples of which can be seen in Homer's epic poems to today's international Ultimate Fighting Championships (UFC) events. As such, they speak to something intrinsic to the human condition.

The educational benefits of such endeavors have been discussed for nearly as long:

Plato spends a great deal of time in the *Republic* talking about the Guardians, the athlete-warriors who

would be trained to defend his model human community, and ultimately to rule it. In fact, it's pretty clear in the Republic that the Guardians represent the very ideal of human existence. While their physical training has an obvious practical, political, and military purpose, Plato emphasizes that the training of the body is the training of the soul. Plato's warriors must develop harmonious souls, where harshness is balanced with gentleness, and wisdom and rational ability are exhibited together with high-spiritedness and bravery. [Lynch 2010]

Yet, the questions of how these qualities are developed still linger. Modern scholars must address this particular issue in order for students to benefit fully from their instruction. Today's educators are encouraged to define their learning goals and objectives for their students [Dunn 2005]. Yet, a modern educator must first have first defined the terms *combat system*, *martial art*, and *martial art* in order to establish their objectives and goals or their students.

Martial artists and combat sports players must be aware of the fundamental differences between their activities [Rhee 2012] not only so they have a better understanding of what they are participating, but so they develop themselves according to their endeavors' educational philosophies. In other words, instructors will facilitate their students' educational process by informing them what they are learning and how their training goals will be met. Just as school teachers identify what their students will know or be able to do at the end of a school term, it is only when martial knowledge instructors identify their training objectives that they can create more effective training regimens. Doing so is important since students that are cognizant of their learning process can better determine their progress in relation to their educational goals and make changes whenever necessary.

Another point to consider is when instructors claim they are providing education in one type of system but are actually not, the central component of trust between student and teacher is broken. Students suffer in these situations, because they may lose motivation due to their educational needs not being met.

Wasik [2014] states the ideal learning environment would incorporate all possible learning objectives [22]. However, this convolutes the learning process. Not declaring if one practices for a combat, martial art, or martial sport purpose also prevents students from working toward a clear goal. From an educational standpoint, this can be detrimental to students' learning a martial art because they lack a clear focus toward definitive long-term learning objectives. While informative, these terms are too vague to determine the educational purposes of martial arts in general. For the instructor, a failure to define their educational intent gives rise to several negative backlashes, the least of which are a failure to retain students, a tarnished reputation, and a resulting loss of income. Martial art organizations are likewise harmed.

The general public will recognize when organizations promote martial arts education yet focus on sporting events. Whether they can articulate it or not, students and potential students alike will question if their system is truly a martial art or sport. They will eventually shun these organizations' affiliated schools due to this lack of continuity.

Conclusions

as martial arts education is becoming more widely accepted as a means of physical education [Cox 1993: 366], educators and researchers should correspondingly understand the nature of their subject material. This paper has approached the definition of combat systems, martial arts, and combat sports from a pedagogical perspective. In doing so, distinctions in each system's learning objectives made for the first time.

Educational standards cannot be maintained however without first establishing a curriculum's learning objectives and goals. Martial art instructors cannot establish their educational objectives until they can articulate their ultimate purpose for teaching the martial art. Competent educators will use their final martial knowledge learning objective, whether it is for combat, self-cultivation, sporting purposes, or otherwise, to establish their students' long-term objectives. Only then can they devise weekly or even daily goals for students effectively.

As anecdotal evidence and research has continually showed martial arts provide benefits beyond the realm of physical fitness [Trulson 1986: 1131-1140; Harris 1998: 484; Ripley 2003: 2; Seng 2006: 86-88] and are being included in some schools' academic programs [Mt. View Elementary School n.d.; McFarland 2011], it has never been more important to define what martial arts are and ensure instructors are teaching them accordingly. Doing so is critical when we realize martial knowledge is being used to help students overcome social and emotional issues [Seng 2006: 86-88], ADD [Harris 1998: 484], juvenile delinquency [Trulson 1986: 1131-1140], and English as a Second Language (ESL) difficulties, as well as learn teamwork [McFarland 2011].

