



Libraries and Learning Services

University of Auckland Research Repository, ResearchSpace

Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognize the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the [Library Thesis Consent Form](#) and [Deposit Licence](#).

Kicking at the Habitus

Exploring staff and student 'readings' of a socially critical physical education teacher education (PETE) programme

Rod Philpot

**A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy in Education, The University of Auckland, 2016**

Abstract

While social justice and equity are themes foregrounded in many initial teacher education (ITE) programmes, there are a myriad of ways in which ITE draws attention to inequities and supports future teachers with the skills, knowledge and desire to address these issues. Critical pedagogy, with roots steeped in critical theory and the emancipatory literature of Paulo Freire is an orientation to ITE that privileges such aims.

This thesis examines how critical pedagogy is understood and enacted by physical education teacher education (PETE) teacher educators in a single PETE programme that is underpinned by a critical orientation, and also the sense that the students in the programme have made of the critical pedagogies they encounter. At one level this thesis is an attempt to understand the enactment and subsequent reading of critical approaches to PETE. At a deeper level this research has the emancipatory aims of producing physical education (PE) teachers who aspire to, and who are equipped with, the required skills and dispositions for foregrounding social justice in their own teaching.

In this thesis I draw on critical theory, specifically the work of Paulo Freire, Jurgen Habermas and Pierre Bourdieu, to illustrate both the synergy and tensions associated with the enactment of critical pedagogies by several teacher educators who teach within a single ITE programme. The teacher educators' varying understandings and subsequent enactments of critical pedagogy ensure that their students are exposed to numerous critical approaches. At the same time, the encounters between individual student biographies and multiple, often unique, critical approaches, have led to uncertainty within students in their ability to coherently explain what critical pedagogy is, and how they could teach from a critical perspective. Each student claims that critical approaches in the PETE programme have made a difference, yet it is a *different* difference for each student. Complex life histories have served to filter the sense that students have made of the PETE programme. Some students

understand critical pedagogy as taking action against structural injustices. These students have the eyes to recognise, and the will to address, some issues of social inequity, most often those issues they have encountered through their own lives. Other students conceive of critical pedagogy as a process of problematising knowledge and reflecting on their own teaching.

Acknowledgements

He aha te mea nui o te ao?

He tangata, he tangata, he tangata

I would like to acknowledge the many people who have helped me on this journey. This project could not have happened without the 19 PETE students and six teacher educators who volunteered their time. I thank you for your willingness to participate and the trust you showed in sharing stories of who you are, and how you have come to be you.

Thank you to my two supervisors, Richard Tinning and Wayne Smith. More than a decade ago, Richard planted the seed for a PhD. While it took many years for the seed to germinate, I am grateful for the confidence Richard showed in me at a time when a PhD was unthinkable and the support he has provided over the last six years to ensure that the thesis has come to fruition.

My trajectory from undergraduate degree to doctoral completion has been enhanced by a decade of support from Wayne Smith. Wayne has mentored me from Master's thesis, through four co-authored papers, to the culmination of this doctoral thesis. His guidance and support are not limited to writing, but more broadly to helping me understand and succeed in the broader university context.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge my family for enabling six years of doctoral study to 'happen'. It didn't just happen. My energy and enthusiasm for thinking and writing comes from the energy and joy of living with Deb, Cam, Jess and James, and the constant reminder of what matters most in the world. Completing my thesis has been a wonderful addition *because* of my pleasure for life outside of doctoral studies.

I also acknowledge my parents for shaping who I am in the world, which ultimately has shaped my research interests. I suspect their pride will be in both the completion of the thesis and politics that it represents.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
Tables	x
Figures	x
Publishers' Approvals	xi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
The Importance of Good Teachers	1
Education in Neo-Liberal Times	2
Initial Teacher Education (ITE).....	4
Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE)	7
My Research Interest: Who Am I? ... No ... Who Am I?	8
Purpose of the Study.....	12
Research Rationale and Research Questions.....	13
Theoretical Framework	17
Chapter Organisation.....	18
CHAPTER 2: RESEARCH SETTING.....	20
The Bachelor of Physical Education	20
The Bachelor of Physical Education Philosophy	22
The Bachelor of Physical Education Programme.....	25
The Introduction of Critical Health and Physical Education Curriculum	29
Summary.....	36
CHAPTER 3: CRITICAL EDUCATION – REVIEW OF LITERATURE	37
Introduction	37
Critical Theory.....	37
Critical Pedagogy	40
The Continuum of Critical Pedagogies	44
Critical Pedagogy and Initial Teacher Education.....	52
Critical Pedagogy and PETE	56
Practitioner Understanding of Critical Pedagogy.....	60
Critical Pedagogies in PETE: An Antipodean Perspective.....	63
Critical Pedagogies in Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE).....	64
Touring the 'Big Tent'	65
Problematisation of knowledge.....	66

Reflection.....	67
Power sharing through democratic classrooms.....	69
Dialogue.....	70
Border crossing.....	70
The Challenges of Critical Pedagogies in PETE.....	71
The Search for Meaningful Critical Pedagogies in PETE.....	72
Critical Pedagogies in PETE: Beyond the Antipodes.....	74
Criticism of Critical Pedagogues and Critical Pedagogy.....	77
Chapter Summary.....	80
CHAPTER 4: Methodology.....	82
Introduction.....	82
Methodological Framework.....	82
Critical Research.....	85
Conceptual Framework.....	87
Data Collection.....	94
Document analysis.....	94
Interviews.....	95
Individual semi-structured interview.....	98
Data Analysis.....	100
Critical discourse analysis.....	100
Thematic analysis.....	103
Inductive thematic analysis.....	104
Research Participants.....	107
PETE teacher educator participants.....	107
BPE student participants.....	108
Trustworthiness.....	109
Ethical Issues.....	111
Chapter Summary.....	112
CHAPTER 5: What is a critical physical education teacher education programme?.....	113
Introduction.....	113
In search of a critical pedagogy.....	113
The Bachelor of Physical Education Programme.....	115
Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA).....	115
Methodological Framework.....	116
Habermas' knowledge constitutive interest.....	118
Findings.....	119
Calendar description of BPE courses.....	119
Learning outcomes.....	120
Knowledge constitutive interests.....	122

Discussion.....	125
Chapter Summary	127
CHAPTER 6: BPE Teacher Educators: Understanding and Enactment of Critical Pedagogy.....	
Pedagogy.....	128
Introduction	128
Physical education initial teacher educators’ expressions of critical pedagogy(ies): Coherency, complexity or confusion?	
Educators and Their Understanding of Critical Pedagogy	130
Study Context	131
Methodology.....	132
Data Analysis.....	133
Findings	133
Teacher educators understanding of critical pedagogy.....	133
Critical pedagogy – Connected to critical theory.....	134
Social justice orientation.....	135
Reflection as a critical practice.	136
Critical pedagogy as an analysis of power.....	137
Critical pedagogy – teaching for democracy.	138
Critical pedagogy – thinking critically about pedagogy.	138
Critical Pedagogies in the BPE.....	139
Disrupting thinking.	139
Democratic education.	140
Discussion and Conclusions	141
Critical Pedagogy –A Maturing Field	144
Shaking Students’ Cages: A Freirean pedagogy that challenged PETE students’ beliefs about physical education	
Freirean Pedagogy	147
Context	149
Research Methods	149
Research Findings	150
Changing beliefs – PE as more than sport.	150
The influence of one lecturer.	151
Tom’s Freirean pedagogy	152
Problem posing.....	152
Critical consciousness.	154
Dialogism.	155
Discussion.....	156
Chapter summary.....	157

CHAPTER 7: The BPE students and critical pedagogy	159
Introduction	159
Making a different difference: Physical education teacher education students' reading of critical PETE programme	160
Research setting.....	162
Methodology.....	163
PETE Students' Understandings of Critical Pedagogy	163
Critical pedagogy as reflection on teaching.....	165
Critical pedagogy is responsive pedagogy.....	167
Constructivism to conscientization.	168
Uncertainty of understanding.....	170
Discussion and Conclusion.....	170
Summary.....	174
Students' readings of critical pedagogies in PETE: When biography and critical pedagogy intersect	174
Findings	176
Habitus as a filter of the BPE: Individual programme readings.	176
Pedagogical work in the BPE.....	178
Pedagogical work beyond the BPE courses.....	179
No certainty of a critical perspective.	180
Kicking at one's habitus: Kicked, shaken and unstirred.....	183
Critical pedagogies as cultural capital in the field.	186
Discussion and Conclusions	187
Chapter conclusion	189
CHAPTER 8: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS.....	190
Introduction	190
Exploring Critical PETE.....	191
Theme 1: The BPE Programme Provides a Coherent Critical PETE Programme	194
The notion of a critical PETE programme.	200
Theme 2: Making a Different Difference - The BPE Programme does not have the Same Impact on all Students	205
How will this habitus prosper in the field of HPE?.	208
Kicking the habitus and changing the field.....	210
Looking Back and Moving Forward	214
Limitations.....	220
Conclusions	223
References.....	225
Appendix 1 : Participant Information Sheets.....	272

Appendix 2 Consent Forms	287
Appendix 3 Transcriber confidentiality agreement	294
Appendix 4 BPE interview guide: Student focus group one	295
Appendix 5 Interview guide: Student semi-structured interview one	296
Appendix 6 Interview guide: Student semi-structured interview two	297
Appendix 7 PETE teacher educator interview guide	298
Appendix 8 Interview guide: BPE – Programme of study outline	299
Appendix 9 Interview guide: Critical Pedagogies	301
Appendix 10 Ethics Approval.....	302
Appendix 11 Permission to include published works.....	303
Appendix 12 PhD timeline.....	306
FOOTNOTES	308

Tables

Table 2.1:	Programme of Study	28
Table 3.1	Continuum of Critical Pedagogies.....	46
Table 4.1	Student Participants	109
Table 5.1	Analytical Framework	117
Table 5.2	Transitive Verbs used in Learning Outcomes	121
Table 5.3	BPE Courses with Critical Pedagogies.....	123
Table 6.1	PETE Teacher Educators' Understanding of Critical Pedagogy	134
Table 7.1	PETE Students' Understanding of Critical Pedagogy	164

Figures

Figure 2.1	Changes in New Zealand Health and Physical Education Curriculum	32
------------	---	----

Publishers' Approvals**Chapter 3**

Article: Philpot, R. (2015). Critical pedagogies in PETE: An Antipodean perspective.

Journal of Teaching in Physical Education. 34(2), 316-332

Editor: Ben Dyson

Publisher: Taylor and Francis Group

See page 63

This is an accepted manuscript of an article published by Taylor and Francis Group in *Journal of Physical Education*. Available online at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2014-0054>

Chapter 5

Article: Critical pedagogies in PETE: In search of a socially critical programme.

This paper has been submitted. No notification yet received.

See page 113

Chapter 6

Article: Philpot, R. (2015) Physical education initial teacher educators' expressions of critical pedagogy(ies): Coherence, complexity or confusion, *European Physical Education Review*. 22(2), 260-275.

Editor: Dr. Nollaig McEvilly

Publisher: SAGE

See page 129

This is an accepted manuscript of an article published by SAGE Publications Ltd, in *European Physical Education Review*. Available online at: <http://dx.doi:>

10.1177/1356336X15603382

Article: Philpot, R. (2016). Shaking student's cages: A Freirean pedagogy that influenced PETE students' beliefs about physical education, *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 7(1), 143-164.

Editor: Leila E Villaverde

See page 146

This is an accepted manuscript of an article published by *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*.

Chapter 7

Article: Philpot, R. Making a different difference: Physical education teacher education students' reading of critical PETE programme

Article: Philpot, R. Students' readings of critical pedagogies in PETE: When biography and critical pedagogy intersect

These two papers have not been submitted to peer-reviewed journals at the time of the PhD submission

See pages 160 and 174

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The Importance of Good Teachers

This thesis stems from my belief in the importance of good teachers and good teaching. This belief is not unsubstantiated as research in many countries including the United States (US), New Zealand and Australia has shown the important contribution good teachers make to student outcomes (Alton-Lee, 2003; Chetty, Friedman, & Rockoff, 2011; Hayes, Mills, Christie, & Lingard, 2006; Presley, White, & Gong, 2005; Rockoff, 2004; Roe, 2003). My interest (and my thesis) moves beyond statistically significant improvements in standardised testing outcomes to issues of equity and social justice. I am most interested in the outliers¹.

Educational outcomes are not equitable for all students. Peske and Haycock (2006) conclude that “we [United States] have a caste system of public education that metes out educational opportunity based on wealth and privilege, rather than on student or community needs” (p. 15). In the US, it is the poor and the children of colour who are most likely to have inexperienced teachers or teachers who have not completed a full-scale teacher education programme (Darling-Hammond, Holtzman, Gatlin, & Vasquez, 2005; Peske & Haycock, 2006; Shields et al., 2003). Allard and Santora (2004, December) suggest that, in Australia, “a significant proportion of school-age students whose ethnicity, socio-economic status or ‘race’ mark them from that of middle class, (Anglo-Australian mainstream) continue to fail...the failure of such a proportion of students is no longer morally or socially acceptable” (p. 2). Despite changes in the New Zealand Education Act (1989) requiring schools to develop policies and practices that cater for New Zealand’s cultural diversity, underachievement is also unequally distributed amongst ethnic groups (Juan, Turner, & Irving, 2010).

More than a decade ago, Darling-Hammond (2000) suggested that the demands on teachers would continue to swell as they are expected to teach an increasingly diverse group of students to a much higher standard. At the same time, much of the contemporary literature has concluded that the predominately white, middle-class initial teacher educators (ITEs) are insufficiently prepared to work with students from diverse backgrounds (McDonald, 2005; Sleeter, 1995; Zeichner, 1996).

Education in Neo-Liberal Times

In the last 20 years the infiltration of neo-liberal ideology into education debates and reforms has arguably been the most significant challenge for teachers and teaching. Neo-liberalism is an economic theory that proposes that the reduction of state intervention in economic and social activities and the deregulation of labour and financial markets will empower citizens to take advantage of the market economies and ultimately improve human wellbeing (Navarro, 2007). Although the term neo-liberalism has come to public discourse only since the 1990s, the ideas behind it originate with Frederic Von Hayek and Milton Friedman at the University of Chicago in the 1950s (Saltman, 2006).

Neo-liberalism, is marked by deregulation, open markets, economic liberalisation and privatisation in the belief that free markets can mitigate economic and social problems (E.W. Ross & Gibson, 2007). The economic policies of Margaret Thatcher in the United Kingdom (UK) and Ronald Reagan in the US, policies that resulted in significant reductions in public sector employment and privatisation of public services, embody the new competitive ethos of neo-liberal ideology (George, 1999, March). The neo-liberal mantra is that governments should be about providing opportunities and, to succeed, citizens need only to take personal responsibility for their own outcomes. Individual responsibility has usurped social responsibility.

While those who control the markets may benefit from unrestricted free enterprise, the poor are being asked to find their own solutions to health care, education and employment (Martinez & Garcia, 2000). Not surprisingly, one of the consequences of neo-liberal policies is growing inequities in many markers of health and wellbeing (R. Wilkinson & Pickett, 2010).

Education has not escaped the effects of neo-liberal ideology. Tatto (2007) claims that control of education is being taken away from the educators and given to the private market. Neo-liberal education reforms in many countries involve large-scale transformation of public education that opens it up for private investment and commercial gain. Neo-liberal thinking has led to the reframing of education discourse around issues of capital such as accountability and competition between schools (E.W Ross & Vincent, 2013). Neo-liberal thinking positions education as a commodity that foregrounds the efficiency of educational costs to the government, rather than value of equitable, high quality education. Neo-liberal thinking privileges underfunding and over-regulation of schools. Zeichner (2010) proposes that “neo-liberal logic transforms education from a public good into a private consumer item” (p. 1550).

Key corporate-driven educational strategies include privatisation of schools, promoting competition between schools to attract students, standardisation of curriculum and testing, and performance pay for teachers (E.W Ross & Vincent, 2013). Government reforms in education are an attempt to control and mould teachers and student teachers to prepare them for the task of developing labour power and workers (Hill, 2004). At first glance, the growing inclination of schools to align curriculum with the needs of industry would appear to better serve the needs of students as it prepares them for employment. Spring (1996) questioned this rationale, suggesting that, when schools offer curriculum to meet the needs of employers, they develop a large pool of workers that serve to provide an ideal situation for

employers: a large pool of applicants that will allow businesses to keep wages low and select the best workers. What is good for business may not be good for students (Spring, 1996).

In many western countries the outcomes of neo-liberalism include the establishment of charter schools, national assessments, and league tables that rank school achievement. Centralized control of teacher professional development has been moved from the hands of teachers and schools and put into the hands of private enterprises that align their 'products' with standards and standardised assessments (Zeichner, 2010).

Berliner (2006) argues that neo-liberal policies in education that narrowly focus on results in standardised assessments ignore the injustices that exist within neo-liberal education such as equitable education, employment opportunities and health care. The 'neo-liberal turn' has led to the promotion of the relevant values that underpin it and consequently, a move away from other values that do not align with neo-liberal thinking (Hill, 2004). Nearly a decade ago, Ross and Gibson (2007) warned that education had been engulfed by neo-liberalism. It has become not only the dominant paradigm in education but, for governments and industry, it is fast becoming the *only* paradigm.

This thesis is framed on the assumptions and beliefs of the critical project. As such, it presents a perspective on education that is in tension with the values and beliefs that underpin neo-liberalism.

Initial Teacher Education (ITE)

Preparing high quality teachers for the diverse challenges of modern classrooms is entrusted, predominantly, to university-based initial teacher education (ITE) programmes. Although research contributes to policy and practice in ITE, decisions about policy and practice are mediated by moral, ethical and political considerations (Zeichner, 2005, 2010). Neo-liberal policies are impacting on ITE. As an example, Zeichner (2010) suggests that there is a growing emphasis on cost-effective teacher training that focuses on raising

standardised test scores through the learning of well-rehearsed teaching scripts. In the US, UK and, more recently in Canada, Australia and New Zealand, not-for-profit companies have become involved in delivering initial teacher education. Non-university providers such as ‘Teach for America’ (TFA) in the US, and ‘Teach First’ in the UK and New Zealand, have developed cost effective, ‘pay while you train’ teacher education programmes. These programmes see untrained individuals teaching in classrooms for minimal pay, while completing concurrent teacher training.

These ITE programmes are not distributed evenly throughout communities (Darling-Hammond, 2004). TFA places ‘students’ in under-resourced urban and public schools (www.teachforamerica.org). Peske and Haycock (2006) reported that, in the US, it is the poor and the children of colour who are most likely to have these inexperienced teachers who have not completed a full-scale teacher education programme. In New Zealand, the ‘Teach NZ’ programme, an offshoot of ‘Teach for America’ specifically targets the lower-decile schoolsⁱⁱ where minority students are over-represented. The ‘bright college graduates’ selected for these programmes engage in a short (five week) ITE induction programme before commencing two years of teaching in ‘difficult to staff’ schools (Heilig & Jez, 2010). Despite TFA claiming a commitment to improving teaching for disadvantaged students, one study by Darling-Hammond et al. (2005) reported that “we found no instances where uncertified TFA teachers performed as well as standard certified teachers of comparable experience levels teaching in similar settings” (p. 20). In addition to the uncertainty of quality of the teaching, 80% of TFA teachers leave after three years (Heilig & Jez, 2010).

Zeichner (2010, 2014) suggested that these ITE programmes are closely aligned with a technicist view of the role of the teacher, where teachers are now replaceable technicians. Neo-liberal logic places value on dutiful “robotic technicians” (Hinchey, 2006, p. 128) who implement (rather than question) decisions and comply by simply following directions

(Smyth, 2011). Rather than preparing teachers with a broad knowledge of the social and political context of teaching that enables teachers to adapt and exercise judgment in the classroom, Ellis (2010) concluded that, in the UK, the school-based teacher education programmes served to reproduce the status quo.

While the logic of accountability requirements in ITE (e.g., through the use of electronic portfolios, student evaluations, course reviews, programme reviews, alignment of assessments with mandated standards) are linked to improvements in educational outcomes, many researchers (Kornfeld, Grady, Marker, & Riuddell, 2007; Rennert-Ariev, 2008) argue that accountability requirements lead to allocation of resources away from teaching and learning. With limited resources, ITE has to strike the difficult balance between enabling a satisfactory level of technical competence while, at the same time, shifting ITE students beyond commonsense ways of thinking to critically examining the political, ethical and social issues involved in schooling and teaching (Kirk, 2009). In order to make decisions about what and how to teach, I contend that ITE must help ITE students to recognise students who are being marginalised and the knowledge and perspectives that are being excluded. Giroux (1993) called for educators to be 'transformative intellectuals' who are aware of their own theoretical convictions and willing to take a critical stance toward their own practice and the practice of others.

In this thesis I will examine an ITE programme that espouses to privilege the development of transformative intellectuals through a social justice orientation. While an emphasis on social justice has emerged as a theme in teacher education over the past decade (Cochran-Smith, 2010) there is much debate about how to ensure that prospective teachers become committed to equity and socially just education. Hinchey (2006) suggests that teachers who wish to pursue social justice must develop different perspectives and habits, and acquire different knowledge than has been customary for public educators.

One of the responses to a call for a greater emphasis on social justice has been the introduction of ITE practices that are underpinned by critical pedagogy. The purpose of critical pedagogy is to reshape individuals' subjectivities, making students aware of oppression "with the belief that enlightened students will somehow make an impact on society" (Cho, 2006, p. 133). An in-depth description of critical pedagogy and 'critical theory', the theoretical underpinning of critical pedagogy, follows in Chapter 3.

Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE)

Issues of social justice in relation to PE began to gain traction in the mid-1980s with critiques of physical education (PE) curricula, physical education teacher education (PETE), and PE teachers (see Bain, 1990; Dewar, 1990; Dodds, 1985; Fernandez-Balboa, 1993, 1995; Kirk, 1986; Kirk & Tinning, 1990; Lawson, 1987; Tinning, 1985, 1988). It was during this period of greater awareness of issues of social justice that Tinning (1991) proposed that the dominant discourse in PETE was based on utility and focused on mastering recipe-like approaches to teaching PE through a 'traditional' or craft orientation (Zeichner, 1983).

Twenty years on it seems that little has changed. A recent study in Norway by Mordal-Moen and Green (2012) suggested that physical education teacher educators may still privilege a traditional approach to PETE where the primary purpose of physical education is "PE as teaching and coaching sport" followed by "inducting student teachers into teaching and coaching sport" (p. 6). This study concurred with previous PETE research in the US (Curtner-Smith, 2007; Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004) that suggested that PETE programmes focus on the development of traditional PE practices, that is, the practice of sport. It is not surprising that PETE offers little that 'shakes or stirs' the beliefs or practices of PE teachers (Evans, Davies, & Penney, 1996).

My Research Interest: Who Am I? ... No ... Who Am I?

“Who are you?”

“I am John.”

“No.... who are you?”

In Chapter 6 of this thesis, a participant in this study provided a detailed account from his first lecture in PETE of being asked this question several times by a teacher educator. The teacher educator, in his own way, was making the point that who you are, and how you have come to be who you are, matters. Who one is provides a unique perspective on how the world is seen. Who one becomes is a complex and detailed amalgam of upbringing, education, family, life experiences, and life chances. In the next few paragraphs I provide a snapshot of the life experiences that have helped shape *who* I am.

I grew up in Terrace, a small town in Northern British Columbia, Canada in the late 1960s and 1970s at a time when a strong, forestry-based economy provided well-paid, full employment opportunities for menⁱⁱⁱ in the community. Despite having a university-educated parent, this appeared to me (through a child’s eyes) to be of little economic advantage. An awareness of the advantages of university only surfaced after experiences of part-time work in tent camps, in winter weather, work around big relatively unsafe forestry machinery^{iv}, and the rampant unemployment that followed a drop in log prices and the imposition of tariffs by the US on Canadian timber.

My journey into teaching started with a five-year conjoint degree in education and physical education at the University of Lethbridge, a small liberal arts university in Southern Alberta, Canada. Almost immediately after completing my degree I moved to New Zealand. Since my arrival in 1991, I have taught in four different New Zealand high schools and, more recently, a university PETE programme.

Like the majority of my PE teacher colleagues and many of the students I have encountered in PETE, I am a middle-class European male who spent far too much of my youth playing, coaching and officiating in a number of sporting codes. As I entered my late teens, ambitions of being a professional athlete in my chosen sport, hockey,^v were tempered by the reality of not being ‘up to it’. Nevertheless, playing and coaching hockey afforded me opportunities to compete throughout Canada and later to coach and play international hockey in New Zealand.

On reflection, the sport I participated in played a significant role in my identity. As with many athletes I was a typical candidate for PETE, a male with “a suitable (predominantly mesomorphic) physique; demonstrations of specialised physical ability; a strong competitive disposition...and a willing acceptance of physical contact, pain and effort in sport” (Brown, 2005, p. 10). Like many of my contemporary PE teachers, PETE teacher educators (PETEs) and current PETE students, I studied physical education as a means of continuing my involvement with sport, attempting to “convert my physical capital into economic and cultural capital” (Brown, 2005, p. 11).

I have been fortunate to have gained a wide range of experiences in education including teaching mathematics, science, health and PE, a year as Sixth Form Dean, two years as House Leader, and a short-term stint as Deputy Principal. My roles within physical education have included: assistant teacher of both health and PE, teacher in charge of outdoor education, assistant head of department (PE), head of department (PE) and faculty leader (health and PE). I have been involved in national curriculum and assessment development and I have presented at subject association conferences.

Since 2006, I have lectured in ITE, first on a part-time basis and for the last six years on a full-time basis. My lecturing spans both primary and secondary teacher education. I teach in four different ITE programmes concentrating primarily on PE pedagogy and the

biophysical foundations of physical education. Most of my teaching in PETE takes place in a four-year Bachelor of Physical Education programme. The students in this programme are preparing to be teachers of secondary school health and physical education (HPE) in New Zealand schools.

Lecturing in ITE provides me with an opportunity to share my own practice and experience but, just as importantly, I have benefitted from the chance to examine my own practice as a teacher and as a teacher educator. My role as a teacher educator has offered new insight and a fresh perspective on the challenges faced by PETEs and ITE students. As an example, I have struggled to identify how to adequately prepare teachers of primary school PE who may only take part in 12 hours of PETE in their whole ITE programme. With new eyes I observed the challenges PETE students faced in developing content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and an understanding of the complexity of teaching and learning.

My Master's thesis clarified to me how many students enter PETE with a simple and unproblematic understanding of PE as sport. The beginning students came to PETE to learn more sports and to learn how to 'coach' different sports. For them PE *was* sport and sport *is* PE (Philpot & Smith, 2011). At the end of their four-year PETE programme the graduating students expressed a much more informed, but far less certain view of PE. The students recognised that PE was 'more than sport' although they struggled to articulate teaching programmes that extended beyond sport (Philpot, 2009).

Through postgraduate study I have become cognisant of something that I took for granted; that PE and PETE are fields dominated by individuals [sportsmen and sportswomen] with a sporting habitus^{vi} (Hunter, 2004). A focus on performance prevails amongst the PETE students (Tinning, 1997, 2012). Moreover, a performance discourse draws from a biologically conceptualised body, privileging the sport sciences such as anatomy, biomechanics, and exercise physiology (Tinning, 2012). This positivist view of the body privileges a biophysical

understanding of the body that contrasts and perhaps negates a sociocultural^{vii} understanding of the body that is promoted in social models of health and physical education that underpin HPE in Australia and New Zealand (Kirk, Macdonald, & Tinning, 1997).

In regard to this thesis, the biographies of PETE students and PETEs are significant. Who the students are, and how they have come to be, are significant as they present a considerable challenge for faculty who engage with critical approaches in PETE. As Tinning (2012) has suggested, how HPE teachers think and feel about health, physical activity, and the body will determine the impact of the relatively new socially critical HPE curriculums in place in New Zealand (Ministry of Education, 1999, 2007) and Australia (Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2012; Queensland School Curriculum Council, 1999). The adoption of these socially critical practices may be problematic as previous research reports that HPE teachers tend to be sexist, elitist and insensitive to social issues (Evans et al., 1996; D. Macdonald & Kirk, 1999; Sirna, Tinning, & Rossi, 2010). Research also shows that HPE departments are gendered (Brown, 2005; Penney, 2002) and sites where hegemonic masculinity is reproduced (Brown, 2005; Sirna, Tinning, & Rossi, 2010).

My interest in this research has arisen from my own experiences in teaching and teacher education as well as previous research I have undertaken in teacher education. In schools, PE is a site of educational practice where the reproduction of inequity (be it gender, ethnic or social) can be hegemonically reinforced or it can be challenged. Much of what I have seen taught in the name of PE privileges performance discourses that focus on “how performance can be improved or enhanced” (Tinning, 1997, p. 102). A performance-based focus advantages students with superior skills and techniques (‘sporty’ kids) who come with cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986) through embodied physical competence. After studying the nature of school PE, Evans and Davies (1986) argued that one of the consequences of

focusing on performance discourses is that physical education makes friends of some students and enemies of others.

It is important to note that I am not independent of this research project. I am profoundly immersed in my own attempts with critical PETE. I am fueled by having 'skin in the game'. In addition to lecturing in PETE and teaching HPE in schools, I am married to a secondary HPE teacher and have three children who come home from school each day and are inevitably interrogated by their parents about what they did in HPE. I am constantly reminded through multiple perspectives about the potential for HPE and HPE teachers to make a positive difference to both individuals and communities.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this thesis is to explore the influence/effect of a four-year Bachelor of Physical Education (BPE) ITE programme that espouses to be underpinned by a critical orientation to address issues of social justice and equity. The first part of the study investigates the extent to which the BPE programme's theory-in-use (Argyris & Schon, 1974) is consistent with the espoused critical orientation. Evidence is gathered from programme and course documents and through interviews with BPE faculty. The second part of the study investigates how students interpret their experiences of the BPE programme with a specific emphasis on the meaning and value students place on the critical approaches to PETE they have experienced and how this may impact on their practices in their own teaching.

Zeichner and Flessner (2009) suggest that there is a gap between the way in which teacher educators describe their programmes and what is discovered by researchers outside the programme. This study will contribute to the discourse of critical PETE, moving beyond the theoretical to how it is enacted and understood by PETE students.

Research Rationale and Research Questions

More than 25 years ago Kirk (1986) advocated for PETE programmes to adopt practices that require PETE students to examine some of the political, social, and ethical dimensions of teaching. Despite the growing interest and research in critically oriented PETE, Curtner-Smith and Sofo (2004) suggest that the conservative nature of physical educators has resulted in a very limited number of empirical studies of critical PETE.

Critical pedagogies in PETE problematise PE pedagogies and PE curriculum. The intention of critical PETE is to uncover dominant ideologies, and deconstruct taken-for-granted knowledge, meanings and values (Fernandez-Balboa, 1997b). Fernandez-Balboa (1997b) suggested that those who teach through critical pedagogy in PETE programmes start with the premise that ‘teaching the physical’ and ‘teaching through the physical’ are a basis for analysis and critique.

The few published studies of critical PETE have focused on the examination of the impact of critically oriented courses that have been situated in PETE programmes (Cassidy, 2000; Curtner-Smith, 2007; Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Devis-Devis & Sparkes, 1999; Fernandez-Balboa, 1995; Gore, 1990; Hickey, 2001; Ovens & Tinning, 2009). Studies examining critically oriented undergraduate PETE programmes (not just individual courses) are conspicuous by their absence. The gap in research is partially due to the lack of critical undergraduate PETE *programmes*, and secondly because, although critical pedagogy is not a new concept in the field of physical education (Fernandez-Balboa, 1995), a critical orientation to PETE is only one of many orientations or perspectives (Feiman-Nemser, 1990; Tinning, 2006; Zeichner, 1983).

The implications of *doing* critical pedagogy in PETE have typically been met with only modest optimism about its potential to transform society (Sicilia-Camacho & Fernandez-Balboa, 2009; Tinning, 2002). Many commentators have suggested that there is

little evidence that critical pedagogies have been effective in PETE (for example see Curtner-Smith & Sofu, 2004; Hickey, 2001; Muros Ruiz & Fernandez-Balboa, 2005; Sicilia-Camacho & Fernandez-Balboa, 2009). Lortie (1975) proposed that neither ITE programmes nor workplace experiences are strong enough to overcome the core beliefs that form early in life and are resistant to change (Doolittle, Dodds, & Placek, 1993; Fernandez-Balboa, 2009; Lortie, 1975; Rokeach, 1968). Accordingly, Haberman (1991) concluded that perhaps teacher educators should spend more time ‘picking the right people’ rather than trying to ‘change the wrong ones’.

Although advocacy for, and promotion of, critical pedagogy in PETE dates back to the 1980s (Gore, 1990; Kirk, 1986; Tinning, 1988), more recently Tinning (2002) has reminded proponents of critical pedagogy that defending (and promoting) critical pedagogy is not the same as *doing* critical pedagogy. This thesis progresses Tinning’s (2002) sentiment. Practising critical pedagogy is different again from researching the practice of critical pedagogy. While researchers have called on teacher educators to create programmes that problematise ethical, political, and moral issues (Kirk, 1986; Tinning, 1988), there are very few published studies or accounts of teacher educators’ attempts to conduct critical PETE (Curtner-Smith, 2007). The implication of this is that little is known about socially critical PETE beyond why it *should be* enacted. PETEs have “little idea of the tactics, strategies, structures and organisational frameworks that PETE staff might employ...” (Curtner-Smith & Sofu, 2004, p. 118) in the name of socially critical PETE. While socially critical PETE strives to challenge unjust practices through exposing issues of gender equity, equality of opportunity, and diversity (Tinning, 1987, 2002, 2010), as Cassidy (2000) points out, it does not come with a ‘how-to guide’.

I believe that further research outlining socially critical practices used in ITE and how different students respond to these practices is needed if critical pedagogy is to be practised

rather than simply preached or promoted. As Fernandez-Balboa and Muros (2006) posited, “having specific examples of success always helps” (p. 211). There is currently limited scholarship available to help those who want to embrace critical pedagogy.

Overall, this research will contribute to the body of knowledge about socially critical approaches to teacher education (Tinning, 2006; Zeichner, 1983). More specifically, this thesis explores how PETE students perceive many of the courses and other learning experiences (e.g., camps, practicums) that make up the BPE programme, and their interpretations of the relationship between courses and other programme experiences, exploring the coherence and/or the tension that may exist. The student participants in the study take 32 courses over the four years of the ITE degree. The sum of the parts may be greater than the parts in the sum, which resonates with Emirbayer’s (1997) suggestion that the units in a transaction gain their meaning and significance from the dynamic role they play in the transaction. In my study the transaction (programme) rather than the unit (course) becomes the primary unit of analysis.

McMurtry (2008) posits that the relational aspects between courses, the crossroads where students and courses meet, is where novel, innovative and insightful knowledge may emerge. While an empirically pure socially critical pedagogy does not exist (Evans, 2000 cited in Cassidy, 2000), the coherence that can be offered through a four-year programme may offer hope for promoting a critical approach through PETE. Lawson (1983) proposed that “programmes in which a shared, technical culture and professional ideology have been agreed upon and made explicit will have greater impact on recruits than programmes in which this has not occurred” (p. 10). Similarly, Darling-Hammond (2006) suggested that social justice is best taught in an integrated and coherent teacher education programme rather than through individual courses. While it would be churlish to suggest that there is a uniform philosophy and approach amongst all the BPE faculty, many of the unique features of the

BPE programme suggest that there may be a shared understanding of beliefs about PETE or a *group habitus*^{viii} (Bourdieu, 1990; Smith, 2008).

The question of whether a socially critical teacher education programme can develop socially critical teachers remains a conundrum. This is, however, a question I hope to address and help clarify. One of the assumptions behind this research proposal is that students and PETEs will construct their own meaning from experiences in the BPE. As Tinning (2002) pointed out in reference to the critical pedagogies used at Deakin University in the 1980s, “different students made *different* [emphasis in original] sense of their experiences in the programme” (p. 232). My intention therefore, is to offer insight into the individual meaning the BPE students make of this particular BPE programme that may be generative in constructing an understanding of, and a desire to be, a socially critical teacher of PE. In this way it will advance our understanding of the potential of, and possibilities for, critical pedagogy in PETE. Although research into critical practices will not provide recipes or formulas that can be readily transferred between contexts, aspiring critical pedagogues in ITE programmes will be better served by research that describes ITE practices that they *might* be able to use or modify with their own students in their own context.

In exploring how this particular PETE programme enacts critical pedagogy and how its students read this enactment, this thesis asks three key research questions:

1. To what extent is the delivery of the BPE programme consistent with the programme’s espoused socially critical philosophy?
2. What sense do the BPE students make of the courses and their other learning experiences in the programme in relation to the socially critical philosophy of the BPE programme?
3. How do the BPE students’ biographies influence their ‘readings’ of the PETE programme?

In spite of the significant promotion of critical pedagogy in Australian and New Zealand PE communities, the programme at the focus of this study may be one of the few critically oriented four-year undergraduate PETE programmes in either country, therefore making this study a unique and valuable opportunity for scholarship. This study is timely, as proposed structural changes to the delivery of ITE in New Zealand (Education Workforce Advisory Group, 2010) may bring about an end to undergraduate teacher education and as a consequence, the end of the four-year BPE programme.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework used in this research is an explicit statement of the theoretical assumptions, concepts and theories that underpin the study and provides the reader with a framework from which to evaluate the study design and findings.

This thesis reports on a qualitative study that draws upon critical theory as part of the theoretical framework. Qualitative researchers are interested in investigating how people experience the world and how they make sense of it (Cresswell, 2003). Qualitative research privileges the interpretation of the experiences and the meaning that social actors give to their world (Bryman, 2008). I locate my research in a qualitative tradition because it enables me to explore the socially constructed nature of both the BPE programme and the PETE students' reading of the programme. Detailed descriptions of epistemological and ontological assumptions that underpin qualitative research are provided in Chapter 4 of this thesis.

This thesis is located within a critical methodological framework. Critical research projects move beyond interpretation and analysis toward emancipation. They are informed by critical theory(ies) that emanated from the Marxist critique of capitalism by the Frankfurt School (see Chapter 3). In more recent times, critical theory has broadened to include activism on emancipatory issues beyond capitalism. I happily position myself somewhere in what Patti Lather (1989) called the 'big tent' of criticality. I am interested in discourses of

emancipation and social justice and I hope this thesis adds pragmatic value to those who aspire to be critical PETEs or critical teachers.

The social concepts used in this thesis come primarily from three critical theorists^{ix}. Principally I call on Jurgen Habermas' (1972) concept of Knowledge Constitutive Interests; Paulo Freire's (Freire, 1970b) concepts of dialogue, problem posing and conscientization; and the Bourdieuan (1977, 1990) concepts of field, capital, habitus, pedagogical action and pedagogical work. A full description of the methodology including the concepts aforementioned will follow in Chapter 4.

Chapter Organisation

This thesis is a 'thesis with publication', permitted under the *University of Auckland Revised 2011 PhD Statute and Guidelines*. As such, the thesis includes six individual papers that have been submitted or written for submission to international journals. These have been written in a format that may lead to some repetition especially within the chapters that focus on contextualising the literature and methodology used to inform the research. The papers are presented in a different font to allow the reader to identify their start and end points.

The thesis has eight chapters. Chapter 1 has provided an introduction to the study. The second chapter offers a detailed description of the research setting, a PETE programme in New Zealand that espouses a critical orientation. In addition, this describes the health and physical education (HPE) curriculum documents that foreground the introduction of socially critical HPE in both New Zealand and Australia.

Chapter 3 introduces the literature relevant to this study. The literature is organised under ten different headings and includes the first of the publications that summarise accounts of socially critical research in PETE and, in particular, how this has influenced PETE in New Zealand and Australia. In the fourth chapter I outline the research methodology. The chapter provides an overview of the methodological framework used in the

thesis, a rationale for the design, and descriptions of the data collection and data analysis methods. Chapter 4 provides a description of some of the theoretical concepts employed in this thesis. A full description is located in the individual research papers that follow.

Chapters 5, 6, and 7 report the findings of the thesis. The finding chapters include five journal articles that have been accepted for publication or are in the final stages of preparation for submission. Chapters 5 and 6 address the first research question, *‘To what extent is the delivery of the BPE programme consistent with the programme’s espoused socially critical philosophy?’* In Chapter 5, I use evidence from the BPE programme and course documents to evaluate the claims that the BPE is a critical PETE programme. Chapter 6 includes two papers. The first reports on the PETE faculties’ understanding and enactment of critical pedagogy. The second paper describes how ‘Tom^x’, one of the BPE teacher educators, enacts what he calls a ‘Freirean pedagogy’.

Chapter 7 addresses the second and third research questions: *‘What sense do BPE students make of the courses and other learning experiences in the BPE programme in relation to the socially critical philosophy of the PETE programme?’* and *‘How do the BPE students’ biographies influence their ‘readings’ of the PETE programme?’* The first of the two papers focusses on how students understand critical pedagogy as they near the end of the four-year BPE programme. The second paper in this chapter explores how student biographies serve to mediate their ‘reading’ of the BPE programme, and ultimately what sense they make, of the BPE programme.

In the eighth, and final, chapter the major findings of the study are discussed in relation to the research questions and the context of the literature. Chapter 8 brings this investigation to its close. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the implications of the study for critical PETE and critical ITE along with suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER 2: RESEARCH SETTING

The Bachelor of Physical Education

The context for this research is a four-year physical education teacher education (PETE)^{xi} programme, a Bachelor of Physical Education (BPE) that officially espouses a socially critical orientation. The BPE programme approval documents (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2005)^{xii} state that, “the BPE will foster high standards of scholarship, intellectual inquiry, critical thought and action, which are underpinned by a socially critical orientation” (p. 27). The context for this research is an important feature of the study, as the BPE programme structure includes many of the features that researchers of critical pedagogy have suggested are important in developing socially critical pre-service teachers. One of these features is a small cohort number. The BPE enjoys cohorts of between 40 and 70 students per year group; numbers that allow faculty to know them well and develop trusting relationships (Curtner-Smith & Sofu, 2004).

More than 40 years ago, Apple (1976) proposed that socially critical teacher education must problematise the everyday, taken-for-granted world of schools and classrooms. The BPE programme approval documents suggest coherence with Apple’s views stating:

Physical education is socially and historically constructed and constituted. This allows for a problematisation of the field, which encourages examination of knowledge and its obsolescence, vested interests and sedimented practices, professional identity and the foundations of constructing professional practice. (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2005, p. 26)

Studies by Hickey (2001) and Curtner-Smith and Sofu (2004) of the influence of socially critical PETE courses proposed that one of the limitations in developing coherent socially critical programmatic outcomes has been the lack of support for critical pedagogy by

other faculty and supervising teachers. They concluded that critical pedagogy suffers from its marginal status within PETE programmes. In contrast, critical pedagogy sits at the heart of the BPE programme philosophy.

Curtner-Smith and Sofo (2004) also posited that PETE programmes that primarily focus on technically oriented methods courses, along with early field experience, lacked ‘traction’ as the teacher educators are overwhelmed by the dominant discourse of sport and exercise science. While the BPE operates in a society that privileges sports science and performance, the programme is delivered through a faculty of education on a different campus than the Exercise Science programme, which sits in the Faculty of Science. The BPE teacher educators are predominantly social scientists who publish through sociological lenses in journals such as: *Sport, Education and Society*, *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, *Quest*, *Sociology of Sport Journal*, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, and the *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education*. The four-year PETE programme is underpinned by what Tinning (1997) called a discourse “of participation rather than performance” (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2005, p. 25). While acknowledging fields of high performance sport, fitness and recreation, the qualification “focuses on the physical education pedagogy and curriculum aspects of the field” (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2005, p. 25).

This combination of a socially critical programme philosophy, education focus, a physical location separate from sport scientists, and PETEs who publish in the HPE field rather than the field of biophysical sciences *may* provide what Hickey (2001) advocated for, that is, “a complete and coherent culture of support...to ensure students have engagement with alternative pedagogical frameworks” (p. 243). This may contribute to coherency between the views of the teacher educators, a feature that Tatto (1996) claimed was necessary for ITE to have an impact. Finally, previous empirical research on the effectiveness of critical

pedagogy has concluded that short individual pedagogy courses are simply not enough (Curtner-Smith, 2007). A four-year BPE offers a context that may provide a unique coherency unavailable in other studies.