Furthermore, combat systems, martial arts, and combat sports cannot be approached philosophically until a clear definition for each is determined. A lack of proper understanding of their final goals prevents clear conclusions and accurate explorations of their methodologies. Many organizations, leaders, and authors have propagated this problem by relying on legend and oral histories of their system when discussing their systems' philosophies. As more historical documents are being translated and disseminated, these erroneous interpretations are being amended languidly [Lorge 2012]. The fact remains that decades of articles, books, television shows, and movies have cemented these legends as if

they were facts. It will take many more years to revert this unfortunate trend.

Accordingly, if martial knowledge instructors wish to ever achieve the same respect as their classroom counterparts, they should maintain identical pedagogical standards. One of the most central of these standards is the establishment of clear educational objectives and goals for students. More essential to lay martial knowledge instructors are the clearly defined (and consequently better understood) objectives that will guide their daily lesson plans. When students know their educational objectives, learning is facilitated [SABES and ACLS 2008; Berkeley], because students can understand their learning process and be able to determine their progress in relation to their personal educational goals. Moreover, well-define "learning goals/outcomes contribute to a structure that surrounds a course and can aid in selecting appropriate graded and ungraded assessments, selecting relevant content for the course, and enhancing the assessment or grading practices" [UC Regents 2015].

As mentioned previously, one of the limitations of this paper is that the terms combat system, martial art, and martial sport are quite delineated. Clearly, martial knowledge instructors can establish more than the three learning objectives outlined above for their students of which physical exercise is possibly the most obvious. This research also does not examine how short-term education goals can influence the long-term learning objectives described herein. These topics should be explored by future researchers.