The Bachelor of Physical Education Philosophy

As this research project explores students' reading of a socially critical PETE programme it is important to ascertain what a socially critical PETE programme might look like and to investigate the claim that the BPE *is* such a programme. In this section I describe the evidence from the BPE programme approval documents that supports the claim that the degree is underpinned by a critical orientation. In Chapters 5 and 6, I will analyse evidence from the individual BPE course guides and the interview data from the BPE faculty to interrogate the claim that critical pedagogy is more than an espoused perspective of the programme.

The philosophy upon which the BPE programme is based is articulated in the programme approval documents. These documents propose that the BPE degree:

conceptualises physical education within a socially critical perspective where the work of the physical educator is related to the wider social and world scene and is concerned with how physical education makes for a better world. (Te Ika a Maui College of Education, 1996, p. 7; Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2005, p. 25)

The BPE programme approval documents reference literature from many PETE researchers who promote critical approaches in PETE. The work of Richard Tinning in particular was used to justify the programme orientation. Tinning has, for an extended period of time, had close involvement with the BPE programme and its teacher educators, many of whom have completed their post-graduate study under him.

The BPE programme approval documents (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2005) state "the BPE will foster high standards of scholarship, intellectual inquiry,

critical thought and action which are underpinned by a socially critical orientation” (p. 27). This strongly suggests a social science orientation, one which contrasts with the significant growth in the field of human movement science during the latter half of the 20th century, a field dominated by science-based, performance-oriented discourses (Brustad, 1997).

Physical education is defined by the BPE approval documents as:

an educational process through which people acquire physical competencies, learn about and understand their bodies, develop their physical capabilities, enjoy their participation in physical activity, express their creativity and cultural diversity, learn personal and social skills and understand the cultural and social construction of the physical culture. (Te Ika a Maui College of Education, 1996, p. 9; Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2005, p. 26)

The BPE programme recognises that the processes involved in becoming physically educated are many and varied, drawing on aspects of the sciences and humanities, and experience (Te Ika a Maui College of Education, 1996; Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2005). This statement is consistent with the programme of study (see Table 2.1) that includes a diverse range of courses, learning through physical activity, as well as regular teaching experiences.

The BPE philosophy is based on the premise that all professions have their own domains of expertise, acknowledged functions and sets of responsibilities (Smith, 2008). The guiding principles underpinning the philosophy of the degree are:

- Physical education is firstly grounded within an educational context and must be treated as a professional activity.
- As a professional activity, a PETE programme must focus on the essential knowledge, disposition and practices of teaching.

- Central to learning to teach is the synthesis of theory, professional inquiry, practice and reflection. (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2005, p. 26)

The degree promotes the concept of teaching as a complex, socially established and co-operative human activity involving an array of teacher, student, classroom and community factors (Te Ika a Maui College of Education, 1996). This conception of teaching acknowledges the multiple roles of a teacher, the wide range of stakeholders with whom interactions take place, and the sensitivity required to meet the diverse needs of students. The interplay of these factors ensures that educational contexts are seldom replicable, making complex interactions and decision-making features of teaching.

A vital part of learning to teach is the ability to synthesise theory, professional inquiry and reflection (Te Ika a Maui College of Education, 1996), with the concept of ‘critical inquiry’ promoted within the degree as being synonymous with reflection. The aim is to “promote reflective thought and reconstructive action (i.e., a critical pedagogy) which, by definition entails the problematisation of both the task of teaching and the contexts in which it is embedded” (Te Ika a Maui College of Education, 1996, p. 12). Critical inquiry allows students to participate in self-examination of their assumptions and beliefs, making connections between daily routines and the complex issues of society, challenge taken-for-granted practices and explore alternatives. Schön (1987) supports the notion of critical inquiry, suggesting that the training of professionals must equip them for contemporary professional practice that is increasingly unpredictable, complex, situation-specific and value-laden. Rather than dismissing technical proficiency, the degree “locates reflection within a critical paradigm and seeks to achieve socially just, equitable, inclusive and humane educational practices” (Te Ika a Maui College of Education, 1996, p. 12).

Ovens (2004) describes the discourse of critical reflection on teaching as the underpinning philosophy of the degree. The degree is structured to enable this process with professional and academic study occurring concurrently thus enabling students to contextualise their growing knowledge base through an iterative rather than a linear process.

While physical education at tertiary level has traditionally been characterised by competing discourses (Smith, 2008) the aim of the BPE is to provide students with a course of study in the fields of physical education, pedagogy, and curriculum (Te Ika a Maui College of Education, 1996; Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2005). This emphasis on having a programme grounded in a professional teacher context is demonstrated in the following statement:

The central thesis of this programme is the contention that physical education is firmly grounded within an educational context and, as such, must be treated as a professional activity. Thus the synthesis of physical education content knowledge, professional inquiry and practice, and reflection are central tenets of this degree programme. (Te Ika a Maui College of Education, 1996, p. 9)

The BPE programme documents described in this section, suggest that this PETE programme espouses to be a critically oriented ITE programme (Tinning, 2006). As such, a shared programmatic privileging of socially critical thinking by all teacher educators within a range of courses could provide a uniquely coherent PETE programme (Tatto, 1996). As pointed out by Lawson (1983), “program[me]s in which a shared, technical culture and professional ideology have been agreed upon and made explicit will have greater impact on recruits than programmes in which this has not occurred” (p. 10).

The Bachelor of Physical Education Programme

The Bachelor of Physical Education (BPE) is delivered at a large university in New Zealand. The university is spread across four main campuses. The Faculty of Education is

located on one of the smaller campuses, and has a history of more than 125 years of teacher education as both a separate entity and, more recently, as a university.

The history of the BPE programme dates back to 1968 when students completed a combined college of education and university programme, gaining a Bachelor of Arts or Science degree with some complementary studies in physical education. In 1974, a degree programme specialising in health and physical education was started as a result of a partnership with a New Zealand university and the former Te Ika a Maui College of Education, with students graduating with a Bachelor of Education (B. Ed) and a Graduate Diploma of Teaching (GradDip.Tchg). This concurrent programme thrived for over 20 years from 1974 until 1996 with the exception of a brief period from 1982 until 1986 when the New Zealand government withdrew the funding for the programme due to an oversupply of physical education teachers (Smith, 2008).

The college of education BPE programme was introduced in 1997 following the establishment of a new government-controlled accrediting body for secondary and non-university tertiary institutions known as the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) that was given the power to approve degree programmes which sat outside the country's universities (Smith, 2008). This BPE programme was the primary provider of beginning secondary school health and physical education teachers within the Auckland and Northland regions, with annual graduating cohorts of 25 to 30 students (Smith, 2008).

As a result of having a small cohort that completes most courses together over four years, one of the enduring features of the BPE is the close relationship that develops between each year group. This strong social network lasts well beyond their years at university. I have observed how the students from a BPE year cohort network and share resources and 'cluster' together at national and regional PE conferences.

The BPE programme aims to “attract students from diverse backgrounds who share a common interest in becoming teachers of secondary school physical education” (Te Ika a Maui College of Education, 1996, p. 13). While there is no official affirmative action policy, the degree attracts equal numbers of female and male students, and significant numbers of Māori^{xiii} and Pasifika^{xiv} students. Candidates who meet the entry requirements for the programme are selected by BPE faculty through a combination of interviews, a written statement and observation of candidate participation in a practical session of adventure-based learning activities.

The BPE programme includes compulsory health and physical education (HPE) courses, two HPE elective courses, two general education^{xv} courses and annual outdoor education camps and teaching experiences (practicums) in schools (see Table 2.1). The programme benefits from extensive facilities including three gymnasiums, a heated outdoor swimming pool, tennis courts, fitness centre, and two dance studios. In addition, the BPE programme uses off-site facilities to teach in a range of contexts including athletics and outdoor education. In each of the four years of their programme, students participate in outdoor education ‘camps’, including a culturally focused experience at a Northland marae^{xvi}.

The majority of the courses are delivered by a core group of approximately 12 full-time health and physical education lecturers. Approximately half of the BPE teacher educators were involved in developing both the ‘old’ BPE degree in 1996 (Te Ika a Maui College of Education, 1996) and the ‘new’ BPE degree in 2005 (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2005). Since 2005, six ‘new’ PETE staff, who have come from secondary schools and other universities, now teach in the BPE programme.

Table 2.1

Programme of Study

BPE – YEAR 1	BPE – YEAR 2	BPE – YEAR 3	BPE – YEAR 4
EDCURRIC 132 Bio-physical Foundations of HPE	EDCURRIC 230 Physical Education Nga Kakano	EDCURRIC 232 PE Practice 4	EDUC 321 Politics, Philosophy and Education
EDCURRIC 130 PE Practice 1	EDPROFST 203 Teaching Health and Physical Education 1	EDPRAC 303 Health and Physical Education Practicum 2	EDCURRIC 431 Physical Education Pedagogy
EDCURRIC 135 Socio-cultural Foundations of HPE	EDCURRIC 233 Youth Health Education	EDCURRIC 235 Senior School Health and Physical Education	EDCURRIC 430 Curriculum Issues in Health and PE
GENERAL EDUCATION	EDUC 142 HPE in a Diverse Society	EDPROFST 303 Teaching Health and Physical Education 2	EDCURRIC 335 Research Study in Physical Education
EDCURRIC 133 Bio-physical Foundations of HPE 2	EDCURRIC 200 Biophysical Concepts in Physical Education	EDCURRIC 333 Advanced Youth Health Education	EDPRAC 403 Advanced Health and P E Practicum
EDCURRIC 134 Expressive Movement and PE	EDPROFST 214 Assessment for Learning and Teaching	EDCURRIC 234 Physical Activity and Health	EDCURRIC 334 Exercise and Physical Education
EDCURRIC 131 PE Practice 2	EDCURRIC 231 PE Practice 3	EDCURRIC 236 Teaching Outdoor Education	Option Papers (2) from: EDCURRIC 237 Recreation and Leisure
EDPRAC 103 The Professional Teacher HPE	EDPRAC 203 Health and Physical Education Practicum 1	GENERAL EDUCATION	EDCURRIC 238 Special Needs EDCURRIC 239 Teaching and Coaching Sport EDCURRIC 240

			The Dance Educator
			EDCURRIC 241
			Special Study in HPE
			EDCURRIC 336
			OE Leadership
			EDCURRIC 337
			Sports Coaching
			Pedagogy
			EDCURRIC 432
			Research Project in HPE
			EDCURRIC 433
			The Health Educator
CREDIT TOTAL 120	CREDIT TOTAL 120	CREDIT TOTAL 120	CREDIT TOTAL 120

Source: Te Ika a Maui University (2012) *Bachelor of Physical Education Handbook*.

The Introduction of Critical Health and Physical Education Curriculum

The context for this study is also influenced by the socio-political environment in education in New Zealand that the BPE programme operates within. Although the BPE programme is situated in New Zealand, I will elaborate on the development of socially critical health and physical education curriculums in both Australia and New Zealand. While each country continues to develop its own unique identity, a social justice agenda in education that grew from roots traced back to Deakin University in Australia (Tinning, 2011), provided an impetus for the infusion of a critical perspective into HPE curriculums in both countries. In the late 1990s in both New Zealand and Australia, critical pedagogy was incorporated into HPE curriculum documents (Ministry of Education, 1999; Queensland School Curriculum Council, 1999). This represented a significant change to the traditional PE discourses of health, sport and nationalism (Tinning, 2014). These ‘new’ HPE curricula in

both countries articulated critical underpinnings based on principles of diversity and social justice.

As an example, the rationale for the key learning area of Queensland HPE (Queensland School Curriculum Council, 1999) proposed that HPE emphasised:

the social justice principles of diversity, equity and supportive environments... an understanding of social justice principles supports students in applying the knowledge, processes, skills and attitudes needed to participate effectively in the promotion of equitable outcomes with respect to health, physical activity and personal development. (p. 1)

The Queensland HPE curriculum is described as an inclusive curriculum that should be accessible to all students. The curriculum advocated for:

...overcoming barriers that limit students' participation and benefits from schooling. Learning should be based on the contributions of a full range of social and cultural groups and acknowledge diversity within and amongst groups. Students should be empowered to critically analyse and question disadvantage in social structures, to challenge injustice and to participate in society as equals. (Queensland School Curriculum Council, 1999, p. 6)

At the same time (1999) in New Zealand, HPE teachers were presented with a new curriculum document, *Health and Physical Education in the New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 1999) that saw the three previously separate subjects of health, aspects of home economics and PE merged into a single learning area. The writers of the 1999 HPE curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1999) deliberately set out to introduce a socially critical orientation to the curriculum that explicitly grounded critical thinking and action into pedagogical practices (Gillespie & Culpan, 2000). Ian Culpan, one of the two lead writers of the 1999 New Zealand HPE curriculum, stated that the New Zealand HPE curriculum document aimed to shift physical education from a technocratic imperative to a focus that privileged a socio-critical examination of the whole movement culture (Culpan,

2000). This document encouraged students to “identify inequities, make changes and contribute positively, through individual and collective action, to the development of healthy communities and environments” (Ministry of Education, 1999, p. 11).

The 1999 HPE curriculum “sought to redress the dominant focus on the scientisation of movement and its corresponding emphasis on individualism” (Culpan & Bruce, 2007, p. 4). Culpan and Bruce posited that the curriculum statement provided clear opportunities for teachers to challenge and question assumptions about movement culture including hegemonic practices such as “health-related fitness, mass health, body image, the scientific underpinnings of performance in sport, masculine interpretations of the body, and excessive competition and performance” (p. 5).

Culpan and Bruce (2007) suggested that teachers implementing the New Zealand HPE curriculum would not only need to acquire knowledge about oppressive political and social practices within the broad physical education and movement contexts, but they would be required to take social action through emancipatory physical education practices that lead to equity and social justice within physical education specifically and within society more broadly. The key characteristics of this shift in how HPE is conceptualised are summarised in Figure 2.1.

Scientised or technocratic model of physical education	Moving toward a critical pedagogy	Socio-critical model using critical pedagogy
Previous New Zealand Curriculum		The 'new' New Zealand Curriculum
Focus on physical skill development		Focus on all aspects of the movement culture; (i.e., learning in, through, and about movement)
Health promotion is for physical health through physical activity and fitness development		Health promotion is conceptualised in the broadest sense, emphasising the holistic nature of health
Programmes are dominated by movement orientations dedicated to sport		Movement is conceptualised in the broadest sense with the significant, influence and functions of movement from both an individual and societal perspective being studied
Direct style of teaching		Teaching is inquiry based and reflective in nature
Characterised by a very scientific view of movement in which skills and fitness are measured for performance		Ensures that the scientific, physical, social, economic, ethical and political dimensions of movements are explored and critically examined

Figure 2.1. Changes in New Zealand Health and Physical Education Curriculum

Source: Adapted from Culpan and Bruce (2007).

Further advocacy for critical HPE followed in subsequent HPE curriculum documents in both New Zealand (Ministry of Education, 2007) and Australia (Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2012). The national Australian Health and Physical Education curriculum statement (Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2012) espouses critical underpinnings. A 'critical inquiry approach' is one of five principles that directs the 'new' Australian HPE curriculum:

The Health and Physical Education curriculum will draw on its multidiscipline evidence base for students to learn to appraise the social, cultural, scientific and political factors that influence healthy, active living using relevant student centred, problem oriented pedagogies. In doing so, students will explore matters such as inclusiveness, power inequalities, taken-for-granted assumptions, diversity and social justice, and develop and implement strategies to improve their own and others health, wellbeing and physical activity opportunities. (Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2012, p. 5)

The Australian HPE curriculum endeavours to develop students' ability to think logically, critically and creatively in response to a range of HPE issues. For example the Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) (2012) claims that the capacity for critical thinking:

...will be developed by empowering students to question taken-for-granted assumptions, solve problems creatively and generate their own interpretations and meanings about Health and Physical Education concepts, based on the evidence available to them. (p. 25)

Not surprisingly, the introduction of socially critical HPE curricula in New Zealand and Australia has led to calls for PETE faculty to ensure that their graduating students have an understanding of how socially critical HPE might be enacted (Gillespie & McBain, 2011; D. Macdonald & Kirk, 1999).

While all of these curricula have been acknowledged for their intent (see Culpan, 2000; Ovens, 2010; Tinning, 2000, 2012; Leahy, O'Flynn, & Wright, 2013), questions about the potential of the 'new' socially critical HPE curricula have also been raised. For example, Tinning, a long-time proponent of critical pedagogy expressed his nervousness about how HPE seemed to present itself as a curriculum solution to a multitude of individual and social problems (Tinning, 2000).

The final production of curriculum documents and the eventual translation from policy to practice have been problematic. Curriculum writing and decision making are complex tasks that do not escape political forces that extend beyond the curriculum writing teams (Penney, 2010; Penney & Evans, 1999). Leahy et al. (2013) suggested that, “curriculum documents produced in neo-liberal times are imbued with neo-liberal purposes and tactics” (p. 177). The authors highlighted the way in which critical approaches in ACARA were subject to change as draft curriculum papers were reviewed and modified and reproduced as draft curriculum statements. Changes to the draft curriculum included: the dropping of the heading ‘socio-critical’, and ‘question’ was replaced with ‘appraise’ [the social, cultural and political factors] and the pedagogical aspects were reinforced with the inclusion of ‘experimental learning’. Leahy et al. (2013) suggested that ACARA (2012) embraced the neo-liberal notion of Healthism (Crawford, 1980) which places considerable emphasis on the individual (the student) to use their capabilities to look after their own health and change themselves and others through the acquisition of knowledge and life skills.

In New Zealand, the subsequent production of *The New Zealand Curriculum* (NZC) (Ministry of Education, 2007), a document that included all eight of the learning areas^{xvii} saw the 1999 HPE curriculum move from a separate curriculum document to assume a place alongside seven other learning areas in a single document. One consequence of this move was ‘slippage’ away from some of the language of critical pedagogy and the elimination of the examples communicating the scope of the achievement outcomes. HPE in *The New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 2007) is devoid of the traditional language associated with critical pedagogies such as ‘emancipation’ and ‘inequity’. ‘Social justice’ appears in descriptions about what HPE is about (see Attitudes and Values, p. 22), but does not appear again in the rationale for studying HPE, nor the ensuing achievement outcomes. The terms ‘critical pedagogy’ or ‘socially critical pedagogy’ (a term commonly used in

Australasian HPE literature), are not used in the curriculum statement. Instead HPE foregrounds a '*socio-ecological perspective*', "a way of viewing and understanding the interrelationships that exist between individuals, others and society (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 22). The development of national assessments in both Health and Physical Education in New Zealand may also serve to further distance the intent of critical pedagogy from the minds of HPE teachers. The National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) achievement standards focus attention on increasing levels of achievement through the use of verbs such as 'describe, 'explain' and 'evaluate'^{xviii}. Ovens (2010) has recently suggested that the slippage has allowed critical pedagogy to be conflated with, or replaced by, the more commonly observed concept of critical thinking^{xix}.

In the absence of any direct reference to taking action to challenge structural injustices, it is difficult for anyone other than those who are dispositionally attuned to challenging inequity to connect the curriculum to emancipatory actions. Recent critiques of the New Zealand HPE curriculum by Ovens (2010) and Culpan and Bruce (2007) proposed that, even though the NZC (Ministry of Education, 2007) is underpinned by critical pedagogy, all of the supporting statements they choose as evidence come from the 1999 HPE curriculum. More recently, Fitzpatrick (2013) suggested that any critical intentions in the NZC are subsumed by the prevalence of a language that seeks to address individual student behaviours rather than the social structures that influence these behaviours. While the 1999 New Zealand HPE curriculum may remain in the hearts and minds of the 1999 curriculum writers and advocates, for those new to teaching HPE, or those who have come from overseas, the critical underpinnings are less than explicit.

In Australia, a critical discourse analysis of the Queensland HPE curriculum document (Rossi, Tinning, McCuaig, Sirna, & Hunter, 2009) questioned the ability of the curriculum document to promote social change and encourage teachers to engage in social

action. Part of the analysis included an examination of the curriculum learning outcomes. The authors concluded that the curriculum's concept of health in 'strand one'^{xx} "reinforced a middle-class Anglo-European agenda, marginalising more diverse and heterogeneous agendas or multicultural and working-class people (Rossi et al., 2009).

The second strand was also criticised for uncritically identifying the development of 'fundamental movement skills' as the norms for student learning outcomes. The authors suggested that, even when issues of social justice are raised in level 6, the strand proposes that 'students will understand' that there are inequities in participation in physical activity and therefore they need to demonstrate planning strategies to overcome these inequities. This certainty of understanding predicates the notion that diverse learners and diverse contexts may experience physical education in different ways.

Summary

The espoused alignment between the BPE programme, a programme that claims to be underpinned by a critical orientation and a socially critical HPE curriculum provide a unique context for the development and support of the new field of socially critical HPE. As stated at the start of the chapter, this alignment provides a unique context where 'official' curriculum discourses sanction critical perspectives. The next chapter provides a more nuanced and detailed background of the development of critical perspectives in education. The literature review that follows will document the advocacy for critical pedagogy, along with the enactment and outcomes of critical pedagogies in ITE and PETE. This background will serve to further highlight how the apparent alignment between the espoused socially critical orientation of the BPE and socially critical HPE curriculum is far more fluid and complex when it is *enacted* in HPE and PETE programmes.

CHAPTER 3:

CRITICAL EDUCATION – REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter focuses on reviewing the relevant literature that informed this study. The literature review begins with an overview of critical theory, the seminal theoretical underpinning of critical pedagogy. The majority of the literature review will identify how critical theory has been received, reinterpreted, and applied in a range of educational contexts including both initial teacher education and physical education teacher education.

The literature in this chapter is presented under 10 main themes. The chapter includes '*Critical Pedagogies in PETE: An Antipodean Perspective*' (2015a), a paper published in the *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, that reports on the enactment of critical pedagogies in PETE in Australia and New Zealand.

Critical Theory

As mentioned above in the Introduction chapter, over the last three decades the considerable challenge of promoting socially just educational practices in TE has been exacerbated by neo-liberal economic reforms. With neo-liberalism as a backdrop for many current concerns in education, there has been a growing body of literature that highlights the inequity and injustice of current education practices. Academics such as Paulo Freire, Michael Apple, bell hooks, Henry Giroux, Patti Lather, Peter McLaren, Stanley Aronowitz, Ira Shor, Ken Zeichner and Joe Kincheloe and many others have produced critiques of current educational policy and practice. In addition, these critiques have included visions of alternative approaches to education that privileges equity, social justice and critical inquiry, values that appear to be incompatible with neo-liberal ideology. The theoretical framework for this alternate vision of education originated in the 1920s from the critical theory(ies) of a small group of academics from the Frankfurt School in Germany.

The roots of critical theory can be traced back nearly 80 years to the *Institute of Social Research* or *Das Institut für Sozialforschung*, known to many now as the Frankfurt School, as it was originally attached to the University of Frankfurt (Held, 1980). The academics in the group concerned themselves initially with an analysis of bourgeois society (Jay, 1973) and later with the changing nature of capitalism (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000). Max Horkheimer, who took over the directorship in 1930, along with Herbert Marcuse, Erich Fromm, Walter Benjamin, Leo Lowenthal and Theodor Adorno, are names synonymous with the institute.

The focus of the Frankfurt School was emancipating people from a positivist ‘domination of thought’ allowing them to reflect upon their own situations and themselves through their own actions (Carr & Kemmis, 1986). Horkheimer called for a social theory that investigated the conditions that “make possible the reproduction and transformation of society, economy, culture and consciousness” (Held, 1980, p. 33). The Frankfurt School proposed that truth claims must be interrogated through acknowledging the value-laden interests they represent. These scholars called for a combination of critical reflection on the genesis of truth claims, and dialogue that exposed who was best served by them (Giroux, 2009).

Jurgen Habermas, a later addition to the Frankfurt School, is described by Sanderson and Ellis (1992) as the most important critical theorist because of his contribution to, “the importance of philosophical abstraction and macro-sociological generalization” (p. 3). Habermas rejected the notion that truth could be established by scientific methods suggesting instead that the only truth is reached through ‘communicative reasoning’, that is, open and free communication (Roberts, 2009).

Many of the contributions of the Frankfurt School were made in a different era, but they arguably continue to be relevant in current times and provide the foundations for contemporary critical theory. Horkheimer’s suggestion that a positivist view of knowledge

and science strips inquiry of its critical possibilities was more recently echoed by Giroux (2009) who lamented that positivism's unquestionable faith in scientific rationality was "the low point of enlightened thought" (p. 31). Giroux (2009) proposed that the critical theories attributed to the Frankfurt School were "never a fully articulated philosophy shared unproblematically by all members" (p. 27). The seminal works from the Frankfurt School that started as a broad critique of capitalism, serve as the building blocks for emerging critical theories of society (A. Darder, Baltondano, & Torres, 2009) that have expanded to include other, associated, forms of oppression and domination.

Critical theory is the basis for critiques of gender inequity, racism, and disability (A Darder, 2005; Fine, 2004; hooks, 1991; Weis, 2004). While unique frameworks have been developed for each based on the issue of inequity, the underpinnings of all of them are a focus on explanations of power and a commitment to social justice and social change (Carr & Kemmis, 1986; Coakley, 2001). Critical examinations include identifying whose voices define the dominant discourse, while endeavouring to foreground voices and perspectives that are not heard. While the context and the nature of the oppressed groups narrows from those who are marginalised by capitalism, to specific inequalities (e.g., racism and sexism), the unifying feature of critical theory is the goal of human emancipation (Giroux, 2009).

A second common thread that binds critical theorists is the belief that positivism has resulted in "widespread growth of instrumental rationality and a tendency to see all practical problems as technical problems" (Carr & Kemmis, 1986, p. 130). With the positivist notion of rationality defined in terms of rules and laws, Carr and Kemmis (1986) argued that there was little concern for creative, critical and evaluative powers. The rationality used by science under the guise of neutrality being "efficient and economic" (Giroux, 2009, p. 33), devalues the complex philosophic concept of truth. No longer is 'why?' an appropriate question, with the rational and technical question of 'how?' reigning supreme. The culprit is identified not

as science, but the scientific method where questioning the development of systems and structures used to define facts appears to be “outside the concern of positivist rationality” (Giroux, 2009, p. 32). Methodological correctness is perceived as a guarantee of truth.

In contrast, critical theory starts with the perspective that all knowledge is value-laden. Researchers working within this perspective explicitly articulate the assumptions that might influence their research (D. Macdonald et al., 2002). Critical researchers endeavour to problematise taken-for-granted truth claims, highlighting issues of power in order to effect social change for marginalised groups in society.

‘Dialectical thought’ is described by many as a key aspect to critical theory (Carr & Kemmis, 1986; Freire, 2009b; McLaren, 2009). Dialectical thought emphasises the historical and relational dimensions of social inquiry and knowledge. This contrasts with positivist thinking that focuses on the predictability, verifiability and transferability of knowledge (Giroux, 2009). Carr and Kemmis (1983) described dialectical thinking as searching out contradictions, as an open and questioning form of thinking, demanding reflection back and forth between elements such as part and whole, knowledge and action, process and product, subject and object, rhetoric and reality. The contradictions were seen as generative of new thinking and creative resolutions (Carr & Kemmis, 1983).

Critical Pedagogy

Critical pedagogy builds on the foundations of critical theory through the critique of education and schooling. Critical pedagogy, a term coined by Henry Giroux in 1983 (Muros Ruiz & Fernandez-Balboa, 2005), is an educational perspective concerned with questions of justice, democracy and ethics (Kincheloe, 2008b). Seeking an alternative outcome from schooling, critical pedagogy enables the transformative possibilities of schools and classrooms (Smyth, 2011).

Advocates of critical pedagogy in education such as Michael Apple (1982) contend that schools serve to maintain the status quo. The economic returns from schooling favour those already economically advantaged while schools continue to ignore and disconfirm the values and abilities of the powerless; the poor, minorities and females (McLaren, 1989). Schooling cannot be politically neutral as it takes place “within a constellation of economic, social, and political institutions” (Giroux, 1981, p. 143). Teaching is political as teachers exercise judgments about content and pedagogical approaches on a daily basis. More than 40 years ago Michael Young (1971) observed how the knowledge designated for mastery in school curriculums reflected the knowledge that best served the dominant groups with the most political power. Schools are part of a power structure (Giroux, 1981, 2010; Greene, 2009) that serve as vehicles for reproduction, as they prepare the workers needed for the existing power structures in society (Wink, 2005).

Critical pedagogues believe that schools should be safe from market forces and market logic with democratic rather than commercial values being the primary concerns of both public education and the university (Giroux & Giroux, 2006). McLaren (1989) argues, “schooling for self and social empowerment is *ethically prior* to mastery of technical skills, which are primarily tied to the logic of the market place” (p. 162).

Critical pedagogy sees the splicing of pedagogy and critical theory. Critical implies “being able to understand, analyse, pose questions and affect the socio-political and economic realities that shape our lives” (Leistyna, 2007, p. 117). ‘Critical’ in this sense means more than the problem solving and higher order thinking skills associated with ‘critical thinking’. Simon (1992) claimed that, acting critically involves investigating why things are the way they are, how they got that way, and the conditions that sustain them. Furthermore, the term ‘critical’ in critical pedagogy denotes taking action to change these conditions, not just understanding them. Pedagogy refers to the integration in practice of curriculum, classroom

strategies and techniques, evaluation, purposes and methods (McLaren, 1989); “the meaningful interaction between teaching and learning” (Wink, 2005, p. 23). Pedagogy reflects what teachers and students do together in the classroom and the cultural politics the practices support (McLaren, 1989). Leistyna (2007) argued that teachers must be theorists, intellectuals who interpret and make sense of the world around them in a way that guides their actions.

As each concept (critical theory and pedagogy) in itself is understood differently, the quest for a concise definition of a critical pedagogy remains elusive. McLaren (1989) argued that critical pedagogy does not represent a homogenous set of ideas; rather it is focused on the principle or objective of transforming social inequality and empowering those without power. The inability to pigeonhole and totally encapsulate critical pedagogy within a sentence in a glossary is, in itself, a characteristic of a pedagogy bound by principles rather than practice. Critical pedagogy is context-specific and organic in the sense that it adapts and responds to changing environments and social situations. Recognising the importance of context, Hinchey (2006) proposed that recipes are simply not possible in critical classrooms.

Perhaps the name most synonymous with critical pedagogy is that of Paulo Freire. Inspired by the Frankfurt Schools’ critical theory, Freire merged ideas about critical theory with theological ethics and progressive education (Kincheloe, 2007). Freire (1998a) promoted teaching skills beyond technical skills. He argued that teachers should recognise inequality and take action to create healthy, responsive and self-empowering educational contexts. Freire (2009b) maintained that education has as much to do with a teachable heart as it does with a teachable mind. The ability to rethink reason requires ‘radical love’, love that is compassionate, creative, sensual and informed.

Freire advocated for ‘problem-posing’ education with an emphasis on dialogue. The process involves teachers presenting material to the students for their consideration, with the

teacher equally open to reconsidering their earlier position based on student responses. The role of the problem-posing educator is to construct “conditions under which knowledge at the level of the *doxa* (common belief or popular opinion) is superseded by true knowledge, at the level of the *logos* (the analytical voice of critique)” (Freire, 2009b, p. 81). Problem-posing education involves challenging habits, taken-for-granted ways of doing things and cherished assumptions (Smyth, 2011) through developing ways of “extraordinarily re-experiencing the ordinary” (Shor, 1980, p. 93). By this, Shor (1980) was promoting teaching practices that allow students to see things they take for granted from different perspectives and in ways that might allow them to reconsider world views they accepted as normal and unproblematic. Problem-posing teaching develops the power of students to perceive both the way they exist in the world, and how this impacts on how the world exists to them. Freire (1972) encouraged a view of the world not as a static reality but as a reality in the process of transformation.

Through problem-posing education Freire (1997) foregrounded the emergence of *conscientizacao* or critical consciousness. *Conscientizacao* involves “learning to perceive social, political and economic contradictions, and to take action against the oppressive elements of reality” (Freire, 1970b, p. 19), a deepening awareness that allows people to understand a situation as a socially constructed reality that is susceptible to transformation (Freire, 1997). *Conscientizacao* is an awareness that our ideas come from our own particular set of life experiences. What is normal and right are products of these life experiences rather than universal laws (Hinchey, 2006). *Conscientizacao* also breaks the metaphoric ‘shackles’ of understanding the world through dominant lenses that leads to the acceptance of the way things are as inevitable facts of life, empowering people to take control, and to overcome authoritarianism and oppression (Freire, 1997).

The Continuum of Critical Pedagogies

While critical pedagogy has been applied to a variety of fields in education it by no means represents a united field (Apple, Au, & Armando Gandin, 2009; Cho, 2006; McLaren, 1998).

In 1998 Patti Lather used the metaphor of a ‘big tent’ to describe critical pedagogy, suggesting that it may be better to move away from trying to establish the ‘right’ definition, to embracing competing understandings, counter-narratives and contradictory voices. Building on this metaphor, critical pedagogy may be the main ‘spar’ that supports the ‘big tent’, but critical pedagogy also benefits from additional ‘posts’ such as feminist pedagogies, post-colonial projects, post-modernist and queer theories. Lather (2001) later suggested that the heterogeneity of critical pedagogy needed to be embraced as all of the critical projects were equally committed to social change. Recently, Blackmore (2013) argued that, in the modern global world where context matters, a single theory of social justice is inadequate. For Lather, Blackmore and other proponents, the essence of critical pedagogy is multiple teaching practices for a more socially just world.

In contrast, a critique by McLaren and Farahmandpur (2000) highlighted the need for critical pedagogy to return to its Marxist roots, that is, a critique of class and capitalism. The authors proposed that, if class issues were resolved, then other issues of oppression would be lessened as a result. McLaren (2000) bluntly claimed that post-modern projects “have failed in the main to challenge in any deep or sustained way the engineered misery of neo-liberal fiscal regimes” (p. 26) with postmodern theorists “woefully remiss in explaining how cultural representations and formations are indentured to capitalism” (p. 26). More recently, Breunig (2011) queried whether a single, more focused critical agenda may offer more potential than the dilution of critical pedagogy into a range of subfields and related critical projects.

Michael Apple (2009), a long-standing advocate of critical education, recognised that the term 'critical pedagogy' has been conflated and used so broadly that it could mean:

anything from cooperative classrooms with a somewhat political content, to a more robust definition that involves a thorough-going reconstruction of what education is for, how it should be carried out, what we should teach, and who should be empowered to engage in it. (p. 3)

With this uncertainty as a backdrop, in what follows I will elaborate on the debates about what critical pedagogy is, and is not. I will use a continuum (see Table 3.1) as a heuristic to try to capture the essence of the debates about the nature of critical pedagogy. The vertical lines of the table serve to delineate between the similarities, overlap and commonalities. I acknowledge in advance that my conceptions of 'humanism', 'socially critical pedagogy' and 'radical critical pedagogy' are overly simplistic, but they are a useful heuristic. My objective is to recognise and highlight that espoused critical educators who claim to empower and act in the name of social justice, will use practices or pedagogies based on a growing number of theoretical perspectives. Through different perspectives they will endeavour to address the needs of diverse individuals and groups in society.

Table 3.1

Continuum of Critical Pedagogies

	Humanism	Socially Critical Pedagogy	Radical Critical Pedagogy
Targeted Groups	Individuals	Specific marginalised groups in society (e.g., women, African Americans, Transgender youth)	Society
Theory	Psychology (self actualisation)	Post-modernism, post-structuralism, post-colonial theory, feminism, queer theory	Critical theory; Marxist critique of capitalism
Challenges Structure such as...	No specific focus on structures	Challenges structures that discriminate against specific groups (e.g. Gender, race, sexual orientation)	Challenges class structure and capitalism
Influential theorists	Abraham Maslow Carl Rogers	bell hooks Patti Lather Gloria Ladson-Billings Judith Butler	Karl Marx Max Horkheimer Theodor Adorno Jurgen Habermas

The first column starts with ‘humanism’. Humanism is a “doctrine, attitude or way of life centred on human interests or values” (www.merriam-webster.com). Key supporters of humanism include Abraham Maslow and Carl Rogers. Humanism focuses on ‘self-actualisation’, a psychological theory that prioritises self-fulfillment of human needs. Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy of needs proposed that human requirements start with basic physiological needs such as food and sleep. Humans move on to emotional needs such as love, self-esteem and self-growth only when physiological needs are met. Maslow (1943) posited that self-actualisation needs such as morality, creativity, and problem solving sit at the top of the needs hierarchy.

Humanistic education privileges personalised teaching strategies. Teachers need to build relationships and know their students so that they can provide a trusting, supportive environment in which to facilitate learning. A humanistic educator would attend to both the learning and to the emotional needs of each of the individual students in their classrooms. Humanism does not specifically claim a social justice agenda although morality and developing a lack of prejudice sit at the top of the needs hierarchy as expressed goals (Maslow, 1943).

Humanistic^{xxi} education strives for educational equity for all individuals. The humanistic teacher will ensure that teaching provides equality of opportunity through personalised education. Humanism focuses on problems at the level of human interaction, rather than challenging the overarching social and economic power structures in society that serve to govern and suppress. A humanistic teacher will work *within* the constraints of their classrooms, schools, and communities to cater to the needs of the students whom they teach.

bell hooks (1994), an American critical feminist scholar advocated that teachers must have an “engaged pedagogy” that involves teaching, “in a manner that respects and cares for the souls of our students” (p. 13), that requires “teachers to be actively involved and committed to a process of self-actualisation that promotes their own well-being if they are to teach in a manner that empowers students” (p. 15). While it would be remiss to suggest that bell hooks was calling for humanistic education as an *alternative* to critical education, it is clear that a humanistic perspective and a commitment to self-actualisation and empowerment overlap with the aims of all definitions of critical pedagogy.

In physical education, Don Hellison (2011) proposed that humanistic physical education is focused on the development of self-esteem, self-understanding, and interpersonal relationships. Recently Judy Bruce (2014) highlighted how Sports Education (Siedentop,

1984) and the Personal and Social Responsibility (TPSR) model (Hellison, 1973) operated as two examples of humanistic physical education that promote ‘valued cultural practices’.

Critics of humanistic education suggested that advocacy for valued cultural practices such as cooperation, loyalty, and social responsibility (qualities which are often viewed as highly desirable characteristics), were consistent with neo-liberal ideals rather than critical education (Bruce, 2014). Humanistic education does not attempt to create space for diversity and difference by challenging these taken-for-granted ideals, nor does it challenge societal structures and valued cultural practices. Those who espouse a critical pedagogy while working at the humanistic end of the spectrum, may be focussing on micro-level politics with a narrow focus on individuals and classrooms where teachers believe they can have a direct impact (Cho, 2006). Many would argue that humanistic education, with this narrow individual focus, is not critical pedagogy (see Muros Ruiz & Fernandez-Balboa, 2005).

I have placed a number of theoretical positions such as post-structuralism, post-modernism, post-colonial theory, queer theory and feminism in the middle of the ‘critical’ continuum under the heading ‘socially critical pedagogies’. Cho (2006) suggested that ‘post’ theories that provided a ‘language of possibility’ represent an evolution of critical pedagogy that moves beyond the economic determinism of Marxism. She stated that, as critical pedagogy has evolved, it has “moved away from economics to culture, shifting theories about the *infrastructure* (the unity of the productive forces and the relations of production), to the *superstructure* (particular historical systems of beliefs, religion, juridical, political...)” (p. 126). Cho (2006, 2013) argued that recent accounts of critical pedagogy have been heavily influenced by post-structuralist and post-modern thinking where culture is understood as being autonomous from the material base. She pointed out that “concepts such as social class, alienation, ideology, bureaucracy, the division of labour, and the state [concepts associated with Marxism] are usually not found in critical pedagogy research” (p. 127). This evolution

of critical pedagogy has seen researchers turn their attention to issues of sexuality, the body, disability, and race (Apple, 2004).

A central tenant of post theories is that knowledge is socially constructed rather than objective and out there to be discovered. Post-modernism advocates for the deconstruction and problematisation of knowledge through questioning the dominant representations of knowledge and knowers. Deconstruction challenges assertions of what is considered right and normal. Post-modernists believe that there are no universal norms or truths from which to judge the validity of knowledge. Proponents of post-modernism and post-structuralism suggest that Marxist praxis focuses exclusively on class, subordinating other forms of domination such as race, gender, sexuality and imperialism (Butler, 1997; McCarthy, 1988; Torres, 1998; Warren, 1984). Kilgore (2001) proposed that a post-modern approach to learning is based on recognising the diversity of learners and the learning needs of students. 'Post' education should focus on problematising our understanding of concepts such as gender, race and sexuality with the explicit goal of emancipating those who have been marginalised by these labels.

Feminism, post-colonial theory and queer theory build on post-modern thought, focusing on dominant representations of social norms, specifically gender, sexual orientation and race. As an example, feminist theory is used to examine the social and performative constructions of gender and sexuality (Butler, 1988). Feminism addresses stereotyping and gender or sexuality-based oppression. Post-colonial theory is used to deconstruct the effects of colonisation on cultures and society (Childs & Williams, 2014), creating an awareness of how colonisation has led to notions of racial inferiority (Staszak, 2008). Post-modern and post-structural theory(ies) differ from humanism in that they critique and act on *structures* that discriminate against specific *groups* in society. 'Post' theories challenge socially constructed structures of domination that oppress marginalised others, rather than simply

doing the best possible for students within these constraints, and they do this to achieve just outcomes for marginalised groups in society.

I have located ‘radical critical pedagogy’ at the end of the critical pedagogy spectrum. Radical critical pedagogy(ies) imply a deeply political agenda focused on radical structural change in education (Freire, 1970a; Giroux, 1997; McLaren, 1998). For many years, radical educators have criticised schools for “unproblematically adopting practices that reproduce the dominant culture and track students into the labor force based on gender, race and class” (Giroux, 1986, p. 48).

Radical critical education is synonymous with the critical theories of the Frankfurt School. Radical critical pedagogy focuses on economic (rather than cultural) explanations of oppression, advocating for taking action against structures that lead to *class* domination. McLaren proposed that globalisation and capitalism are the most significant structures of social control that lead to international class domination. In a 1998 special edition of *Educational Theory*, McLaren argued for a critical pedagogy that focused on Marxist rather than post-structural or post-modern critiques. He claimed that:

critical pedagogy has been so completely psychologicalised, so liberally humanized, so technologicalised, and so conceptually post-modernized that its current relationship to broader libertarian struggles seems severely attenuated if not fatally terminated ... In fact, critical pedagogy no longer enjoys its status as a herald for democracy, as a clarion call for revolutionary praxis, as a language of critique and possibility in the service of a radical democratic imaginary, which was its promise in the late 1970’s and early 1980’s. (McLaren, 1998, p. 448)

More recently, Kincheloe, McLaren, and Steinberg (2012) argued that Marxism provided *the* powerful theoretical approach for explaining how issues of gender and race emanate from class-based structures shaped by capitalism and economic exploitation. Kincheloe et al. (2012) proposed that, to shatter the hegemony of racism, critical pedagogues

need to understand how class “interacts upon multiple groups and sectors in various historically specific ways” (p. 17).

Using a continuum to highlight different understandings of critical pedagogy can lead one to take two different stances. One perspective is that critical pedagogy is a socially constructed concept that has changed in meaning over time. As individuals in unique contexts have sought explanatory and emancipatory theories and practices, the contextualising process (Bernstein, 2000) has brought about changes both in the theorising of social inequity and in the development of effective forms of action for social change. As an example, feminists may well argue that, even within a more equitable economic space, the social conditions for oppression of females will still exist because they are underpinned by different social and psychological forces. Feminist scholars may point out the disparity in salaries between men and women, the imbalance between male and female chief executive officers on company boards and in governments as examples of how oppression on the basis of gender crosses all class borders.

The second perspective taken most recently by radical critical pedagogues is that critical pedagogy has been hijacked by liberal education. Taking a moderate stance, Apple (2000) concedes that:

Some of it [critical pedagogy] is disconnected from the gritty materialities of daily economic, political, cultural and educational struggles. Some of it does romanticize the cultural at the expense of equally powerful traditions of analysis based in political economy and the state. And some of it does place so much emphasis on ‘post’ that it forgets the structural realities that set limits on real people in real institutions in everyday life. (p. 253)

In a recent interview McLaren (n.d.) lamented the fate of the aspirations of radical critical pedagogy of 1980s:

around the 1980's when corporations began to become more powerful than some nation states, the battle for critical democratic citizenship became just a smokescreen for the production of consumer citizenship and critical pedagogy, as it was conceived became more like a dying star about to go into a supernova stage and incinerate any real hope we had for real educational transformation.

(<http://www.globaleducationmagazine.com/critical-pedagogy-againstcapitalist-schooling-socialist-alternative-interview-peter-mclaren/>)

In this thesis I use the concept of critical pedagogy to encompass the continuum of critical approaches with the caveat that critical pedagogies must, at all times, challenge structures that oppress. Teaching exclusively within the structures of most western institutions, teaching critical thinking as higher order thinking, and teaching in a student-centred manner will not be considered as critical pedagogies unless there is evidence that these pedagogies are designed to challenge oppressive structures. In this thesis, ITE that does not move beyond humanistic education will not be considered critical pedagogy.

Critical Pedagogy and Initial Teacher Education

Initial teacher education (ITE) programmes around the world are given the challenging task of making decisions about what content, skills and values are needed to best prepare teachers for modern classrooms. A tension exists in ITE between teaching “knowledge and skill bases that all teachers should know” (Cochran-Smith, 2010, p. 453) while recognising that this knowledge may have been constructed in ways that “privilege some cultural and racial groups and dismiss the knowledge traditions of other groups” (2010, p. 453).

Seminal work in categorising ITE perspectives by Zeichner (1983) and Feiman-Nemser (1990) contributed to this debate by identifying conceptual or theoretical programme alternatives. Feiman-Nemser (1990) identified: academic, practical, technological, personal and critical, as possible conceptual orientations to ITE. Both Feiman-Nemser (1990) and Zeichner (1983) posited that one option, a ‘critical orientation’, is unique in its focus on

issues of social justice and equity in teaching. Support for this perspective comes from Cochrane-Smith and Zeichner (2005) who argue that ITE is morally and ethically bound to explicitly address issues of race, equity and promote social change. Similarly, Kirk (2009) stressed that teachers must be aware of the complexities of the educational process in order to “guard against the use of schools as agents of social control” (p. 219).

The purpose of a critical pedagogy in ITE is to engage students in the process of identifying and interrogating their ideological perspectives so that they may become aware of the social forces that have shaped their own individual subjectivities^{xxi}. This is a process that may make them more aware of oppression “with the belief that enlightened students will somehow make an impact on society” (Cho, 2006, p. 133). Enlightenment, of course, is a complex journey that may require changes in students’ values, beliefs and behaviours. To enable change, Cho (2006) claimed that ITE needed to create social structures that support individual growth.

Bartolome (2004) proposed two important principles that underpin critical pedagogy in an ITE curriculum: a critical understanding of dominant ideologies^{xxiii} and the development of effective counter-hegemonic discourses that help to transform oppressive practices. In particular, Bartolome (2007) identified a need to interrogate “the myth of meritocracy, deficit views of minority students, and the superiority of white mainstream culture” (p. 11). Accordingly, Bartolome (2007) suggested that ITE curricula should be deliberately designed to expose prospective teachers to a variety of ideological positions so that they can compare and contrast their ideologies with others and critically examine the biases they may hold. For example, Bartolome advocated for the practice of ‘border crossing’ (Giroux, 1992) through learning second languages and studying abroad, as a means of examining their own ideological positions about social order.

Cochrane-Smith and Lytle (2006) stated that teaching for social justice required more than subject matter knowledge and scientifically proven teaching skills. Therefore, to prepare ITE students to teach for social justice, ITE must involve more than learning pedagogical techniques and curriculum knowledge. Kincheloe (2007) builds on this notion, suggesting that ITE programmes must examine the social, economic, psychological, and political aspects of schooling, knowledge of indigenous cultures, and the ways in which forms of power are involved in constructing identity that either empower or oppress different groups. In order to problematise the relationship between education and politics, Fischman and McLaren (2005) encouraged teacher educators to challenge pedagogical traditions, educational philosophies and school policies. ITE students need these insights to help them see beyond the motives of particular groups, allowing them to move beyond obedience and reproduction to creative and intelligent practice (Kirk, 2009).

Earlier, Giroux (1981) proposed that, through teacher education, prospective teachers should be given the concepts and methods to “delve into their own biographies, to look at the sedimented history they carry around, and to learn how one’s own cultural capital represents a dialectical interplay between private experience and history” (pp. 158-159). Similarly, Zeichner and Teitlebaum (1982) advocated for the use of ‘macro-contextualised ethnographies’ in ITE to disrupt the continuation of the dominant ideology and practices that students may develop while on practicum.

Cochrane-Smith (2010) recently suggested that, although social justice had emerged as a theme in many ITE programmes, the interpretation of social justice and thus the nature of the programmes has varied. Her theory of teacher education for social justice starts by identifying unequal distribution of justice and recognition of unique contexts. Cochrane-Smith (2010) positions socially just ITE as addressing four key issues: (1) the importance of selecting and recruiting a diverse teaching force while also recruiting teachers whose beliefs,

experiences, and values are consistent with social justice goals; (2) the opportunity to interrogate curriculum and pedagogy; (3) the importance of acknowledging diverse contexts to develop “local knowledge of practice” (p. 460); and (4) the provision of rich opportunities to learn in contrast with opportunities to be accountable (Cochran-Smith, 2010). In addition to knowledge and teaching skills, methods, and strategies, she argues that teachers should explore the interpretive frameworks that underpin their thinking, how they think about their work, interpret what is going on in classrooms, and make decisions and form relationships with students. This is developed through “questioning their own and others’ assumptions, posing and researching problems and using curricula, tests and research as generative rather than prescriptive” (p. 456).

Unfortunately, much of what is done in the name of preparing prospective teachers for diverse backgrounds involves exposing them to “what are perceived [to be] the best practical strategies to ensure the academic and linguistic development of their students” (Bartolome, 2004, p. 97). Little time is spent examining ITE students’ assumptions, values, and beliefs, and exploring how these may inform their perception and actions when working with politically, socially, and economically disadvantaged students. Bartolome (2004) stressed that ITE must be purposely designed to expose prospective teachers to a variety of ideological positions, so that they can compare their own ideologies with the ideologies of others. In addition, Werner (2007) proposed that ITE programmes underpinned by a critical pedagogy must recruit ITE students who are committed to teaching in less privileged schools with programmes specifically geared toward the needs and interests of the poor and the oppressed. Werner (2007) contended that “privileged people do not give up their privilege voluntarily”, rationalising their privilege by “internalizing the myth that hard work, fair assessment and equal access to institutions of power create equal opportunity for success and failure” (p. 61).

Finally, Segall (2008) reminded teacher educators that there was a difference between teaching *about* critical pedagogy and enacting a critical ITE programme. As part of his critical pedagogy, Segall endeavoured to have students implicate themselves through “critical, public reflection” (p. 24) in order to create a degree of discomfort and disequilibrium that forces them to consider their taken-for-granted assumptions.

The following three statements broadly encapsulate the principles of critical pedagogy that are relevant to ITE. These statements provide a framework from which I draw upon the findings of this study.

- Critical pedagogies must help students understand how power works;
- Critical pedagogies must prepare students to participate in a democratic society;
- and
- Critical pedagogies must attend to identifying inequity and taking action for social justice.

Critical Pedagogy and PETE

PETE, like all forms of ITE, endeavours to equip prospective teachers with the knowledge and skills required to work successfully in schools. Exactly *what* knowledge and skills are necessary and appropriate for current physical education teachers is less obvious. Decisions about what is taught in PETE may be context-specific and the result of historical processes that serve many different ideologies and interests (Fernandez-Balboa, 1997a). As an example, Kårhus (2010) proposed that the content knowledge in PETE degrees is produced and reproduced among competing interests in the field of sports sciences and physical activity, increasingly reflecting marketisation of higher education.

Identifying the field of PE remains contestable (Alderson & Crutchley, 1990; Kårhus, 2010; Murdoch, 1986; Siedentop & Tannehill, 2000) with ongoing debates over the naming and framing of the relevant fields of knowledge (Kårhus, 2010). Given the complexity of

teaching (Alton-Lee, 2003; Kagan, 1992) and the lack of agreement on what PE is, it follows that there are many models of PETE. Building on the ITE orientation scholarship of Feiman-Nemser (1990), Doyle (1990), and Zeichner (1983), Tinning (2006) described a *critical orientation* in PETE as one that privileged critical inquiry. A critical orientation to PETE investigates the hidden messages of power and control aligned with technical teaching skills. PETE students are challenged to critique behaviourist programmes and traditional teaching methods.

According to Kirk (1986), critical pedagogy in PETE gained a foothold following Zeichner and Teitlebaum's (1982) call for social and economic justice to become a part of every ITE programme. Substantial progress in the development of critical PETE was made in the 1980s at Deakin University in Australia where David Kirk and Richard Tinning, names synonymous with critical PETE, worked in conjunction with a broader group of academics to conceptualise a critical pedagogy for ITE aimed at social justice, democracy, and equality (Curtner-Smith, 2007). Key issues specific to physical education included questions about the nature of knowledge in PE, specifically the prominence of the human movement sciences; scrutiny of curriculum and curriculum issues; issues of power that influence our understanding and thinking about the body: gender identity, meritocracy, 'technocentric ideology' (Bain, 1990), obesity (Kirk, 2006), ethics (Sicilia-Camacho & Fernandez-Balboa, 2009), and the privileging of certain forms of knowledge (Tinning, 2004).

Kirk and Tinning (1990) described critical PETE as coming from an "explicit and coherent political position" (p. 8) that embraced the values and beliefs of social justice and democracy. They called for the critique of "taken-for-granted assumptions that underwrite forms of educational and organizational practices in physical education" (p. 9) and an approach that provides multiple perspectives of the events and practices in PE. More recently, Bruce (2013) described critical PE as learning through and about movement, asking questions

of how PE and movement cultures may contribute to injustices that exist in schools and society.

A growing number of scholars have stressed that critical physical education teacher educators must develop a commitment to critical pedagogy rather than simply understanding critical pedagogy (Cassidy, 2000; Gore, 1990; Muros Ruiz & Fernandez-Balboa, 2005; Tinning, 2002, 2012). In this vein, Gore (1990) and Tinning (2012) emphasised the need to recognise the importance of the affective domain. In one of the seminal studies of the enactment of critical pedagogy in PETE, Gore (1990) noted that many students come to PETE with little emotional connection to, and enthusiasm for, critical pedagogy. Tinning (2012) suggested that how HPE teachers *think* and *feel* (original emphasis) about education and social justice, physical activity, bodies and health is the most important graduate attribute. Whilst acknowledging that students may come into PETE with dispositions, values and embodied histories of PE, contrary to the views of Gore, Tinning (2012) optimistically proposed that “this does not mean that they can’t be changed” (p. 230).

Advocacy for a critical PETE is based on the notion that shifts in how HPE teachers think and feel about PE *are* possible. Earlier, Sparkes (1996) proposed that change in PE will *only* occur through changing individual and group consciousness toward PE. In recent years Tinning (2002, 2012) has advocated for a ‘modest pedagogy’, cautioning PETEs who are searching for *the* (original emphasis) pedagogical solution that will lead to emancipatory outcomes, to be more modest than certain in their expectations. A modest pedagogy would not assume that there is a single set of pedagogical practices that will lead to the delivery of certain outcomes (Tinning, 2012). Tinning (2012) posits that “the use of a rational discourse to problematise taken for granted practices will be insufficient to change those practices unless there is a corresponding level of emotional commitment for change” (p. 233). I have come to think that Tinning’s turn towards more modest expectations was his way of saying

we should stop searching for *the* definitive critical strategy and focus more on the modest gains that can be achieved by individuals collectively teaching from the heart with a consciousness toward social injustices. Despite Tinning's call for academics to stop searching for the grand answers in the form of prescriptive teaching practices, researchers strive to define models and paint-by-number approaches for teachers who work in complex and uncertain contexts.

Several academics have contributed ideas for critical approaches in PETE. Scholarship on how critical pedagogies in PETE might be enacted (see Curtner-Smith, 2007; Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Fernandez-Balboa, 1995; Gore, 1990; Hickey, 2001; Macdonald & Brooker, 1999; Tinning, 1992a) has described teaching strategies and structures designed to develop critical teachers of physical education. The strategies advocated for include: the questioning of taken-for-granted aspects of teaching (Gore, 1990; Kirk, 1986; Tinning, 2002), recognising issues of privilege and oppression in PE and sport (Fernandez-Balboa, 1995; Hickey, 2001), linking courses to broader social issues, and an inward focus through experience and action research (Curtner-Smith, 2007; Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Kirk, 1986; Tinning, 1992b). Kirk (1986, 2009) suggested that PETE must include curriculum studies courses that focus on helping students understand their experience of teaching in broader frames of reference such as the school and society at large. More traditional teaching strategies include the use of peer teaching and reflection (Gore, 1990), journals (Gore, 1990; D. Macdonald & Brooker, 1999) and the use of resources designed to present teaching as problematic (Gore, 1990; Kirk, 1986; Tinning, 2002).

Fernandez-Balboa (1995) emphasised that critical pedagogies required the application of the principles of democracy. He stressed the importance of establishing democratic classrooms that were neither hierarchical nor dichotomous, where the student and teacher were equal partners in learning. Fernandez-Balboa (1995) suggested that these conditions

were crucial if the “gray areas” (p. 100) of content were to be explored from multiple perspectives.

Practitioner Understanding of Critical Pedagogy

One of the difficulties for both teacher educators and ITE students in learning to understand and enact critical pedagogy is the challenge of understanding the language of critical pedagogy and the scarcity of literature on the enactment of critical pedagogies in PE/PETE. There is concern that the language of critical pedagogy makes it inaccessible to all but those in academia who regularly engage with the language. Critical pedagogy may not be accepted or understood by prospective teachers due to the complexity of the language and vocabulary associated with it (Kincheloe, 2007; Macedo, 2009; Werner, 2007). This complexity is magnified in HPE in New Zealand and Australia where terms such as *socio-ecological perspectives*, *sociocultural perspectives*, *socially critical pedagogies*, *critical thinking* and *critical reflection* serve to further distance understanding from the original ideas conveyed in the seminal literature on critical theory.

More than 15 years ago, Burbules and Berk (1999) argued that different epistemological traditions of *criticality* ensure that a universal understanding of criticality is unlikely. In education, the term *critical* is used in different ways (Rizvi, 2011) which has resulted in slippage between a critical theorist’s understanding of critical and its use in critical thinking. Critical thinking has been described as:

the intellectually disciplined process of actively and skillfully conceptualizing, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and/or evaluating information gathered from, or by, observation, experience, reflection, reasoning, or communication, as a guide to belief or action. (Scriven & Paul, 1987, p. 1)

Critical thinking as highly disciplined rational thinking evolved from positivist underpinnings that involve high levels of cognition. In a book chapter titled, *Critical thinking and critical pedagogy: Relations, differences and limits*, Burbules and Berk (1999)

articulated the differences between critical thinking and critical pedagogy. The authors suggested that critical thinking concerned itself with “the criteria of epistemic adequacy” (p. 46), where one learned to “recognise faulty arguments, hasty generalizations, assertions lacking evidence and truth claims based on unreliable authority” (p. 46). Critical thinking is *not* critical pedagogy. Burbules and Berk (1999) highlight this difference stating that critical thinking *might* lead to a closer examination of structures in society, although it does not depend on it.

In contrast, critical pedagogy starts with an understanding that all knowledge is socially constructed within a network of power relations. Rizvi (2011) positions this notion of criticality as a “universal rejection of positivism, and the instrumentalism that views educational thinking in technical terms, eschewing moral and political issues” (p. 154). Rizvi advocates that education *should* be viewed as a moral activity that requires the methodological resources of criticality for an “inextricably political” (p. 154) analysis. This tradition of criticality is less concerned with assessing knowledge with criteria to ascertain its truth claims, but instead focusing on issues of power such as ‘who benefits from this understanding?’ and ‘who is marginalised?’ Critical pedagogy advocates for action along with understanding when a dominant understanding discriminates and marginalises.

Studies in ITE (Sahragard, Razm-Joo, & Baharloo, 2014), PETE (Breunig, 2011; Muros Ruiz & Fernandez-Balboa, 2005) and secondary school teaching (Fitzpatrick, 2013; Kelly, Brandes, & Orlowski, 2004; McIntyre, Philpot, & Smith, 2016) highlight the differences in practitioner understanding of critical pedagogy. These studies are critiqued later in the thesis.

A quest for social justice in critical pedagogy similarly requires further consideration of what social justice is, and for whom social justice is sought. Social justice is the subject of great dispute (G. Marshall, 1998). McLaren (2009) suggested that, as knowledge is a social

construction grounded in power, our understanding of social justice remains a contestable concept that will mean different things in different communities. The critical educator must acknowledge that there are many aspects of social justice that are relevant to certain classes, races and gender interests (McLaren, 2009).

In addition, social justice and equality are not necessarily synonymous with each other. Equality could mean equal treatment where everyone is treated the same regardless of race, gender, sexuality. In contrast, equality could also mean the equal distribution of resources that can only be achieved through redistribution to those in need. It is conceivable that *unequal* distribution of resources may be needed for the purpose of social justice (G. Marshall, 1998). Friesen (2006) reported that, for many New Zealanders, affirmative action and reverse discrimination (redistributing goods to the disadvantaged) *hindered* rather than led to social justice. Equity through redistribution was viewed as discriminatory and unjust. Social justice might both be a process (through socially just actions) and a goal (L. Bell, 2007).

While teaching for social justice is described as “crucial in creating counter-hegemonic resistance to neo-liberalism” (Smyth, 2011, p. 53), an educator has to decide for whom social justice is sought. To do this they must interrogate their own values and beliefs to uncover why they accept or challenge the social conditions that confront them (Smyth, 2011). Educators must themselves develop a critical consciousness to ensure that the social justice they advocate for is consistent with the types of oppression experienced by those whom they educate.

Critical Pedagogies in PETE: An Antipodean Perspective^{xxiv}

Philpot, R. (2015).

Critical Pedagogies in PETE: An Antipodean perspective.

Journal of Teaching in Physical Education. 34(2), 316-332.

Beginning around the late 1980s in western democracies such as the USA, Canada, the UK, New Zealand and Australia, the educational discourse began to change (Marginson, 1993). According to Ovens (2010), Human Capital Theory (HCT) emerged as a powerful discourse orienting educational thinking and policy making in New Zealand and Australia. With its focus on the link between education, employment and wealth creation, HCT focuses on the need to compete on a global stage in an increasingly technology driven, rapidly changing, mobile and interconnected world. With education increasingly regarded as a commodity, schools are seen as a site for the development of human capital. As education researcher Alan Luke (2002) argues, there is “now [an] internationally rampant vision of schooling, teaching and learning based solely on systemic efficiency and the measurable technical production of human capital” (p. 1).

Such thinking is part of the broader political discourse called *neo-liberalism*. Neo-liberal initiatives are characterised by free market policies, deregulation, encouragement of private enterprise and consumer choice, small(er) government, the outsourcing of government services to private providers, personal responsibility and entrepreneurial initiative. The discourses of neo-liberalism are those of competition, human capital, and individual responsibility. In the logic of neo-liberalism, schools and universities are seen as providing educational services to clients.

Influenced by the discourses of neo-liberalism and HCT, the main purpose of school physical education in both New Zealand and Australia increasingly became the ‘making’ of *healthy citizens* (Tinning & Glasby, 2002). Healthy citizens are conceived of as self-regulating, informed, and capable of constructing their own healthy lifestyle and minimising risky behaviours. In a neo-liberal context, healthy citizens are seen as more productive in their working life and they do not become a burden on the state as they age. In order to facilitate the making of *healthy citizens*, physical education was conceptually and practically integrated with health education as a new hybrid learning area called *Health and Physical Education* (HPE) (Tinning & McCuaig, 2006).

However, the *HPE National Curriculum Statement* (Australian Education Council, 1994), which articulated the neo-liberal concept of the healthy citizen also made explicit that HPE, like all other learning areas of the curriculum, was to embody the principles of diversity, social justice and supportive environments as underpinning new curriculum developments. In New Zealand the then

new HPE curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1999) embraced similar principles and was also seen as presenting a sociocultural perspective of HPE. However, in both Australia and New Zealand, the fact that the values that are embodied in neo-liberalism and the sociocultural–social justice perspectives were in tension with each other, seems to have been unrecognised or ignored.

This sociocultural–social justice perspective has continued to find voice in the contemporary HPE curriculum developments in both countries. For example the latest draft *National HPE Curriculum for Australia* (Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2012) promotes a critical inquiry approach to HPE where:

students will explore matters such as inclusiveness, power inequalities, taken-for-granted assumptions, diversity and social justice, and implement strategies to improve their own and others' health, wellbeing and physical activity opportunities. (p. 4)

Similarly in New Zealand, Health and Physical Education (HPE) aims to “develop a sense of social justice” and “foster critical thinking and action that enables students to understand the role and significance of physical activity” (Ministry of Education, 2007, pp. 22-23).

Importantly, however, these Antipodean curriculum developments have made new demands on physical education teacher education (PETE) programmes that need to prepare teachers who are capable of engaging PE from a socially critical perspective Tinning (2012). The advocacy for, and appropriation of, *critical pedagogy* for PETE became one response to this challenge. Indeed, Macdonald and Kirk (1999) claimed that the introduction of what they called socially critical physical education school curricula in New Zealand and Australia behoves physical education teacher educators to introduce their trainee teachers to critical pedagogies.

Critical Pedagogies in Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE)

A socially critical perspective, which was inspired by principles of critical pedagogy, became evident in the physical education literature in the early 1980s. In the US, scholars such as Bain (1990), Dodds (1985), Dewar (1991), Fernandez-Balboa (1995) and Lawson (1987, 1998) were advocating for a socially critical PE and PETE. The edited collection of Kirk and Tinning (1990), *Physical Education, Curriculum and Culture: Critical Issues in the Contemporary Culture*, included work from most of the contemporary critical scholars of that period.

Within Australia and New Zealand, critical pedagogy in both teacher education and PETE can be traced back to a period in the 1980s and 1990s when a critical mass of scholars at Deakin University, Australia provided unprecedented innovative critical scholarship on education (Tinning, 2011). The seminal *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education* articles from Australia that articulated critical pedagogies included Kirk's (1986) description of an inquiry-based approach to teacher education, Tinning's (1988) paper on the pedagogy of necessity, and Tinning's (1991) examination of

PETE pedagogies. Critical pedagogy in PETE was introduced to the wider Australian public in 1987 with the publication of a text for undergraduate pre-service PE teachers entitled *Improving Teaching in Physical Education* (Tinning, 1987).

Since Macdonald and Kirk (1999) claimed that HPE teachers in Australia have a “responsibility to [teach] the socially critical liberal curriculum as defined by the State” (p. 140) advocacy for critical pedagogy in PETE has continued in both Australia and New Zealand with the work of scholars such as Burrows (2000), Culpan and Bruce (2007), Hickey (2001), Macdonald and Kirk (1999), Ross (2001), and Tinning (2002). However, more has been written *about* advocacy for critical pedagogy than on how it might be operationalised. As Curtner-Smith and Sofo (2004) point out, there are few published accounts of critical pedagogies in PETE, leaving teacher educators with little idea of the tactics, strategies, structures and organisational frameworks that could be used in the name of socially critical PETE. Accordingly, Tinning (2002) reminds us that *defending* critical pedagogy is not the same as *doing* critical pedagogy.

In this paper I report how physical education teacher educators foreground the educational perspective within the PETE courses they teach. In the Australian and New Zealand context, issues of justice and democracy align with the aims of socially critical PE curricula that claim to privilege social justice agendas. In reporting on many of the problems experienced by physical education teacher educators, I hope that readers will recognise and reflect on the possibilities presented in these accounts.

Touring the ‘Big Tent’

In 1998, Lather introduced the metaphor of a ‘big tent’ when describing critical pedagogy, with the aim of steering critical pedagogues toward embracing diverse counter-narratives and competing understandings rather than focusing on a ‘right’ definition of critical pedagogy. Diverse critical PETE literature concurs with this metaphor, engaging with issues of gender discrimination (Dewar, 1990; Tinning, 1985), racism (see Fitzpatrick, 2009, 2011; Legge, 2010), the hidden curriculum (Fernandez-Balboa, 1993) and motor elitism (Tinning, 1997). However, this critique cannot in itself be considered critical pedagogy. The literature may provide knowledge and draw attention to issues of inequity and social justice but identifying that there is a problem does not necessarily lead to transformative action for social change (Kohli, 1998; Segall, 2008; Van Heertum, 2006).

In contrast, Freire (1970b) promoted a critical pedagogy of praxis, a process of naming the world then taking action to change it – an ongoing cycle of action and reflection. Freire (1970b) suggests that pedagogical practices should provide the knowledge and skills that enable students to explore the possibilities of what it means to be critical citizens. Freire’s work and others have

inspired a range of critical pedagogies in PETE. These range from Kirk's (1986) inquiry-oriented approach through to more contemporary descriptions of co-constructing initial teacher education curricula (Cameron, 2012; Fernandez-Balboa, 1995) and story-telling (Garrett & Wrench, 2011a). While all of these critical pedagogies are promoted, not all include accounts of the pedagogies being used.

In what follows, I offer a categorisation of critical pedagogies that may form a basis for a more enlightened interpretation of its impact/influence in PETE. These include: problematisation of knowledge; reflection; power sharing through democratic classrooms; dialogue; and border crossing.

Problematisation of knowledge. Many initial teacher education (ITE) students come to ITE with the expectation that the programmes will provide them with the knowledge and skills needed to replicate the teaching techniques that lead to the most successful teaching outcomes. ITE programmes that emphasise transmission of knowledge have been described as a technical orientation (Rink, 1993) or a traditional/craft orientation (Zeichner, 1983).

In contrast to technically oriented ITE programmes that frame educational issues as technical problems, critical ITE frames these issues as political problems (Cho, 2013). As such, teacher education underpinned by a critical pedagogy begins by asking questions about the political dimensions of schooling, education, and pedagogy (Cho, 2013). This is what I have termed the *problematising of knowledge*. Freire (1970b) describes this problematising process as an 'awakening' that leads to the development of a critical consciousness^{xxv}, that is a "deepening of the attitude of awareness characteristic of all emergence" (p. 90).

Tinning (2002) and Fernandez-Balboa (1995) have promoted the importance of problematising knowledge construction in the field of physical education through critically examining the ideology, power, and culture that may lead to dominant ways of thinking about sport, the body, and physical education (Tinning, 1985, 1987, 1991).

One of the earliest published attempts of critical pedagogy in Australian PETE was undertaken by Gore (1990) when she endeavoured to challenge the taken for granted assumptions about "the core activity of physical education curricula" (p. 115). Gore described the main features of the course as being: peer teaching followed by reflection, self-reflective journals and a series of lectures, seminars, videos and readings that attempted to "present knowledge as problematic" (p. 116). She observed that students differed in both what they reflected on, and how they reflected. While some students, whom she categorised as 'committed', enjoyed the process, others, the 'acquiescent' group, accepted it and cruised along. A third group, the 'recalcitrants', rejected the need to reflect. For the recalcitrant students, questions of efficiency and effectiveness dominated concerns about the purposes and implications of their practices (Gore, 1990).

In a later attempt to challenge taken-for-granted assumptions about PE Macdonald and Brooker (1999) focussed on issues such as “what is the worthwhile PE knowledge in schools?” (p. 56). This pedagogical approach required the third-year PETE students to compare their own experiences of PE with peers, while also considering reading materials from Australian based critical theorists and the influence of newspaper articles and videos. In order to address perceived challenges with the language of critical pedagogy, Macdonald and Brooker endeavoured to engage with the ideas of critical pedagogy rather than the language, and they reported that their pedagogy did provide fresh perspectives on taken-for-granted practices for some students, although for many, a focus on the acquisition of technical knowledge continued to dominate.

In 2000, Cassidy added to this field of knowledge by providing an account of the critical pedagogies of ‘Frank’, a teacher educator teaching a PE paper in a generalist primary ITE programme at an Australian university. Frank’s problematising pedagogy sought to present new lenses to highlight the idea that PE makes both friends and enemies of students (Cassidy, 2000). Frank’s strategies included using videos to highlight the role the media plays in not only reporting but also constructing reality, using non-stereotypical tutors for practicals to challenge students’ ideas about what a physical educator should look and act like, and using practical classes in dance, movement education, and jump rope that purposely challenged his students’ conceptions of PE. Cassidy (2000) reports that many of the ITE students involved were in the first semester of their first year and expected the course to be about how to teach and found the course to be “a bit esoteric” (p. 154). Cassidy concluded that the students’ limited subject and theoretical knowledge meant they had difficulty problematising the issues. She identified this as being one of the major constraints in the course.

In more recent years, Garrett and Wrench (2011a) have provided an account from a South Australian University of how they used storytelling to problematise adolescent girls’ experiences in PE. The stories selected provoked issues of humiliation, body image, and an emphasis on high-level sport in PE. They argued that stories enabled them to create empathy towards the storyteller, that is, empathy towards the way other people understand, experience, and feel during, or as an outcome, of their PE classes. The authors report that the stories allowed some PETE students to talk about their own experiences of sport and physical education, helping them to both reflect on their own experiences and make them conscious of how other students have different experiences in physical education.

Reflection. One of the major trends in all teacher education has been the rise of *reflection* as a dominant concept (Tinning, 2006). Given the high profile and status enjoyed by reflection, it is surprising that there is little consensus over the meaning of the term (Ovens, 2004). Gore (1990)

differentiates between technical reflection and critical reflection. Critical reflection represents a critical pedagogy as the reflections move beyond the routine actions of the teaching process, focussing instead on the political and ethical principles that underpin teaching (Smyth, 1989). A critically reflective teacher makes decisions based on conscious awareness and careful consideration of the assumptions upon which decisions are based (Yost, Sentner, & Forlenza-Bailey, 2000).

In PETE there has been a strong call for reflection on individual subjectivities^{xxvi}. The significance of how life history, personal biographies, and identity act as a filter for learning has been acknowledged by many in teacher education (Lortie, 1975; Tinning, 2002; Wrench & Garrett, 2012). There is compelling evidence that those entering PETE programmes are strongly influenced by their experiences in sport and school physical education (Brown, 1999; Garrett & Wrench, 2011a; Green, 2002; Matanin & Collier, 2003; Mordal-Moen & Green, 2012; Tinning, 2012; Tsangaridou, 2006). Tinning (2002) concluded that PETE students make different sense of teacher education because of the individual subjectivities they bring with them. Ultimately, who we are is inextricably linked to how we teach (Fernandez-Balboa, 2009; Tinning, 2002).

In the Antipodean context, Kirk (1986) promoted an inquiry-oriented approach to explore individual subjectivities whereby the starting point for developing theories about teaching is the act of teaching itself. He suggested the use of video recordings of student microteaching as a means of researching their own practice, arguing that students should teach and then reflect on the political, social and ethical dimensions of their own teaching. Inquiry into their own practice provides students with opportunities to understand the assumptions and beliefs that underpin their teaching practice, allowing them to make changes toward more equitable and socially just teaching.

Hickey (2001) reported on his own critical pedagogy in an Australian university where he attempted to promote critical reflection of students' beliefs about good teaching. Hickey used strategies that included the use of a range of readings, personal narratives, videos and workshop activities. In addition, Hickey led a PE lesson where he purposely endeavoured to cater to the most able participants as a means of highlighting how PE practices can discriminate. Students constructed biographical timelines that required them to reflect on important influences on their understanding of PE and sport, "locating their personal commitments within discourses associated with social control and order, sport and mastery, and health and fitness" (Hickey, 2001, p. 230). Further reflection was facilitated through the inclusion of guest speakers in lectures who represented perspectives of parents, teachers, and teacher educators. Following these lectures, PETE students were asked to compare their own biographies to those of the guest speakers, exploring the similarities and differences, and how this might impact on their beliefs and assumptions about PE.

In an attempt to understand the possibility of developing critical reflection through PETE, Ovens (2004) used memory work as a method to understand the experiences of five PETE students who were in their last year of their four-year PETE programme in New Zealand. Ovens (2004) concluded that critical reflection occurred, but only in specific contexts. The students' stories demonstrated that they critically reflected in university courses because it was valued and expected in that context. In contrast, the practicum context elicited a less critical form of reflection that was focused on learning to 'think on one's feet' with a focus on management and student control.

Power sharing through democratic classrooms. In a powerful metaphor, Freire (1970b) described traditional forms of pedagogy as 'banking,' where the teacher, who possesses all of the knowledge, fills up the empty vessel (the student) with knowledge. Proponents of critical pedagogy suggest that teachers and students should be equal partners in a community of learners (Fernandez-Balboa, 1995), where students and teachers act as co-investigators, generating themes that are problematised then explored together (Freire, 1970b).

Some of the seminal work in PETE occurred in the US, where Fernandez-Balboa (1995) provided explicit descriptions of his attempts to share power within his classroom through co-creating syllabi for courses, negotiating grading standards and procedures, self-assessment, and using a circular seating plan that privileged the use of dialogue amongst class members in preference to lecturing.

In Australia, Macdonald and Brooker (1999) built on the work of Fernandez-Balboa by using negotiated assessment with students as a means of sharing power. The students were introduced to a range of both traditional and innovative assessments. In small groups the assessment options were discussed, then democratically selected by the class. The authors believed that the principle of negotiating course work and assessment was an important component of their critical practices as they model notions of empowerment and democracy in classrooms.

Much later in New Zealand, Ross (2010) described how he used student self-assessment in courses in the first and fourth year of a PETE programme. In contrast to the democratically selected assessments described by Fernandez-Balboa (1995) and Macdonald and Brooker (1999), Ross prescribed self-assessment. His version of power sharing was through enabling students to self-assess and determine their own grade for the course. Ross (2010) described self-assessment as "an attempt to foster critical thinking from a Freirean perspective" (p. 1). At the conclusion of each course students were required to write a self-assessment statement and complete a dossier of evidence to support their self-assessed grade. Each student attended a formal 10-minute interview where they used their dossiers to support their self-assessment statements. While there was clearly a possible power imbalance, Ross (2010) adamantly argued that he "*never* changed the grade" (p.

205, italics in original). Ross posits that self-assessment helped students to question and explain their own ideas, rather than reiterate the lecturer's discourse.

Dialogue. Freire (1970a) referred to *dialogics* as a pedagogy of engaging students in dialogue in a bid to uncover the taken-for-granted in their lives. Freire (1997) proposed that human nature is dialogic and that communication plays a significant role in how we create ourselves, and as such, encouraged educators to create the conditions that promote open dialogue as a means of arousing interest or epistemological curiosity.

Elsewhere (Philpot, 2016), I have described the critical pedagogy of 'Tom', a PETE teacher educator in New Zealand, who espoused a Freirean pedagogy. Tom's strategies include Freire's strategies of problem-posing and dialogue. Through problem-posing Tom promoted group discussion in class and through online discussion groups. A combination of academic articles, current media, fiction and poetry were used to further challenge the students' thinking and to promote debate. Tom appeared to purposefully provoke students through suggestions such as "PE teachers should be below everyone else and we should sit in the shed with the caretakers". Students recall Tom rarely accepting answers without further probing questions or a contradictory response that required them to further support their thinking. Tom provided opportunities for students to think about the scientific, social, historical, and philosophical construction of meanings for the practice of physical education (Philpot, 2016).

In Australia, Hickey (2001) described how he used journaling as a means of promoting dialogue within the class. Using small groups of no more than six, Hickey would read the journals and facilitate discussions within these small groups. Student journals remained anonymous when discussions commenced. Students were able to signal when journal entries were to remain private and exempt from public forums.

Border crossing. Bartolome (2004) describes 'cultural border crossing' as personal experiences of being positioned as low status or witnessing someone else's subordination. A *border crosser* is "an individual who is able and willing to develop empathy with a cultural 'Other' " (p. 109), through critically considering the positive cultural traits of the other while, at the same time, "critiquing the discriminatory practices of his or her [own] culture that may be involved in the creation of the cultural 'Other' in the first place" (p. 109).

In an auto-ethnographic account of her own teaching, Legge (2010) described a border crossing experience that is a compulsory part of a four-year PETE programme in a New Zealand university. Although this experience may not sit comfortably within Bartolome's description of border crossing because it is a compulsory course requirement rather than a 'willing' experience, the intended outcomes are the same.

Legge (2010) described the week-long immersion into a Māori community, as an experience designed to develop cultural sensitivity, knowledge and skills through first hand experiences. Taking a 'hands on' stance in a setting where Māori language, values, beliefs and protocols are contextualised means the repetition of cultural practices where "students become socialised into the culture" (Legge, 2010, p. 9). The second year students stay on a marae, where they sleep, prepare food with the local community, engage in discussions on the marae, and engage in the traditional collection of *kai moana* (seafood). The experience is supported by campus lectures (pre-and post-trip), group work and, on return to campus, students lead activities teaching *te ao kori*^{xxvii}.

The marae experience introduces a critical pedagogy that is designed to "stir them [the students] up, get them thinking and see the world from a different perspective" (Legge, 2010, p. 9), in the hope that these students will work toward a new cultural understanding through first-hand experiences on the marae.

The Challenges of Critical Pedagogies in PETE

Reports of engagement with critical pedagogies by PETEs in New Zealand and Australia consistently report that challenging content knowledge that students' take for granted, challenging students' identities as PE teachers, and challenging students to make changes to the way they perceive 'good teaching' is not for the faint hearted. Hickey (2001) and Macdonald and Brooker (1999) highlight the difficulty of changing students' practices through a single course. In the absence of a sound framework of support within the PETE programmes and from associate teachers, PETE students quickly returned to familiar pedagogies.

Ovens (2004) suggested that critical reflection does not appear to become embodied, rather it is seen to be enacted only in particular contexts. He proposed that critical reflection may remain bound to the confines of the university until ITEs see them used legitimately in schools. Legge (2010) reported that the experience on a marae can cause a bumpy ride because of students' misunderstandings and misconceptions of Māori history, colonisation and cultural identity. When students are confronted with having to recognise their dominant Pākehā (Eurocentric) hegemonic views of the world, many begin to feel frustrated, blamed, or guilty as they become aware that what they know about Māori people and Māori culture is biased and stereotyped. Māori students equally experience similar emotions as they recognise the loss of their own heritage.

Gore (1990) used the metaphor of a 'recalcitrant' to describe the significant number of students who rejected the need to reflect on teaching. Ross (2010) noted that many students who excel within the 'banking' education system resist his teaching approach. Challenges from these students are given increased purchase because of the discourses of accountability of performance

within universities that favour highly structured course work, specialised knowledge, and traditional pedagogies (D. Macdonald & Brooker, 1999).

However, it is important to highlight that, for some students, critical practices gave them new perspectives on taken-for-granted practices (D. Macdonald & Brooker, 1999); made them aware of equitable and inclusive practices (Garrett & Wrench, 2011a); and gave them the insight to recognise indigenous culture (Legge, 2010). While PETEs who adopt critical pedagogies in PETE can perhaps expect resistance from both students and the structural constraints of universities, there is some evidence that their perseverance will impact on the consciousness of some students.

The Search for Meaningful Critical Pedagogies in PETE

This article is an attempt to describe and categorise a range of critical pedagogies used in Australia and New Zealand PETE in response to the need to prepare teachers to teach the new socially critical curricula. The metaphor of a big tent is used to portray a range of possibilities for critical pedagogies rather than a set of prescriptive practices.

The critical pedagogies I have described should, and do, encapsulate a humanistic perspective that focusses on being compassionate for those who experience social inequality as democratic education, social justice and equality are values consistent with humanism. However, the critical pedagogies reported in this paper move beyond humanism as their intent is to change the political status quo in schools by engaging prospective PE teachers in pedagogies that require them to question and (re)consider their own beliefs and make changes to their own teaching practices. These critical pedagogies seek ultimately to change the social, economic, and political conditions that marginalise groups of students.

The pedagogical work done through critical pedagogies in PETE is, as Tinning (2008) suggested “often unpredictable and always dependent on meaning making processes, which are beyond the control of the teacher” (p. 416). Tinning (2012) later proposed that the most important graduate attribute is how teachers *think* and *feel* about education and social justice. Critical pedagogies in PETE must engage the minds of students to empower them to privilege social justice in their teaching, but firstly PETE must connect with the hearts of students to ensure that there is an emotional commitment to the critical perspective.

The studies that informed this paper represent how some PETEs have engaged the spirit of critical pedagogy focussed on identifying inequality, promoting social justice and empowering actions. Whilst I would argue that the practices I have reported have had pedagogical intentions that encapsulate the principles of critical pedagogy, I also recognise the inherent danger of readers seeing this as a fixed set of teaching strategies and techniques, and employing them in classroom practices in ways that no longer remain consistent with the principles and purposes of critical

pedagogy. As an example, while PETE practices that encourage reflection on the relationship between power and knowledge fit within the framework of critical pedagogy, PETE practices that focus on reflection about how a teacher has managed transitions between activities or academic learning time would not.

As one embraces the big tent of critical pedagogies a tension grows between the evolution of critical pedagogy and the dilution of critical pedagogy. At what point is critical pedagogy no longer critical pedagogy? This tension is exacerbated in the field of PETE. It appears that critical pedagogy in PETE aligns strongly with feminist, post-structuralist, and post-colonialist theories. Critical pedagogies in PETE are contextualized in a PE context, examining many of the subject-specific issues previously listed (see Bain, 1990; Gore, 1990; Kirk 1986; Tinning, 1985, 1991).

The critical pedagogies described in this paper represent empowering practices beyond the constraints of Marxist critique. It is interesting to note that PETE literature reveals less debate about what counts as a critical pedagogy and greater focus on challenging ITE students to explore issues of power, unchallenged assumptions and dominant discourses relevant to the content and teaching of physical education. This is consistent with Tinning's (2002) call for a 'modest' critical pedagogy that resists exploitation within capitalism rather than resisting or rejecting capitalism. While some critical scholars may see this as the dilution and de-radicalisation of critical pedagogy, others will welcome the opportunity to be a part of a larger community of educators who collectively address issues of social justice while individually challenging different forms of oppression.

As Macdonald and Brooker (1999) have pointed out, because of their respective socially critical liberal HPE curricula, Australia and New Zealand physical educator teacher educators must engage with critical pedagogy. While we still know very little about what difference critical pedagogies in PETE make to the thinking, and eventually to the practices, of prospective teachers of PE, we do know that student biographies will continue to impact on the implementation of critical pedagogies in PETE ensuring that PETE will make *different* differences to individual students.

In reviewing the Antipodean accounts of critical pedagogies in PETE, I am left wondering how prepared prospective teachers would be to take action in schools. The critical pedagogies described in this paper demonstrate that PETE students in the Antipodes are learning *through* critical pedagogies, but are they learning *how* critical pedagogies can be used in their own teaching? Will encounters with critical pedagogies in PETE give students the pedagogical skills to privilege issues of social justice in their teaching? Will the modelling of critical pedagogies in PETE produce a ripple effect in schools? (Muros Ruiz & Fernandez-Balboa, 2005). It is clear that there remains a need for further accounts of the practice of critical pedagogies in PETE and a need for further research to

illuminate how critical pedagogies are 'read' by PETE students, and ultimately if, and how, graduating PETE students implement critical pedagogies in their own teaching.

Critical Pedagogies in PETE: Beyond the Antipodes

Other accounts of critical pedagogies in PETE in North America and Europe offer further insight on the use of critical pedagogies in PETE. Devis-Devis and Sparkes' (1999) case study of a student in a Spanish university who burned his textbook as a means of trying to escape an identity crisis similarly highlights the power of student biography as a barrier to socially critical PETE. In a course that questioned the value and purpose of sport, the student experienced a crisis due to a belief that "my life and my way of life, created for me, is sport, and without it life has no sense" (p. 146). This led Devis-Devis and Sparkes to conclude that pedagogues who adopt a critical pedagogy are "in for a hard time" (p. 148), not only because they may be 'swimming against the tide' of their PETE programmes, but also because of the anxiety they cause for their PETE students.

A study of PETE in a US university by Curtner-Smith and Sofo (2004), and a later replication of the same study by Curtner-Smith (2007), examined the influence of a critically oriented physical education methods course followed up by an early field experience. These studies reported that, although the PETE students were able to reflect on technical aspects of their teaching, there was little evidence of critically reflection on broad moral, social or political issues. The authors concluded that the conservative socialisation of the students' schooling experiences before they entered their PETE was very strong. Expecting significant change from a single course was simply asking too much.