References

- Allen B. (2013), *Games of sport, works of art, and the striking beauty of Asian martial arts*, "Journal of the Philosophy of Sport", vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 241-254.
- Allender S., Cowburn G., Foster C. (2006), *Understanding participation in sport and physical activity among children and adults: A review of qualitative studies*, "Health Education Research", vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 826-835.
- Argyraids K. (2013), *Shotokan Karate-Do: Hirokazu Kanazawa*, "Budo International Magazine", vol. 42, pp. 6-11, retrieved from www.budointernational.net/content/6-magazine, accessed on 3rd of October 2014.
- Back A., Kim D. (1984), *The future course of the Eastern martial arts*, "Quest", vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 7-14.
- Choi H.H. (1985), *Encyclopedia of Taekwon-Do, volume 2*, International Taekwon-Do Federation, Canada.
- Choi H.H. (2001), *Taekwon-Do and I, volume one, motherland in turmoil*, Master Publications, Denver, CO.
- Chozan I. (2010), *The mysterious skills of the old cat* [in:] "The Samurai Mind: Lessons from Japan's Master Warriors," Hellman C. [ed.], Tuttle Press, Tokyo, pp. 16-24.
- Chun R. (2002), *Taekwondo: Spirit and Practice Beyond Self-defense*, YMAA, Roslindale, MA.
- Cooper S., Taylor T. (2010), *Armbarring the common good*, "Martial Arts and Philosophy", Priest G., Young D. (eds.), Open Court, Chicago, IL, pp. 71-80.
- Cardillo Joseph (2003), *Be Like Water: Practical Wisdom from the Martial Arts*, Hachette Central Publishing: New York, NY.
- Cox J.C. (1993), *Traditional Asian martial arts training: A review*, "Quest", vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 366-388.
- Cynarski W.J., Obodynski K., Zeng H.Z. (2012), *Martial arts anthropology for sport pedagogy and physical education*, "Romanian Journal for Multidimensional Education", vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 129-152.
- Cynarski W.J., Skowron J. (2014), *An analysis of the conceptual language used for the general theory of martial arts - Japanese, Polish and English terminology*, "Ido Movement for Culture. Journal of Martial Arts Anthropology", vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 49-66. doi: 10.14589/ido.14.3.7
- Donohue J.J. (1998), *Herdng the Ox: The Martial Arts as a Moral Metaphor*, Tuttle Press, Wethersfield, CT.
- Draeger D.F. (2007a), *Classical Bujutsu: The Martial Arts and Ways of Japan* (4th printing), Shambhala Publications, Inc., Boston, MA.
- Draeger D.F. (2007b), *Classical Budo: The Martial Arts and Ways of Japan* (4th printing), Shambhala Publications, Inc., Boston, MA.
- Dunn S. (2005). *Philosophical Foundations of Education: Connecting Theory to Practice*, Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Dziwenka R. (2014), *Applying a Buddhist Paradigm of Spiritual Practice to Contemporary Martial Art/Martial Sport Study*, "Journal of the International Association for Taekwondo Research," 1(1), pp. 14-21.
- Funakoshi G., Nakasone G. (2004), *The Twenty Guiding Principles of Karate*, Teramoto J. [trans.], Kodansha, Tokyo.
- Harris M.J. (1998). *Tai-kwan-do in relation to ADD*, "Journal of Paediatrics and Child Health", vol. 34, p. 484.
- Herraiz S. (n.d.), *Kissshomaru Ueshiba*, "Budo International Magazine", vol. 52, pp. 20-25, retrieved from www.budointernational.net/content/6-magazine; accessed on 3rd of October 2014.
- Jones G.W., Mackay K.S., Peters D.M. (2006, July 1), *Participation motivation in martial artists in the west midlands region of England*, "Journal of Sports Science and Medicine, Combat Sports Special Issue" (CSSI), vol. 5, pp. 28-34.
- Jones L.C., Hanon M.J. (2010), *The Way of Kata in Kodokan Judo*, "Journal of Asian Martial Arts," 19(4), pp. 8-37.
- Kano J. (2005), *Mind over Muscle: Writings from the Founder of Judo*, N.H. Ross [trans.], Kodansha, Tokyo.
- Kano J. (1989), *The contribution of Jiudo to education* [in:] *The Overlook Martial Arts Reader: Classic Writings on Philosophy and Technique*, Nelson R.F. [ed.], Overlook Press, Woodstock, NY.
- Kaufman D. (2015, January 17), *Sun Tzu, The art of war and your portfolio*, *Financial Post*, retrieved from <http://business.financialpost.com/2013/08/17/sun-tzu-the-art-of-war-and-your-portfolio/>, accessed 19th of January 2015.