In a Canadian context, Cameron (2012) highlighted the perils of challenging the identities of PETE students in an auto-ethnography where she gives an account of her journey as a critical pedagogue in PETE. Cameron described how some students were able to recognise the importance of emancipatory dialogue in challenging issues such as sexism,

elitism and racism in sport. Unfortunately, Cameron (2012) lamented that, in the end, the most vocal in the class resisted. As an example of her concern, she recounted the reception of the final project of two male students in her class. It was a video that “mocked the social justice issues we had asked them to critically reflect on” (p. 8), which was treated to a standing ovation by a number of other male students in the class. Dowling, Fitzgerald, and Flintoff (2015) share a similar tale of rejection when a student wrote ‘lecture cancelled’ as an alternative to attending a lecture that examined the issue of women in sport. Tinning (2012) suggested that, for many students, “the intellectual rationale for a socially critical pedagogy are insufficient to change their opinions or practice” (p. 231). All five of these studies concur with Gore’s (1990) earlier conclusion that many PETE students reject the need for critical reflection on the moral and ethical issues of teaching PE.

A study in Norway by Mordal-Moen and Green (2012) reported that the traditional practice of PETE teacher educators may contribute to the lack of engagement with critical reflection. Using Bourdieu’s concept of habitus^{xxviii}, Mordal-Moen and Green (2012) explored ways in which the habitus of 15 PETEs in Norwegian universities shaped their philosophies and practices. Mordal-Moen and Green (2012) suggested that the PETEs shared a sporting habitus with the students where sport was seen as a core element of their personal identity and national identity. Reflexivity was not viewed as a feature of the PETE programme. The teacher educators claimed that the main part of their job was to plan teaching, to teach, and then to evaluate the teaching they do. This habitus lead to teacher educators who neither problematised PE, nor challenged the deep-seated beliefs and dispositions of the prospective PE teachers. This led Mordal-Moen and Green (2012) to conclude that reflexivity is something that teacher educators would like to believe is a consequence of teacher education, but in practice it seldom occurs.

A very recent study by Dowling, et al. (2015) used ‘collective biographies’ to share the authors’ memories of their own experiences of foregrounding social justice agendas in PETE. The authors highlight the emotional toll of “swimming against the tide” (p. 1037) through privileging socially inclusive practices in PETE. They suggest that this has been compounded by the lack of PETE colleagues with a shared perspective and the proliferation of short-module ITE programmes that reduce the time for opportunities to get to know students, implement problem-based inquiry and negotiate curriculum. Dowling, et al. (2015) call for continued sharing of “tales from the field” as a means of “pursuing a collective dialogue about how best to organize teacher education” for social justice and for the purpose of filling the “ever-present need for collegial support and encouragement” (p. 1043) for those who embody critical education.

These studies represent most of the research available on the *practice* of critical pedagogy in PETE within the last 20 years. While there is further literature that outlines principles of critical pedagogy (Azzarito, Macdonald, Dagkas, & Fissette, 2016; Bain, 1990; Fernandez-Balboa, 2009; Kirk, 1986), advocacy for critical pedagogy (Fernandez-Balboa, 1995, 1997b; Gillespie & McBain, 2011; Lorente & Kirk, 2013; Sicilia-Camacho & Fernandez-Balboa, 2009; Tinning, 1997, 2010), and PETEs’ understanding of critical pedagogy and teaching for social justice (Breunig, 2011; Burden, Hodge, & Harrison, 2012; Muros Ruiz & Fernandez-Balboa, 2005), this literature focuses on *why* critical pedagogy should be employed and *how it could be used*. Beyond what has been reported on in this literature review, there is a dearth of literature reporting on actual accounts of critical pedagogies in PETE.

In 2002, when Tinning proposed the need for a modest critical pedagogy, he stated that there is a need for continued research in socially critical PETE. Tinning (2002) hoped that, through his writing, he would “stimulate some engagement with these ideas [critical

pedagogy] in the practice of teacher education...and perhaps some teacher educators will communicate their attempts to do so within the pages of this journal at some future time” (p. 237).

Criticism of Critical Pedagogues and Critical Pedagogy

While advocates of critical pedagogy appeal to the principles of democracy (Giroux & Giroux, 2006), liberation and emancipation (Freire, 2009a), morality and ethics (Kincheloe, 2007), and promoting social change (Dewey, 1916), the practice of critical pedagogy in teacher education programmes is neither prolific nor widespread.

Critics of critical pedagogy cite several concerns ranging from the notion that it is indoctrination of a political ideology (Biesta, 1998; Ellsworth, 1989; McArthur, 2010); that it fails to go beyond the deconstruction of society (Biesta, 1998); to the suggestion that there is little evidence to show that it makes a difference (Ellsworth, 1989; Kohli, 1998; Lather, 1998; M. OSullivan, Siedentop, & Locke, 1992). Several scholars, including those who support critical pedagogy, caution that critical pedagogy is in danger of being a blip on the education landscape (Kincheloe, 2007; Werner, 2007).

Kincheloe (2011) proposed that neo-liberal ideology is pervasive in education, thus moving the intentions of critical pedagogy further from interests of politicians and business. Critical pedagogy is not consistent with the business driven reforms to education where education exists to meet the needs of business and industry. Critical education that focusses on raising students’ critical consciousness, equipping them with the skills to identify and challenge injustices and challenge antidemocratic forces, may serve as an impediment to a society focussed on technology and positivism (Kincheloe, 2011). Giroux and Giroux (2006) posit that critical pedagogy is viewed as uneconomical, as providing students with anything other than work skills compromises students’ ability to contribute to the job market.

Ellsworth (1989) described critical pedagogy as highly abstract, more useful for philosophical debates than for planning classroom practices in ITE. She questioned the need for critical education's "existence, its goals, priorities, risks or potentials" (p. 301). Ellsworth suggested that "critical pedagogues are always implicated in the very structures they are trying to change" (p. 310). An example of this is the challenge of bringing to light the relationship between power and knowledge when the teacher educator is not free from their own understandings of oppression.

Questions about the very possibility or the impossibility of using critical pedagogy in the classroom have been asked (Biesta, 1998; Ellsworth, 1989; Gur-Ze'ev, 1998; Lather, 1998). Biesta (1998) suggested that critical pedagogy was impossible, citing the impossibility of three key concepts that were used to build the case for critical pedagogy. He described the impossibility of predicting the outcomes of education, the impossibility of separating knowledge from power, and the impossibility of justice. Biesta (1998) called on Derrida's concept of justice as 'a concern for others' with true justice only able to be applied singularly, to each individual in their own lives (Derrida, 1992). In contrast, a conventional understanding of justice is based on principles or criteria that are used to judge, and not applied to all. Biesta (1998) concluded that if justice requires judgment, then justice itself was unjust.

The challenges of understanding the language of critical pedagogy have been highlighted early in this chapter. In contrast, although equally problematically, Macedo (2009) questioned whether it was the language that makes critical theory difficult to understand, or whether it is the ideology that some find difficult to accept. Studies of PETE students have highlighted that PETE is a field characterised by a resistance to changes in beliefs, thinking and practice (Curtner-Smith, 1999; Rossi, Sirna, & Tinning, 2008). Recruits to PETE who typically share a common background consisting of sport may not be inclined

to consider alternate views on the nature, purposes and practices of physical education (Mordal-Moen & Green, 2012). As Kohli (1998) cogently suggested, it is not easy to change deeply held political, social, and philosophical positions "...simply by acquiring new knowledge or new perspectives" (p. 515).

In further reference to PETE, O'Sullivan et al.(1992) suggested that radical (critical) pedagogues have promoted the notion that all technocratic oriented programmes are positivist and behaviourist, while only radical (critical) discourses are socially just. The authors posit that "an 'us' and 'them'" (p. 269) had been created, with 'them' representing the technocrats and advocates of performance pedagogy. The irony in suggesting that critical pedagogues have purposefully set up dichotomies lies in the notion that dualisms are a positivist argument, an argument rejected by many from a critical orientation (Giroux, 2009). O'Sullivan et al. (1992) also questioned the high moral ground and lack of evidence to support many of the claims of critical pedagogy, describing radical literature as "long on criticism of existing practice in physical education ... short on descriptions of what a radical physical education would look like" (p. 275). Subsequent studies elaborating the practices used in a critical pedagogy (see Curtner-Smith, 2007; Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Fernandez-Balboa, 1995; Hickey, 2001) have begun to respond to these questions, although further research is needed if this criticism is to be fully addressed.

Bruce (2013) posits that critical pedagogues may be guilty of channeling students' 'critical consciousness' toward a predetermined destination as they "tend to know where they are headed; the end is a given" (p. 10). Bruce cautions that this perspective may limit possibilities and resist the complexities of both society and physical education. While advocates of critical pedagogies in PETE propose that critical pedagogues look for spaces to explore conflicting opinions and beliefs (see; Fernandez Balboa, 1995, 2009; Hickey, 2001; Kirk, 1986, 2009; Tinning, 2002, 2006), Ellsworth (1989) questioned whether it is even

possible to create dialogical spaces that are entirely open and honest due to the hierarchical nature teacher education classrooms.

Despite, or perhaps, because of, the criticisms, critical pedagogy continues to change from its Marxist roots focussed on criticism of capitalism to a broader focus on diverse issues of social justice. Continual change and critique are consistent with critical pedagogy with Freire (1998a) suggesting that learning and relearning never end. Critical theory and critical pedagogies must continue to be developed and redeveloped. Opportunities for further research into critical practices and outcomes from critical pedagogies continue to present themselves as new forms of discrimination appear in new contexts.

Chapter Summary

This literature review illustrates how the critical theories of the Frankfurt School have been understood and enacted as critical pedagogies in ITE and PETE. The evolution of critical theory has resulted in criticality coming to mean anything from humanistic, student-centred education to radical activist education with a commitment to actively challenging social structures for social change. A number of recent studies within a constellation of economic, social, and political institutions (Breunig, 2011; McIntyre et al., 2016; Muros Ruiz & Fernandez-Balboa, 2005; Sahragard et al., 2014) indicate that there is some incoherence between the principles of critical pedagogy and the practice of many educators who subscribe to them.

Theoretical perspectives such as critical race theory, queer theory, and feminism have been welcomed by some into the big tent of critical pedagogy. Others express concern that criticality is becoming diluted and less powerful as it moves from an exclusive economic critique to a narrower focus on gender, race and sexual orientation.

In New Zealand and Australia, school HPE programmes are informed by curricula that attempt to embody the principles of social justice and critical action. The Te Ika a Maui

University Bachelor of Physical Education is a PETE programme underpinned by a critical orientation that espouses to prepare HPE teachers who can engage with socially critical HPE curricula. The degree to which the BPE can justify calling itself a critical programme and the sense that students make from their 'reading' of the critical PETE programme form the basis for undertaking this study.

CHAPTER 4:

Methodology

Introduction

This chapter focuses on my approach to researching how the PETEs and PETE students ‘read’ a PETE programme underpinned by critical pedagogy. I will start with a description of, and a justification for, the research methodology that was selected for this study. The theoretical concepts used in this study will be introduced in this chapter with fuller explanations of some of the key concepts located in the published papers in Chapters 5, 6 and 7.

This chapter describes and justifies the sources of data that were selected for the study and how these data were analysed. A full description of the three methods of data collection and the processes of data analysis will be followed by an explanation of how research participants for the study were selected. I conclude this chapter by introducing the research participants and discussing the ethical considerations pertinent to the study.

Methodological Framework

Methodology is described by Silverman (2003) as a general approach for studying research topics that defines how one goes about studying any phenomenon. As all research rests upon assumptions of what is considered to be real and true (White, 2011), I will explicitly articulate the methodology in order to explain and justify the methods I have used.

I locate my research in a qualitative tradition. Qualitative researchers start with the position that there is no single objective truth to be found therefore they are interested in investigating how people experience the world and how they make sense of it (Gomm, 2008). Interpretative methodology is a form of qualitative research. Interpretive research is based on assumptions that “social life exists as people experience and give it meaning” (Neuman,

2003, p. 77). These assumptions enable me to explore the socially constructed nature of both the PETE programme and the PETE students' reading of the programme.

Interpretive research is *inductive* and *ideographic*. Induction involves collecting empirical data from which we seek to generate theoretical propositions on social life (May, 2011). This contrasts with deduction, which involves the formal testing of existing theories (Tolich & Davidson, 2011). Ideographic refers to an approach that provides a thick description, rich in detail that gives the reader a feel for another person's social reality (Neuman, 2003). The nature of interpretive research privileges a nonlinear process that includes focusing and refocusing the questions (Tolich & Davidson, 2011). The process for this thesis focused on gathering thick detailed descriptions through an iterative process that spiraled back and forth between data collection, analysis, formulating new questions and further analysis (Berg, 2004).

Ethnomethodology is an interpretive approach that is used in this study to explore how social reality is constructed in everyday life and how people come to do and see things (Gubrium & Holstein, 2000). Garfinkel (1967) suggested that ethnomethodology sets out to:

treat practical activities, practical circumstance, and practical sociological reasoning as topics of empirical study, and by paying to the most commonplace activities of daily life the attention usually accorded extra ordinary events, seeks to learn about them as phenomena in their own right. (p. 1)

Interpretative research distinguishes itself from other methodologies based on the philosophical (ontological, epistemological) assumptions and principles that underpin it. Through articulating these assumptions, the researcher provides direction for the study design (Cresswell, 1994). Quantitative researchers view reality as objective, that there is a reality out there that is waiting to be found. An objective ontology position asserts that social phenomena and their meanings exist independent of the social actors. The social phenomena are real and objective. Quantitative researchers use methods that allow them to measure or

quantify this reality. In contrast, qualitative researchers base their work on the assumption that the social world is subjective and based on the world as people perceive it, that multiple interpretations of an experience or reality are possible (Neuman, 2003). Researchers working within qualitative paradigms believe that individuals construct meaning from different experiences. These meanings are fluid and individual, constantly being produced, and reproduced through social interaction (Cresswell, 1994).

In this thesis I subscribe to a subjective or constructivist ontological position. I believe that students experiencing the same BPE courses with the same PETEs may read the courses and ultimately the BPE programme differently. Each student will construct their own understanding of teaching, physical education, and critical pedagogy as individual life histories colour the process of meaning making. This thesis explores how the courses and other experiences during the BPE programme, such as camps, practicums and events have contributed to this understanding.

Epistemological assumptions similarly locate researchers to certain methods. Quantitative researchers have an 'objective' epistemological orientation. They come from the viewpoint that knowledge is objective and tangible therefore the researcher must be independent from those that are researched (Cresswell, 1994). Conversely, qualitative researchers assume a 'subjective' epistemology in which the researcher and the subject co-create understanding (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Qualitative researchers believe it is appropriate for the researcher to interact with those being researched. As I am a teacher educator working within a particular Bachelor of Physical Education programme in New Zealand, a subjective epistemology is warranted. Due to the small size of the New Zealand PE community and my long-standing connection to it, many of the PETE teacher educators and students who agreed to participate in this research project were known to me. I have a

sound knowledge of the PE and PETE context within New Zealand and of the BPE programme specifically.

A subjective epistemology also acknowledges that all research is value-laden and biased (Cresswell, 1994). The qualitative researcher reconciles the epistemological issue of objectivity and subjectivity by stating biases and assumptions as part of the research process. The issues of power and possible bias that could arise were acknowledged through the university ethics approval process and will be made explicit in the final section of this chapter.

Critical Research

This study used a critical methodology. What differentiates critical qualitative research from ‘other’ qualitative research is both the theoretical lens through which critical qualitative research must be conducted and its critical purposes.

Critical research projects are informed by critical theory(ies). As noted previously in Chapter 3, critical theory emanated from the Marxist critique of capitalism by the Frankfurt School. More recently Coakley (2001) suggested that critical theory is now a broad umbrella term that encompasses critical frameworks including neo-Marxist theories, hegemonic theory, feminist theories, queer theories and post-structuralist theories

Critical research projects move beyond description, interpretation and analysis and toward a goal of emancipation. The intent of critical research is to effect social change where and when social injustice occurs. Critical research is not neutral as it openly and unashamedly privileges socially just and equitable praxis (Kincheloe et al., 2012; Steinberg, 2012). Work in the critical paradigm is “avowedly political in the sense that it sets out to make a difference to people’s lives by exposing and challenging inequities and power relations” (Fitzpatrick & Tinning, 2012, p. 56). Kincheloe, McLaren, and Steinberg (2012) propose that inquiry that aspires to the name *critical* must be connected to an attempt to confront the injustice of a

particular society or public sphere within the society. They suggest that a critical researcher accepts the following assumptions:

- All thought is fundamentally mediated by power relations that are social and historically constituted.
- Facts can never be isolated from the domain of values or removed from some form of ideological inscription.
- The relationship between concept and object and between signifier and signified is never stable or fixed and is often mediated by the social relations of capitalist production and consumption.
- Language is central to the formation of subjectivity (conscious and unconscious awareness).
- Certain groups in any society are privileged over others and, although the reason for this privilege may vary widely, the oppression that characterises contemporary societies is most forcefully reproduced when subordinates accept their social status as natural, necessary, or inevitable.
- Oppression has many faces, and focusing on only one at the expense of others (eg. class oppression vs racism) often elides the interconnections among them.
- Mainstream research practices are generally, although most often unwittingly, implicated in the reproduction of systems of class, race, and gender oppression.

This research project is a critical interpretation of the BPE teacher educators' and students' reading of a socially critical PETE programme. It is explicitly political in the sense that I explore readings and subsequent understandings of a critical programme to support and make a positive difference to critical ITE. I recognise that many PETE programmes are situated within broader sport science and kinesiology departments that privilege knowledge and values that are not consistent with the previously listed assumptions. I recognise that the

knowledge of sport science and performance in sport are often taken for granted as the logic of PE with little debate about whom that logic serves. This thesis is a 'modest' attempt to make a difference to those who are not served by the status quo.

Conceptual Framework

This thesis uses concepts from social theory to deconstruct and make sense of the data within a critical framework. Social theory is used to help researchers understand and explain social phenomena and to provide a model of the way that social systems work and can be worked upon (Anyon, 2009). Social researchers examine their data through selected theoretical concept(s). By clarifying the concepts to the reader the researcher is exposing their bias and subjective position on an issue. This has led May (2001) to suggest that, in social research, *what* is produced is inseparable from *how* it is produced. The findings are a product of the theoretical position the researcher takes.

Those who move beyond interpretative research and engage in social theory should be prepared for a challenge as the interplay of data and theory throws up new meanings with further possible meanings available through the use of different social theories. The plethora of theoretical possibilities requires the researcher to consider broadly but ultimately choose and justify their own theoretical position. Anyon (2009) declared that:

The conceptual vocabulary and grammar of the ideas involved in a theory must be thoroughly mastered before they can be meaningfully transferred onto data and analysis, or critiqued as a system of thought. And each time a new theory is encountered, or the next study undertaken, a new struggle begins. One wants to build a theoretical edifice that is sound and of good proportion. One wants the explanations to be right – and useful. (p. 6)

In this thesis I draw on the work of Jurgen Habermas, Paulo Freire and Pierre Bourdieu to highlight the way in which critical pedagogies in PETE are understood by the BPE teacher educators and both 'read' and understood by BPE students. Habermas and Freire

are names synonymous with critical theory. The concept of *Knowledge Constitutive Interests* (KCI) (Habermas, 1972) is used in Chapter 5 to explore the extent to which the espoused discourse of the BPE programme documents privileges emancipatory knowledge (Habermas, 1972). The concept of KCI offers insight into the interests that are served, and by courses individually and the programme collectively. The Freirean (Freire, 1970b, 1989) concepts of *dialogue, problem posing and conscientization* are drawn on in this thesis in Chapter 6 to examine the practice of one of the critical pedagogues in the BPE programme. These concepts emerged as an explanatory framework for the critical work of one teacher educator who espouses use of Freirean pedagogy in his teacher education courses.

The concepts of '*habitus*', '*field*', '*capital*', *pedagogical action*, and *pedagogical work* from the work of French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (1986, 1990, 1996, 2002) are used in Chapter seven and Chapter 8 to illustrate the PETE students' readings of the critical pedagogies in the BPE. Although Bourdieu is typically not identified as a critical theorist yet he offers concepts or "thinking tools" (Grenfell, 2015, p. xi) that assist in understanding how the PETE students in this study negotiate the structures of schools and ITE. These tools allow me to examine the significance of the habitus of the initial teacher educators and the PETE students involved in the study. They offer insight into the overlapping fields of PE and PETE. Bourdieu's concepts overcome the sociological dualism of structure and agency (Moore, 2004) and provide a framework for explaining how a socially critical PETE may 'kick at' the deeply held values and beliefs in a way that may enable and support a growing critical perspective.

Although Bourdieu has written extensively about both sport and education, he has not addressed teacher education (Grenfell, 1996). Bourdieuan concepts have been used by other researchers to examine ITE (Grenfell, 1996; Mills, 2013; Nolan, 2012; Thompson, 2000), PETE (Brown, 2005; Smith, 2014) and PE (Aldous & Brown, 2010; Fernandez-Balboa &

Muros, 2006; Fitzpatrick, 2011; Hunter, 2004; Redelius, Fagrell, & Larsson, 2009; Wright & Burrows, 2006). A recent edited book *Pierre Bourdieu and Physical Culture* by Lisa Hunter, Smith, and Emerald (2014) included a collection of papers that employed Bourdieu's concepts in the examination of PE, PETE and sport. In this paper I use the concepts of *habitus*, *capital*, *field*, *pedagogical action* and *pedagogical work* to explain how the participants in this study have negotiated their own individual meanings from the BPE programme.

In *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*, Bourdieu and Passeron (2000) espoused that habitus, capital and field worked collectively to reproduce class structure and maintain systems of domination. In this thesis I use the concepts as an explanatory theory as to how a critical PETE programme is 'read' by PETE students. In what follows, I discuss each concept individually to articulate my understanding and use in this thesis, although in practice, I have come to understand habitus, field, and cultural capital in terms of their relationship to each other.

Habitus is a set of acquired patterns of thought and embodied behaviours. In his own writing Bourdieu (1990) described habitus as:

Systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to act as structuring structures, that is, as principles which generate and organize practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to their outcomes without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary in order to attain them. (p. 53)

Bourdieu proposed that the world is constituted or socially constructed in a relationship with the habitus. Habitus acts as a system of cognitive and motivating structures, naturally occurring schemes of perception, that limits comprehension and unconsciously regulates what is seen to be reasonable, common sense and possible and/or impossible (Bourdieu, 1990). In 'unpacking' the impact of habitus, Nash (1990) articulated that "we do

what we chose to do and what we chose to do must be what we have learned to do and want” (p. 445).

While habitus structures thought and behavior, Bourdieu does not conceive habitus as fixed and finite. As we live and grow, our habitus colours our interpretation of the world, serving as a filter through which sense is made of social interactions and the social world. Bourdieu argued that, while habitus impacts on how we perceive the world, our biographical journeys, life stories and life experiences concurrently influence our habitus (Buchanan, 2010). This means when habitus is confronted, it potentially has the malleability to adapt. The conundrum is that the habitus of an individual serves to resist and limit generative possibilities. Bourdieu (1990) intimated that habitus has limits set by the very nature of its production. Habitus will generate only the ‘reasonable’, ‘common sense’ behaviours that are possible within the limits of its regulatory functioning, while excluding all ‘extravagances’ (Bourdieu, 1990).

These thoughts and behaviours are developed in different social spaces and social contexts that Bourdieu refers to as *fields*. In *The Logic of Practice*, Bourdieu (1990) posited that fields are relatively autonomous structured spaces that “are the products of a long, slow process of autonomisation” (p. 67). Fields are sites of struggle between holders of different kinds of power (Bourdieu, 1996). Fields emerge when agents recognise and refer to its history.

These social spaces or fields come with their own rules and practices. Similar to a sporting field (a metaphor used by Bourdieu), agents within the field compete for domination by endeavouring to legitimise their own thoughts and opinions (Bourdieu, 1996). Agents with the habitus that matches the habitus of others in a given field tend to excel, as they are “like a fish in water” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 127).

Bourdieu clarified that, while fields were highly structured, there is room for the agency of the actors in the field to effect change. Fields are not permanent and static. Fields have boundaries that are subject to change and redefinition as agents in the field with their own dispositions and resources compete for legitimacy. The malleability of a field relates to the dispositions and resources of the occupants of a given field.

The third Bourdieuan concept used in this thesis is that of *cultural capital*. The original Marxist concept of *capital* alludes to the financial wealth through the accumulation of commodities or money. Bourdieu (1986) extends the concept of capital beyond financial capital to include other forms of ‘immaterial’ capital that have the potential to advantage individuals in society. Cultural capital includes dispositions, values and cultural distinctions. Cultural capital is a form of social capital created out of struggles between classes that attempt to legitimise their own culture (Devine, 2008). Cultural capital is embedded in social networks where membership is the key to participation (Moore, 2004). Bourdieu (2000) used the example of the importance of ‘linguistic capital’ (as a form of cultural capital) stating that the “educational mortality rate” (p. 73) increased as students without the linguistic capital of scholarly language are systematically removed from higher education.

If we were to use the analogy of economic capital (money), cultural capital comes in different ‘currencies’ that would, or would not, be ‘bankable’ or ‘tradeable’ in different social contexts. In the same way that the *yen* or *peso* is not tradable in a shop in London or New York, cultural capital that does not represent dominant cultures cannot always be ‘cashed in’ in certain fields such as education. An investment in cultural capital in the form of education or language allows an agent to acquire a habitus that can equip them to participate and benefit in a field for whom that cultural capital is a desired currency.

Drawing on these concepts of field, habitus, and cultural capital, I added Bourdieu’s theories of pedagogy to analyse the BPE students’ espoused engagement with critical

pedagogies. In *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1979, 1990, 2000) Bourdieu and Passeron focused on education and the role of pedagogy in cultural reproduction. In this thesis I call on the concepts of *pedagogical action* and the less familiar concept of *pedagogical work* to analyse the findings of this study. The authors assert that all pedagogical action occurs within power relations. Bourdieu and Passeron described pedagogical action as, "...the imposition of a cultural arbitrary by an arbitrary power (p. 5). Bourdieu uses the term *arbitrary* to convey a message that pedagogy serves to legitimise the cultural interests of those who hold power. In the context of this study I interpret this to mean that the BPE teacher educators are the *arbitrary power* that are mandated by the university. These teacher educators have agency to enact pedagogical strategies that privilege their own *cultural arbitrary*.

The pedagogical choices of individual teacher educators will be influenced by their own thought patterns and embodied behaviours or habitus. Given the lack of diversity that characterises ITE faculty and ITE students (Schleicher, 2014; Zeichner, 2003) in general, and PETEs and students specifically (Dowling et al., 2015; Flintoff, 2012; Sato, Fisette, & Walton, 2013), it is likely that, without a critical approach, teacher education programmes will privilege the cultural capital of the dominant groups. In the case of PETE, the dominant group is the white, middle-class, and heterosexual, 'sporty' male (Brown, 2005; Dowling et al., 2015).

Bourdieu (2000) suggested that the dominant form of education is transmission (a historically produced habitus of educators). Given that students in ITE may be cognisant of learning content and pedagogy at the same time (e.g., students may hear and see both *what* you teach and *how* you teach) it is probable the ITE faculty will reproduce the dominant habitus (transmission) though drawing on and privileging their own cultural capital. When this occurs, pedagogical action represents the process of inculcation of what Freire (1986)

called ‘banking’ education, the repeated depositing of certain knowledge into passive students.

The concept of pedagogical work relates to the outcome of pedagogical action. Bourdieu and Passeron (2000) argued that pedagogic work is “a process of inculcation that must last long enough to produce a durable training” (p. 31), that is, the internalisation of the principles of the cultural arbitrary that result in a change in habitus. The productivity of pedagogical work is measured by the degree to which it reproduces its effect of reproduction and secondly, “the degree to which the habitus it produces is durable” (p. 33) and capable of generating practices that conform with “principles of the inculcated arbitrary in a greater number of different fields” (p. 33). For this study, productive pedagogical work can be quantified by the change in students’ habitus within the BPE field, but more importantly, the change in habitus as they enter into different fields such as the field of school physical education.

This thesis inquires into how the BPE student ‘reading’ of the critical pedagogies used in the BPE courses will be influenced by their own habitus. In what ways will the habitus of the participants in this study influence the understanding and messages that are deemed to be meaningful? Bourdieu (1990) suggested the habitus defends itself against change by rejecting information that calls into question the logic or deeply held beliefs that have resulted in the formation of the habitus. Inevitably, students will read pedagogical actions differently, rejecting some messages that do not fit in with their own beliefs and values.

The theoretical concepts used in this thesis were selected through an iterative process of moving back and forth between data and theory. My initial thinking, which is reflected in the title for this thesis ‘*Kicking at the habitus: Exploring staff and student ‘readings’ of a socially critical physical education teacher education (PETE) programme*’ was exclusively limited to Bourdeauian conceptual tools. As the research process progressed and data were

collected, reduced and analysed, different conceptual tools that had greater explanatory power emerged and were eventually included.

A full explanation of the theoretical concepts used in the thesis follows in the relevant papers that are located in the remaining chapters.

Data Collection

The research methods selected to inform a study should align with both the research question and the ontological and epistemological assumptions behind the study. Qualitative researchers collect data through four primary methods: participation in a setting, observation, interviewing and document review (K. Marshall & Rossman, 1995). Data for the thesis was collected through document analysis (Cresswell, 1994) and interviews. In the following pages I will describe these methods and justify their selection.

Document analysis. The official documents of the BPE programme represent data that have been compiled with thought and attention (Cresswell, 1994). Documents represent ideas and taken-for-granted principles that are produced within the constraints of particular, social, historical or administrative structures (K. MacDonald & Tipton, 1996). Punch (2005) suggested that understanding the full meaning of documents required an understanding of the social context in which they were produced. With this in mind, Chapter 2 has provided a detailed overview of the context in which the BPE documents were constructed and operationalised.

The relevant BPE documents examined in this study include: programme accreditation documents, student handbooks, and course outlines. The purpose of examining these documents was to establish the espoused dominant programme discourse. Scott (1990) suggested examining both the *authorship* and the *access* of documents. These issues are relevant to this study in relation to the consistency in thinking between those who wrote the documents and those who enact the BPE programme. Issues of authorship include the

discrepancy between those who developed the courses and programme and those who deliver the courses within the programme. Issues of access to programme documents may restrict new BPE teacher educators from understanding broader programme discourses.

Interviews. Interviewing is the most common form of data collection in qualitative research (Lichtman, 2006). Despite the existence of an extensive literature base on interviewing, there is limited consensus on how to conduct an interview. Berg (2004) suggested that interviewing was an art that required ongoing reflexivity, rather than a technical skill that could be rote learned and memorised. Like any method used in research, interviews have strengths and limitations. One of the limitations with interviews is that they do not always give direct access to experiences as these experiences are conveyed through the filtered views of the interviewees (Creswell, 1994). The interview is taken as a means of access to what lies beneath it, such as beliefs, attitudes and opinions (S. Wilkinson, 2004). Conversely, one of the strengths of interviews is in providing access to “people’s perceptions, meanings, definitions of situations and constructions of reality” (Punch, 2014, p. 144). Through interviews, participants are able articulate how they understand or interpret a social situation, giving insight into the meaning they attach to the experience (S. J. Taylor & Bogdan, 1984). This study is based on the assumption that “the respondent is at least an adequate reporter of his or her attitudes, beliefs and subjective state” (Ackroyd & Hughes, 1992, p. 103).

Patton (1990) identified three categories of interviews: informal conversational interviews; a general interview guide approach; and a standardised open-ended interview. Similarly, Fontana and Frey (2000) classify interviews as structured, semi-structured and unstructured. They suggest that these classifications apply both to individual and group interviews. All interviews conducted in this study were semi-structured interviews. The rationale for using semi-structured interviews was Ackroyd and Hughes’ (1992) suggestion

that they encompass the advantages of the unstructured interview, that is the flexibility to ask probing questions that lead to greater depth of data, while remaining a structure that focuses the interview on the relevant research questions.

Both focus group interviews and individual interviews were used to collect data. Interview questions were piloted with a cohort of BPE students not involved in the proposed study to both ensure that questions were appropriate and meaningful and to make certain that they provided data that were appropriate to the aims of the study. Additionally, this gave me an opportunity to practise and develop my own interview skills as a researcher. One pilot focus group interview and two individual semi-structured interviews were conducted. Subsequent changes to questions were made before interviews for the thesis commenced.

All interviews were completed at the university. They were audio taped and transcribed. Transcripts of all semi-structured interviews were returned to participants. Participants were given the opportunity to remove data from the transcripts if they did not wish it to be used in this study. Only one transcript was returned with only minor clarifications.

Focus group interviews. The purpose of focus group interviews is to gather information from participants on a topic of interest (Lichtman, 2006). Focus group interviews are informal, small group discussions, focused around a particular topic (S. Wilkinson, 2004). In focus group interviews the facilitator acts as a moderator for the group, posing the questions, establishing rapport, being sensitive to non-verbal cues and keeping the discussion flowing (S. Wilkinson, 2004). In addition, focus group interviews require the moderator to actively manage people to enable all group members to participate.

Lichtman (2006) suggested that focus group interviews stimulated participants to think of experiences and examples that might not have emerged during individual interviews as they allowed time for participants to provide considered responses. Wilkinson (2004)

concluded, stating, “in the context of agreement and support, one or more focus group members may enthusiastically extend, elaborate or embroider an initially sketchy account” (p. 180). Frith (2000) suggested that focus groups are suited to exploring sensitive topics as the group context may actually help facilitate disclosure as the ‘solidarity’ amongst friends appeared to decrease their discomfort. The reduction in control that the researcher has over the conversation is thought to draw attention to unnoticed phenomena as the group participants discussion flushes out and develops themes most important to them (Cooper, Diamond, & High, 1993).

I initiated the data-collecting process with focus group interviews with the BPE students in their final year of the BPE programme. The purpose of the focus group interviews was to provide initial insight into how students ‘read’ the courses within the context of the BPE programme, with plans to follow up on initial themes in the subsequent individual interviews. Heeding the advice of Berg (2004), the interview guide (Appendix 4) consisted of introductions, an outline of the general rules for the interview, and a series of open questions. During the focus group interviews students were given a handout with a list of recognised critical approaches in ITE (Appendix 9) to try and help them recall some of the critical pedagogies that they may have encountered in the BPE programme. Following the first interview, questions were further refined. Detailed probing questions that were not on the interview schedule were added when appropriate. This is consistent with qualitative research described by Cresswell (2003) as emergent rather than tightly prefigured, involving “questions that may change and be refined as the inquirer learns what to ask and to whom it should be asked” (p. 181).

On reflection, Krueger’s (2000) suggestion that focus groups be kept to no more than seven should have been given more regard. The initial focus group consisted of eight students. This interview was stopped after 60 minutes without completing the full schedule of

questions. The interview schedule was completed with follow-up focus group interviews in two smaller groups of four students. The subsequent cohort of 11 students was divided into two focus groups of five and six respectively. Each of these interviews lasted approximately 90 minutes. This allowed me to complete the schedule of questions and ensure that all voices within the smaller groups were heard.

Individual semi-structured interview. In this study, interview responses were not treated as direct access to experiences but instead as actively constructed narratives (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995) filtered through the views of the participants (Cresswell, 2003). Fontana and Frey (2000) proposed that while structured interviews often elicit rational responses, semi-structured or unstructured interviews were more suited to assessing the emotional dimension, a dimension that is strongly linked to both the development of beliefs (Abelson, 1979; Nespor, 1987) and the impact of beliefs on teaching (Ernest, 1989).

The initial semi-structured interviews with students were used to clarify and expand on the ideas they communicated during focus group interviews providing rich “context bound” information (Cresswell, 1994, p. 6). The themes generated from the focus group interviews informed the subsequent line of questioning. This is reflected in the interview guide (Appendix 5) whereby the gaps allowed for individualised questions.

The second semi-structured interview (Appendix 6) focused on student life histories^{xxix}. Reconciling life histories represents “an attempt to define the growth of a person in a cultural milieu and to make theoretical sense of it” (K. Marshall & Rossman, 1995, p. 88). Taylor and Bogdan (1984) describe life histories as “the important events and experiences in a person’s life” (p. 143). Life histories help to gain a picture of how people construct meaning from their experiences. They highlight the social, cultural, economic and historical forces that ‘frame’ individual lives (Brown, 1999). Life histories not only represent the memories of an individual, but they also serve to produce identity (Tierney, 2000).

Similarly, Nespor (1987) proposed that beliefs, strongly influenced by particular life episodes or events, later frame how individuals comprehend the world. The significance of this for ITE comes from research that indicates that the beliefs of pre-service teachers impact on what they learn during TE (Lortie, 1975; Pohan, 1996; Richardson, 1996, 2003; Tsangaridou, 2006). Pierre Bourdieu's concept of the habitus discussed earlier in this chapter is closely linked to the life experiences of students.

Cognisant with the literature that demonstrates the significance of student life histories, I used the second interview to explore the biographies of the BPE students. These interviews were used to try and understand how life histories influenced students 'reading' of the BPE, with a specific focus on their engagement with critical pedagogy. The intention of exploring life histories was not to identify the nature of the students in the programme, rather to provide data that may offer some explanation as to how individual students 'read' courses within the BPE. While life history research and biographical research exist as independent methods (Lichtman, 2006), I explored life histories through semi-structured interviews. A generic interview guide that represents initial questions is attached (see Appendix 6)^{xxx}.

Individual semi-structured interviews were also used to gather data from the BPE teacher educators (Appendix 7). These interviews provided insight into the meaning they gave to their practice (K. Marshall & Rossman, 1995). The purpose of the interviews was to gather biographical information regarding their backgrounds in teacher education, focusing particularly on their experiences teaching, lecturing and researching. Secondly, the interviews were used to gain their perspectives on their understanding of critical pedagogy and descriptions of how a socially critical pedagogy was enacted in the courses they were teaching (Table 2.1).

Data Analysis

Data for this thesis included 27 course outlines, six focus group interview transcripts and 43 semi-structured interview transcripts. Like many researchers, the fascination with the interview process and initial reading of transcripts was soon overwhelmed by concerns about, ‘what do I do with it now?’ In this section I will answer this question by describing the data analysis procedures that I followed. The rich descriptions in this chapter will inevitably incur some repetition in the published and submitted papers in the subsequent chapters. The decision to maintain this section is based on the brevity of data analysis descriptions that, while deemed appropriate for peer-reviewed publications, are inadequate in a doctoral thesis.

The data for this study were divided in three distinct sets. The programme documents, the official discourse of the BPE programme were analysed separately from the interview data. The interview data were further divided into data from interviews with students and a separate data set from the BPE teacher educators. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; Gee, 1999) was used to analyse programme and course documents. CDA afforded a more nuanced microanalysis of the language used in the programme and course documents. The analysis of both interview data sets was completed through a five-stage process of thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). While the description that follows suggests a linear process, in reality, analysis was iterative and inductive.

Critical discourse analysis. To understand CDA requires distillation of its component parts. The usage of ‘critical’ and ‘discourse’ in everyday nomenclature do not serve to articulate what CDA is, what it endeavours to do, and how CDA is used in research.

In practice there is only limited agreement on what ‘discourse is’. Discourse is more than text or written words. Whereas a ‘text’ or ‘text’ refers to an oral utterance or a written document, discourse is “structured forms of knowledge” (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 6).

Sparkes (1990) described discourse as regular, reoccurring patterns of language that shape and reflect the users' thinking and actions. Van Dijk (2009) offered a broader description when he suggested that, in addition to words, actions, social interactions, and practices all represent constituent parts of discourse.

Constructivist ontology suggests that individuals make their own sense of the world, sense that is constituted "as people talk about it, write about it and argue it" (Barker & Rossi, 2011, p. 143). The words we write serve to construct reality, through the meaning, value, relations and politics that we privilege (Gee, 1999). Fairclough (2011) suggested that language works at many levels, shaping both understanding and actions. Language simultaneously reflects and constructs the situation or context within which it is used (Gee, 1999). The BPE programme and course documents are examples of written texts that were written by a specific group for a specific purpose, representing the values and ideals that a small group of teacher educators considered to be important at one point in time. The documents may simultaneously reflect the values and beliefs of the authors while serving to influence the thinking and actions of current teacher educators in the BPE programme.

Gee, Michaels, and O'Connor (1992) suggest three principles that inform all studies of discourse. The first principle is that discourse is rule-governed and internally structured. Secondly, discourse is produced by speakers and writers who are situated in a "sociohistorical matrix whose cultural, political, economic, social and personal realities shape the discourse" (Gee et al., 1992, p. 221). Thirdly, while discourse is governed and shaped by social factors, it also constitutes human experience (Punch, 2005).

When analysing speech or writing, attention should be paid to more than just content. Features of language include the range of terms and vocabulary, grammatical features and specific metaphors (Barker & Rossi, 2011). Discourse analysis (DA) involves "asking questions about how language, at any given time and place, is used to construe the aspects of

the situation network as realised at that time and place and how the aspects of that situation network simultaneously give meaning to the language” (Gee, 1999, p. 92). DA is based on the details of speech or writing that are deemed relevant to a situation and that are relevant to the argument the analysis is trying to make (Gee, 1999).

DA helps to “explain how language works the way it does when it is put into action” (Gee, 1999, p. 8), and helps us to understand how language is recruited and used to create identity and support specific social activities. Gee (2011) promotes an analysis that focuses on the “utterance type meaning task” (p. 24), examining the relationship between function and form in language that provides a general meaning, and the “situated meaning task” (p. 24), a task that investigates the meaning of language in a specific context.

CDA aligns itself with the aims of all critical social research, that is, to address injustice and inequality by “analysing their sources and causes and trying to overcome them” (Fairclough, 2009, p. 163). CDA offers tools to help critical researchers demystify ideologies and power (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). With its historical roots in the analysis of language used in public speeches and political platforms (Patel Stevens, 2011), CDA starts with the assumption that all language use is political. CDA adds a third step to the analysis of discourse (beyond utterance meaning and situated meaning), exposing implications of language in terms of power and the distribution of social goods (Gee, 2011). CDA aims to explore the relationships between texts and discursive events located in a wider social, cultural structures and processes (Fairclough, 1995). CDA is not a unified body of theory, method and practice (Punch, 2005). CDA has been described as an “eclectic research strategy ... long on theory and contentious on process” (Rossi et al., 2009, p. 77).

DA and CDA have not been used extensively for research in PE, with their limited use characterised by significant methodological variety (Barker & Rossi, 2011). Examples of DA in physical education include analysis of gendered discourse in physical education

lessons (Wright & King, 1990), relationships between power and knowledge (Wright, 2004c), understanding teachers and their work (Barker & Rossi, 2011), an analysis of physical education curriculum materials (Rossi et al., 2009) and an examination of how race is constructed in PE curriculum policy (Dowling & Flintoff, 2015)

Rossi et al.'s (2009) critical discourse analysis of the Queensland HPE syllabus provided a reminder that many documents are produced through a number of processes that are relevant to the current study. Issues of power must be considered as texts are rarely written by a single person, instead they are negotiated, representing sites of competing discourses and ideologies (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Similarly, the BPE documents analysed in this study are not immune to competing interests. In this study I have used CDA to both reveal consistencies and contradictions (Jager & Maier, 2009) within and between the discourses of BPE programme and course documents.

Thematic analysis. In 1990 Tesch identified 26 approaches to the analysis of qualitative data highlighting the point that there is no single right way to do qualitative data analysis. For the purpose of analysing the interview data in this thesis, I elected to use thematic analysis. In this section I will explain the process I used and justify my selection of this method of analysis.

Thematic analysis is a widely used qualitative analytic method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns within data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). While a definition of thematic analysis is easy to elucidate, there is no clear agreement about how you go about doing it (Braun & Clarke, 2006). There is general agreement that the goal of analysing data is to arrive at common themes (Lichtman, 2006). The production of categories and themes is described in some texts as 'emerging' from the data (Lichtman, 2006; Patton, 1990), while others suggest that themes are abstract, often fuzzy constructs (G. Ryan & Bernard, 2000).

Ultimately, themes are determined by a researcher's judgement. The theme captures something important about the data in relation to the research question, representing some form of patterned response. Braun and Clarke (2006) suggest that the 'keyness' of a theme is not necessarily based on quantifiable measures, but on whether it captures something important. Punch (2005) reminds us that, regardless of the method of data analysis, a systematic, disciplined and transparent process is needed if a reader is to have confidence in the findings that are put forward. In keeping with that recommendation I have provided a detailed account of how I have used thematic analysis in this thesis.

While I have elected to use thematic analysis for all interview data I remind readers that this is a critical study where analysis moves beyond interpretation to analysis through sociological lenses. Thematic analysis has been used exclusively for interview data yet different critical theories and concepts have been used to analyse different data sets. The relevant concepts will be described in detail in each of the subsequent peer-reviewed papers.

Inductive thematic analysis. Analysis is described as a recursive process that involves movement back and forth throughout the phases (Braun & Clarke, 2006) as the researcher must be open to contrary explanation, and new and changing themes (Cresswell, 1994). Themes generated for the thesis from interview data were identified through analytical induction, "a systematic examination of similarities between cases to develop concepts and ideas" (Punch, 2014, p. 170) (Punch, 2005, p. 196). Induction refers to the type of analysis that begins with particular observations that lead to generalisations (G. Marshall, 1998). Through an inductive approach the researcher analyses the data to build theories and concepts (Cresswell, 1994) where the themes identified are strongly linked to the data themselves (Patton, 1990). Marshall and Rossman (1995) described this phase of data analysis as "the most difficult, complex, ambiguous, creative and fun" (p. 114).

Thematic analysis occurs at the latent rather than the semantic level. Braun and Clarke (2006) differentiate between the two levels, describing semantic as the “explicit or surface meanings” (p. 84) while the latent level is where meaning is interpreted as the investigation starts to identify some of the underlying ideas or assumptions that inform participant responses. As stated earlier, this thesis moves beyond the interpretive, beyond description, as I use relevant social concepts to understand and explain how staff and students read the PETE programme and courses rather than describing their experiences in an espoused socially critical PETE programme.

Braun and Clarke (2006) describe six distinct phases of thematic analysis. The first five of these were used in this study. The first phase involved familiarisation with the data. The familiarisation process started through repeated active reading of the data. Transcripts were read while listening to the audio recordings of the interviews. Riessman (1993) suggested that hearing the voices through directly accessing interviews allows the researcher to hear subtle changes in voice, pauses and inflections in voice, features that are not discernible when presented exclusively as text. During this process, I made corrections to the transcriptions especially where the transcriber was unfamiliar with the subject-specific language.

The second phase, initial coding, occurred almost concurrently. Punch (2014) described codes as tags, names or labels that attach meaning to pieces of data. Initial coding is the first part of the analysis which involves a reduction of the data (G. Ryan & Bernard, 2000) into manageable pieces. The data were analysed as they were gathered (Silverman, 2003), sorted and coded with data taken apart and put back together through what Tesch (1990) called decontextualizing and recontextualising. The codes emerged through reading and thinking about the data, through a process of “sifting and sorting” (Lichtman, 2006, p. 164), changing codes, adding and subtracting codes until theoretical saturation was reached

(Glaser, 1978). In this study, initial coding involved notes and comments directly written in the right-hand column of the interview transcripts. While initially I explored and experimented with the use of NVIVO[®] as a tool for analysis, eventually I withdrew from qualitative analysis software and continued with manual coding.

Advanced coding operates at higher levels of abstraction. While the initial descriptive coding was useful for summarising segments of data, the process of advanced coding began a search for inference. Inferential coding focussed on looking for patterns, pulling data into smaller, often more abstract and meaningful units. As data from interviews were collected over an 18-month period, these codes were revisited and changed as I read new transcripts and began a cyclical process of advanced coding.

The third and fourth phases involve searching for, and reviewing, themes. Themes represent patterns across data sets that identify what the data means. A visual representation using theme maps (Braun & Clarke, 2006) was used to elucidate themes. Heeding Marshall and Rossman's (1995) advice, as categories and patterns became apparent I tested them through the critical act of challenging the patterns and looking for alternate or plausible explanations. Further analysis or checking from the fresh eyes of colleagues and supervisors was used to scrutinise and challenge findings.

The fifth phase involved defining and naming themes, determining the 'essence' of each theme (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Conducting this final layer analysis involved drawing on theoretical concepts that could contribute to understanding and explaining the data. While this thesis was always positioned as a critical project, this represented my own emancipatory interests. I began the thesis without a theoretical stake in the ground. The conceptual frameworks for this thesis involving concepts from Habermas, Freire and Bourdieu were not consolidated until well into the latter stages of data analysis.

In this research project the process described above occurred separately across two data sets. The interview data from the PETE staff were analysed separately from the interviews of PETE students.

Research Participants

This study involved interviews with six physical education teacher educators and nineteen PETE students. The participants were selected through purposive sampling (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000) where the researcher seeks out “groups, setting and individuals where and for whom the processes being studied are most likely to occur” (p. 370). Purposive sampling uses the judgment of an expert in selecting cases with a specific purpose in mind (Neuman, 2003), placing greater emphasis on a small body of empirical materials (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 370). The intention is to purposely select informants who will best answer the research question (Cresswell, 1994). The potential participants were the physical education teacher educators and PETE students at the university where the research took place.

PETE teacher educator participants. Potential staff participants were limited to PETEs who had taught at least two courses in the BPE programme in the past year. Three male and three female PETE staff agreed to be interviewed for this study. To protect the anonymity of the institution and the participants, pseudonyms that do not indicate gender have been used. The pronouns ‘s/he’ and ‘hir’ (Spade, 2003) have been used in reference to all PETEs regardless of gender.

Terry is the longest-serving BPE teacher educator with more than four decades teaching in the institution. S/he teaches courses in aquatics education and the biophysical foundations of physical education. Terry is a former secondary school PE teacher. Toni is a long-serving BPE lecturer who became a teacher educator after nearly two decades of teaching secondary school physical education. S/he currently teaches outdoor education, PE pedagogy, creative movement and *te ao kori*. Jamie has taught in the BPE programme for

more than 20 years. In hir university profile page s/he describes hir teaching focus as PE curriculum and pedagogy. Jamie is a former secondary school PE teacher. Jean has taught across a number of ITE programmes in hir time at the university. S/he currently teaches health education within the BPE programme. Jean is a former primary school teacher and deputy principal. Sam teaches across four ITE programmes at the university. S/he has been teaching within the BPE programme since 2009. Hir current teaching within the BPE includes outdoor education, coaching and PE practicals. Sam has taught in both primary and secondary schools in New Zealand. Michael has lectured in tertiary education for 16 years. S/he has taught in the BPE programme since 2011. Hir teaching and research focus on the sociology of sport and physical education. Michael is a former secondary school PE teacher.

Four of the six teacher educators had been teaching within the BPE programme for more than 20 years and had been involved in either the initial programme development in 1996 or the redevelopment in 2005. Only two (Sam and Michael) had not been involved in either of the two phases of degree development.

BPE student participants. Potential student participants were restricted to students in their fourth and final year of full-time study in the BPE programme at the Te Ika a Maui University. I had planned on accepting a sample of 16 students with an even mix of male and female students. I was also keen to ensure that there were participants that represented the three major ethnic groups represented in the programme, New Zealand European, Māori and Pacifika students^{xxxi}.

Students were approached by teacher educators within the BPE programme. Students who showed an interest in being involved were given a participant information sheet (PIS) and a consent form (CF) that included my contact details. Twenty-three students replied, of whom four were either unable to commit to the time or were not eligible based on the sampling criteria. The 19 students who participated ranged in age from 21 to 41. There were

10 male and nine female students. Twelve of the 19 students were European. Three students identified strongly as Samoan, three as Māori, while one student identified as Samoan, Māori and European. Pseudonyms have been used to protect the identity of the 19 students in the study.

Table 4.1

Student Participants

Male Participants			Female Participants		
Pseudonym	Age	Self-Identified Ethnicity	Pseudonym	Age	Self-Identified Ethnicity
Liam	25	European	Brenda	22	Māori
Jamie	22	Samoan / Māori/ European	Margaret	21	European
George	21	European	Holly	22	Māori
Richard	21	European	Amber	22	Samoan
Xavier	21	European	Wendy	22	European
Felix	21	European	Kerry	36	Māori
Shane	41	European	Gail	32	European
William	23	European	Jess	22	European
Dillon	39	European	Tash	23	Samoan
Steven	32	Samoan			

Trustworthiness

Many qualitative researchers argue that the concepts of validity and reliability are not useful in qualitative research, preferring to use the notion of trustworthiness that is addressed through dependability, confirmability and credibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Cresswell (1998) recommended that qualitative researchers do at least two of the following: triangulation, peer review or debriefing, negative case analysis, clarifying

researcher bias, member checks, rich thick descriptions, external audits. Four of these processes were used in this research.

Triangulation in qualitative research involves using multiple data sources to examine the same phenomenon (Denzin, 1970). In this study, triangulation occurs through collection of data from documents and interviews with PETE teacher educators and students. In a thesis that seeks to understand how students 'read' the programme, the additional perspectives on the nature of the programme and what is done in course-work in the name of critical pedagogy in the programme, helps to supplement the limitations of any one perspective.

Peer debriefing is a second strategy used in this study to negate any unconscious researcher bias. Peer reviewing involves using a peer who reviews and asks questions about a qualitative study (Cresswell, 2003). In this study I engaged in ongoing peer debriefing with colleagues. This process served to challenge and critique the research design, the development of the interview questions and my interpretation of the data.

Member checking is the practice of checking your analysis with your participants. Lincoln and Guba (1985) proposed that member checking is a credibility check that aims to determine if the results are credible and consistent with those of the participants. Participants were informed in the PIS that all transcripts were to be returned for feedback and clarification. Three students elected to take this opportunity although the corrections were very minor and did not represent a retraction or change in response. Furthermore, PETE teacher educators who participated in this study were sent an initial analysis of their interview data for comment and clarification.

The trustworthiness of this study comes from the rich, thick descriptions (Cresswell, 1998) that allow the reader to make decisions regarding transferability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Consistent with an interpretive research, no attempt has been made to generalise the findings of this study although I have attempted to include "the thick description necessary to

enable someone interested in making a transfer to reach a conclusion” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 316). As with other studies within single institutions, generalisation beyond the context lies in the interpretation of the reader who has “the responsibility to determine what explanatory power the study has within their local context” (Borko, Liston, & Whitcomb, 2007). While the findings of one study are difficult to compare with another as the time, place and participants all differ (Kirk, 2009; D. Macdonald & Brooker, 1999), I concur with Walker’s (1980) suggestion that “it is up to the reader to ask, what is there in this study that I can apply to my own situation?” (p. 34).

Ethical Issues

Ethical considerations are important in any social research as participants can be placed in potentially vulnerable positions. It is therefore the moral and professional obligation of the researcher to act in an ethical way (Neuman, 2003). Ethics approval for this research project was obtained from the participating university (Appendix 10). The approval covered the ethical issues of anonymity and confidentiality, informed consent, as well as power relationships. The approved ethics application stated that the name of the institution where the research took place and the participants in the research remain anonymous. Pseudonyms have been used for both the university and the study participants. Participant Information sheets (PISs) and Consent forms (CFs) cautioned that, even though participant and institution names would not be published, they may be identified due to the small sample size (Appendices 1 and 2).

Informed consent was gained from the Faculty Dean, Head of School, Bachelor of Physical Education programme leader before approaches were made to, and consent was gained from, the study participants (Appendices 1 and 2). Student consent was given voluntarily (Neuman, 2003) meaning that participants freely chose to take part in the study.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter I have outlined the methodological framework and the methods of data collection and data analysis that I have used in this project. I have argued that a critical interpretivist framework is suitable to answer research questions that explore how faculty and students' understanding of critical pedagogy and how students have 'read' a PETE programme underpinned by a critical perspective. As this project is a critical interpretation I have taken heed of the ontological consideration that I come with values and biases that impact on the project. Implicit in the term *critical* is the intention that this project is not simply to give an account of the findings, but it is based on values of equality and democracy whereby the project seeks to redress inequality (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007). The critical interpretation is informed by theoretical concepts from Habermas, Freire and Bourdieu. In this chapter I have explained these concepts and justified why they have been selected and what they offer as analytical tools.

This chapter has provided a detailed account of how data in the form of documents and interviews have been collected. A description of critical discourse analyses and thematic analysis clarifies how I have completed the analysis of the documents and the interview data.

Chapter 5, the first of three findings chapters that follow, focuses on exploring the extent to which critical pedagogy is embodied in the programme and course documents that inform the BPE programme. The body of the chapter is a single paper, '*In Search of a Critical Programme*' that has been submitted to a peer-reviewed academic journal for publication. As such, some of the methodological and theoretical concepts will be repeated.

CHAPTER 5:

What is a critical physical education teacher education programme?

Introduction

The research questions for this thesis focus both on how the BPE staff and students understand critical pedagogy, along with the students' reading of a socially critical PETE programme. Any attempt to engage with these questions is based on the premise that the students are engaged in learning through a critical initial teacher education programme.

In this chapter I explore the extent to which the claim that the BPE is a critical PETE programme can be justified. The data for this chapter comes from: the BPE programme accreditation guide (Te Ika a Maui College of Education, 1996; Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2005), the Te Ika a Maui university calendar (Te Ika a Maui University, 2010), and the BPE course booklets.

In the following paper, '*In Search of a Critical Pedagogy*', I use critical discourse analysis (Gee, 1999) to complete a finely nuanced analysis of aforementioned texts, seeking evidence of the espoused critical orientation.

In search of a critical pedagogy

Philpot, R. (under review).

In search of a critical pedagogy. *European Physical Education Review*.

Over the last two decades, as society has become more concerned about the steep growth in social inequity and the marginalisation of some sectors of society, teacher education literature has begun to focus on related issues of social justice. For more than 20 years, scholars such as Macedo (1994a) and Freire (1998b) have suggested that many prospective teachers hold uncritical views reflecting dominant ideologies about social order. In more recent times, Bartolome (2004) proposed that it is inevitable that educators who do not identify and interrogate negative and racist ideologies often work to reproduce the existing social order.

Much of the literature focused on issues of social justice in ITE has concluded that the predominantly white, middle-class students who are attracted to ITE programmes are insufficiently prepared to work with students from diverse backgrounds (McDonald, 2005; Mills, 2009; Sleeter, 1995; Zeichner, 1996). Recognising the importance of addressing the needs of diverse students, Cochrane-Smith (2003) and Zeichner (2005) claimed that ITE was both morally and ethically bound to do a better job of preparing teachers to meet the needs of *all* students.

Research in physical education teacher education (PETE) similarly reports that PETE students come with deeply entrenched views that privilege some and marginalise others. According to Hunter (2004), the privileged are most often white male students who come with a sporting habitus. Fernandez-Balboa and Muros (2006) add that many physical education (PE) teachers enact social norms that reinforce binary notions of masculinity and femininity which, in turn, serve to discriminate against certain individuals and groups within their classes. Curtner-Smith and Sofo (2004) concluded that PETE students pay “little attention to political, moral, ethical, or social issues related to their teaching” (p. 116). It is not surprising, therefore, that studies of PETE report few successes in shaking the deeply held beliefs and practices of PE teachers (Evans et al., 1996; Mordal-Moen & Green, 2012).

One of the responses to calls for ITE to address issues of social justice and equity, to better prepare teachers for the challenges of teaching in 21st century multi-cultural, technology-rich schools, is through critical ITE^{xxxii}. Critical ITE has evolved from critical social theories concerned with emancipation from social injustices. Bates (2013) suggests that the two most significant influences on critical ITE have been the approaches of the Frankfurt School and the Marxist liberation theories of Paulo Freire. Both traditions advocate for democratic schooling, critiquing power and knowledge relations and promoting student and teacher agency (Blackmore, 2013).

Tinning (2006) described a critical orientation^{xxxiii} as privileging critical inquiry, where course work investigates hidden messages of power and control aligned with technical teaching skills and traditional teaching methods. The purpose of critical ITE is to engage students in the process of identifying and interrogating their ideological perspectives so that they may become aware of the social forces that have shaped their own individual subjectivities. ITE should be deliberately designed to expose prospective teachers to a variety of ideological positions so that they can compare and contrast their ideologies with others and critically examine the biases they might hold (Bartolome, 2007).

A critical orientation to ITE is synonymous with ‘critical pedagogy,’ a term coined by Henry Giroux in 1983. While the term critical pedagogy suggests a unified movement, critical pedagogies (plural) may be a better term to recognise the diversity of practices (McArthur, 2010) that take place

in educational settings. There are distinct forms of critical pedagogies preceded by prefixes such as feminist, queer, race, or red (McArthur, 2010). These prefixes provide a focus on specific social justice agendas that are consistent with broader emancipatory pedagogies. I will use the plural, critical pedagogies, intentionally throughout this paper to encompass all emancipatory pedagogical practices, recognising that critical pedagogies are not single methods nor instructional models, rather they are practices based on principles of social justice and democratic education.

While ITE literature has reported on individual critical teacher education courses, there is a paucity of studies of coherent critical ITE programmes, where critical pedagogies are privileged across many courses. A coherent, critically oriented programme may provide teacher educators with greater opportunities to instill a critical perspective in ITE students. In this research gap lays the significance of this study.

The Bachelor of Physical Education Programme

This research project was an examination of a Bachelor of Physical Education (BPE) programmes at Te Ika a Maui University. The BPE programme is a four-year undergraduate PETE degree that espouses a critical orientation as part of the philosophic underpinning of the programme.

The BPE programme accreditation documents conceptualise physical education, “within a socially critical perspective where the work of the physical educator is related to the wider social and world scene and is concerned with how physical education makes for a better world” (Te Ika a Maui College of Education, 1996, p. 7; Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2005, p. 25). The stated aim of the BPE is to “promote reflective thought and reconstructive action (i.e., a critical pedagogy) which, by definition, entails the problematisation of both the task of teaching and the contexts in which it is embedded” (p. 12).

In this paper, I draw on evidence from the BPE programme accreditation documents, calendar descriptions, and course booklets to determine how the espoused critical orientation articulated in the accreditation documents is reflected in the 26 compulsory BPE courses.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

Societal concerns are the focus of CDA. The ‘critical’ in CDA foregrounds an interest in both demystifying ideologies and power (Wodak & Meyer, 2009) and has an emancipatory aim of addressing injustice and inequality (Fairclough, 2009). CDA practitioners start from an explicit ethical position where the intent of the research is to draw attention to social inequity and power imbalances. CDA is an interdisciplinary approach that can use a mixture of methodologies and social theories. Its aim is to disrupt discourse, challenge restrictive pedagogies and reveal how texts

operate in the construction of social practices (Rogers, Malancharuvil-Berkes, Mosley, Hui, & O'Garro Joseph, 2005).

Educational researchers have used CDA to study classroom discourse (Baxter, 2002; Griswold, 2007; Hinchman & Young, 2001; Rogers & Mosley, 2008), to analyse interviews with students, teachers and educational leaders (Allard & Santoro, 2008; Ayers, 2009; Llewellyn, 2009; Rymes, Cahnmann-Taylor, & Souto-Manning, 2008) and the analysis of educational documents (Ailwood & Lingard, 2001; Romanowski, 2014; M. Ryan & Bourke, 2013; S. Taylor, 2004; Thomas, 2002). (For a comprehensive overview of educational research using CDA, see Rogers et al., 2005.) DA and CDA have a modest presence in physical education and PETE literature with significant methodological differences between studies (Barker & Rossi, 2011).

Methodological Framework

As CDA is more of an *approach* to analysis than a succinct method, it is important to select and describe the framework used in this paper. In what follows, I present a modification of Fairclough's (2001) three-step analytical framework that was developed and used previously by Rossi et al., (2009) to examine PE curriculum documents.

Fairclough (2001) proposed that identification and description of the social problem to be investigated (see Table 5.1) is the first stage of analysis. In this study, the concern (the social problem) is that PE marginalises students who do not fit within the hegemonic norms of traditional PE, making both friends and enemies of students (Tinning, 2000). The adoption of critical pedagogies in physical education is seen as a way to make physical education more relevant, meaningful and democratic.

Table 5.1

Analytical Framework

Stage	Description
1. Focus on a social problem in its semiotic aspect	The marginalisation of students who do not fit within the hegemonic norms of traditional physical education. Overcoming the neo-liberal ideology.
2. Linguistic/semiotic analysis	Linguistic analysis of the modality and mood created by the verbs and the objects of the verbs in the calendar description and learning outcomes of courses.
3. Critical reflection on the analysis	Habermas' (1972) theory of knowledge constitutive interests (KCI) is used in the analysis of course content and assessment focusing on the representation of emancipatory interests in the course documents.

Source: Rossi et al., 2009

The second stage in Fairclough's framework is an analysis of text^{xxxiv}. Barker and Rossi (2011) highlight the need to focus on features of language such as the range of terms, vocabulary, grammatical features, and specific metaphors. Following the advice of Van Dijk (2001) that a complete analysis of a text is impossible, I have elected to start with a linguistic analysis of the text in the course calendar descriptions^{xxxv} (Te Ika a Maui University, 2010), and the course learning outcomes (LOs) in the course booklets^{xxxvi}. These sections of the documents have been selected as they represent the interests of more than the individual lecturers who teach their own courses. The course descriptions and learning outcomes were created collectively by members of the BPE teaching staff (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2005) and approved for consumption by a university academic programme committee.

Similar to Rossi et al. (2009), I have focussed on analysing the *processes* (the types of verbs) and the *mood and the modality* of the document (see Table 5.1). *Mood* refers to the certainty or lack of certainty conveyed through the text. Rogers et al. (2005) suggested looking at sentences to see if they reflect questions, statements, or declarations. Modality is the degree of *assertiveness* in the text (Rogers et al., 2005).

A critical reflection on the analysis completes the process. I will move from micro-analysis of text to an understanding of the text in its social, political, and historical context. I call on social theory at this stage. I have used Jurgen Habermas' (1972) theory of knowledge constitutive interest

(KCI) as a conceptual tool through which to examine the discourse in the BPE programme documents. In this third stage of analysis, I use KCI as a theoretical lens to examine lecture schedules, assessments, and course readings in order to explore the degree to which critical emancipatory pedagogies are privileged in the BPE programme.

Habermas' knowledge constitutive interest. Habermas (1972) argued that science offered only one form of knowledge, rather than being the litmus test by which all knowledge is measured. For Habermas, knowledge was always constituted from the needs of individuals that have been shaped by historical and social conditions. These 'interests' are shaped by our biographies and life experiences; often in ways that govern our self-image and our social expectations (Carr & Kemmis, 1986). Habermas proposed that all knowledge is based on three categories of human interest: toward technical control, toward practical intervention, and an interest in emancipatory ideals.

'Technical knowledge' is the interest in acquiring knowledge that will allow humans to control their environment (Habermas, 1972). This knowledge is founded in the sciences and is typically instrumental in function. In the field of education, this includes knowledge of instructional models for teaching strategies, of planning principles, and of assessment practices to assure reliability and validity.

The second category, 'practical knowledge', is social knowledge based on mutual understanding. Carr and Kemmis (1986) suggested that practical knowledge "generates knowledge in the form of interpretative judgement which can inform and guide practical judgement" (p. 135). Practical knowledge in teaching is thought to be learned through the thousands of hours spent teaching and interacting in a classroom (Berliner, 2004; Clandinin & Connelly, 1987; Elbaz, 1983). For teachers, practical knowledge informs the multiple decisions that are made in classrooms (Elbaz, 1983). In ITE, practicums^{xxxvii} provide experiences that start shaping the practical knowledge of training teachers.

'Emancipatory knowledge' privileges an interest in equity and social justice. It is gained through adopting a position by which one asks critical questions of both what is to be learned and how it will be taught. It is a form of self-knowledge that is gained through self-reflection. This knowledge allows for the reification of self-understanding, through challenging taken-for-granted ways of thinking and it attempts to "distil the historical processes which have caused subjective meanings to be historically distorted" (Carr & Kemmis, 1986, p. 137).

Emancipatory knowledge in schools serves to challenge any structures that oppress students. This may include oppression based on gender, religion, body shape, race, and sexual orientation. Emancipatory knowledge provides an orienting way of *thinking about* teaching (Tinning, 2002), rather than a *body of knowledge for teaching*.

The process of learning to teach combines the acquisition of research-based knowledge and experience-based knowledge (Kreber & Cranton, 2000). Initial teacher education can, and should, be a combination of technical, practical, and emancipatory knowledge learned through lecture, experience and reflection. More than 30 years ago Zeichner and Teitlebaum (1982) suggested that technical proficiency in teaching should be highly valued, but only for its ability to bring about socially just outcomes for all students, not as an end in itself.

Habermas' (1972) KCI theory has been used in a wide range of disciplines including education. In education, it has previously been used as part of a conceptual framework for examining the scholarship of teaching (Kreber & Cranton, 2000) and action research (Carr & Kemmis, 1986; Newton & Burgess, 2008; Tinning, 1992a). More recently, KCI has been used to analyse the new national teacher profession standards in Qatar (Romanowski, 2014).

The BPE programme documents examined in this study posit that the degree is underpinned by a socially critical orientation. This would suggest that emancipatory knowledge is privileged through the teaching programme.

Findings

Calendar description of BPE courses. The following statements are two examples of calendar descriptions for a first- and third-year course.

Introduces students to thinking critically about Health and Physical Education. Examines discourses about health and physical activity from historical and sociological perspectives. Introduces diversity as it relates to education opportunity in health and physical education. Addresses questions such as: How are notions about health and physical education constructed and reported? (Te Ika a Maui University, 2010, p. 508)

Examines physiological responses to physical work and the research evidence linking health and physical activity. Addresses questions such as: What is the nature of work? How do humans respond and adapt to work? What activities promote adaptation to physical work? What is the veracity of the evidence linking physical activity and health? (Te Ika a Maui University, 2010, p. 524)

The structure of the calendar descriptions of all BPE courses is similar. Transitive verbs such as: 'introduces', 'develops', 'critically examines', identify the content to be introduced or examined. These verb groups are followed by an indication of the *key questions* the course will address such as, "Examines discourses about health and physical activity from historical and sociological perspectives" (Te Ika a Maui University, 2010, p. 508)

The language used in the calendar descriptions privileges the examination and contestation of knowledge. The transitive verb, 'addresses,' presents the 'object' of the courses as being *questions* rather than knowledge that is certain and absolute. The mood of the calendar descriptions

is one of uncertainty, where knowledge of health, physical education, and teaching are not absolute; rather, knowledge is contestable and constructed within a set of power relations. In the first-year course, the suggestion is that there are different 'historical and sociological' perspectives. The use of the word, 'constructed', suggests a constructivist epistemology, whereby knowledge is socially constructed rather than out there to be discovered. This is consistent with the principles of critical pedagogy where the problematisation of knowledge construction is privileged and questions are asked of how the dominant ways of thinking about health and physical education have come to be.

Learning outcomes. Learning outcomes (LOs) describe what students will be able to do at the end of each course. Each of the processes or verbs listed above is preempted by the statement, "At the completion of the course, it is intended that the students will be able to....". The word 'will' is standardised across all learning outcomes. The use of 'will' as an auxiliary verb (that precedes the transitive verb) conveys a mood and modality of certainty.

The following table (Table 5.2) categorises the transitive verbs that are used in the learning outcomes. The choice of transitive verbs in the learning outcomes conveys a more fragmented and less consistent mood than the calendar descriptions.

Table 5.2

Transitive Verbs used in Learning Outcomes

58%	18%	24%
Demonstrate34	Examine5	Reflect 7
Explain8	Justify.....5	Critique..... 5
Apply4	Explore.....2	Critically examine 3
Collect2	Investigate2	Critically reflect 3
Identify2	Appraise and demonstrate.....1	Evaluate..... 3
Read2	Assess1	Collect and reflect 2
Understand2	Consider and demonstrate.....1	Analyse 1
Describe1	Create1	Consider 1
Behave1	Examine and interpret.....1	Appraise 1
Establish1		
Present1		
Practice1		
Structure1		
Articulate1		
Summarise1		

More than half (58%) of the transitive verbs are declarative in mood (such as ‘demonstrate’, ‘describe’, and ‘explain’). These verbs describe what it is that students will do and know at the end of a course, therefore constraining the actions of the PETE teacher educators to ensure that this happens. The modality of these statements is of certainty and necessity, compelling students to meet these outcomes and teacher educators to teach accordingly.

The verbs in the right column (Table 5.2) foreground contestable knowledge where ‘evaluation’, ‘critical reflection’, and ‘critique’ are required. The mood of these learning outcomes is of less certainty, where students are required to consider that the knowledge and skills that are outcomes of the course are contestable and contextually and historically located. Despite the certainty of the auxiliary verb, ‘will’, the modality of these statements is of possibility rather than

certainty. The transitive verb (e.g., consider, evaluate, reflect) empowers (although one could suggest *requires*) students to recognise knowledge as ‘socially constructed’ rather than ‘objective’.

Knowledge constitutive interests. The BPE course LOs examined in this study show evidence of technical, practical, and emancipatory knowledge interests (Habermas, 1972). Technical knowledge that is of instrumental value in the classroom is privileged in more than half of the learning outcomes (see Table 5.2). Technical interests are served when students are asked to ‘collect information’, ‘demonstrate’ stated skills and knowledge, and ‘apply’ their knowledge and skills. An example of a LO that reflects technical knowledge is: “Demonstrate understanding of the biomechanical basis of human movement” (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2011d). Practical knowledge is similarly evident in each year of the BPE courses. The degree provides practicums across the four years, where students work in schools, learning how to be a teacher from watching teachers, teaching experiences, and through feedback and discussions with teaching colleagues. Four course outlines describe microteaching experiences^{xxxviii} that further contribute to practical knowledge.

The BPE courses show evidence of emancipatory knowledge through learning outcomes that foreground critical reflection. Nearly a quarter (24%) of LOs asks students to do more than accept knowledge as taken for granted. This is reflected in the learning outcomes through the promotion of actions, such as ‘critically reflect’, ‘critically examine’, and ‘evaluate’ (see Table 5.2).

There is evidence of emancipatory knowledge across all four years of the BPE programme. The interest of teacher educators in privileging emancipatory knowledge is conveyed through the use of recognised critical practices, such as, reflecting on biographies (Hickey, 2001; Kirk, 1986), problematising knowledge through dialogue (Freire, 1970b; Giroux, 1997), power sharing through democratic classrooms (Fernandez-Balboa, 1995; D. Macdonald & Brooker, 1999), border crossing (Bartolome, 2004) challenging dominant discourses (McLaren, 2003), and introducing less-dominant forms of physical education such as creative movement, indigenous games, and outdoor education. Fifteen of the 26 compulsory course descriptions identify one of these critical pedagogies^{xxxix} or the teaching of critical pedagogy or critical theory in the teaching and assessment programme (see Table 5.3).

Table 5.3

BPE Courses with Critical Pedagogies

BPE Year 1	BPE Year 2	BPE Year 3	BPE Year 4
Course 1	Course 5	Course 10	Course 15
Power sharing through self-assessment opportunity	Border-crossing opportunities	Power sharing through 'choice' in assessment and self-assessment opportunity	Critical reflection (biographies) Identifying Inequity: (Discrimination through PE)
Courses 2 & 3	Course 6	Courses 11 & 12	The teaching of critical theory and critical pedagogy
Introduction of diverse / less dominant forms of physical education	Power sharing through 'choice' in assessment and self-assessment opportunity	Introduction of diverse /less dominant forms of physical education	
Course 4	Course 7	Course 13	
Challenging dominant discourses in PE and sport	Knowledge as a social construction	Critical reflection (beliefs and values)	
Critical reflection	Teaching of critical theory and critical pedagogy	The teaching of critical theory and critical pedagogy	
Identifying inequity			
Teaching of critical theory and critical pedagogy	Course 8	Course 14	
	Problematizing historical and cultural understandings of health	The teaching of critical theory and critical pedagogy	
	Course 9		
	Critical reflection: (biographies)		

In the interests of brevity, I have selected two courses to discuss in greater detail. These first-year and fourth-year courses appear to be positioned to disrupt the thinking of students through challenging dominant ideas about physical education and sport. The courses introduce less dominant, more culturally responsive forms of physical education, with a particular focus on the inclusion of Māori students.

Health and Physical Education in a diverse society (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2011e) is a first-year course that requires students to “reflect on the historical and sociological factors that shape health and physical education practices in schools...” and “examine and explain diverse socio-cultural constructions of physical education, physical activity and health...” (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2011e, p. 2) as two of the learning outcomes. The lecture schedule divides the course into three themes: ‘HPE, values, culture and identity’; ‘the need for critical pedagogy’; critical examination of sport culture, and ‘Health, Fitness, well-being: What are the connections?’ (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2011e). The course readings focus on gender (Brown, 2005; Denison, 1996; Parker, 1996; Pringle, 2001) identity (C. Bell, 1996; Tinning & McCuaig, 2006) and inequality (Grant & Pope, 2007; Howden-Chapman, 2005; Wright, 2004a), foreground emancipatory interests. Students complete two assignments as course work. The first is a personal narrative that ‘revolves around a personal sporting epiphany’ while the second assignment requires students to conduct a content analysis that ‘compares and contrast[s] the quantity and quality of coverage devoted to sportswomen and sportsmen’.

Curriculum Issues in Health and Physical Education (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2011b) is a fourth-year course in the BPE that articulates critical pedagogies that aim to problematise knowledge and challenge dominant discourses. Learning outcomes require students to “formulate personal meanings for health and physical education...” and “discuss current issues facing health and physical education teachers...” (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2011b, p. 2).

The three major themes in the course outline are: ‘Developing critical ways of being and thinking about curriculum issues in HPE’; ‘Exploring contemporary issues that impact on curriculum’; and ‘reflecting on your own practice and exploring possibilities for subversion/resistance’ (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2011b). The course readings include issues of racism and racialization (Azzarito & Harrison, 2008; Fitzpatrick, 2010), gender and sexuality (Zack, Mannheim, & Alfano, 2010), and obesity (Gard & Wright, 2005). Readings on critical approaches and critical pedagogies in HPE feature at the start and end of the course (Brookfield, 1995b; hooks, 2010; Oliver & Hamzeh, 2010; Wright, 2004b). The assignments in the course ask students to critically reflect on their own life histories and develop a personal philosophy of health education and physical

education. Students are required to 'chose a bold statement from their philosophy... and make your argument and justification ready for your class...' (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2011b). Students present their bold statement to the class and engage in debate.

Both of these courses strongly privilege emancipatory knowledge interests over technical and practical knowledge. Both ask critical questions of taken-for-granted knowledge, and require students to examine their own life histories and how their own values influence their thinking about teaching and HPE. There is evidence of course readings that question and challenge structures that may disadvantage groups in society.

Discussion

The purpose of this paper was to examine the evidence that supports the claim that a four-year PETE programme is underpinned by critical pedagogy. Critical discourse analysis using Habermas' concept of KCIs was used as part of the methodological framework in this study.

The analysis of the BPE course documents suggests that the programme caters to technical, practical, and emancipatory knowledge interests. As teaching strategies consistent with a critical perspective appear across multiple courses throughout the four years of the programme (see Table 5.3), there is evidence of a foregrounding of emancipatory knowledge across the BPE programme. The courses that privilege critical perspectives and emancipatory knowledge interests are taught by a number of different teacher educators. The course documents identify courses with explicit critical teaching strategies taught by seven different teacher educators. This supports the proposition that, rather than representing the sole critical perspective of one individual, a shared critical perspective may exist across multiple teacher educators in the BPE programme.

The accreditation documents and learning outcomes written by BPE teacher educators articulate the officially approved BPE programme. These official discourses are constructed *within* the constraints imposed by government and university-appointed authorities, to reflect the intent of the BPE programme. The accreditation documents and learning outcomes require the approval of the university's Faculty of Education programme committee, the National Qualifications Authority (NZQA) and the New Zealand Teachers Council. These texts represent sites of struggle with evidence of contrasting discourses and ideologies that are competing for dominance (Wodak, 2007). The accreditation documents and the LOs are negotiated texts that are constructed within a set of institutional and political power relations. As such, these documents on their own offer only a limited amount of insight into the perspectives of the teacher educators.

In contrast, course documents (lecture schedules, prescribed course readings, assessment tasks) provide fertile ground for reaffirming or challenging of 'official policy' (Penney, 2013). Most courses in the BPE are taught by only one or two PETEs, therefore, the teacher educators have more

autonomy in the construction of these texts. At this level, there is greater agency for the PETEs to introduce content that reflects their own interests and their own beliefs. It is less certain that a critical perspective that aligns with LOs will be explicit in course documents. It is significant therefore that espoused critical strategies and course content that introduces and examines critical theory and critical pedagogies feature prominently in 15 courses, taught by seven different teacher educators. This would suggest that a shared critical perspective exists amongst many BPE faculty, and gives rise to the possibility of a “coherency that offers maximal impact on teacher recruits” (Lawson, 1983, p. 10).

Given the uncertainty about the nature of a critical programme, and therefore the degree to which the BPE programme can claim to foreground emancipatory interests, it is prudent to reflect on any omissions or anything that has been overlooked. Missing in all but one of the course documents is language that foregrounds emancipatory *action*. Critical pedagogies move beyond analyses of society and involve social change. Given that the lack of social justice in physical education was the problem identified in this methodological framework for this study, these documents are devoid of statements that suggest social action. While it is unlikely that statements in course booklets such as ‘exploring possibilities for subversion/resistance’ (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2011b) would be present in the official discourse of calendar descriptions and LOs, ‘Evaluates and acts on...’ or ‘Critically examines and makes changes to..’ are absent yet coherent possible LOs.

The question of *how* the BPE teacher educators understand critical pedagogy is unanswered. A shared understanding of criticality is not clearly evident in the BPE course documents. For example, critical reflection is described in one course book as ‘reflecting on one’s own biography’ (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2011e), while in another course, reflecting on one’s teaching is ‘critical reflection’ (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2011c).

Finally, I need to reiterate the difference between what Gee (1999) calls ‘big D’ and ‘little d’ discourses. ‘Little d’ discourses are language-in-use. ‘Big D’ discourses combine words, actions, beliefs and values. An investigation of the ‘big D’ discourse (the actions) of the BPE programme is planned as part of a larger study, but it is beyond the scope of this paper. An examination of documents can only convey the ‘little d’ discourse, not the resulting actions or enacted discourse – the ‘big D’ discourse – that takes place in the BPE courses. The paucity of emancipatory action evident in the documents may belie subversive pedagogies taking place in course work.

The significance of the written discourse (the ‘little’ d) of the BPE documents resides in its consistency with the claim that the programme is underpinned by critical pedagogy. Many BPE

teacher educators promote critical pedagogies in their own courses. The illusion that the BPE programme enacts critical pedagogies as the 'big D' discourse warrants further investigation.

Chapter Summary

This chapter provides a launching pad for the rest of the thesis. The extent to which the BPE programme can call itself critical, the degree to which a critical perspective is enacted in courses, and the degree to which a shared understanding of critical pedagogy, remains open for debate. Understandably, a reader well versed in critical pedagogy may, based on their own experiences, offer suggestions as to what could be added. The claim in the BPE programme documents that the BPE degree is underpinned by a critical orientation is largely supported by the analysis in this chapter. The combination of officially sanctioned learning outcomes that foreground emancipatory interests, 'keystone' critical courses in the first and fourth year of the degree, course readings that support challenging structures that create inequity, and courses taught by seven different teacher educators that privilege critical perspectives suggest a programme coherency that is not evident in the literature.

The final research question in this thesis, exploring the BPE students' reading of these espoused critical pedagogies, requires further exploration and description of the practices within the BPE. The following chapter provides this detail. The two papers that follow in Chapter 6 provide further analysis of the enactment of critical perspectives in the BPE programme. The first paper, based on interviews with six BPE teacher educators helps to answer a question raised in this chapter, that is, what is the teacher educators' understanding of critical pedagogy. The second paper critiques the self-described Freirean pedagogy of one of the teacher educators. Interviews with 19 graduating BPE students and the academic writing of the teacher educator inform this paper. While the methodology differs from that used in the current chapter, these two papers help to further articulate the enactment of critical pedagogy in the BPE programme.

CHAPTER 6:

BPE Teacher Educators: Understanding and Enactment of Critical Pedagogy

Introduction

Chapter 6 articulates the understanding and enactment of critical pedagogy by the BPE teacher educators at Te Ika a Maui University. Building on Chapter 5, the findings show how the texts produced as BPE programme and course documents are put into action. This chapter provides examples of how individual understandings of critical pedagogy are translated into critical teaching strategies by the teacher educators. The chapter includes two papers that have been published in academic journals. The first paper, entitled '*Physical education initial teacher educators' expressions of critical pedagogy(ies): Coherency, complexity or confusion?*' explores the BPE teacher educators' understanding and espoused enactment of critical pedagogy in their own practice. That paper highlights how many of teacher educators have engaged with critical pedagogy over many years and have developed their own unique critical approaches to enacting critical pedagogy in PETE. The second paper, '*Shaking students' cages: A Freirean pedagogy that challenged PETE students' beliefs about physical education*', highlights how one of the teacher educators has developed their own approach described as Freirean pedagogy. This second paper uses data from both the teacher educator's own research and interviews with the students to describe both his practice and the sense that the students in this study have made of these practices.

Physical education initial teacher educators' expressions of critical pedagogy(ies):**Coherency, complexity or confusion?**

Philpot, R. A. (2015).

Physical education initial teacher educators' expressions of critical pedagogy(ies): Coherence, complexity or confusion, *European Physical Education Review*. 22(2), 260-275.

doi:10.1177/1356336X15603382

For more than 30 years, numerous voices in education including Paulo Freire (1970b) Henry Giroux (1981), and Michael Apple (1982) have been calling for education practices that include a focus on issues of equity and social justice. Critical pedagogy, a perspective on education informed by the critical theory of the Frankfurt School and the influential work of Paulo Freire, has provided a theoretical framework used by many critical scholars. These formative critical pedagogies sought to draw attention to inequity through a Marxist critique of capitalism, and to empower those who were marginalised by capitalism to overcome this form of oppression.

In the subsequent 30 years, voices for social justice have come from other critical theoretical frameworks that retain the emancipatory aims of critical pedagogy, but apply their critique to social structures beyond capitalist theory. Critiques that focus on discrimination based on race (Ladson-Billings, 1998), gender (hooks, 1984), sexual orientation (Butler, 1990), and religion (Rossatto, 2006) have broadened the vocabulary of criticality to include theoretical perspectives such as post-structuralism, post-modernism, post-colonial theory, and queer theory.

This evolution of critical pedagogy to critiques beyond capitalism has been received in different ways. Many of the aforementioned theoretical perspectives subscribe to being in the 'big tent' (Lather, 1998) of critical pedagogies. Lather (2001) argues that Marxist social theory ignores issues specific to anti-racist, feminist and post-colonial educational projects. She proposes that these projects are consistent with the central purpose of critical pedagogy, that is, using education to bring about a more socially just world. More recently, McLaren (2000) expressed a different perspective by suggesting that shifts away from its Marxist roots have diluted critical pedagogy. McLaren and Farahmandpur (2000) call for a shift back to class-based analysis, claiming that issues of cultural oppression are conflated by differences in class.

Sweet (1998) adds further complexity to critical pedagogy through using the term 'radical pedagogy'. While acknowledging that his definition does not enjoy universal agreement, he describes radical pedagogy as practices that "question the legitimacy of existing systems of hierarchy as related to race, gender, class, disability, sexual orientation, or other socially constructed divisions

between people” (Sweet, 1998, p. 101). Rather than linking the critique to class, Sweet (1998) suggests that radical pedagogues’ *practices* include sharing power with students, using non-traditional assessment methods, engaging in genuine dialogue rather than lecturing, and coupling learning with activism. This notion of critical pedagogy shifts the focus to *how* one seeks socially just and democratic educational practices rather than *for whom*.

While advocacy for critical pedagogy and education for social justice has grown exponentially through traditional and emerging theoretical frameworks such as feminist, post-colonial and queer theories, there is little research that aims to understand how educators conceptualise and practise critical pedagogy. Critical pedagogy is not a narrow set of prescriptive practices (Breunig, 2011); therefore it is important to understand what is done in educational settings in the name of critical pedagogy. This paper addresses this research gap and advances these issues through exploring the understanding and practices of critical pedagogy, of six initial teacher educators teaching in a four-year physical education teacher education (PETE) programme. The paper has two key aims. The first is to explore the teacher educators’ personal understanding of critical pedagogy. The second aim of the paper is to investigate their practices of critical pedagogies in PETE. Ultimately this research attends to a social justice agenda through sharing how teacher educators interpret and practise critical pedagogy.