27. Lee K.H. (2011), *What Is Taekwondo Poomsae?* (2nd ed.), Osung Publishing Company, Seoul.
28. Lorge P.A. (2012), *Chinese Martial Arts: From Antiquity to the Twenty-first Century*, Cambridge University Press, New York, NY.
29. Lynch J.J. (2010), *Plato and the Shaolin Monks Square Off, Martial Arts and Philosophy: Beating and Nothingness*, Open Court Publishing Company, Chicago and La Salle, IL.
30. McFarland A. (2011, October 11), *Teaching Taekwondo in City Schools*, retrieved from <http://abclocal.go.com/wabc/story?section=news/education&id=8403538>
31. Morgan D. (2009), *Warrior Mind: Strategy and Philosophy from the Martial Arts*, AuthorHouse, Bloomington, IL.
32. MTAC. (2013, August 19), *Interview with Grand Master Choi*, retrieved from <http://www.itf-administration.com/articles.asp?arturn=3724>, accessed on 19th of August 2013.
33. Mt. View Elementary School (n.d.), *Tae Kwon Do*, retrieved from www.mtviews.mnps.org/Page39563.aspx, accessed on 1st of March 2014.
34. Ozawa H. (1997), *Kendo: The Definitive Guide*, Kodansha International, Tokyo.
35. Phillips J.J., Phillips P.P. (2008), *Beyond Learning Objectives*, ASTD Press, Alexandria, VA.
36. Rhee K.H. (2012), *This Is Taekwon-Do*, Media Insight, United Kingdom.
37. Ripley A. (2003), *An Awesome Alternative to Drugs: Martial Arts Practice as Treatment for Children with AD/HD*, retrieved from http://www.milehighkarate.com/pdf/ma_add.pdf, accessed 1st of May 2012.
38. SABES, ACLS (2008), *SABES/ACLS Lesson Planning Resource Guide*, retrieved from <http://www.sabes.org/sites/sabes.org/files/resources/lesson-planning-guide-2008.pdf>, accessed on 17th of May 2015.
39. Sakai T., Bennett A. (2010), *A Bilingual Guide to the History of Kendo*, Ski Journal Company, Tokyo.
40. Seng N.S. (2006), *English abstract [in:] Effect of Taekwondo Training on Intellectual and Emotional Development and Self-esteem of Primary School Students* (masters dissertation), Kyung Hee University, Yongin, Korea [in Korean].
41. Stefanek K.A. (2004), *An Exploration of Participation Motives Among Collegiate Taekwondo Participants* (PhD dissertation), Kinesiology Publications, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR, retrieved from [http://www.oregonpdf.org/print-script.cfm?path=../pdf%5C&src=PSY2337Stefanek\(17-2\).pdf](http://www.oregonpdf.org/print-script.cfm?path=../pdf%5C&src=PSY2337Stefanek(17-2).pdf), accessed on 6th of May 2013.
42. Stevens J. (2013), *The Way of Judo: A Portrait of Jigoro Kano & his Students*, Shambhala Publications, Inc., Boston, MA.
43. Takuan S. (1987), *The Unfettered Mind*, W.S. Wilson [trans.], Kodansha, Tokyo.
44. Trulson M.E. (1986), *Martial Arts Training: A Novel "Cure" for Juvenile Delinquency*, "Human Relations", vol. 39, pp. 1131-1140.
45. UC Regents (2015), *Learning Goals/Outcomes*, University of California Berkeley Center for Teaching and Learning, retrieved from <https://teaching.berkeley.edu/learning-goal-soutcomes>, accessed on 17th of May 2015.
46. Ueshiba K. (1987), *The Spirit of Aikido*, Unno T. [trans.], Kodansha, Tokyo.
47. Ueshiba M. (2010), *Preface [in:] Morihei Ueshiba's The Heart of Aikido: The Philosophy of Takemusu Aiki*. Stephens J. [trans.], Kodansha, Tokyo.
48. Wasik J. (2014), *Three Areas of Taekwon-do Identification and Practice*, "Ido Movement for Culture. Journal of Martial Arts Anthropology", vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 22-26. doi: 10.14589/ido.14.3.3
49. Webster-Doyle T. (1989), *Karate: The Art of Empty Self*, Atrium Publications, Ojai, CA.

Naświetlanie celów pedagogicznych systemów walki, sztuk walki i sportów walki

Słowa kluczowe: znajomość sztuk walki, wychowanie fizyczne, samodoskonalenie

Abstrakt

Dla celów niniejszej pracy, nauka o sztukach walki została sklasyfikowana jako zebrany zasób wiedzy dotyczący umiejętności fizycznych przeznaczonych do celów samoobrony, który poprzednio przez naukowców został zdefiniowany jako „sztuki walki”. Każdy system wiedzy o sztukach walki zawiera unikalne umiejętności i metody poruszania ciała w celu samoobrony. Umiejętności te mają albo filozoficzne, albo praktyczne uzasadnienia. Tak, jak każdy system używa ciała w różny sposób, tak każdy cel nauczania wiedzy o walce będzie się różnił pomiędzy systemami.