Educators and Their Understanding of Critical Pedagogy

Previous research demonstrates that teacher educators have diverse understandings of critical pedagogy. Breunig’s (2011) study of 17 self-identified critical pedagogues teaching in ITE programmes in the US and Canada offers some insight into the varied understanding of the aims, purposes and practices of critical pedagogy. Breunig reports that there was limited consensus as to what a ‘self-identified critical pedagogue’ meant. For some participants it meant teaching *about* critical pedagogy, while for others it revolved around the *practice* of critical pedagogy in their classrooms. The 17 participants expressed significant differences as to whom they believed were the most influential critical theorists, and what they felt were the purposes of critical pedagogy. More than 36 ‘influential theorists’ were identified, with Freire, McLaren and Giroux the most frequently cited. The purposes of critical pedagogy were similarly varied, from purposes commonly linked to critical pedagogy such as social justice, democracy and social change, through to purposes that move away from social justice agendas such as constructivism and critical thinking (Breunig, 2011).

A cross-sectional study by Sahragard et al., (2014) of 20 Iranian school and university teachers of English as a first language (EFL) provides some salient examples of the challenges for critical pedagogues. The study showed that the EFL teachers linked critical pedagogy strongly to creative thinking, while they were less aware of issues of “educational justice” and “language and

ideology” (2014, p. 186). The authors reported that teachers with postgraduate degrees were more likely to be aware of the principles of critical pedagogy and “were much fonder of this pedagogy” (Sahragard et al., 2014, p. 187). However, the authors observed that teachers, who were able to articulate teaching practices consistent with social justice agendas, did not often use these in their teaching. Issues of limited class time, class size, an insufficient understanding of students’ backgrounds, and the constraints of a top-down educational system were identified as barriers to using critical approaches.

In the field of PETE, Muros-Ruiz and Fernandez-Balboa (2005) found similar inconsistencies in the understanding and practice of critical pedagogy. These authors report that, of the 17 participating teacher educators, all of whom volunteered for the study and claimed to practise a critical pedagogy, more than half did not understand the main principles of critical pedagogy. Moreover, many of the methods they used in their PETE were incongruent with these principles (Muros Ruiz & Fernandez-Balboa, 2005). This led the authors to suggest that the limited success of critical pedagogy in PETE may be due to an inadequate understanding by the teacher educators purporting to enact it. The authors summarised their study by suggesting that “not all that is called CP [critical pedagogy] is actually CP; and perhaps not everyone who calls him – or herself – a ‘critical pedagogue’ is so either” (Muros Ruiz & Fernandez-Balboa, 2005, p. 258).

These findings reinforce the suggestion that critical pedagogy may be challenging to understand. Without rich learning experiences, critical teaching in ITE may be reduced to creative or critical thinking, with no emphasis on issues of social justice.

Study Context

This study was located within a PETE programme at Te Ika a Maui University in New Zealand. The Bachelor of Physical Education (BPE) programme is a four-year, concurrent ITE programme where content, pedagogy, and practicums are embedded in all four years of the programme. The BPE programme is delivered on a small campus in a faculty of education that was previously designed as a college of education. Most of the courses in the BPE programme are taught by a group of 12 PETEs.

The BPE programme espouses to being underpinned by a critical orientation. The programme accreditation documents state that the aim of the programme is to: “promote reflective thought and reconstructive action (i.e. a critical pedagogy) which, by definition, entails the problematisation of both the task of teaching and the contexts in which it is embedded” (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2005, p. 12). This implies that critical pedagogies are represented across the programme rather than in a single course.

The goals of critical pedagogy are congruent with education policy in New Zealand where the valuing of diversity and challenging inequality are principles that are explicitly articulated in policy documents (Ministry of Education, 2007). The New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007) describes Health and Physical Education (HPE) as, “fostering critical thinking and action” (p. 23) with, “a sense of social justice” (p. 22) being an integral part of the attitudes and values at the heart of the learning area. Culpan and Bruce (2007) suggest that the New Zealand HPE curriculum provides a socio-critical perspective requiring pedagogy, “that is critical in nature and emancipatory in action” (p. 2).

Social justice features prominently in the academic writing of New Zealand PETEs. Recent examples of literature that foreground social justice issues include examinations of: race and culture (Burrows & McCormack, 2011; Fitzpatrick, 2013; Legge, 2010), critical reflection (Ovens & Tinning, 2009), critical pedagogy (Bruce, 2013; Culpan & Bruce, 2007; Philpot, 2015b), privatisation of physical education (Powell, 2014) and critical examinations of health education (Fitzpatrick & Tinning, 2014; Sinkinson, 2011).

Methodology

This is a critical interpretive study based on the epistemological and ontological assumptions of qualitative methodology. The study has been designed to explore teacher educators’ understanding and use of critical pedagogies in PETE. I have focussed on moving beyond being descriptive to a deeper understanding through a conceptual account of the data (Braun & Clarke, 2013).

Data for this study come from semi-structured interviews with six PETEs who teach HPE courses in the BPE. Given the small number of teacher educators in the group, the names and gender of the participants are protected through the use of pseudonyms and the non-gendered pronouns ‘s/he’ and ‘hir’. The teacher educators were selected through purposive sampling, where the intention is to select informants who can best answer the research questions (Cresswell, 1994). All participants were required to teach at least two courses within the BPE programme during the 2011 academic year.

All of the PETEs who participated in this study were former teachers in either primary or secondary schools in New Zealand. The years of experience teaching within the BPE ranged from three to more than 40 years. The three male and three female teacher educators represented a range of academic positions including a professional teaching fellow, senior lecturers, principal lecturers and an associate professor.

All interviews were audiotaped and transcribed by an approved transcriber for analysis. All transcriptions were returned to the research participants for member checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Data Analysis

Data were analysed using a six-step process of inductive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Thematic analysis is a systematic examination of similarities between cases to develop concepts and ideas (Punch, 2005). The first two phases of analysis involved familiarisation with the data and initial coding (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The process of data analysis began by listening to the interviews as I read through the transcriptions. The initial codes represented understandings and practices consistent with the espoused principles of critical pedagogy. Initial codes were written directly onto the right-hand column of the transcripts. The third phase of advanced coding involved copying statements from transcripts and mapping them into theme maps (Braun & Clarke, 2006) in a separate document. The initial themes experienced three differing outcomes: some themes disappeared, as they did not hold up to further scrutiny; some merged; and other themes remained.

The final stage of analysis involved drawing on theoretical concepts that helped to contribute to understanding and explaining the data. Consistent with a research project that examines critical pedagogies, the data analysis uses concepts from critical theory. The concepts used, which were not predetermined before the data analysis began, were: teaching for equity (Freire, 1970); social justice (Kincheloe, 2008a; Smyth, 2011); examining power (Apple, 1982; Giroux, 1981); democratic education (Fernandez-Balboa, 1995); and reflection (Smyth, 1989). Concepts became apparent during the process of coding. These concepts were based on my own grounding in critical theory and critical pedagogy which begins with the premise that all knowledge is value-laden, and secondly, that schools should be places that transform social inequalities. I was looking for practices consistent with these principles. Peer reviewing (Cresswell, 2003) with a colleague was used as a means of critiquing how the process of data analysis had led to the development of themes in this study.

Findings

The findings of this study are presented in two sections. The first focuses on the physical education teacher educators' (PETEs') understanding of critical pedagogy. The subsequent section conveys the PETEs' descriptions of their own teaching practices in the BPE programme.

Teacher educators understanding of critical pedagogy. As previously stated, this study was an exploration of the understanding and practice of critical pedagogy of six teacher educators in a four-year concurrent PETE programme. While the six teacher educators in this study did not claim to

be critical pedagogues, they all teach in a BPE programme that claims to be underpinned by critical pedagogy (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2005).

When asked directly ‘what is your understanding of critical pedagogy?’, the participants’ responses elicited a number of key concepts that appear regularly in most literature on critical pedagogy (see Table 6.1). The number of concepts discussed by each participant varied dramatically (from Jamie and Jean, who discussed five of the six concepts, through to Terry and Sam who mentioned one).

Table 6.1

PETE Teacher Educators’ Understanding of Critical Pedagogy

	Link to critical theory	Teaching to address inequity	Social justice Orientation	Examination of power	Democratic teaching	Reflection on teaching
Jamie	√		√	√	√	√
Jean	√	√	√	√		√
Michael	√	√	√			
Sam						√
Terry						√
Lee		√	√			

Critical pedagogy – Connected to critical theory. There is almost universal recognition amongst critical scholars that critical pedagogy can trace its theoretical roots back to the critical theorists of the Frankfurt School (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997). Three of the PETEs interviewed in this study reiterate the significance of critical theory as an underpinning for critical pedagogy.

Jamie recalled that critical pedagogy is strongly linked to both the Frankfurt School in Germany and the work of Paulo Freire in Brazil. S/he stated:

Critical theory emerged out of some locations where oppression was a big deal, and it was about improving the life chances of those people in those settings...whether it was in Brazil, whether it was the feminist movement, whether it was in Germany.

Michael made the connection between critical pedagogy and critical theory when s/he suggested, “I see the word critical as influenced by Marx...it’s not good enough just to know about

the world, you want to try and change the world". While Michael did not refer to critical theory directly, the connection with Marxist analysis is consistent with the critical theory of the Frankfurt School.

Jean described critical pedagogy as: "the type of analysis that will be occurring in learning based on critical theory and post-structural analysis". Jean differentiated between the Marxist analysis of the Frankfurt school and her own understanding and use of critical theory that moves beyond a Marxist critique of capitalism stating:

If you go back to something like critical theory, which is also called neo-Marxism sometimes, as I understand it Marxism was an analysis of economic systems, particularly capitalism, whereas critical theory is an analysis of social structures and very much who's got [a] position of power, who's got a position of advantage and who has not.

While Jamie and Jean acknowledge the historical importance of critical theory, it is clear that their understanding of critical pedagogy has evolved beyond the critical theory of the Frankfurt School. Jamie referred to feminism while Jean alluded to post-structural analysis. These statements provide a glimpse of how their understanding of critical pedagogy has broadened to the point where critical theory is not the only theoretical perspective that informs their current understanding of critical pedagogy.

Social justice orientation. Four of the teacher educators suggested that critical pedagogy has an explicit social justice agenda that involved addressing issues of inequality. Michael proposed that the purpose of critical pedagogy is "to help more broadly with issues of social injustice and equity..." Hir understanding of critical pedagogy foregrounds teaching *for* social justice rather than teaching *about* social justice issues. Michael stated that, "If you're adopting a critical pedagogy, you're accepting that there are these issues out there already and you want to teach in a manner that's going to have some impact on these issues." The emphasis on teaching to *change society* in the interests of social justice is an important distinction to make in comparison with teaching to learn about inequity and social justice.

In contrast, Lee suggested that critical pedagogy foregrounds social justice agendas as it helps students to "understand something like colonialism". While Lee's descriptions of hir *practices* in PETE suggest that s/he does take action to de-colonise students, hir description above could be interpreted as being limited to critique.

Jean did not use the words 'equity' or 'social justice' in the interview, however, s/he recognises critical pedagogy as an analysis of who is, and who is not, privileged by structures in society. Jean stated that critical pedagogies are, "not looking at individual circumstances ... you're looking at group circumstances". Jean proposed that critical pedagogues focus on examining how

equitable education is for all students and suggests asking, “who are the groups in society that are privileged by the way schools are structured? Who in society is privileged/disadvantaged by the way education systems are structured?”

Similar to the other three participants, Jamie asserted that social justice is at the heart of critical pedagogy, however, s/he questioned the relevance of traditional critical theories suggesting that s/he is, “quite drawn to other ways of theorising it”. Jamie described hir own teaching as a “sort of social justice approach”.

Reflection as a critical practice. ‘Reflection’ was a concept mentioned by four of the teacher educators. It is noticeable in the responses that there are different understandings of reflection. Two participants described reflection as a cognitive process consistent with critical thinking. In contrast, Lee and Jean suggested that reflection is a moral process where the reflection is on social justice agendas.

Sam mentioned the value of reflection repeatedly during hir interview. It appears that, for Sam, reflection is synonymous with thinking about, and reflecting on, one’s teaching. S/he foregrounds a strong humanistic perspective when s/he suggests, “with PE it’s all about the person, and the whole person, and it’s probably the curriculum area that is most situated to actually look at that, that whole person, the physical, the spiritual.” Sam advocated for reflective practices that have been described by Kemmis (1994) as ‘technical reflection’. As an example, Sam stated that, “I do the standard peer reflection, the self-reflection ... giving them the opportunity to offer up how they would do things differently... just reflecting on what they have learned.”

Terry also asserted that critical pedagogy involves reflection. S/he stated that critical pedagogy is:

...discursive, it’s reflexive. It requires the teacher participant to think about what they are doing and more importantly, why they are doing it... We cannot treat all students as the same, based on what they bring to the classroom in exactly the same way as we bring our own critical perspective to the classroom from our own previous perspectives and understanding.

Both Terry and Sam advocate for teachers who know and understand their students, who endeavour to cater to the educational needs of students of all abilities. Notwithstanding the value of this humanistic perspective, without foregrounding a social justice agenda it is not clear as to the basis on which the teaching is being judged. Without a clear social justice agenda that focuses on marginalised groups in society, it is difficult to ascertain how consistent this type of reflection is with the purposes of critical pedagogy.

In contrast, Lee subscribes to the ideal that teaching is based on values. S/he suggested that, “for me critical pedagogy is being able to look at what you’re doing and ask yourself, ‘is what I’m teaching worthwhile?’” Lee is alluding to the process of judging teaching based on someone’s values (what is worthwhile). What differentiates this from technical reflection is the proposition that reflection is based on the values of equity and social justice. Lee conveyed this when s/he stated that reflection involves “understanding issues of equity and inequality and being able to look at what you’re teaching as a way of trying to make a difference to those things”. Hir description of reflection included a focus on classroom practice, to recognise how their practice as teachers may privilege and benefit groups of students. Lee espoused reflective practices where PETE students are asked, ‘Have you considered gender? Have you looked at the equity issues that might be in your lesson? What are you doing culturally in your physical education classes?’

Jean foregrounded the importance of making students aware that their ideas and beliefs come from their own life experiences. Hir description resonates with Freire’s (1970b) concept of *conscientization*, a breaking of the metaphoric ‘shackles’ of understanding the world through dominant lenses that leads to the acceptance of the way things are, as inevitable facts of life. Jean proposed that hir critical pedagogy engages PETE students in reflecting on *why* they do things, challenging students to explore how their own social and historical realities may influence their beliefs. Jean suggested that:

...I want them to second think their own beliefs, their own values and to identify where their beliefs and attitudes have come from, so it’s an historical tracking really of why do I believe whatever it is I believe? Why do I believe that? So it’s not just about this is what I believe, it’s why do I believe that?

In contrast to the technical reflections of Terry and Sam, “that aims at problem solving within a social context” (Kemmis, 1994, p. 145), Lee and Jean advocate for critical reflection that focuses on questioning hegemonic assumptions and exploring how power frames educational practices (Brookfield, 1995a).

Critical pedagogy as an analysis of power. Two of the six teacher educators proposed that critical pedagogy focuses on the analysis of power. Jean suggested that:

It comes back to an analysis of power. Where does power lie? Who’s got the power? Who’s advantaged by power structures, who’s disadvantaged, who are the disadvantaged? How and why are they disadvantaged by the way society is structured? Whose voice is the one being heard and whose voice is not being heard? So there are some fairly standard little questions you take to any situation if you’re going to apply the socially critical lens.

Jamie similarly recognised that critical pedagogy involves “a really strong critique of power and the influence that power has”. What is revealing in hir comments is that, while s/he concurred that critical pedagogy is an examination of power, Jamie has hir own theory about power that differs from that of many critical theorists. Jamie questioned how critical theory portrays power as being imposed:

So go back to that notion of power, I think it's a bit problematic...the critical theory approach is to say power is imposed from above, it's hierarchical and that we resist power and we fight it. Whereas I think more, post-modern, post-structuralist, complexity sort of approaches, say power is more diffuse than that. It's not about being imposed from the top, but it's about structures that we're embedded in, and it's a lot more strategic than that. We comply, it's more network than diffuse, and therefore it's not always about fighting those that are above us, it's about understanding how structures create the sort of the worlds that we are participating in.

It is apparent in these findings that the analysis of power may not be consistent with the practices of all of the teacher educators in the BPE. While Jean challenges the students to identify who has power, Jamie focusses on how structures in schools create power relationships. I cannot help but wonder how these contrasting views on power will be received and understood by the ITE students as they negotiate the courses in the BPE programme.

Critical pedagogy – teaching for democracy. Democracy and democratic education feature in many descriptions of critical pedagogy (for examples, see Apple, 2006; Fernandez-Balboa, 1995; Giroux, 1981). There are two dominant but connected versions of democratic education, one that focusses on democratic education as a *process* where students participate in determining what is learned and how it is learned (Fernandez-Balboa, 1995), and secondly, democratic education that prepares youth to actively participate in a democratic society (Freire, 1998a; Giroux, 2007).

Surprisingly, only one of the PETEs mentioned democracy as an integral part of critical pedagogy. Jamie was alone in stating that critical pedagogy is underpinned by a commitment to democracy. S/he proposed two fundamental principles that foreground hir own practice of critical pedagogy, “recognising [that] students, as recipients of professional knowledge, have the right to be involved in determining what that knowledge is [and] it's also important for us to give them the skills to work in democratic structures”.

Critical pedagogy – thinking critically about pedagogy. One of the interesting responses that demonstrates how critical pedagogy can be subject to many different understandings comes from one of the ‘newer’ PETEs who started teaching in the programme well after the BPE programme had been developed. Sam stated that, “I guess I look critically at different pedagogies,

but I don't know if I have thought about a critical pedagogy per se." This quote shows how critical thinking about pedagogical practices can be conflated to mean critical pedagogy. In this statement Sam strongly foregrounds reflection about his own practice and s/he stresses the importance of engaging students in reflection on their own practice. Absent in his descriptions are the espoused purposes of critical pedagogy (e.g., social justice, emancipation, democratic education).

Critical Pedagogies in the BPE

The second question this paper endeavours to explore is the PETEs' practices of critical pedagogy. The PETEs were asked to describe the courses they teach in the BPE and the pedagogical practices they used. This line of questioning was taken early in the interviews, before I asked questions about critical pedagogy. The point I wish to make is that the interpretation of these practices *as* critical pedagogies is my own. The PETEs were neither asked to identify as critical pedagogues, nor to explain their own critical pedagogies.

Disrupting thinking. A common theme amongst the PETEs is that their practices in the BPE are geared toward disrupting students' thinking. Jean conveyed how s/he uses provocation activities as a teaching tool designed to disrupt thinking. S/he proposed that, "provocation is quite a good teaching tool, if you want to get people to be thinking and contemplating and considering issues". Specifically, Jean uses moral dilemmas in his teaching. S/he concludes that dilemmas require students to make choices. Inevitably these choices are "...based on say any 'isms' they bring with them so if they bring sexism, racism, homophobia or any bigotries [sic] with them, if you put up a moral dilemma, that then starts bringing those isms to the fore".

Michael articulated that there is a need to challenge and disrupt students' thinking. "My strategy has been to link it through to their own biography and to refer back to that..." During the interview Michael reflected that, in recent years, s/he was uncertain how effective this practice had been, as conversations in class become uncomfortable and served to stymie conversations. Michael gave the example of discussions around racism:

The way that I introduce it is talking about Asian drivers and I just mention the word Asian drivers and there's laughter in the classroom...There are very few Asian students and the students strangely enough feel happy to talk about Asian drivers...If we talk about pakeha/Māori relations, or Pasifika, it stymies conversation... they don't want to acknowledge that there's racial problems in the country ... I think Māori and Pasifika [students in the class] typically don't feel comfortable raising issues in the class and confronting those.

Michael suggested that "students start to take it personally" when engaging in conversations about racism that 'hit too close to home'. Michael reflected on his practice, wondering if "it's a

better strategy to leave out the biography and to look at physical education as a whole and then people may not feel so individually connected to it".

Lee described hir practice of disrupting thinking about the role of sport in physical education through teaching content in the BPE programme that extends beyond sport. S/he suggested that when:

most of the students come to this degree, they've had little or no experience of contemporary dance and they've had little or zero experience of *te ao kori* and so what we're doing is dealing with students who've got a sport based normative for PE".

Lee relies heavily on experiential learning so that students can develop both confidence and competence in what, for many of them, is a new movement context. S/he progresses their movement skills through requiring students to, "research, write and then teach [the content] in an active way" to their classmates. Lee described hir practice as, "working against that [domination of sport in physical education], to get them to have another view about the nature and purpose of physical education".

In a different course Lee described how s/he endeavours to disrupt students' thinking about race. Included in the course is a four day 'camp' where the students live on a marae. This border crossing (Giroux, 1993) experience is described by Lee:

[the course] builds on that experience of stepping into the shoes of Māori ... it asks them [the BPE students] to become immersed in the culture ... it's like this massive role play of lived experience ... I put people out of their comfort zones ... There's a lot of prejudice.

Democratic education. Jamie focuses on democratic education as the key strategy in hir teaching in the BPE. S/he asserted that, "democratic teaching for me is recognising that students, as recipients of professional knowledge, have the right to be involved in determining what that knowledge is ... students are involved in co-designing the course with me ... I use negotiated grading contracts where possible." Jamie proposed that, "the key message that I'm trying to get through to them is for them to take charge of their own professional learning, to be inquisitive, to be led by inquiry".

In recent years Jamie has extended this concept of co-designing courses so that it extends across three years of the programme. S/he observed that the first time s/he had the students (in the second year) they didn't come with "the same level of commitment to have an input into the course [as the fourth year students] ... You are always dealing with this power differential and you try and coach them to think critically".

Secondly, Jamie described how s/he empowered students to take control of, and responsibility for, their own learning through the use of negotiated grading contracts. Jamie explained his rationale for this strategy: “students can think about the course work, think about what knowledge they need, and can pursue that through their own sort of options”.

Discussion and Conclusions

This study has endeavoured to explore the understanding and practice of critical pedagogy of six teacher educators in a PETE programme underpinned by critical pedagogy. The importance of this study is that these PETEs are teaching the same students in the same four-year ITE programme. The BPE programme offers a place and space for a comprehensive, coherent *programmic* approach to issues of social justice. This contrasts with the ‘lone ranger’ approach to critical pedagogy in PETE, where a number of academics’ report on the difficulty of foregrounding issues of social justice through a single course (Cameron, 2012; Hickey, 2001; Tinning, 2002).

This study demonstrates that six teacher educators teaching in the same PETE programme have some similarities, yet a number of differences, in their understandings and espoused practice of critical pedagogy. The differences in understanding of critical pedagogy range from Sam, who foregrounds reflection on pedagogical practices (a critique of pedagogy), to a sophisticated understanding of critical pedagogy whereby Jamie and Jean question the theoretical basis of critical pedagogy and, in the case of Jamie, the notion that power is hierarchical and imposed.

The findings of this study suggest that most of the teacher educators in the BPE programme connect critical pedagogy to issues of social justice. The teacher educators recognised the value of challenging dominant ways of thinking and, in their own ways, try and develop the critical consciousness of students. Jean uses moral dilemmas to expose student biases. Lee exposes students to practical and bicultural experiences that move beyond the normative boundaries of PE as sport. Michael’s practice involves both assessment and coursework that engages students in exploring their own values and beliefs through discussions about stereotypes (e.g., Asian drivers), while Jamie foregrounds the empowerment of students through negotiating curriculum and peer assessment. While Terry makes no mention of many of the purposes of critical pedagogy in his interview (see Table 6.1), s/he does give examples of addressing issues of social justice. Two examples of his work for social justice include the production of a video resource designed to promote ‘water safety’ for migrant communities, and research into the links between socio-economic status and drowning.

Jean, Lee and Michael demonstrate an understanding of critical pedagogy that is strongly connected to social justice. This is reflected both in their descriptions of critical pedagogy and their descriptions of their practices of critical pedagogy where they describe how they attempt to disrupt

the students' thinking through exposing student's biases and prejudices. It is telling that, although these three participants acknowledged that critical pedagogy is closely connected to its origins in the Frankfurt School of critical theory, none of the participants described their own practices as informed by Marxism and class-based analysis of society. Instead, there appears to be a strong influence from 'post' theories that attempt to address issues of racism, sexism and other forms of discrimination beyond class. This broadening of critical pedagogy reflects Lather's (2001) suggestion that a critical pedagogy based on the single narrative of class is insufficient as it ignores issues of racism, feminism and other dominating discourses (such as sport) that serve to marginalise groups of students.

The descriptions and practices of critical pedagogy described by the participants in this study are consistent with much of the advocacy for critical approaches in PETE, where a focus on class and capitalism is conspicuous by its absence (for exceptions see Evans & Davies, 2011). For the last 30 years, critical pedagogy in PE and PETE has largely consisted of an analysis beyond class. The foundational critical PE and PETE literature called focussed on the hidden curriculum (Bain, 1990; Dodds, 1985; Fernandez-Balboa, 1993) and feminism (Dewar, 1990, 1991). Social justice issues in PETE literature continue to highlight issues of racism (Fitzpatrick, 2013; Legge, 2010), body image (Kirk, 2006; Tinning & Glasby, 2002), gender (Brown, 2005; Burrows, 2000; Dewar, 1991; Dowling, 2009; Ennis, 1999; Evans et al., 1996; Olofsson, 2005), and motor elitism (Devis-Devis & Sparkes, 1999; Evans, 2004; Hunter, 2004; Mordal-Moen & Green, 2012; Tinning, 1997, 2012).

Whether this is interpreted as a dilution of critical pedagogy (McLaren, 2003) or an overlap of pedagogies for social justice (Lather, 2001) that welcomes greater numbers of practitioners is unclear. In this study Jamie acknowledged some of that tension when s/he proposed, "we are quite drawn to other ways of theorising it [social justice]." Breunig's (2011) study of 17 self-proclaimed critical pedagogues revealed the same tension between the desire to expound a single and more focused critical pedagogy; the desire to find the one right definition (Lather, 1998), and the evolution of "subfields" of critical pedagogy (Breunig, 2011, p. 18).

As the current wave of neo-liberal ideology continues to consume all discussions and decisions about education, I find myself agreeing with McLaren and Farahmandpur (2000) and Apple (2000) who contend that class issues conflate other issues of discrimination. Yet, in my own role as a teacher educator, I wonder how useful and relevant it is for the PETE students I teach to focus on the injustices created by class and neo-liberal thinking. How much agency will young teachers have to develop praxis that counters neo-liberalism?

Many of the six teacher educators explicitly conveyed that their work in the BPE courses focuses on addressing inequality. They employ diverse pedagogical practices including negotiated

contracts, moral dilemmas, explorations of biographies, and border crossing experiences on a marae. How this clustering of different critical practices in a single programme is read and understood by the students in the BPE is unclear. Will students connect these practices or methods to the purposes of critical education, that is, to social justice agendas, or will the students see disparate practices that seemingly are unconnected?

Tinning's (2002, 2012) call for a more modest pedagogy appears to resonate with the PETEs in this study. If there is any validity to Tinning's (2012) proposition that there is no single set of pedagogical practices that will lead to the delivery of certain outcomes, then the multiple critical pedagogies of Jamie, Michael, Jean, and Lee are needed to engage different students in considering the value of critical pedagogy.

Although the quest for certain outcomes through a critical pedagogy in PETE remains unclear, Jamie suggested the critical pedagogies in the BPE programme should not be construed as an attempt to indoctrinate students into social justice agendas. S/he proposed that the BPE programme serves to plant a metaphoric seed that, under the right conditions, will thrive in the practices of the programme graduates:

I think we do plant a seed ... and it's about being able to nurture that seed. So that seed might not germinate if you are the only student, the only person in this department and are quite conservative in the way they teach. But given the right nurturing, and maybe five or six of our students graduate and end up working in the same school, then I can see that that would germinate and you do have an effect.

A second study that explores the understanding and practices of critical pedagogy of teachers who have completed the Te Ika a Maui BPE programme is currently being conducted. This study will help to illuminate how the critical pedagogies practised by the PETEs translate into physical education classrooms in schools.

The evidence from this study suggests that the PETE students in the BPE programme are exposed to a range of practices that are designed to empower students to take action against inequity. While each PETE may approach different issues of social justice in dissimilar pedagogical ways, it appears that principles of critical pedagogy inform many of their practices. The Te Ika a Maui BPE programme, while not an empirically pure critical pedagogy, should be fertile ground for growing a critical perspective.

Critical Pedagogy –A Maturing Field

Gee's (1999) concepts of 'little d' and 'Big D' discourses are helpful in connecting the findings of Chapter 5 and the subsequent paper that followed in Chapter 6. Gee (1999) describes a 'Big D' discourse as a combination of words, actions, beliefs and values. The findings from the interviews with the BPE teacher educators suggest that critical perspectives extend beyond the official written discourse of the BPE programme documents. The espoused underpinning critical pedagogy of the BPE programme (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2005) can be seen in the actions of Lee as s/he attempts to challenge racial discrimination and racial stereotyping through border crossings experiences (Giroux, 1993) and through the negotiated curriculum used by Jamie where s/he endeavours to break down the hierarchy of the ITE classroom through empowering democratic education practices (Fernandez-Balboa, 1995).

While acknowledging the diversity of understanding and pedagogical action of the teacher educators, attempts to embrace the principles of critical pedagogy are espoused by many BPE teacher educators. What may appear seemingly to be disparate teaching approaches gain synergy from multiple perspectives on social justice agendas that embrace rather than ignore the complexities of society and PE. More than 40 years ago Paulo Freire was adamant that critical pedagogy was not a teaching strategy to be mastered and rolled out like an intervention despite the changing context. The findings of this paper perhaps highlight that, in the subsequent decades, critical pedagogy has matured into a field united by principles, yet diverse in both the social justice agenda it engages with and the pedagogical actions involved.

The second published paper in this chapter highlights how one BPE teacher educator has enacted critical pedagogy within the classes he has taught. The primary data source for this paper comes from interviews with 19 PETE students who recalled 'Tom's'^{x1} teaching

practices. Further data comes from Tom's own academic writing, where he articulates his own 'Freirean pedagogy' in the BPE.

**Shaking Students' Cages: A Freirean pedagogy that challenged PETE students' beliefs
about physical education**

Philpot, R. (2016).

Shaking students' cages: A Freirean pedagogy that influenced PETE students' beliefs about physical education, *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 7(1), 143-164.

Cochrane-Smith and Zeichner (2005) argue that teacher education is morally and ethically bound to explicitly address issues of race and equity and to promote social justice. One of the responses to the call for social justice and critical teacher education is for teacher education to be underpinned by a critical pedagogy.

Giroux (2010) describes critical pedagogy as a political practice that provides students with the knowledge and skills needed to become critical citizens. Critical pedagogy is not a set of teaching techniques, rather it is a perspective on teaching that highlights inequities and discrimination and takes action against the political, social, and economic factors that marginalise groups in society (Macedo, 1994a).

Critical teacher education endeavours to problematise the relationship between education and politics, encouraging educators to reconsider and challenge pedagogical traditions, educational philosophies and school policy (Fischman & McLaren, 2005). Cho (2006) advocates that the task of a critical pedagogue is to create social structures that allow individuals to change and grow.

Critical pedagogy in physical education teacher education (PETE) has enjoyed a strong history in Australia and New Zealand with the work of Kirk (1986), Tinning (1988), Gore (1990) and others promoting a critical pedagogy in PETE as far back as the mid-1980s. In subsequent years, while many researchers have continued to *promote* critical pedagogy in PETE (Fernandez-Balboa, 1995; Sicilia-Camacho & Fernandez-Balboa, 2009), there have been fewer published studies or accounts of physical education teacher educators' attempts to conduct critical PETE (for exceptions see Curtner-Smith, 2007; Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Devis-Devis & Sparkes, 1999; Fernandez-Balboa, 1995; Garrett & Wrench, 2011a, 2011b; Hickey, 2001). The implication of this is that little is known about critical PETE beyond why it should be enacted, with teacher educators having "little idea of the tactics, strategies, structures and organisational frameworks that PETE staff might employ..." (Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004, p. 118).

Advocacy for critical pedagogy in PETE is based on the premise that physical education is a site of educational practice where the reproduction of inequity, be it gender-based, cultural, or social, can be hegemonically reinforced or challenged. Much of what is done in the name of physical

education privileges a “performance discourse” that focuses on “how performance can be improved or enhanced” (Tinning, 1997, p. 102). A performance discourse draws from a biologically conceptualised body privileging sport sciences such as anatomy, biomechanics, and exercise physiology (Tinning, 1997). A performance-based focus privileges students with superior skills and techniques (‘sporty’ kids) who come with cultural capital (Bourdieu & Passeron, 2000) through embodied physical competence.

O’Sullivan, MacPhail, and Tannehill (2009) report that PETE students choose teaching as a career based on their interest and success in sport. Physical education (PE) teachers have beliefs about PE that are strongly influenced by their past positive experiences and typically strong associations with sport (Green, 2000, 2002). For many PE teachers who identify as sportsmen or sportswomen, the hegemonic qualities of competition and domination (Brown, 1999) are reinforced through their own teaching practice, making friends of students who share a love of sport and enemies of those who do not (Evans & Davies, 1986).

Kirk (2010) uses the phrase ‘physical education as sports techniques’ to describe PE practices that are reduced to learning about sport (Mordal-Moen & Green, 2012; Philpot & Smith, 2011) with a narrow focus on motor skills (O’Sullivan, 2005; Placek et al., 1995) and sports strategies (O’Sullivan et al., 2009).

Challenging the dominance of “physical education as sport techniques” through critical approaches in PETE involves confronting the possibility that sport creates institutionalized inequality (Karen & Washington, 2010) through, as an example, the narrow portrayal of hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1987) as being mesomorphic, heterosexual and competitive (Brown, 1999; Hickey, 2008) and the representation of female healthy bodies as objects to be observed (Evans, 2006). Tinning (1997) advocates for critical PE that is oriented by a “participation discourse” (p. 102) with an emphasis on inclusion, equity, involvement, enjoyment, social justice, caring, cooperation, and movement. Critical PE would confront issues related to gender equity, cater to diversity, and challenge unjust practices such as motor elitism (Tinning, 2002).

Given the strong and positive associations PETE students have with sport, it is not surprising that studies of a range of PETE programmes have acknowledged the difficulty of the changing the beliefs of PETE students (Evans et al., 1996; Graber, 1995; Matanin & Collier, 2003; Mordal-Moen & Green, 2012; Tsangaridou, 2008; Tsangaridou & OSullivan, 2003).

Freirean Pedagogy

Perhaps the name most synonymous with critical pedagogy is Paulo Freire. Freire (1997) called for education that goes beyond ‘banking’; that is, the depositing of unquestioned knowledge into a compliant repository, the student. Freire (1998a) promoted teaching skills beyond technical

skills, arguing that teachers should recognise inequality and take action to create healthy, responsive, and self-empowering teaching contexts.

Freire called for 'problem-posing' education that breaks the pattern of banking education. Problem-posing education involves challenging habits and taken-for-granted ways of doing things (Smyth, 2011) through developing ways of "extraordinarily re-experiencing the ordinary" (Shor, 1980, p. 93). Problem-posing education develops the power of students to perceive the way they exist in the world in contrast to viewing the world as a static reality (Freire, 1970b).

The role of the problem-posing educator is to create, together with the students, an emerging awareness of the conditions that create inequity so that, rather than adapting to these conditions, students can take action to change the conditions themselves (Freire, 1970b). Students are encouraged to examine matters of importance to them, to ask "why things are the way they are, to analyse who benefits from the status quo and to explore possibilities for changing conditions they don't like" (Hinchey, 2006, pp. 122-123).

Problem-posing education moves from the hierarchical patterns characteristic of banking education to learning through dialogue between students and teacher. In this joint learning process, the teacher and student co-investigate and learn together in acts of cognition, where both the teacher and the student consider and reconsider their understandings (Freire, 1970b).

Through problem posing Freire foregrounds the emergence of *conscientizacao* or a critical consciousness. This involves "learning to perceive social, political and economic contradictions, and take action against the oppressive elements of reality" (Freire, 1970b, p. 19). *Conscientizacao* involves becoming conscious of consciousness. Aronowitz (2008) describes this level of consciousness not as a form of indoctrination, but as an awareness of the forces in one's life that have ruled and shaped one's consciousness.

In this paper I draw on Paulo Freire's (1970b) concepts of dialogue, problem-posing and critical consciousness to present findings of how a critical pedagogy was enacted in PETE by one teacher educator and how it was 'read' by students.

This research is a rich description of a pedagogical approach that the PETE students I interviewed claimed had influenced their thinking and beliefs about teaching PE. While Freire was adamant that his ideas were not "methods," an account of one interpretation of a Freirean pedagogy may provide stimulus for others to further "recreate and rewrite [his] ideas" (Freire, as cited in Macedo, 1994b, p. xiv).

The teacher educator discussed in this study has been given the pseudonym Tom Rose^{xii}. Tom has recently retired after more than 30 years' lecturing in tertiary PE. Tom and I worked in the same teacher education programme for one year. Although I gained a sense of Tom's teaching

philosophy and critical approach during this time, I have chosen to focus my analysis on data collected only from student interviews and Tom's publications and unpublished papers on his own understanding and practice of a Freirean pedagogy.

Context

Previous empirical research in PETE has suggested that single courses in critical pedagogy are ineffective as they are overwhelmed by their marginal status in PETE programmes (Curtner-Smith, 2007; Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Hickey, 2001). In this sense, the context of this study is important because the whole of the PETE programme that was the focus of this study "conceptualises physical education within a socially critical perspective" (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2005, p. 25) and claims to be "underpinned by a socially critical orientation" (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2005, p. 27).

The initial teacher education (ITE) programme is a four-year PETE programme with cohort groups of approximately 50 students per year group. It aims to attract students from diverse backgrounds who share a common interest in becoming teachers of secondary school PE (Te Ika a Maui College of Education, 1996). The teacher educators are predominantly social scientists with most having backgrounds in teaching secondary school PE.

The combination of a socially critical programme philosophy, a physical location separate from sport scientists, and a teaching staff who publish predominantly in the field of Health and Physical Education (HPE) may provide what Hickey (2001) proposes as "a complete and coherent culture of support" (p. 243), that is, a context that provides a unique coherency that is unavailable in many other contexts.

The Bachelor of Physical Education (BPE) courses taught by Tom were compulsory for all students. The courses, which occurred in the first and the final years of the programme, focus on critically examining the nature of teaching and PE (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2011a, 2011d). As an example, a learning outcome from the first-year course required the students to "reflect on the historical and sociological factors that shape physical and health education practices in schools" (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2011d, p. 2). A learning outcome from the fourth-year course asked students to "develop and explain personal meaning of physical education" (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2011f, p. 1). These course learning outcomes suggest that the courses were explicitly designed to acknowledge, discuss and challenge PETE students' assumptions about, and understanding of, PE.

Research Methods

The research reported in this paper came from a larger study that examined the beliefs about PE of beginning and graduating PETE students and the influences that have impacted on their

conceptualising of it. A qualitative interpretive design was employed to discover how these PETE students came to see things (Gubrium & Holstein, 2000) and make meaning (Merriam, 2002) from the PETE programme. One of the assumptions behind the study was that students had developed their own individual understanding and meaning from their experiences both before and during their study within the programme.

Purposive sampling (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000) was used to select participants for this study. The 10 male and nine female participants were in their fourth and final years of the PETE programme. Twelve students identified as European, three as Samoan, three as Māori while one student identified as Samoan, Māori and European. They ranged in age from 21 to 41. Pseudonyms are used in this article to protect the identity of these participants.

Data were gained exclusively through interviews. Although interviews are not a means of direct access to experiences, they are actively constructed narratives (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995) filtered through the eyes of the PETE students (Cresswell, 2003). Each participant was interviewed twice. Following the initial interviews, an inductive process was used to draw common themes (Maycut & Morehouse, 1994). These themes were used to inform follow-up questions for a second round of interviews where the intent was to gain rich, context-bound information (Cresswell, 1994). All interviews were audiotaped, transcribed, and returned to participants for member-checking (Cresswell, 1998).

Data were analysed in four separate stages. The first involved individual reading of each student's transcript to gain a sense of their perspective. The student responses were then grouped together and searched for emerging themes. The third step involved a coding process (Rossman & Rallis, 1998) where data were coded based on reoccurring words and phrases until distinct themes emerged. The final step involved a comparison of students' 'reading' of Freirean pedagogy with the teacher educator's intentions to foster critical thinking.

Research Findings

In this section I report on the findings of the interviews with the 19 graduating PETE students. In the first section I summarise the students' views that their understanding and beliefs about physical education have changed during the PETE programme, with the claim that this teacher educator had been particularly influential. The second section, 'Tom's Freirean Pedagogy', conveys the students' reading of the pedagogy of the teacher educator, with a specific focus on his practice using a Freirean critical pedagogy in PETE.

Changing beliefs – PE as more than sport. The graduating PETE students argued that their experiences in PETE have influenced their beliefs and understandings of PE. The students suggest

that they now recognise PE as being more than sport and suggest that this is a change in their thinking from when they began their PETE programme.

Liam represents the views of many students who began the PETE programme when he suggested that “I thought it was going to be coaching sport and teaching sport and playing sport...” (Int. 1). Similarly, David posits that, “if you had asked me straight after high school ‘what do you do in PE?’ I would have said ‘sports’” (Int. 1).

Upon graduation, Liam states, “I’ve pretty much changed completely” (Int. 1), while Felix concurs, adding that, “whereas at university I realized that, OK, there is more to PE than that [sport]” (Int. 1). Tash, a female student with a similar affinity with sport, recognises that “now, I think a lot of PE is just teaching sports, which doesn’t really have a huge amount of relevance to me in terms of physical education” (Int. 1).

These comments are typical of both the male and female participants in this study. These findings provide evidence of a growing awareness amongst the PETE students that PE can, and should be, more than just learning how to play sports. This awareness is absent amongst many students entering PETE who describe PE almost exclusively as learning to play sport (Philpot & Smith, 2011).

The influence of one lecturer. All of the graduating participants stated that their beliefs about the purpose of PE and how they define physical education had changed during their four years in the BPE programme. This does not come as a complete surprise as the BPE programme is underpinned by critical pedagogy where problematising knowledge construction and challenging taken-for-granted practices are privileged (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2005). What stood out is that one teacher educator was named by almost all of the PETE students as having “the main influence” (Holly, Int. 1).

Their reflective comments typically included phrases such as: “I’m fully influenced by Tom of course” (Holly, Int. 1) and Dillon’s suggestion that “It’s started off with Tom Rose [laughter] ... he made me think as well but in a different sort of plane or whatever” (Int. 1). Brenda suggested that there had been a number of lecturers who had contributed to her present understanding of PE, however, “probably [the] main influence would be Tom. Until Tom’s paper this year I was always kind of thinking to myself, ‘well, what is actually the point of PE?’” (Int. 1). Margaret reflected that, while she found Tom’s course a bit confusing, “that was the beginning of us opening our eyes to the wider issues in the PE class” (Int. 2).

The participants further suggested that it was the lecturer more than the course itself that made a difference. In any ITE or PETE degree that has been developed into a coherent programme rather than a series of courses, it is entirely possible that certain courses are positioned at key stages

in the qualification to purposely challenge and disrupt the thinking of students. Holly was adamant that it was “definitely Tom’s class” (Int. 2). Jess agreed suggesting that, “there are lecturers [who] run classes a lot better ... it’s more the way he teaches... He makes you think deeper through questioning and challenging you” (Int. 2). David proposed that, “if anyone else did that course they would struggle to have his way of portraying the values or just the information in a certain way” (Int. 2).

A telling observation comes from a student who completed this same course a year ahead of her graduating cohort, a year in which Tom did not teach it. Holly reflected that:

When I was [a] first-year [in] the socio-cultural paper, I didn’t have Tom because Tom was doing some research or something ... they [my cohort] remember Tom quite strongly ... he was challenging them why and all that, whereas I can’t remember who I had, I don’t have very many memories from that class. (Int. 2)

The claims from students that one lecturer in a PETE programme has been instrumental in changing their thinking about the place of sport in physical education are accompanied by rich descriptions of the practice of that teacher educator. In the following section I provide students’ descriptions of Tom’s classes focusing on *how* Tom was able to make them conscious of how their life histories may influence their work as teachers and the possible implications of “physical education as sport techniques” (Kirk, 2010, p. 5).