W niniejszej pracy autorzy klasyfikują trzy zasadnicze rodzaje systemów wiedzy o walce, a mianowicie: *systemy walki*, *sztuki walki* i *sporty walki* w zależności od ich ostatecznych celów nauczania. *Systemy walki*, jako prekursorzy tego, co powszechnie nazywa się dziś sztukami walki, są systemami samoobrony i walki, które mogą lub nie muszą wykorzystywać broń. Ostatecznym celem systemów walki jest ochrona własnego kraju, mienia lub osobowa/indywidualna. Ochroniają to co jest cenne: życie, rodzinę, kulturę, stabilną sytuację w kraju oraz inne cenne materialne i niematerialne skarby. Termin *systemy walki* używany tutaj, ma odzwierciedlać cel do badania umiejętności fizycznych występujących w tych systemach; czyli systemy walki są wykorzystywane wyłącznie w celu przetrwania w sytuacjach życia lub śmierci. Te systemy wiedzy „należy rozumieć przede wszystkim jako umiejętności wojskowe, a nie metody własnego samodoskonalenia lub działalności religijnej”. Draeger [2007a] dodaje, że systemy walki są tworzone przez i dla osób angażujących się w działania bojowe.

Systemy walki są stosowane zarówno dla samoobrony lub do celów agresywnych, ale mogą być stosowane i/lub zmodyfikowane do innych celów, takich jak utrzymanie pokoju (czyli techniki samoobrony, których uczą się funkcjonariusze policji). Koncentrują się one zazwyczaj na fizycznych formach i strategiach walki oraz zwykle nie stoi za nim ezoteryczna filozofia. Przykładami systemów bojowych są Japońskie *jujutsu* i program walki dla amerykańskiej marynarki wojennej (MCMAP). Celem

uczenia się systemów walki jest więc zaopatrzenie żołnierzy i bojowników w niezbędne fizyczne umiejętności potrzebne do przetrwania na polu walki za wszelką cenę.

Lekcje pozyskane z systemów bojowych są jednak ograniczone. Jako swój główny cel stawiają umiejętności przetrwania; motywacja do nauki czegokolwiek innego jest tłumiona. Gdy student nauczy się umiejętności walki, wymaga się od niego wykonywania tych umiejętności, dopóki nie będą już potrzebne. Nie ma potrzeby, aby szukać innych źródeł wiedzy, jako że ostateczny cel nauki został spełniony. Jednak faktem pozostaje to, że lekcje wyciągnięte z systemów walki mogą posiadać zastosowanie pozbawione przemocy. Podczas gdy zamiarem większości systemów walki nie jest pomaganie uczniom stać się lepszymi ludźmi, można jednak wyciągnąć z nich etyczne i moralne lekcje.

Sztuka walki, według drugiej klasyfikacji, to system samoobrony z ostatecznym celem samodoskonalenia. Termin *sztuka walki* jest stosowany w tej pracy, ponieważ systemy te oferują wiedzę samoobrony i są używane do samodoskonalenia. Ponadto praktykujący często wyrażają siebie lub uczucia artystyczne podczas ćwiczeń [Dziwienka 2014]. W ten sposób systemy te oferują znacznie więcej niż tylko waleczność. Zapewniają one lekcje wychowania fizycznego i samodyscypliny w procesie uczenia się umiejętności walki, a także sposób poprawy samego siebie psychicznie, społecznie i (potencjalnie) duchowo. Pozwalają one także na wyrażenia artystycznych umiejętności walecznych, które nie mogą być skuteczne na polu bitwy. Na przykład, rzadko, jeśli w ogóle, żołnierz jest w stanie biec, a następnie odbić się od pleców innej osoby, aby kopnąć cztery stacjonarne cele przed lądowaniem, jak jest powszechnie przedstawiane w pokazach sztuk walki. Niektórzy uczniowie mogą uważać, że takie pokazy mogą wchodzić w sferę sztuki.