Tom’s Freirean pedagogy

Problem posing. Freire (1997) advocates for problem-posing education whereby the teacher works *with* students, co-investigating in dialogue with the students. The participants recognised Tom’s ability to use questions effectively to challenge their ideas and raise their consciousness:

I don’t know how to word it, but they just screw with your head ... This course probably make[s] us different from other teaching degrees or physical education degrees ... He [Tom] taught us to question everything and not go with what everyone else thinks. Just to think for ourselves. (Brenda, Int. 1)

David observed how Tom made him “think about the way you teach and the way you think and why you think the way you think” (Int. 1). Liam described Tom’s strategy as:

... like the devil’s advocate kind of thing ... if you have an answer you get another question that rebuts you. You have to keep thinking even deeper and deeper and deeper about your own personal experiences and how they’ve formed your understanding and your teaching ... He [Tom] just questions the things that we take for granted. (Int. 2)

Dillon recounts an ‘incident’ that took place in one of Tom’s first lectures on the first day of his PETE programme, in front of a class full of students. Most students had not experienced tertiary education before. Few of the students knew each other:

Tom: What’s your name?

Dillon: Dillon.

Tom: Well how do you know? How do you know your name is Dillon?

Darren: Because my parents call me Dillon ... because it’s on my birth certificate.

In hindsight, Dillon recognised that Tom was challenging him to consider not just his name but who he was:

At the time I’m sitting there going, I was like, ‘what else can I say?’, my name’s Darren. So now I look back and I think, obviously who am I is a lot deeper than that. Not my name, but what do I represent, what do I believe, what do I value? All that sort of stuff. (Int. 1)

These student descriptions characterise the deep, probing questions and substantive debate and discussion that underpinned Tom’s classes. His classes challenged the assumptions and ideas of students, bringing to the surface their beliefs and values (Richardson, 1996), often in ways that clearly engaged students emotionally.

Brenda described a lecture where:

He just yelled at us ... he’s so frustrating it’s not funny. He was saying to us ‘how do you know that I’m not on P?’ And we were like... ‘because you are not supposed to be’ and he [asks] ‘how do you know?’...That’s what he said. That made us think, how do we know? It made me question everything. (Int. 2)

Tash recalls a similar approach:

He fired up people ... he told us PE teachers should be below everyone else and we should sit in the shed with the caretakers ... we were up in arms about that one ... he pauses a lot and leaves an awkward silence so we have to just sit there. (Int. 2)

These student experiences exemplify how Tom engaged in his problem-posing pedagogy. It is a pedagogy that is not just a case of engaging the cognitive, but also the *emotional* state, creating “a degree of discomfort or strangeness” (Segall, 2008, p. 22). Tom clearly recognised, as Cassidy (2000) and Tinning (2002) did, the limitations of rational thinking as a catalyst for change. As Cassidy

(2000) has argued, rational discourse is insufficient unless there is a corresponding emotional commitment.

While students recalled comments from Tom such as “[PE teachers] should sit in the shed with the caretakers” they speak most passionately about the deep level of questioning and problem posing used by Tom. Students reflected on discussions of genuine contestation rather than simply indoctrination of his own ideological position, referring to Tom’s willingness to “argue his point but then he’ll also argue against his point” (Holly, Int. 2).

Critical consciousness. I examine now how Tom enacted a pedagogy of critical consciousness. Critical consciousness begins with “an awareness that our ideas come from a particular set of life experiences, an ability to trace our ideas to their source in our experience, and an acknowledgement that others will have equally valid, if different, life experiences” (Hinchey, 2006, p. 25).

Tom, being an advocate of Freire, was familiar with the Freirean philosophy of education that promotes acts of thinking rather than collecting and remembering information as an end in itself. As Freire (1997) stated, critical consciousness, is “the deepening of the attitude of awareness characteristic of all emergence” (Freire, 1997, p. 90). For Freire, critical consciousness is the “consciousness of consciousness” (p. 60). It is a means to recognise and revolt against the conditioning forces in the world.

Xavier described how Tom enacted critical consciousness and introduced students to Gramsci’s (1971) concept of hegemony in asking his students to challenge many of the underpinning beliefs about HPE:

I always remember from his lectures how he tried to get us to challenge the norms of society and we did all those activities where we had to jump into the other person’s shoes. It was all to do with our own attitude, beliefs and values, and then our peers’ attitudes beliefs and values and society’s attitudes, beliefs and values ... I disregarded his stuff about hegemonic processes at the start. I didn’t understand it at the time. When it came up again later it made sense. (Int. 1)

Tom challenged students to think differently and be different from PE teachers even in their first practicum experience in schools:

He’s made us look outside the box. Tom told us to wear something different ... don’t wear shoes and all of this sort of carry-on, and I think it’s made me think of things differently rather than [to] follow what everybody else is doing. (David, Int. 2)

Typically, Tom challenged the dominant discourses of PE, bringing to the surface an awareness of what is taken for granted. As Jess recalls:

You come into a course [programme] like this with already pre-established beliefs. I think Tom was really valuable in the sense that he challenged those beliefs. I can remember quite vividly one article he gave us to read in our first year talking about how sport is oppressive and I couldn't understand how anybody could see it that way. But after reading that, and on reflection of it and talking to people, I really now have a better understanding of how sport can be oppressive and how, as physical educators, we need to reverse that so it's not. (Int. 2)

Dialogism. A further component of Tom's pedagogy is what Freire referred to as dialogic, that is, the pedagogy of engaging students in dialogue in a bid to uncover the taken-for-granted in their lives. Freire (1997) proposed that human nature is dialogic, that communication plays a significant role in how we create ourselves and, as such, encouraged educators to create the conditions that promote open dialogue as a means of arousing interest or epistemological curiosity.

Gail recognised Tom's attempts to structure lectures that privileged open dialogue. She observed:

It wasn't just 'learn a theorist and write about them', or learn a particular pedagogy or some teaching styles ... it [Tom's lectures] really actually made you think about, and take responsibility for, your own pedagogy. (Int. 1)

Students reported that making and defending statements was a feature of the class discussions. Students could not make comments or statements without having their thinking challenged. Tom used polemic statements to provoke students but he would also argue the other side of an issue to raise the consciousness of students. Again, a student participant comments:

He may present his idea or a paper that he's written and we can read it and then have a discussion or debate about what that means ... he will argue his point but then he'll also argue against his point. You can't just say that you agree. You have to really think ... you have to give reasons why you agree with him. (Jess, Int. 2)

In his own academic publications, Tom describes his quest to find ways of teaching that evoke vigorous dialogue, and how he encourages his students to become emotionally engaged in the intellectual work of trying to make sense of their perceptions, experiences, feelings, and actions. Tom describes his pedagogy as:

Restricting my tendency to lecture by using my knowledge to prompt and organize whole-class discussions, group discussions in class and on the intranet as well as class readings

involving academic articles, current media, fiction and poetry. I ask questions in the hope that students will ask hard questions about what they mean by physical education and how they construct those meanings. (Rose, n.d.)

Tom used self-grading practices in a further attempt to empower the students to engage in dialogue in an environment of trust as they argued their case for an appropriate grade. This self-grading practice required the students to keep dossiers of evidence and readings associated with his course. In a one-to-one, self-assessment interview, each student assigned themselves a grade and defended it. This was described by Tom as “being an opportunity for them to show what they did by using their dossier to support the grade determined in the self-assessment statement” (Rose, n.d.). Tom used the grading interview to ask students if they really thought the evidence in their dossier supported their stated grade. As an outcome, students themselves were empowered to make the decision to change their grade.

Discussion

This research project has demonstrated how a single lecturer, using a Freirean pedagogy, has been able to challenge many of these physical education students’ deeply connected relationships – that of sport and PE (Green, 2000, 2002). Tom has been successful in enabling students to become conscious of how their own values, beliefs, and sporting biographies may have led them and other PE teachers to conceptualise PE as learning to play sport. Tom has enabled students to question the privileged position of sport in PE. Tom’s Freirean pedagogy, as it is foregrounded in this research, provides some insight into how he managed to succeed in this endeavour.

The interview data from the student participants strongly suggest that Tom has influenced them to think more deeply about their field of practice and the way they have come to accept the ‘taken-for-granted’. As the interview data clearly show, this has not been through a pedagogy of banking knowledge and facts, but through a process of deep questioning that promoted dialogue and critical thinking. Arguably, Tom’s practice of agitating and ‘firing up’ students could be construed as inconsistent with Freire’s (1970b) descriptions of teacher–student relationships based on love and humility. I would suggest that Tom’s pedagogy was, in fact, built on love and a belief in the value of equitable PE for the students in schools whom the PETE students will eventually be responsible for teaching.

This paper illuminates how one teacher educator interpreted Freire’s educational philosophy and how his PETE students read his pedagogy. The degree to which this lecturer’s pedagogy can be modelled, replicated, and used to influence all students in different contexts is a question for the reader to consider. As Tinning (2002) explained, different students make different

sense of their experiences in PETE. Their own biographies and beliefs will continue to influence their reading of their teacher education programme (Devis-Devis & Sparkes, 1999; Garrett & Wrench, 2011a; Richardson, 2003; Tsangaridou, 2006). Indeed, Bolin (1990) cautioned that “not all students will benefit from a reflective education programme” (p. 34).

One of the reported constraints on the effectiveness of critical pedagogy in PETE programmes is that it is overwhelmed by technocratic discourses (Curtner-Smith, 2007; Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Hickey, 2001). It is possible that Tom’s Freirean pedagogy was effective in raising critical consciousness and transforming student beliefs because it was positioned in a critical programme where questioning taken-for-granted knowledge and examining issues of power were prevalent in more than a single course.

Proponents of critical pedagogy suggest that it must continue to reinvent itself if it is to remain relevant (Allen & Rossatto, 2009). Undoubtedly Freire would be pleased to know that his ideas were not merely imported. Instead, the Freirean pedagogy reported in this paper was re-created and applied to a specific context, PETE, in a time and place far removed from the time and place that Freire located his theories. This research provides some ideas for what Freirean pedagogy might look like in PETE. It serves as one example of the practice of critical pedagogy rather than its purpose.

Chapter summary

Chapters 5 and 6 serve to articulate the BPE teacher educators’ understanding of critical pedagogy and how they have taken the critical perspective espoused in the BPE accreditation documents (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2005) and put it into action as teaching strategies. The second published paper in this chapter provides a sense of how Tom, one of the teacher educators in the BPE, enacts his own understanding of critical pedagogy based on concepts from Paulo Freire, and how students have begun to make their own sense of his approach. The first research question in this study asks: ‘to what extent is the delivery of the BPE programme consistent with the programme’s espoused socially critical philosophy?’ The findings presented to date confirm that social justice and democratic education are values that are expressed in the practices of multiple BPE teacher educators.

The data from interviews with students convey that the practice of Tom has served to disrupt their taken-for-granted beliefs about the privileged place of sport in physical education. Tom's pedagogical actions have engaged students in reflected on how their own values and beliefs serve to reify what they already cherish and negate what is not seen as important to them. These findings begin to answer the second research questions, that is, what sense do the BPE students make of the critical approaches in the BPE programme. Further evidence that focuses specifically on answering this question through exploring the graduating BPE students' understanding of critical pedagogies is presented in Chapter 7.

CHAPTER 7:

The BPE students and critical pedagogy

Introduction

In Chapters 5 and 6 I examined the BPE programme documents and used interviews, student voice, and the academic writing of one of the BPE teacher educators to argue that there is evidence of critical approaches by a number of teacher educators across the four years of the BPE programme.

Chapter 7 explores the sense that PETE students have made of a critical PETE programme. The chapter includes two papers that have been submitted to peer-reviewed journals. The first paper, *'Making a different difference: Physical education teacher education students' reading of critical PETE programme'*, uses interview data from 19 BPE students to describe the variety of understandings of critical pedagogy they take with them beyond teacher education. The second paper, *'Students' readings of critical pedagogies in PETE: When biography and critical pedagogy intersect'* explores how students' biographies serve to mediate the students 'reading' of the BPE programme. This paper uses theoretical concepts from Pierre Bourdieu to analyse data from all three interviews with student participants including the life history interviews (see Appendix 6). This paper is an attempt to understand how student biographies impact on their reading of the BPE programme.

As discussed earlier in the thesis, a growing body of literature exists that identifies the challenges for critical physical education teacher educators trying to promote issues of social justice while 'swimming against the tide' of physical education/kinesiology programmes that foreground performance discourses (Tinning, 1997). Much of this literature, written from the perspective of individual PETEs (for example see Cameron, 2012; Hickey, 1999; MacDonald & Brooker, 1999; Curtner-Smith, 2007; Curtner-Smith & Sofu, 2004; Dowling, Fitzgerald, & Flintoff, 2015) highlighted the rocky road ahead for teacher educators enacting a critical

pedagogy in their classrooms. As there are few, if any PETE programmes that espouse a critical orientation, there is a paucity of research that explores the synergy that a coherent programmatic approach (Lawson, 1983) may provide. In addition, there is only a modest research base that includes the voices of PETE students and their interpretation, reading and understanding of critical pedagogy. This chapter addresses this research gap as the papers contribute knowledge and understanding of how PETE students engage with, and make sense of, critical teacher education.

Making a different difference: Physical education teacher education students' reading of critical PETE programme

Issues of social justice and equity in education gained some prominence in the 1970s with the emergence of Freire's (1970b) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Academics such as Michael Apple, Henry Giroux, Peter McLaren, Stanley Aronowitz, bell hooks, Ira Shor, and Joe Kincheloe reiterated Freire's appeal for socially just education through work that analysed educational practice and advocated for alternative approaches that privileged equity, social justice and critical inquiry. This growing advocacy has not gone unheard, with Cochrane-Smith (2010) recently suggesting that social justice is now a theme in most initial teacher education (ITE) programmes.

Notwithstanding this emergence, what is currently done in ITE classrooms in the name of education for social justice and the tangible outcomes of social justice oriented education are less clear (Larson, 2014). Social justice is a concept with multiple meanings and perspectives. Social justice is the subject of great dispute (Fraser, 1997; G. Marshall, 1998; Young, 1990). A liberal interpretation of social justice portrays schools and classrooms of equal opportunity, where all students are able to be heard, where individual perspectives are listened to and catered for (North, 2006). A critical perspective on social justice starts from the position that schools are characterised by unequal power relations and social inequities (Giroux, 2010; Greene, 2009). In addition, the foregrounding of social justice in ITE may range from a focus in a single lecture or course through to an underpinning ITE programme philosophy.

One of the alternative ITE practices that moves beyond the acquisition of technical skills, to educational experiences that privilege socially just teaching practices is teacher education underpinned by critical pedagogy. Critical pedagogy has the broad goal of transforming social

inequality and empowering those without power (McLaren, 1989). In education, a critical pedagogy examines dominant ideologies and promotes counter-hegemonic actions that transform oppressive practices (Bartolome, 2004). It is context-specific and organic in the sense that it adapts and responds to changing environments and social situations. Critical pedagogy is therefore neither a homogenous set of ideas, nor a method. Hinchey (2006) proposed that recipes are not possible in critical classrooms.

While its origins are located in the critical theories of the Frankfurt School (Held, 1980), critical pedagogy has evolved from a narrow critique that focused on the oppressive nature of capitalism (McLaren, 1989) to include specific theorising of oppression based on culture, ethnicity, gender, religion and sexuality (Cho, 2006, 2013). In the last few decades, amidst the growth of theory, there is an emerging body of research that explores how educators understand critical pedagogies (Breunig, 2009) and endeavour to teach for social justice. The following studies highlight some of the tensions surrounding the theorising and enactment of critical pedagogy that may lead to 'slippage' and varied understandings.

Kelly et al.'s (2004) study of 20 experienced secondary school teachers in Vancouver, Canada, all of whom espoused to be teaching for social justice, reported that the teachers conceived of social justice and the practice of teaching for social justice in different ways. While "nearly every participant mentioned democracy" (p. 44), the concept was understood to range in meaning from ensuring all students have a voice in the classroom, to practices that highlighted how schools were not democratic, through to a few that encouraged activism. A small number of teachers promoted ideological critique, while others focussed on making students "aware of the world they live in" (p. 46). The teachers described critical practices that included: supplementation of curriculum when 'official' texts failed to acknowledge multiple perspectives; deconstruction of formal curriculum; and the use of transformative assignment work that involved taking action against inequalities.

A critical ethnography by Fitzpatrick (2013) described how 'Dan', a secondary school teacher in Auckland, New Zealand, provided a "rare example of critical pedagogy in practice" (p. 99) in (HPE) classrooms. Fitzpatrick (2013) intimated that building the environment, deconstructing power, playfulness, studying critical topics and embodying critical pedagogy (pp. 193-206) were key aspects of Dan's critical pedagogical approach to teaching. Fitzpatrick concluded that critical teachers like Dan often come up against the system in schools because their approaches challenge conservative school traditions and seem to disrupt the traditional order of school life. Indeed, Dan eventually left his job after repeatedly being rejected for the head of department (HOD) role.

A recent study by McIntyre, Philpot, and Smith (2016) explored New Zealand secondary school HPE teachers' understandings and use of critical pedagogies in physical education (PE). The

six HPE teachers in the study had diverse understandings of critical pedagogy that included a focus on the promotion of lifelong physical activity and challenging assumptions. For most of the teachers, critical pedagogy was a pedagogical practice that aligned with health rather than PE. Few of the teachers associated critical pedagogy with challenging or questioning existing structures within schools. For these teachers, critical pedagogy was akin to humanism, that is, a focus on catering for the educational needs of each individual in a holistic way (Maslow, 1943).

In addition, research examining ITE's understanding of critical pedagogy concludes that there is little consensus of understanding as to what critical pedagogy is (Breunig, 2011; Muros Ruiz & Fernandez-Balboa, 2005; Sahragard et al., 2014), and many espoused critical practices in ITE that are consistent with the principles of critical pedagogy (Muros Ruiz & Fernandez-Balboa, 2005). Muros Ruiz and Fernandez-Balboa (2005) surmise that "not all that is called CP [critical pedagogy] is actually CP; and perhaps not everyone who calls him – or herself – a 'critical pedagogue' is so either" (p. 258).

While the growing body of research suggests that teacher educators and teachers who identify as critical pedagogues have different understandings and unique practices of critical pedagogy, there is a paucity of research examining what sense teacher education students make of critical pedagogies when they encounter them during teacher education. This research builds on the critical ITE literature by exploring the understandings of critical pedagogy of 19 students who are in their final year of a four-year PETE programme that espouses to be underpinned by a critical orientation. The significance of this study is that it presents an opportunity to explore the possibility that a programme with, "a shared professional ideology [critical pedagogy] ... will have greater impact on recruits" (Lawson, 1983, p. 10). Previous research examining the impact of critical pedagogies in PETE highlighted the difficulty of changing students' practices through a single course (Hickey, 2001; D. Macdonald & Brooker, 1999). The unique context provided in this study enabled the researcher to explore the influence of a critical PETE *programme* rather than just individual critical courses, on teacher education students' understanding of, and engagement with, critical pedagogies.

Research setting

The setting for this study is a four-year PETE programme, a Bachelor of Physical Education (BPE), at Te Ika a Maui University that espouses an underpinning critical pedagogy. In Chapter 5 of this thesis, the analysis of this programme highlighted many features of the programme that are consistent with critical pedagogy. The BPE course descriptions in the university calendar present content through questions rather than statements. Many of the individual course learning outcomes used verbs such as: 'critically reflect', 'evaluate', 'appraise' and 'critically examine', which further

suggests the problematisation and social construction of knowledge. Fifteen of the 26 compulsory courses in the BPE programme espouse critical practices such as reflecting on biographies (Fernandez-Balboa, 2009; Giroux, 1981; Segall, 2008), democratic classrooms (Fernandez-Balboa, 1995), challenging dominant discourses (Kirk & Tinning, 1990) and problematising knowledge (Gore, 1990; Kirk, 1986; Tinning, 2002). While not all courses and not all PETEs foreground critical pedagogies, there is evidence that critical pedagogies were represented across courses in each of the four years of the BPE programme.

Methodology

Data were collected through focus group and semi-structured interviews with the aforementioned BPE students. The participants were selected through purposive sampling (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). To be considered as possible participants they were required to complete the BPE degree in the year they were interviewed. The participants reflected the diversity of the BPE students. There were nine female and 10 male participants. The participants ranged in age from 21 to 41. Twelve of the participants identified as European, three as Samoan, three as Māori, while one student identified as Samoan, Māori and European.

Data were analysed through a five-stage process of thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Initial coding of the interview transcriptions took place while I listened to the audio recordings. Inferential coding, that is, a focus on looking for patterns, followed. As data from interviews were collected over an 18-month period, these codes were revisited and changed as I read new transcripts. A visual representation using theme maps (Braun & Clarke, 2006) was used to elucidate themes. These themes draw on my own theoretical understanding of critical pedagogy and focus on a 'search' for student understanding of critical theories, critical pedagogies and other examples of teaching that foreground social justice.

PETE Students' Understandings of Critical Pedagogy

The participants in this study were asked about their understanding of critical pedagogy in both focus group and individual semi-structured interviews. In Table 7.1 I have presented a statement from each student that attempts to capture their understanding. The range of responses suggests that there is only limited shared meaning of critical pedagogy. Conceptions of critical pedagogy include student-centred teaching styles, a continual cycle of reflection on teaching, challenging the norms of society in general and PE specifically, and a heightened political awareness. There is little evidence that the BPE students are able to connect critical pedagogy to critical theory. In the following pages I have identified four themes that summarise and expand on their responses.

Table 7.1

PETE Students' Understanding of Critical Pedagogy

Pseudonym Understanding of critical pedagogy

Amber *Thinking about 'how do I cater to different like range of abilities in the class with students?' Thinking critically about the ways you teach (Int. 2)*

Brenda *I think being critical is questioning why you decide to do things and where your assumptions and decision making has come from...it means to constantly question your method or your science of teaching and constantly evaluate whether it's working (Int. 2)*

David *Reflection, reflection, reflection, just thinking and questioning everything that we see...I think the main thing is my own change in attitude beliefs and values (Focus Group Interview (FI)1)*

Dillon *Critical pedagogy is always having an underlying reason for what you are doing. What's the why behind it? What's the how behind it? Who is it going to benefit? Who is it going to be good for? (FI1)*

Felix *We are always questioning why we are doing things...you are just constantly acting and then reflecting on it, just constantly being critical on your pedagogical stance (FI1)*

Gail *Constantly critically analysing it and questioning it [your teaching] ...getting students to actually apply change to their world rather than sitting back and watching it (Int. 2)*

George *You almost want them to be politically aware ... I want them to respect me as a teacher, but I also want to deconstruct that power that I've got as a teacher. (Int. 2)*

Holly *It's all about the student centred idea, so that creating a teaching environment and programme that is focussed around the students within your class... encouraging students to think ...and not just give them information (Int. 2)*

Jason *You are constantly acting and reflecting on it, just constantly being critical on your pedagogical stance Just to always think about others and other perspectives, not just to read anything they read and to accept those, but to question, and question their own beliefs (Int. 2)*

Jess *Not taking for granted prior knowledge and continuing to challenge things that are perceived as the norm... I guess to be critical of something it's to ask questions on it. (Int.*

2)

- Kerry *Thinking critically about the ways you teach. [for example] I don't know if they [students] learn best through experiential learning as opposed to just command style (F1)*
- Liam *Critical pedagogy basically means to me effective teaching styles... being aware of individual student needs... having student come up with the answers rather than just feeding the students teacher directed teaching (Int. 2)*
- Margaret *Not taking for granted prior knowledge and continuing to challenge things that are perceived as the norm (Int. 2)*
- Richard *It is constantly challenging us to think critically about our own pedagogy and the way we want to teach... being able to reassess things to make it better next time (Int. 2)*
- Shane *To explore how their beliefs and values around an issue can affect how they think about it (Int. 2)*
- Steven *Pedagogy is the method or science of actual teaching, so I feel being critical you are constantly evaluating and questioning the method (Int. 2)*
- Tash *It's just thinking about the way in which we teach so as to not disadvantage anyone. (Int. 2)*
I think maybe just not to accept things as fact (F1)
- Wendy *Critical pedagogy to me is encouraging students to think and not just give it to them ...to get them to critically look at things ... to start develop their own thinking (Int. 2)*
- Xavier *To always try and dig underneath the surface and find out is there any more ...to think critically about every aspect of PE as well as to challenge what PE is. I want to include everyone and give everyone equal opportunities ... creating those more socially aware students (Int. 2)*
-

Critical pedagogy as reflection on teaching. Reflective teaching resonated strongly with the majority of the 19 participants as part of their understanding of critical pedagogy. What is evident is that the nature of the reflection suggested by participants differs. Some students advocate for critical pedagogy as reflection on how one teaches and how one could teach differently, while others focussed on examining the values and assumptions behind their practice.

Steven recalled that critical pedagogues had to keep “questioning what you are teaching ... You can be playing games and stuff but there are times when you need to be questioning how it can be done better” (Focus group Int. 1). Jess similarly proposed that critical teachers need to:

ask [themselves] did my students learn what we set out to learn, or what did they learn specifically? Did some people not learn? ... What do I need to do better next time? It’s that constant reflection and asking the real questions to then further your practice. (Focus group Int. 2)

Gail asserted that critical pedagogues are constantly “questioning [their teaching] and making sure that it’s working so that you are always bettering yourself, so that you are not sort of complacent in your teaching.” (Int. 2)

These examples of reflection on *how* one teaches and how one could teach differently are described by Gore (1990) as ‘technical reflection’. This same form of technical reflection (Gore, 1990) can be seen in the following comment by Richard, who associated critical pedagogy with examining “the way we are teaching and then looking if is working right” (Int. 2). Margaret similarly foregrounded technical reflection in her response, “at the end of that topic, I would go okay, are they actually achieving what I want to achieve. If not how can I change it or critique it for the next part of the topic” (Int. 2). While these comments focus on the act of teaching, they fail to acknowledge questions of ‘for whom the lesson may be right?’ or ‘what constitutes a successful lesson?’ There is no indication that these participants consider that how, or what they teach, may privilege or disadvantage different students.

Along with the technical reflection, respondents there are an equal number of students who identify the importance of ‘critical reflection’. Critical reflection involves the examination of the values and assumptions that underpin the way one teaches (Smyth, 1989; Smyth, Down, & McNerney, 2014). A critically reflective teacher makes decisions based on conscious awareness and careful consideration of the assumptions upon which teaching decisions are based (Yost et al., 2000). Brenda highlighted that “being critical is kind of questioning why you decide to do things and where your assumptions and decision making has come from” (Int. 2). Dillon posited that:

for me, critical pedagogy is always having an underlying reason for what you are doing. Not just ‘we’re doing hockey, we’re doing football, we’re doing self-defence’. [But] why? What’s the why behind it? What’s the how behind it? Who is it going to benefit? Who is it going to be good for? (Int. 2)

David proposed that a critical pedagogue reflects, not only on their own experience of a lesson, but also tries to understand the perspective of the students. He stressed the importance of

“having the ability to view your lesson, not from a teacher’s point of view but from a student’s point of view is very important” (Focus group Int. 2). Gail highlighted the value of critical reflection when she maintained, “I think ‘critical’ involves more than just looking on the surface of it, [teachers should be] looking below the surface a bit more, to where the problems are and acting on them” (Int. 2). Naming and acting on oppressive social structures is a key component of the original critical theories of the Frankfurt School (Horkheimer, Adorno, & Noerr, 2002). Whether or not ‘the problems’ Gail refers to are social structures or an individual barrier, is less clear.

Critical reflection represents a critical pedagogy as the reflections move beyond the routine day-to-day actions of the teaching process, focussing instead on the political and ethical principles that underpin teaching (Smyth, 1989). Brookfield (1995a) advocated for critical reflection as it provides a deeper appreciation of how “our actions, decisions and choices all reflect ideological perspectives” (p. 40).

Critical pedagogy is responsive pedagogy. A small number of the participants associated critical pedagogy with pedagogies that cater to the individual needs of all the students in their classrooms. These participants stressed that teachers need to know their students so they can respond to their individual needs.

Amber highlighted that critical pedagogy is “thinking about ‘how do I cater to the different range of abilities in the class with students?’” (Int. 2). With a similar focus on meeting the needs of all students, Gail proposed that critical pedagogy included making sure that, “your students are all sort of equal ... receiving equal content and equal knowledge and equal learning” (Int. 2).

Jess recognised that:

...it is creating that link between their prior knowledge and what their goals are for their learning and how to enact that ... you have to have the knowledge of where your students are coming from ... you need to know them on a personal level and cater for multiculturalism and then suddenly you have this connection and [you realise that] not one model fits everything. (Int. 2)

Tash reiterates the importance of knowing the students she teaches. She asserts that:

...classes are just full of so many different personalities and you have to remember that not everyone is like you ... there might be other barriers in their lives that might be stopping them from doing something and if we can’t see that then we can’t really help the students. (Focus group Int. 1)

Tash provided an example from practicum^{xlii} where she noticed that most of the girls in the class were not bringing their gear, nor were they participating. When she explored why, she

discovered that, “every time they had a practical they always did ‘touch’^{xliii} and [they said] we just want to do something else” (Int. 2).

These students’ responses foreground a desire to provide meaningful education to all students in the classroom. Responsive pedagogies involve identifying the challenges for different abilities, different genders, and different cultures and ethnicities. The participants in this study recognise that they must make an effort to know the students they teach and they must develop a range of teaching strategies to cater adequately to the learning needs of all students in their classes. Although fairness and justice are central themes in the comments of these participants, it is less clear if solutions focus on problems at the level of classroom interactions, or whether there is any attempt to challenge overarching structures that may create these issues.

Responsive pedagogies may be more consistent with humanism. A humanistic perspective focuses on enabling individuals through the use of effective classroom practices that cater for the needs of all students. A humanistic perspective does not challenge social structures that create or maintain inequalities and therefore it is not consistent with most definitions of critical pedagogy. While critical pedagogy encapsulates humanism, humanism is not necessarily the enactment of critical pedagogy. Despite these differences, the ethic of care for individual students expressed, and the desire to develop classroom practices that cater for all students is important especially when working with marginalised students. Indeed, Cho (2006) observed that it is at the classroom level where teachers believe they can make the most significant impact on the students they teach. The limitation of responsive practices is located in the lack of action on some of the broader issues that cause inequalities in the first place. A focus on responsive teaching may suggest that these broader social issues are ‘not on the radar’ of the participants in this study.

Constructivism to conscientization. For a number of the PETE students in this study, one of the primary purposes of critical pedagogy was to enable the students they teach to construct their own knowledge and understanding. In regard to how this can be done, there appears to be a difference in opinion, ranging from constructivist theories (Wadsworth, 1996) to a deeper exploration of how deeply held beliefs may influence individual understanding.

A commonality is that all participants position the student at the centre of the learning process. The ‘knowledge constructing’ pedagogies move beyond ‘banking’ education where the teacher fills the student up with knowledge (Freire, 1970b). The verbs used in the following statements, (e.g., ‘thinking’, ‘exploring’, ‘challenging’, ‘questioning’) are consistent with constructivist teaching where students maintain an active role in the process of making meaning and knowledge construction. Advocacy for constructivism is reflected in comments by Liam who teaches in a way that requires “students to come up with the answers rather than just feeding the students

teacher directed teaching” (Int. 2). Holly indicated that critical pedagogy is based on constructivist principles as she “encourages students to think and not just give them information” (Int. 2). Wendy similarly foregrounded teaching strategies that require students to construct their own knowledge stating, “critical pedagogy to me is like the learning through students, getting them to critically look at things” (Focus group Int. 1).

Whether a constructivist approach amounts to a critical perspective is a matter of degree. Hattam, McInerney, Lawson, and Smyth (1999) stated that a socially just curriculum “treats knowledge as being socially constructed”, although they add the caveat that social justice is only realised when the enactment of the curriculum is “activist oriented” (p. 14). Critical pedagogy that is reduced to understanding the world through multiple perspectives, that lacks any commitment to taking action based on these new perspectives, is not critical pedagogy.

In contrast, Jason proposed a critical pedagogy that shifts from constructivism to something more akin to Freire’s (1970a) notion of conscientization. Through his own teaching Jason proposed that he wants students to:

question their own beliefs ... to challenge themselves and question, you know, challenge themselves to question other’s beliefs and making informed decisions about these things ... I would always want my students not just to read anything they read and to accept it. (Int. 2)

Shane and George showed a similar understanding of critical pedagogy. Shane advocated for making students conscious of how their values and beliefs may influence their understanding, stating that, “[I want them to explore] how their values and beliefs around an issue or subject can affect how they think about it (Int. 2). George asserted that he wanted to “deconstruct that power that I’ve got as a teacher”. He proposed that, “[he wanted] to allow the students to make their own decision and try to get them to rid their own bias through exploring dominant discourses, like ‘what is advantaged?’, ‘what is the normal view?’ and [I] try and challenge it “(Int. 2)

While Jason, Shane and George are proponents of enabling students to explore their own values and beliefs, none of them has clarified whether it is important for themselves as teachers to also reflect on their own values and beliefs. It is less clear if these three participants view conscientization as learning to both perceive, and take action against, social, political and economic oppression (Freire, 1970b), or if it is a teaching strategy centred in unequal power relations that “marginalized [students] into the structures of oppression” (Freire, 2012, p. 74). In line with this thought, Bruce (2013) suggested that critical pedagogues may be guilty of channelling students’ ‘critical consciousness’ toward a predetermined destination as they “tend to know where they are headed; the end is a given” (p. 10).

Uncertainty of understanding. More than half of the participants in this study profess to be unclear as to what critical pedagogy is. These students claim that critical pedagogy has been discussed throughout the four years of the programme but it has never been defined. At the first interview, David was most adamant that he did not understand the term ‘critical pedagogy’:

I find it quite a hazy topic to still talk about ... here we are sitting in a course [programme] that has the philosophy that we all graduate as critical thinkers and critical pedagogues and we get to fourth year and Bob^{xiv} asks us, ‘so what are some examples of what a critical pedagogue is?’, and all of us are sitting there going oh, oh (Focus Group Int. 1)

Similar sentiments came from other students. Tash suggested that perhaps she was let down by the BPE programme as she had struggled with understanding critical pedagogy, “because no one has given me, ‘this is the definition’ of it” (Int. 2). George stated that he was familiar with pedagogy and he had an idea of what ‘critical’ meant, but “the mixture of the two is still a bit unclear in my mind” (Int. 2). Jess was somewhat more optimistic, suggesting that “I think I have a developing understanding of critical pedagogy. I think that it will become clearer as I get into teaching with my own classes” (Int. 2). Similarly, Shane proposed, “I would regard it [my understanding of critical pedagogy] as definitely progressing still” (Int. 2). Only Richard seemed to allude to the possibility that the practice of critical pedagogy may be context-specific and unique to each individual. He maintained that, “I think it’s different for everyone, different person. Everyone’s got their understanding of what they think it is” (Int. 2).

Discussion and Conclusion

This paper reports on an attempt to gain insight into how students who are completing a four-year PETE programme underpinned by a critical orientation understand critical pedagogy. The findings demonstrate that each student has constructed a different understanding, with many remaining uncertain about what critical pedagogy is, and how it is enacted. However, in comparison to the BPE teacher educators who [earlier, in Chapter 5] reported understandings of critical pedagogy based on their own critical frameworks, the BPE students show very limited engagement with concepts central to critical pedagogy. Absent from more description are central concepts such as social justice, equity, deconstructing power, and challenging dominant discourses and taken-for-granted norms. Of the 19 students in this study, only six (Dillon, Gail, George, Margaret, Jason and Xavier) engaged with this language. In addition, David, Jess and Shane suggested that critical pedagogy involves understanding the perspectives of others and questioning one’s own beliefs and values. The other 10 BPE students describe a perspective that is more akin to humanism^{xiv}.

The engagement by nine of the 19 participants with the aforementioned language of critical pedagogy provides some evidence that exposure to critical pedagogies in the BPE programme has,

to some extent, overcome the barrier of not understanding critical pedagogy (Kincheloe, 2007; D. Macdonald & Brooker, 1999; Macedo, 2009; Werner, 2007). Shudak (2014) asserted that 'critical literacy' is absolutely necessary as students need to understand the theoretical and political position taken by those who wish to be critical educators. The language and concepts of critical pedagogy such as hegemony, power, critical consciousness, and inequity, are as important in critical literacy as the concepts of multiplication, division and quadratic equations to numeracy.

Three of the participants espoused the importance of critical reflection, a process described by Giroux (1981) as delving into one's own biographies to look at how life experiences influence beliefs and values. Shane and Jason promoted a critical pedagogy of making students aware of how their values and beliefs influence their understandings. Tash advocated for critical approaches that enabled students to recognise issues of gender equity (Dewar, 1990; Tinning, 1985). Aronowitz (2008) described this level of consciousness, not as a form of indoctrination, but as an awareness of the forces in one's life that have ruled and shaped one's consciousness. Yet it is only George who acknowledged that it is important for *both* students and teachers to carefully examine their own life histories when he stressed the importance of deconstructing his own power as a teacher.

The uncertainty expressed by many of the participants, the promotion of technical reflection by Steven and Jess, and the focus on constructivist learning as critical pedagogy suggests that the participants' reading of the BPE has been filtered by their own biographies and beliefs (Devis-Devis & Sparkes, 1999; Garrett & Wrench, 2011a; Richardson, 2003; Tsangaridou, 2006). Indeed, Bolin (1990) cautioned that "not all students will benefit from a reflective education programme" (p. 34). Given that the analysis of the BPE programme documents and the interviews with the BPE teacher educators [in Chapters 5 and 6] suggested that critical approaches feature prominently in the BPE programme, it is troubling to observe that few of the graduating students are able to articulate a coherent description of some of the principles of critical pedagogy.

It is possible that the BPE students lacked the language and understanding of critical pedagogy to recognise when their own ITE classroom experiences were underpinned by a critical orientation. It is possible that the critical pedagogies in the BPE may have gone unnoticed or dismissed as 'quirky' teaching approaches of the individual teacher educators. The sense, or better put, the lack of sense, that students have made from the BPE programme may be a result of learning *through* critical pedagogies without sufficient learning *about* critical theory and critical pedagogy.

ITE is uniquely placed in tertiary studies as ITE students learn to teach both through *what* is taught (content) and *how* it is taught (pedagogy). By and large, the teacher educators are teachers 'teaching teaching', accountable for facilitating knowledge construction with students, while under the gaze of BPE students who are concurrently learning the process of teaching. In this study the *use*

of critical pedagogies in the BPE may be insufficient as students lack the theoretical understanding to identify them. The participants may not have recognised critical approaches in their BPE courses, because they did not know what to look for. David identified this conundrum when he suggested that it was only in the last year that:

...a definition of critical pedagogy was explained...once it was explained to us, we could actually see how the classes, how the lectures and what we had done over the last three and a half years had actually related to that. (Int. 2)

David's comment can be read in a few different ways. His initial comment reported earlier in the findings, was that until the fourth year of the PETE programme, he had negotiated the BPE programme hearing about, and engaging in courses where critical pedagogies were enacted without a sufficient understanding or even an awareness of, a collective programme-wide attempt to advocate for teaching for social justice. In a four-year undergraduate ITE degree, where most of the students were in tertiary education for the first time, it is possible that David and the other BPE students associate the pedagogies as 'normal' ITE pedagogies rather than critical pedagogies. As the BPE programme is a four-year undergraduate degree, most of the students have no previous university experiences to use as reference points. This second statement by David reveals a growing awareness that the teaching practices that were taking place were examples of critical pedagogies yet, until recently, he had been unaware of, and unable to identify, critical teaching practices despite having encountered them throughout the degree. It is equally interesting that none of the other eight participants from David's focus group, who completed a largely 'lock step' series of courses alongside David, recalled a recent unveiling of a definition of critical pedagogy in their final year. For example, Xavier stated, "to be honest I've never really had it defined [as to] what is critical pedagogy" (Focus group Int. 2). Another telling comment came from Tash. Late in the final semi-structured interview she was shown a list of recognised critical pedagogies (Appendix 9)^{xlvi}. Tash read the list and stated, "Are these honestly critical pedagogies? That is not what I thought they were" (Int. 2).

As David and many other students profess to still being unclear as to what critical pedagogy is, this may signal a need to teach not only *through* critical pedagogies, but more so *about* critical pedagogies. It is alluring to conclude that the BPE programme needs to better prepare students with a more comprehensive understanding of critical theory and critical teaching methods that can be applied in school HPE classes, yet I am reticent to make this suggestion. While a stronger grounding in critical literacy would have enabled the BPE students to provide responses that conveyed a more accurate understanding of critical pedagogy, I am uncertain if, and how, this might change their teaching practices. Tinning (2012) stressed that how HPE teachers *think* and *feel* (original italics) about education and social justice, physical activity, bodies and health is the most important

graduate attribute. Sleeter (2010) warned against transmission teaching of critical teaching methods, as she observed that these approaches to critical pedagogies of race have been marginalised and reduced to celebrations of diversity rather than a serious attempt to challenge unequitable structural constraints. A dilemma exists. While I worry about the participants' inability to recognise critical practices, I am uncertain if learning *about* critical theories and critical practices as concepts removed from a real context and the everyday realities of PETE students will lead to better outcomes. As a teacher educator who has an interest in social justice, it strikes me that there is a delicate balance needed between graduating future teachers with the best of intentions (aka, critical perspective), and teachers armed with a range of critical teaching practices.

Ultimately, critical pedagogy cannot be reduced to a teaching method or instructional model. Critical pedagogy must always be in the continuous process of development and recontextualisation and not reduced to 'one' "narrow set of prescriptive practices" (Breunig, 2011, p. 5). The critical pedagogies of Paulo Freire cannot be taken from the slums of Brazil and imported to the privileged context of a university in New Zealand. The challenge for teacher educators is to equip ITE students with malleable critical practices and strategies that can be learned in a way that these can be adapted to different contexts.

It is not within the scope of this study to determine if the participants' understanding of critical pedagogy can be attributed to the BPE programme, an outcome of their own life histories, or a combination of both. More than 20 years ago, Haberman (1991) suggested that perhaps teacher educators should spend more time 'picking the right people' rather than trying to 'change the wrong ones'. The espoused policy of the Te Ika a Maui University BPE programme (1996) to "attract students of diverse background" (p. 12) may signal that the BPE has attracted the right people.

This study reinforces Tinning's (2002) assertion that different students will make different sense of their experiences in a critical PETE programme. As there is little in the way of literature to make comparisons with, it is difficult as an advocate of critical education to determine whether I should be optimistic because of the small number of students who seem to embody the zeitgeist of critical pedagogy or to lament the uncertainty and the narrow interpretations. What is lacking in this data is the explicit acknowledgement that schools are places both where oppression and social order are reproduced and places where human conditions can be improved (McLaren, 1998). Some of the participants in this study show understanding of *what* a critical pedagogue may do, with less cognisance of *why* they do what they do. On reflection, I feel that I failed to make the politics of critical pedagogy more explicit in the interviews.

As Wink (2005) succinctly stated, critical pedagogy requires teachers to name [injustices], reflect, and act critically in the world. Through ITE, prospective teachers can learn about inequity,

oppression, and disadvantage. They can study politics and education and critical theories. They can observe, name and model critical practices observed in their ITE programme. Ultimately though, it is the ITE students themselves who must commit to being political in their classrooms in the hope of making a positive difference for the students they teach. Further research that follows these graduating ITE students into schools is needed to determine if engagement with critical perspectives survives and grows beyond PETE, and how these teachers enact a critical perspective in their own classrooms.

Summary

The preceding paper has highlighted that the BPE programme has made a *different difference* to the 19 PETE students in the programme. While the lock-step programme provided near-identical experiences during course work^{xlvii}, the students have different understandings of critical pedagogy. While some of the language and perspectives of students are consistent with a critical perspective, other students are less able to articulate a clear understanding of a critical perspective on teaching or connect their learning experiences to espoused critical pedagogies. What is unclear, and not yet discussed in this thesis, is the questions of why and how each student has constructed their own unique understandings.

The final paper in this thesis explores this question through a Bourdieuan analysis of interviews with the BPE students. In this paper I call on Bourdieu's concepts of habitus, field, cultural capital, pedagogical action and pedagogical work to investigate how individual student biographies serve to mediate students' readings of the BPE programme.

Students' readings of critical pedagogies in PETE: When biography and critical pedagogy

intersect^{xlviii}

Initial teacher education (ITE) provides a unique experience for all students who partake. In addition to the variation in ITE programme orientations and structure (Zeichner, 1983, 2010), each student's biography plays a critical role in helping the individual make sense of ITE. The importance of ITE student beliefs and values has long been recognised. For example, Lortie (1975) suggested

that ITE students come to ITE following years of an 'apprenticeship' as students in schools where their personal experiences serve to formulate beliefs about teaching. Borko and Putham (1996) reported that the beliefs teachers hold act as filters through which learning takes place. Research both in education (Borko & Putnam, 1996) and physical education (Doolittle et al., 1993; Graber, 2001; Hutchison, 1993; M O'Sullivan, 2005), indicates that students entering PETE come with strong beliefs about teaching that are difficult to change. While research suggests that attitudes and beliefs impact both on classroom practices and the teacher change processes, the relationship is complex and often person- and context-specific (Richardson, 1996).