Adepci sztuk walki mają więcej styczności z wychowaniem fizycznym; nabywają umiejętności życiowych, ponieważ uczą się stosować doświadczenia zdobyte w trakcie szkolenia w codziennym życiu. Sztuki walki udzielają innych lekcji moralnych i etycznych niż systemy walki. Dylematy etyczne i moralne w systemach walki są zakorzenione w zasadach wojny i samorządności lokalnej, które obejmują zasady obowiązujące w sytuacjach samoobrony. Zawodnicy, z drugiej strony, często zajmują się etykietą i prawidłowym zachowaniem się w społeczeństwie. Etyka jest również w czołowie edukacji sztuk walki, zwłaszcza w przypadku *judo* i *taekwondo*.

Sport walki jest restrukturyzacją i uregulowaniem sztuki walki dla celów współzawodnictwa. Istnieje wiele przykładów systemów walki jak zapasy, *judo* i *taekwondo* olimpijskie. W szczególności, wybrane grupy technik sztuk walki są często wybierane i przystosowane do zastosowania w zawodach. Przyczyny ograniczania rodzajów technik i ich zmiany są podyktowane względami bezpieczeństwa zawodników i dla poprawy szans na sukces w turniejach. Na przykład, tylko najszybsze techniki *taekwondo* olimpijskiego są wykorzystywane w turniejach w celu zwiększenia ilości zdobytych punktów i żadne z nich nie są dozwolone, by zranić przeciwnika w okolicy oczu lub pachwiny. Były to niezbędne modyfikacje oryginalnego systemu w celu zapewnienia bezpieczeństwa zawodników.

Sporty walki powinny być uważane za rywalizacyjną stronę sztuk walki. Tak więc główną różnicą między sztuką walki a sportem walki jest elementem rywalizacji. Podczas, gdy sztuka walki jest przede wszystkim środkiem do samodoskonalenia, gdzie celem jest pokonanie negatywnych aspektów samego siebie, sport walki ma zapewnić rywalizację. Niewątpliwie, sport też zapewnia możliwości samodoskonalenia. Jednak sztuki walki i sporty walki różnią się. Niezastosowanie rozróżnienia podstawowych celów sztuk walki i sportów walki powoduje ponadto zamieszanie, nie tylko co do ich ostatecznego celu, ale i sposobu ich osiągnięcia.

Sporty walki różnią się od sztuk i systemów walki w szansach edukacyjnych, które oferują. Chociaż lekcje ciężkiej pracy, poświęcenia i pokory są znaczną i naturalną częścią sportu wyczynowego, to są ograniczone. Zawodnicy sportów walki mają niewielką motywację do dalszego doskonalenia się lub nawet przestają uprawiać sport, kiedy przestają brać udział w turniejach. Istnieje zatem limit lekcji wynikający z uprawiania sportu. Chociaż trening i zawody są cenne, to gdy zostaną one zaprzestane stają się częścią przeszłości. W tym sensie sporty walki są ograniczone, ponieważ ich cele edukacyjne (tzn. rywalizacja) zostały osiągnięte.

W edukacji sztuki walki stają się coraz bardziej powszechnie akceptowane, jako środek wychowania fizycznego [Cox 1993: 366], badacze powinni zrozumieć naturę ich przedmiotu. Niestety, wiele aspektów sztuk walki jest trudnych do zrozumienia bez wieloletniej praktyki. Praca ta przybliży definicję systemów walki, sztuk walki, i sportów walki z pedagogicznego punktu widzenia. W ten sposób wyróżnienie celów nauczania każdego z wymienionych systemów jest dokonane po raz pierwszy.

W związku z powyższym, w przypadku gdy instruktorzy sztuk walki chcą osiągnąć podobny szacunek jak pedagodzy, powinni trzymać się identycznych standardów pedagogicznych. Jednym z nich jest ustalenie jasnych celów i zadań edukacyjnych dla uczniów. Kiedy uczniowie znają swoje cele edukacyjne, mogą zrozumieć swój proces uczenia się i być w stanie określić swoje postępy w odniesieniu do osobistych celów edukacyjnych.