Critical ITE is an orientation to teacher education that critiques the political, ethical and social issues involved in schooling and teaching. Critical teacher education addresses questions of social justice and democracy (Kincheloe, 2008b). Steeped in the critical theories of the Frankfurt School and the liberation theories of Paulo Freire (Bates, 2013; Blackmore, 2013), critical ITE endeavours to expose inequities in education and foreground the transformative possibilities of classrooms (Smyth, 2011). The hope is that engagement with critical pedagogies will provide ITE students with an awareness of, and a desire to act on, inequity and issues of social justice in their own classrooms.

Although critical ITE has been present since the early 1980s, there is little consensus about how to ensure that ITE students become committed to social justice (Cochran-Smith, 2010). Advocates for critical pedagogies suggest that ITE students need to be exposed to new and different perspectives on education to create a change in students' beliefs about the importance of social justice (Bartolome, 2004, 2007; Cho, 2006; Hinchey, 2006; Kincheloe, 2007; Tinning, 2002).

Critical PETE builds on the social justice agenda by challenging issues specific to physical education (PE) such as the dominance of human movement sciences, issues of gender, race, and the social construction of the body. Bruce (2013) described critical PE as learning through and about movement, questioning the role of PE and how movement culture contributes to injustices that exist in schools and society. Despite critical PETE enjoying advocacy and application for most of the 25 years, Evans et al. (1996) and more recently, Mordal-Moen and Green (2013) have suggested that critical PETE has struggled to 'shake or stir' the beliefs and practices of PE teachers.

This paper examines how students in a four-year PETE programme that is underpinned by a critical orientation 'read' and make sense of the critical pedagogies they were exposed to. The paper focuses on how student biographies mediate the messages from the critical pedagogies used in their PETE programme. Using Bourdieu's concepts of *habitus*, *field*, *cultural capital*, *pedagogical action* and *pedagogical work* [as presented in Chapter 4], I will illustrate how the students in this study make sense of the PETE programme through their own values and beliefs. I will demonstrate that

the PETE programme foregrounded messages of social justice that resonated with some of the students' own life experiences. I argue that the critical PETE programme has impacted on the deeply held beliefs about social justice of many students, although it is less certain whether this will impact on their practices once they leave the field of PETE and enter the field of secondary school physical education.

In Chapter 7 I identified that the participants in this study understood critical pedagogy to mean different things including reflecting on teaching, responsive pedagogy, and a process of 'constructivism through to conscientization'. The participants who were in the final year of the four-year BPE programme recognised that the term 'critical pedagogy' was routinely talked about as 'taken for granted', but they claim that it was not clearly explained in the first three years of the four-year programme. Many participants expressed uncertainty as to the meaning of critical pedagogy. This paper builds on these findings as it explores how the BPE students' life histories, values and beliefs mediate their readings of the *pedagogical actions* of the BPE programme.

Findings

Habitus as a filter of the BPE: Individual programme readings. The BPE programme has 26 compulsory courses spread across the four years of the programme. The majority of these courses are completed in a linear sequence with the same 40 to 50 students progressing as a cohort through each year of the programme. Despite the apparent consistency through which students' progress through the BPE programme, the students actively construct their own meaning through the learning process (Azzarito & Solomon, 2005). It appears that the homogeneity of the programme has produced different understandings based on the meaning and importance that each student attaches to both the individual courses and the four-year programme in its entirety

Individual participants emphasised that a number of different BPE teacher educators teaching a range of different courses influenced their understanding of social justice and equity. One female student whom I will refer to as Brenda recalled how, "Andrew^{xlix} and Karen^l... helped me understand how we can make assessments equitable for kids that struggle" (Int 2). A second student, Dillon stated that, "the Māori camp opened my eyes something chronic" (Int 2). Amber recalled how, "we interrogated ideological beliefs ... in Catherine's^{li} class. She brought up a law for example, like the drinking age and we had to decide whether we were for it or against it and we had to explain why." (Int 2). David suggested that his understanding of PE as being broader than sport started with "Patricia^{lii} in that first-year dance paper" (Int 2). Wendy, a young European student commented that, "swimming in Colin's^{liii} class opened my eyes to diversity. I just assumed everyone could swim because that is what I knew" (Int 2).

While many of the BPE teacher educators and courses acknowledged by participants have teaching and assessment strategies that align with principles of critical pedagogy [see Chapter 5], that is not the case for all of the courses. As an example, the first-year dance course referred to by David, as an individual course, has no apparent connection to critical pedagogy. It is only through reflecting on the dominance of sport in PE (Brustad, 1997; Hunter, 2004; Mordal-Moen & Green, 2012) in another BPE course, that David is able to identify how dance may contribute to a more inclusive physical education programme.

It is clear that participants in this study more easily identify inequities that have occurred within their own life experiences. Margaret advocated for more to be done for people with disabilities. She stated that, "I work with people with disabilities so I want them to be treated fairly. I want them to have the same opportunities as I do and [I] try and make it as easy for them". She later proposed that "it would be cool to have a disability paper come in [to the BPE programme], because I am quite strong on that" (Int. 2). Holly reflected on the racial discrimination she experienced when she started university. She recalls how:

I found it [injustice] personally when I started university and I was applying for Māori scholarships. The letter I got back said I wasn't Māori enough to apply for a scholarship ... as I have gone through this degree, I realise how easy it is for those sorts of things to happen (Int. 2).

David observed that, "I think it's definitely important that people are faced with equal rights...my brother is openly gay, he battled with it all the way through high school and two years afterwards...my brother did find the culture of the school [private boys' school] oppressive" (Int. 2). Shane shows an awareness of discrimination based on sexual orientation when he stated that "through coaching [women's] cricket I know a lot of lesbians and I hated how they were treated. So it's up to society to challenge that. I think it is important, [it is] something we have to challenge" (Int. 2).

Two students reflected on the importance of these lived experiences. George suggested that "if you are disadvantaged in one way, you might understand how other people are disadvantaged" (Int. 2). Similarly, Jason proposed that "it's possible to be aware of disadvantage [if you haven't experienced it], but I think it is harder to" (Int. 2).

Tinning (2008) suggested that learning in teacher education is unpredictable and always dependent on meaning-making processes which are beyond the control of the teacher. These findings reinforce the importance of student habitus. The habitus of the participants in this study has served to filter the meaning-making process as students negotiated the BPE programme, defining what was reasonable and sensible (Bourdieu, 1990). Given that there are differences in the BPE

students' habitus', each individual will have a unique 'reading' of the courses and programme as a whole. Margaret has an acute awareness of disability due to experiences working with disabled students. Holly and Tash are highly attuned to racial discrimination through their own lived experiences. Shane and David recognise the discrimination based on sexual orientation. For these students, the critical pedagogies in the BPE reaffirm their commitment to these specific issues of social justice. These students are 'committed' (Gore, 1990) to social justice; not necessarily to *all* issues, but specifically to forms of discrimination they have encountered in their own lives. For these students, the language of critical pedagogy provides the tools to express and affirm what their habitus structures them to perceive as important. Without the support of critical pedagogies in the BPE, it would be less likely that these social justice agendas would survive. What is less certain is whether or not these experiences of injustice lend themselves to helping the participants recognise *all* inequities or if this heightened social justice agenda is specific to their own lived experiences.

Pedagogical work in the BPE. While I argue that habitus influences students' reading of the PE programme, resulting in individual students placing emphasis on different learning experiences, it does appear that there are specific courses in both the first and final year of the programme that are recognised by many participants as making an important contribution to their understanding of equity and social justice.

The majority of participants in this study identified a first-year BPE paper titled, *Sociocultural Foundations of PE* as being influential. Brenda suggested that critical ITE began, "with Raymond^{liv} in our first year ..., [we examined] really dominant kinds of ideals that come through in New Zealand culture ... It was all about masculinity and hegemony and that kind of male dominance" (Int 2). Richard recounted experiences in the same course that focussed on "identifying and interrogating ideological beliefs. We did that a lot in Raymond's^{lv} class" (Focus group Int. 1). David and Tash, who were in a different year group to Brenda and Richard, remembered the same course although it was taught by a different lecturer. David stated that, "in our first year ... Tom^{lvi} tried to get us to challenge the norms of society. We did all these activities where we had to jump into another person's shoes. It was all to do with our own attitudes and beliefs" (Int. 2.). Tash described Tom's course in the first year as the place where she learned "all the hegemonic stuff... at the time, we couldn't define it as being a hegemonic process but after talking about it ... that was the beginning of us opening our eyes to the wider issues in PE" (Int. 2).

A fourth-year course, *Critical Issues in Health and Physical Education*, is also acknowledged by many participants as contributing to their awareness of social justice. Similar to the previous year one course, the study participants in different year groups were taught by different lecturers. Jess described the course as, "coming up with a bold statement, and looking at that bold statement in

regards to PE and Health” (Int. 2). Felix stated that, “In Terry’s^{lvii} class we had to make a bold statement and we had to argue it ... I think that paper was great” (Int. 2). Participants in the subsequent year group recalled the importance of the paper stating, “In the last semester I think I have changed my ideas about a few things ... I think it has a lot to do with Mandy’s^{lviii} paper” (Richard, Int. 2). Shane proposed that, “Mandy’s paper helped us [examine] those deep seated negative beliefs about hegemonic or whatever, about masculinity” (Int. 2).

In the first-year paper both Raymond and Tom disrupted students’ understanding of physical education. Terry and Mandy had a similar impact in the fourth-year course. The assertion by participants that multiple BPE teacher educators who teach the same courses have contributed to the students’ perspectives on social justice can draw on two explanations. Given that these two courses are explicitly designed to draw attention to issues of equity and social justice [see Chapter 2], it is likely that only lecturers with a critical perspective would deliver these courses. It is also possible that the pedagogical strategies, that is, the pedagogical *strategies* used in the courses were effective in drawing attention to issues of social justice.

The participants describe *pedagogical actions* (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990) that appear to matter. Both courses examine how beliefs have developed through biographical experiences. The ‘bold statements’ described by Jess are consistent with critical pedagogies of facilitating open discussion about racism and stereotyping (Fitzpatrick & Santamaria, 2015). While critical pedagogy is not a strategy, these accounts suggest strategies that are *more likely* to disrupt many of the taken-for-granted ideas that form the logic of the field of physical education.

Pedagogical work beyond the BPE courses. The participants in this study proposed that experiences outside of course work also do *pedagogical work* (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990) that contributed to developing a critical perspective. They acknowledged that both the diversity of their cohort and the diversity of the four practicum experiences they have across the BPE programme impacted on their understanding of diversity and teaching for social justice. Amber, a Pacifica student who attended secondary school in South Auckland recalled that students in the BPE programme are sent to a range of different schools, “They always tell us to go to [diverse] schools, like private schools, co-ed schools, so I think that helps... It challenges our beliefs about people” (Int. 2). Amber recalled going to a private school on practicum:

I went to Veritas College^{lix}. I know it sounds bad, but you think ‘rich kids’ and how you perceive them. But when I went in and taught, they were kind of the same as when I was in school. They were just students. They are diverse in culture and abilities and that sort of stuff ... So I think it’s kind of like an eye opener. I guess it’s like saying not to go with stereotypes. It’s challenging the way I think (Int. 2)

Felix suggested that experiencing a diverse range of schools was helpful. He claimed “I was quite lucky because I got to go into a wide range of schools, so I was able to see quite a good difference” (Int. 2).

A number of participants allege that their understanding of diversity and social justice developed because of the diversity within their respective cohorts. The BPE cohorts are typically an even mix of male and female students. European students are the largest single ethnic group, while approximately 40% of students are of Māori or Pacifica descent^{lx}. Holly, a part-Māori student, suggested that “being part of a diverse class helps, because when we do get into talks about culture and being diverse, we can hear so many different stories” (Int. 2). Richard, a European student, who was one of a small number of students not from Auckland, stated that, “...we are a multicultural course. We are interacting with Pacific Island students, Māori students, Pākeha students ... we are dealing with different cultures” (Int. 2).

It is an interesting, although not unexpected, observation that *pedagogical work* is done outside of the courses. The ability of the BPE programme to provoke students to value a critical perspective links to “its weight in the structure of the power relations” (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990, p. 7). *Pedagogical actions* that occur during the BPE programme compete with the *pedagogical actions* done outside of formal lectures including teaching experiences (practicums) in schools where a competing logic of practice may prevail.

For the participants in this study, empathy for diversity seems to have occurred in ‘spaces’ where the participants have had the agency to construct their own understanding. These ‘spaces’ are not apparent attempts at pedagogical action therefore students feel greater agency to make their own sense of the experiences^{lxi}. These experiences *beyond courses* share some of the characteristics of the valued courses within the BPE where students highlighted the value of problematised knowledge that leads to construction of their own understanding. Given the structuring attributes of habitus, rather than kicking at the *habitus* through *pedagogical actions*, these experiences provided students with the boots to kick at their own habitus.

No certainty of a critical perspective. Critical pedagogy is a perspective on education and not simply a teaching strategy to be mastered and performed. While a strategy can be conceived as a plan of action, a perspective is an attitude or value held towards something. A perspective is based on beliefs and values. Some of the participants in this study demonstrate values and beliefs that are consistent with a critical perspective. They recognise that there are inequities in life and educational structures, and they want to address them through their teaching. For example, Gail recognised the impact of financial inequities as she observed that “lower income families don’t have those opportunities ... not just education, there’s health. It’s harder to stay healthy because food is

expensive, medical bills are so expensive, and then there is things like sport... lower economic families can't afford to do sports" (Int. 2). Shane made a similar observation when he stated, "there are so many people out there that could further themselves but they don't have that opportunity because of wealth ... we have a student loan system, but there are still other restrictions in life (Int. 2)." Jason, a student who identified as Samoan, Māori and European suggested that there are cultural barriers that create inequities. He provided the example of the challenges faced by a cousin in a Samoan family. I include the whole quote to highlight Jason's awareness that access to education is not the same for all university students:

The number one priority is family ... You have to have the rent paid. You have to have food on the table and power... my income is your income, that's how they do it. So she would need to go to university and she couldn't pay for her bus fare because she had to buy bread and milk ... and it only takes being \$20 short to not come for a day or two, so obviously it's going to hinder her performance. She is not given a fair shot. If she was in another family, she might be able to do things. I was brought up in a different family. My parents haven't asked me for a cent. I am only here because of their support. It's different. (Int. 1)

Jess proposed that neo-liberal thinking that foregrounds personal responsibility and being accountable is becoming a dominant force in New Zealand. Neo-liberalism is based on the premise that deregulation of labour and financial markets will empower citizens to take advantage of the market economies and improve human wellbeing (Navarro, 2007). A neo-liberal perspective is based on the belief that individuals need to take personal responsibility for their own outcomes. She expressed concern about this trend stating, "New Zealand is trying to mirror itself with the likes of England and America ... it's going along the lines of everyone for themselves ... this is a departure from where New Zealand has come from and it is a bit disappointing" (Int. 2).

These comments intimate that many of the students are aware of inequity and how this can impact on life opportunities. It is less clear how they have come to feel this way. The four statements above come from two male and two female students, two of whom live in affluent and the other two in less affluent Auckland suburbs. Shane and Gail are older students with families of their own, while Jason and Jess are much younger. These findings would suggest that a critical habitus is a complex embodiment of life experiences and not an outcome that can be reduced to age, gender, and socio-economic status.

This study also suggests that some of the participants demonstrate values and beliefs that are more in line with neo-liberal thinking than a critical perspective. Many of the participants in the study suggested that New Zealand provided a context where all citizens have equal opportunities. For example, David stated that, "definitely, regardless of race and ethnicity ... I think New Zealand is

on the right track. There are people out there who are struggling, but again [these are] tough economic conditions” (Int. 2). Liam similarly commented that, “things are the way they are because they probably are the best way ... if something is the majority, it’s probably that way for a reason” (Int. 2) which suggests a naïve, deterministic, taken-for-granted view of the world. Richard also appeared to be confident that there are equal opportunities for all New Zealand citizens stating, “I’m a huge believer that you’ve got to go get it yourself. It is available ... you should make the most of it” (Int. 2). When Wendy was asked about equality in New Zealand, she showed what I can only describe as a patronising attitude toward the idea that inequality of opportunity exists in New Zealand:

I think it is ridiculous that people think that they can’t be rich and they can’t be happy because they don’t have any money ... you all have the opportunity, some of you grew up in a harder neighbourhood and your parents didn’t treat you with respect, but you have the opportunity to get out of that when you go to school. (Int. 2)

Margaret articulated a similar perspective when she stated that all New Zealand citizens have, ‘a fair shot’ at wealth and happiness. She claimed that, “you’ve got to work for what you want ... if you want to become wealthy you’ve got to work and it’s not going to come to you” (Int. 2). In these statements the participants failed to recognise that structural constraints may differentiate life choices in New Zealand. Interestingly, later in the interview, Margaret reflected that her response is based only on her own life history. She recounted that, “for myself in my growing up I know ... but I don’t know about those who are living in poor conditions and don’t have any food, I don’t know about them” (Int. 2).

It is difficult to see that these values and beliefs can be consistent with a critical perspective. These statements suggest a lack of recognition of inequity. The statements from these five participants suggest that there is limited awareness of the ways in which access to health, educational, and financial resources may impact on the equity of opportunity. While these statements do not fully capture the complexity of their values, they do provide some insight into the challenges for teacher educators that foreground a critical perspective. An embodied habitus that leads to the taken-for-granted outlook that abundant equity of opportunity exists will most certainly clash with a critical perspective that starts with the assumption that life choices are not equal because of socio-economic circumstances. While it would be churlish to conclude that these values will lead the students to dismiss a critical perspective, these findings highlight how the structuring structures of habitus serve to filter ITE.

The BPE teacher educators would likely be concerned that some students appear to accept inequities in New Zealand, without questioning how this happens in a seemingly affluent western

democracy. In multiple BPE courses, students have had exposure to pedagogies designed to provide opportunities for reflecting on equality of opportunity. In the first year of the BPE programme students reflect on their own life histories. In the second year they look at diversity, where issues of prejudice and discrimination are examined. They attend a week long 'camp' on a marae, a border crossing experience where they are immersed in Māori language, Māori perspectives on history and education, Māori culture including traditional Māori music and instruments and physical activity. In compulsory health courses in the second and third year of the BPE programme they examine discrimination, and explore their own values to issues such as sexual orientation, age of consent, attitudes to drugs and alcohol. Throughout the four-year BPE programme students engage in alternate physical contexts such as dance, aquatics, gymnastics, and outdoor education that are designed to disrupt the dominant logic of a sport-based PE curriculum (Azzarito & Solomon, 2005). For some students these experiences provide sufficient exposure to augment or modify habitus (Brown, 2005), for other students, habitus may be more durable.

These findings highlight the resilience of habitus along with the co-constitutive way in which habitus and field serve to support each other. Bourdieu (1990) suggested that membership in a field such as physical education requires an implicit acceptance of the rules in which the field operates. Any change to the field of physical education (away from sport-based PE) impacts negatively on the cultural capital of a sporting habitus. Changing the boundaries of the field of PE through changes in content or pedagogy will impact on the nature of the habitus that is valued in the field. While the BPE programme demonstrates a range of strategies to challenge the field of PE, it is not surprising that the PETE students, many of whom are heavily invested in the kinds of capital that are valued in the field (Fitzpatrick & Santamaria, 2015), are reluctant to acquiesce. While the BPE programme may have kicked at the habitus of students, as Brown (2005) suggested, the experiences in school PE departments systematically refine and reinforce until the habitus "'fits' with the habitus demands of the field of PE" (p. 15).

Kicking at one's habitus: Kicked, shaken and unstirred. I acknowledge from the outset that the metaphor of 'kicking at the habitus' used in the title of this thesis suggests that the participants in this study have the agency to simply choose to change and develop an affinity for teaching for social justice. Bourdieu, in his later work, reinforced that habitus sits at the junction of structure and agency. I am not suggesting that students in this study who report a change in their perspectives on teaching have altogether abandoned subconscious, deeply held dispositions. Habitus is a complex system of durable, transposable dispositions that serve to generate and organise practices (Bourdieu, 1990). Habitus has the resilience to endure kicking, shaking, and stirring.

The BPE students in this study recognise the difficulty of changing beliefs and opening their logic of practice to include the examination of issues of equity. Felix recognised that values and beliefs are developed throughout childhood. He cautioned that, “for some students in our class, it [adopting a critical perspective] will be hard for them, just because of their own upbringing and their own experiences and so they won’t want to challenge them” (Int. 2). Tash questioned whether the BPE programme could hope to bring about a critical perspective in all students stating “I don’t know if it is possible to change their views ... at the end of the day they are just going to think what they think” (Int. 2).

Some participants proposed that exposure to different values and different cultures is critical to shaking one’s habitus. Jason espoused that “if students are not exposed to a culture that is not like their own they won’t change ... if you are advantaged it is hard to see from a disadvantaged view” (Int 2). It is, of course, too simplistic to suggest that exposure to diversity will shake one’s habitus. Shane recognised the importance of the affective domain, how students feel about social justice when he proposed, “I suppose it [BPE] can put the seeds in their mind, but they have still got to want to change ... it is going to be hard to change a lot of those deep seated mentalities” (Int 2). Brenda concurred:

I think it comes down to the person as to whether they value changing issues or value social justice and equity ... If you don’t value them, I don’t think any amount of going to class and reading are going to change until a person has a passion for it. (Int. 2)

Many participants in this study claimed that the four-year BPE programme had shaken their beliefs to the point where they have the desire to effect change. Indeed, Bourdieu suggested that *pedagogical work* is done when a process of inculcation (e.g., teacher education) lasts long enough to produce a habitus that perpetuates after the pedagogical action ends (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990). Evidence of pedagogical work includes George’s assertion that he is more aware of issues of equity:

It is in the last few years that I have realised what privilege is ... for example Māori scholarships ... I thought this is ridiculous, I’m just as bright as anyone and I deserve the same opportunity ... but then I have deconstructed the opportunity that I have and it makes sense ... I definitely believe we should do more to equalise conditions. (Int. 2)

Similarly, Dillon proposed that, “[the] university [BPE programme] has created a desire to do something about social injustice. It has happened to me. Through university we are given an insight into what we can do ... I think everyone has an opportunity to change who they are and the road they go down” (Int. 2). In the same way, Wendy stated, “[when I started] I didn’t have any

knowledge of social inequity. [I] didn't really have a care for it ... I am now aware of how females are judged, how races are judged. I think this course has helped me open my eyes" (Int. 2). Shane alluded to a shift in habitus in claiming that, "I think about how I walked in here at year one. I'm very different now, or my views are very different now than they were at the start of year one" (Int. 2). Liam described his own trajectory through the BPE programme recalling that:

Four years ago, you only think of your own perspective, you only think of what you have been through, your experiences as a white, not so disadvantaged person ... but you realise through this course that people are different. Some things are a lot harder for people to do. Some people have to work twice as hard to get to the same place as someone else. (Int. 2)

I am aware that a close examination of the findings exposes some obvious contradictions. Wendy espouses both an awareness of social inequity related to gender and race yet she also suggested that all New Zealanders have an equal opportunity. Liam conveys a critical perspective as he reflects on the privileges he has experienced as a white male, yet he conceptualises critical pedagogy as constructivist learning rather than the development of a critical consciousness or a transformational pedagogy. These "less than perfect results" (M. OSullivan et al., 1992, p. 278) have been reported in previous critical PETE research (see Gore, 1990; McDonald & Brooker, 2000; Tinning, 2004).

In addition, the participants who claimed to have developed a critical perspective appreciate that critical pedagogy and teaching for social justice are challenging. What follows highlights how two participants leave the BPE programme with a sophisticated understanding of inequity and the challenges ahead as teachers. Jason, a student who identifies as Māori, Pacifica and European shows a growing understanding of the complexity of critical pedagogy:

When I think about it ... realistically, we are not all equal ... we are born in different families, so if you are brought up in a family that is wealthy, you are going to have a lot more given to you to be able to achieve ... whereas people who don't have much, it's not equal and it's not fair. But that's the way it is. I used to be against affirmative action because it goes against everyone getting a fair shot. But then I realised that not everyone is getting a fair shot... (Int. 2)

Jason recognised that there were no simple solutions to inequity:

I live in Aroha^{lxii} now. I see a lot of poor people and they have almost given up. They have given up because it's easy, but it's also not their choice too. You can only play the cards you

have been dealt ... it is still a bit sad, [even] with affirmative action, people can still fall between the cracks, like poor white working class people. (Int. 2)

Jess, a European student from the most affluent northern suburbs of Auckland has developed a heightened awareness of the intersection between education and politics. She stated:

Considering what the government has just been doing with teaching I find myself strongly opposing the government that I elected. For the first time I almost paid attention to politics. I think if you got rid of private schools you would have an interesting debate in the sense that education would almost be equal ... that wouldn't create an equal education for all but it would be a step in the right direction. (Int. 2)

The study design used in this research project does not allow me to determine if these beliefs came with Jason and Jess to the BPE programme, or whether they were developed through the programme. While the life history of growing up in a Pacifica/Māori family in a more disadvantaged suburb may help to explain the affinity toward a social justice agenda for Jason, the contrasting biography of Jess does less to explain her beliefs about equitable education. While the genesis of these beliefs remains difficult to establish, both Jess and Jamie suggest that their engagement with critical pedagogies such as 'bold statements', 'problem posing' and 'exploring values and beliefs' in the BPE programme has played a crucial role in shaping their own critical perspectives.

Critical pedagogies as cultural capital in the field. Bourdieu suggested that the influence *habitus* has on thoughts and behaviours is contingent on the *field* in which one is located. The four-year BPE programme provided a field in which critical pedagogy was legitimised. Holly stated that, "critical pedagogy became more dominant ... in the third and fourth year it is fairly dominant within everything. In the first couple of years ... it is just floating in the background" (Int. 2). The examination of the programme and course documents presented in Chapter 3 of this thesis would not support this assertion. Critical approaches appear to be evenly spread throughout the four years of the BPE. Holly's suggestion that critical pedagogy became more dominant later in the four-year degree may signify a growing awareness that critical perspectives are part of the logic of the field. Her ability to name issues of inequity suggests that she has developed cultural capital in the field of the BPE programme. It is less certain whether this results from a change in her values and beliefs (e.g., a change in her *habitus*), or studentship, that is, an understanding of the rules and practices that represent capital in the field of the BPE.

The growing awareness and confidence by some of the participants with taking action for social justice demonstrates the importance of, and synergistic relationship between, cultural capital

and field. In the BPE programme, a field where critical perspectives represent cultural capital, students who develop this capital excel in the field. The length of the BPE programme, the distribution of critical pedagogies throughout the four years and the valuing of critical perspectives by the BPE teacher educators, ensure that field remains rigid, continually kicking at student habitus.

Darling-Hammond (2006) suggested that social justice is best taught in an integrated and coherent teacher education programme rather than through individual courses or faculties. Jamie proposed that the programme has made an impact on him because of the multiple exposures to critical perspectives. He surmised that “you could do a paper and kind of get the concepts ... but it still wouldn’t have the same effect as the whole four years ... after four years I feel like it [critical pedagogy] is almost in me now” (Int 2). Bourdieu (2000) himself recommended that pedagogical work that durably transforms habitus was most likely to occur “only a thorough process of counter-training, involving repeated exercises...” (p. 172). A number of previous studies have highlighted the difficulty of changing students’ perspectives through a single critical ITE course (Cameron, 2012; Curtner-Smith, 2007; Hickey, 2001; D. Macdonald & Brooker, 1999). A weaker, less focussed intervention by a smaller number of PETEs and courses, in a shorter space of time, would possibility result in the field of PETE being ‘kicked at’ (see Cameron, 2012; Dowling et al., 2015; Flory & Walton-Fisette, 2015; Gore, 1990), rather than ‘kicking at’ the students’ habitus.

Discussion and Conclusions

This study offers some insight into how students have negotiated a critical PETE programme. The findings demonstrate that values and beliefs long established through their own life histories have been both reaffirmed and shaken through critical pedagogies in the BPE programme.

There is evidence that the students’ habitus has filtered their ‘reading’ of the BPE programme. There are diverse issues of social justice that have been highlighted by participants, from courses that cross all four years of the BPE programme. The participants suggested that a range of BPE teacher educators and courses have influenced their understanding of critical pedagogy. In addition, school based practicums have provided experiences to highlight and contextualise the study of social justice. Spaces between courses such as social experiences within their diverse cohort group have served to further challenge their beliefs. While it is beyond the scope of this project to make sense of any relationships between *individual* student biographies and the nature and content of the courses and events that were valued, many influences are characterised as embodied experiences. These embodied experiences include learning about diversity through experiences: on a marae, in a swimming pool, during outdoor education, and while practising and performing dances. Pedagogical work has been done through student-centred strategies such as continuums that

expose values and beliefs, writing about their own biographies, and as a result of defending their 'bold' statements about their beliefs and values.

These collective experiences in the BPE programme have enabled many students to see things in the world that they once took for granted, from different perspectives (Legge, 2010; Shor, 1980). They have created a 'disruptive' space through a process of self-discovery where the common beliefs of students are agitated by the realisation that their perceptions of the world may not be shared. Many students appear to have benefitted from examining their own biographies and beliefs (Barker et al., 2011; Fitzpatrick & Santamaria, 2015; hooks, 2010) and problematising the field of PE (Fernandez-Balboa, 1995; Fitzpatrick & Santamaria, 2015) and teaching (Smyth, 2011).

Habitus, as a durable structuring structure that is resilient to change, may endure the challenges of rational discourses (Tinning, 2012). The power of the experiences in the BPE programme is likely to be a result of their embodied, emotional nature. The caveat attached to this statement is that each experience brings about an uncertain response. Dowling, Fitzgerald, and Flintoff (2015) recently asserted that "nourishing pedagogical encounters" occur in "insecure pedagogical spaces" in moments where the ordinary becomes disrupted, "enabling the vulnerability of acknowledging that thought cannot be complete and knowledge is always becoming" (p. 1038). There will be no encounter that can claim pedagogical work on the habitus of all students.

Further research following students who graduate from the BPE programme is needed to ascertain if the students' espoused changes in beliefs are durable changes in habitus or sophisticated understanding of difference in the logics of the field of PETE and the subfield of physical education. It is simplistic and optimistic to think that an intervention such as a critical PETE programme can do more than kick at the habitus of students. Jamie highlighted this stating, "they [BPE lecturers] can't force us to want to change the world, but they have given us the tools. They have influenced our thinking enough to make us wonder" (Focus group Int.1). My hope is that Jason is indicating that the BPE programme has given him and the other participants the 'tools', that is, the insight, and perspective, needed to kick at their own habitus beyond the intervention of the BPE programme.

How this shaken habitus is nurtured in schools will most certainly influence enduring attitudes toward social justice. In an environment where critical perspectives are perceived to be a form of cultural capital, beliefs and practices that promote equity and social justice may be enabled, and a changing habitus may continue to emerge. Calling again on Bourdieu and Passeron's (1990) theories of pedagogy, in the context of this study, pedagogical work requires the internalisation of the principles of critical pedagogy, a change in students' perspectives toward issues of equity, for a change in habitus to occur. Pedagogical work "is a prolonged process of inculcation" (p. 35). The BPE programme serves to shake the beliefs and values about social justice while students are in the field

of teacher education. While it is unlikely that the intervention of the BPE programme is sufficient to change the habitus of students towards social justice agendas, I am guardedly buoyed by the possibility that the structuring structure of habitus will have been sufficiently shaken to allow for new possibilities. The varied pedagogical actions in the BPE have given many students the boots to continue to kick at their own habitus.

Chapter conclusion

This chapter has examined the PETE students' understanding of critical pedagogy and the influences that their own biographies have had on their 'reading' of a four-year PETE programme underpinned by a critical orientation. The chapter highlights that the BPE has made a difference to the way many students think about issues of social justice and equity, although what difference the programme has made is unique to individual students. I have used concepts from Bourdieu to draw attention to the immense challenge of both developing a critical perspective and providing the graduating PETE students with the strategies to enact critical pedagogy upon entering the teaching profession in the field of HPE, a field that overlaps and shares boundaries with that of PETE, but nonetheless has its own logic of practice (Bourdieu, 1990).

This chapter is the final findings chapter. In Chapter 8 I synthesise the findings of the three preceding findings chapters. To complete this task, I will once again call on Bourdieuan concepts to progress the study and examine the implications both for the field of PETE and the field of school HPE.

CHAPTER 8: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Introduction

This study began with the dual intentions of exploring the nature of an espoused socially critical PETE programme and understanding how PETE students ‘read’, or made sense, of the programme. In this final chapter of the thesis, I synthesise the key findings, conclusions and insights that have emerged from previous chapters. I will engage further with Bourdieuiian concepts as a means of considering the implications of this study for further research and importantly, for the practice of critical PETE.

This study makes a unique contribution to the field of critical research in PETE as it examines a critical PETE *programme*, rather than a single *course* in a broader ITE context. The possible agency offered by a programme-wide approach to social justice has been promoted (Darling-Hammond, 2006), yet there is no literature to document the characteristics of such a programme, nor is there literature that examines how such a programme has been ‘read’ by ITE students.

Cognisant of this research gap, I embarked on this research with a general interest in how PETE could address issues of equity and social justice. It was only after examining documents, conducting initial interviews, and beginning the process of analysing data and engaging with social theory that I refined my research questions to ask:

- To what extent is the delivery of the BPE programme consistent with the programme’s espoused socially critical philosophy?
- What sense do the BPE students make of the courses and their other learning experiences in the programme in relation to the socially critical philosophy of the BPE programme?

- How do the BPE students' biographies influence their 'readings' of the PETE programme?

These questions have guided further data collection and analysis and the key findings that follow.

Exploring Critical PETE

In Chapter 1 I outlined the background to this thesis, justifying the research gap I was attempting to address, or, in part, fill. I began by problematising the understanding of what it means to be a good teacher, followed by an examination of the role ITE and PETE play in preparing teachers for the ever-changing context of post-modern schools. Acknowledging the importance of the researchers' positioning in critical research, I have shared aspects of my own life history and outlined the theoretical framework that underpins the thesis and the relevant research questions.

In Chapter 2 I described the research setting. The research setting is a crucial feature of the study as it provides a unique context for a critical PETE programme. The BPE programme is a concurrent, four-year initial teacher education programme underpinned by a critical orientation and it is situated in a faculty of education that is separate from sport and exercise science. The small annual cohorts of approximately 40-60 students allow the possibility for strong, trusting relationships to develop (Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004) both between students and between students and PETEs. During practicums across all four years of the programme, the BPE students teach in a range of different schools. Also included in Chapter 2 is a broad description of the context of PE in both New Zealand and Australia where critical pedagogies are espoused or foregrounded in school curriculum documents. This alignment, a critically orientated PETE programme and a socially critical school PE curriculum, affords opportunities unique to this study.

Chapter 3 introduced the reader to critical pedagogy. In this chapter I summarised the seminal literature that captured the ethos of critical theory and conceptualised a theory of education that foregrounded issues of transformation based on principles of equity and social justice, as opposed to a logic of education as the transmission of knowledge. The chapter problematised the growth in theorising about education for social justice and provided a working definition of critical pedagogy that has been used in this study. Chapter 3 also examined the literature that reported on the enactment of critical pedagogies in PETE. As a significant portion of the literature is located in PETE programmes in Australia and New Zealand, a paper titled, '*Critical Pedagogies in PETE: An Antipodean Perspective*' summarised the research into the enactment of critical pedagogies in PETE programmes in these two countries.

An overview of, and a justification for, the research methods used in this study were provided in Chapter 4. In this chapter I explained how I addressed the research questions through gathering data from three distinct data sets; the BPE programme and course documents, semi-structured interviews with BPE teacher educators who teach in the programme, and focus group and semi-structured interviews with BPE students. Data from documents were analysed using a critical discourse analysis framework (Gee, 1999), while thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) was used to analyse all interview data from BPE teacher educators and students. Initial descriptions of the theoretical concepts used in data analysis are located in the latter half of the chapter.

The findings of this study are reported in Chapters 5, 6 and 7, As this is a *thesis with publication* approved under the *University of Auckland 2011 Revised PhD Statutes and Guidelines* (University of Auckland, 2011) there are five individual papers located in these chapters that serve to tell the story of the espoused critical orientation of the BPE programme,

explore the understandings and enactment of critical pedagogy by BPE faculty members, and examine the understanding and ‘reading’ of the programme by the BPE students.

In Chapter 5 I analysed the BPE programme and course documents in a search for evidence of emancipatory knowledge interests (Habermas, 1972), that is, characteristics of the programme that foreground critical pedagogies. This analysis demonstrated that critical approaches are evident in the texts of the calendar descriptions, course booklets, readings and assignments. In Chapter 6, data from interviews with six BPE teacher educators articulated how an espoused critical PETE programme was enacted. Drawing on critical theory I examined the teacher educators’ understanding of critical pedagogy and described the teaching strategies they used in its name. The second paper in this chapter crosses three data sets, articulating the teaching strategies of ‘Tom’, one of the BPE teacher educators. The interview data with students provided insight into Tom’s enactment of his version of critical pedagogy. The triangulation between the findings of Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 will be presented later in this final chapter as a major finding to come from this study.

The final set of data, focus group and semi-structured interviews with BPE students highlighted the meaning they have made of the BPE programme. These findings were presented in two papers in Chapter 7. The first paper shows that not all participants graduated from the BPE programme with a clear, easily articulated understanding of critical pedagogy. For some, critical pedagogy had become synonymous with constructivist learning theories. These graduates recognise that knowledge claims are contestable, context-specific, socially constructed understandings of the world. Other BPE students have recognised how power can lead to understandings that serve dominant groups while marginalising others. These students locate critical pedagogy as a means of conscientization (Freire, 1997). They have connected their understanding to issues of social justice. The second paper in Chapter 7 used Bourdieu’s interconnected concepts of cultural capital, field and habitus along with pedagogical action

and pedagogical work to explain how individual students ‘read’ the critical pedagogies in the BPE. In this paper I theorised how individual habitus has intersected at different points with the critical approaches in the BPE programme. I argued that the students’ habitus has been challenged, confronted or ‘kicked at’ through a range of critical approaches from a number of different BPE teacher educators using teaching strategies earlier described in Chapter 6. In this paper I also drew attention to the power of habitus as a structuring structure, one that concurrently ‘kicks back’ at pedagogies, rejecting experiences that challenge it, while favouring experiences that reinforce it (Bourdieu, 1988).

In what follows, I discuss two themes that arise as an outcome of examining the findings across all three data sets. I continue to use Bourdieuan concepts to analyse the BPE and make sense of the students’ reading of the BPE programme.

Theme 1: The BPE Programme Provides a Coherent Critical PETE Programme

Cognisant of Muros-Ruiz and Fernandez-Balboa’s (2005) conclusion that not everyone who claims to be a critical pedagogue demonstrates understandings of, nor enacts, teaching practices that are consistent with critical pedagogy, the first research question in this thesis explored the claim that the BPE programme *is* a critical programme. In Chapter 5, I used programme and course documents, the first of three data sets, to document evidence of content, practices, assessments, readings and lectures that were consistent with critical pedagogy. As the BPE programme is largely a ‘lock-step’ programme, I was able to identify 26 compulsory courses taken by all BPE students. I used Gee’s (1990) concept of ‘little d’ and ‘Big D’ discourses to suggest that documents can only demonstrate the *espoused* orientation of the BPE. I am now able to draw on three data sets to comment further on the programme discourse. In this discussion, I call on the findings in Chapters 5, 6 and 7 to argue that the BPE is an enactment of a coherent programme approach to critical pedagogy that has been absent or not previously articulated in literature on critical PETE.

Without wishing to labour the point, I can only reiterate that critical pedagogy cannot be thought of as an instructional model, that is, a rote-learned teaching strategy that is reproduced in multiple settings and contexts. More than 25 years ago, Peter McLaren (1989) reminded us that critical pedagogy does not represent a homogenous set of ideas, rather it is focused on the objective of transforming social inequality and empowering those without power. It is a ‘pedagogy’ bound by principles rather than a set of prescriptive practices (Simon, 1992). Principles provide an important foundation for the enactment of critical pedagogy as they foreground the beliefs and values that underpin the practice. Principles can be defined as “propositions that serve as the foundation for a system of beliefs or behaviour or for a chain of reasoning” (www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/principle). It is only when one enacts the principles of critical pedagogy, when the *logic of practice* (Bourdieu, 1990) is based around the objective of transforming social inequities and addressing issues of social justice, that teaching strategies or approaches can be conceived of as critical pedagogies and not just critical thinking (see Chapter 3).

I now draw on the following principles, introduced earlier in Chapter 3 to argue that the BPE programme enacts a commitment to critical pedagogy:

- Critical pedagogies must help students understand how power works;
- Critical pedagogies must prepare students to participate in a democratic society;
and
- Critical pedagogies must attend to identifying inequity and taking action for social justice.

This uncertainty of a practice based on principles presents a conundrum for ITE and, in my own experience, a sense of frustration for students. For example, teaching strategies used in PETE to forward issues of equity and social justice cannot be taught unproblematically as ‘the’ critical pedagogies for PETE students to replicate in their own

classrooms. Critical pedagogy is context-specific and organic in the sense that it adapts and responds to changing environments and social situations. Having articulated this as a caveat, I argue that the BPE provides one example of a comprehensive and coherent critical ITE programme.

In Chapter 5 I demonstrated that the *principles* of critical pedagogy were articulated in the BPE accreditation documents (Te Ika a Maui College of Education, 1996; Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2005). The 2005 BPE accreditation document expresses the programme's commitment to social action, as it is "focused on reducing current disparities in educational achievement" (2005, p. 7). In specific reference to the New Zealand context, the BPE programme is guided by the principle that the degree will "respond effectively to the needs and aspirations of Māori students and communities, and to the educational outcomes for Māori" (2005, p. 21). The documents signal a commitment to evidence-based teaching that inquires, "...into the values and assumptions that underlie and derive from the social, moral and political contexts of teachers' work" (2005, p. 21). The BPE programme documents articulate the implications of enacting these principles suggesting that the resulting pedagogical actions of the programme must include:

- critical examinations of their own educational experiences;
- problem-based case studies that explore ethical issues and dilemmas;
- action research; and
- opportunities for "joining support groups of teaching colleagues in the environments where they will be teaching." (2005, p. 14)

The stated aims of the BPE programme (Te Ika a Maui College of Education, 1996) that include conceptualising physical education "within a socially critical perspective" (p. 25), and "promoting reflective thought and reconstructive action...which entails the

problematism of the task of teaching” (p. 12) align with the principles of ‘examining power and taking action for social justice’.

The BPE documents provide evidence of a programme-wide approach to critical PETE. Using the concept of Knowledge Constitutive Interests (KCI) (Habermas, 1972), I have demonstrated how course work promoted emancipatory knowledge interests, that is, an interest in equity and social justice, through the questioning and examination of structures that may serve to oppress students. Emancipatory knowledge interests are evident in learning outcomes (LOs) across numerous courses (see Table 2.2) that require students to evaluate, critically examine, critically reflect and critique. While the LOs do not exclusively foreground emancipatory knowledge interests, their prevalence suggests that the act of teaching and the nature of HPE is problematised and deconstructed.

As I examined the individual course books, I found growing evidence of the principles of critical pedagogy alluded to in the programme documents, that is, the official discourse of the BPE programme, showing that these were further supported by the espoused practices of individual teacher educators. While the accreditation documents, calendar descriptions and LOs are sanctioned from outside the BPE faculty, therefore representing sites of competing discourses (Wodak, 2007), the course books are texts where PETEs have more agency. Interviews with the BPE teacher educators confirmed that the course books were written largely by individual PETEs who, while guided by LOs, have the autonomy to develop their own lecture schedules and assignments. The individual course guides provided further evidence of an alignment with the principles of critical pedagogy.

Students are challenged to develop an *understanding of power* through a number of different courses. The lecture schedules articulate classroom practices and assignments across the four years of the degree that require students to reflect on their own biographies, lectures where historical and cultural understandings of health are presented and problematised, and

courses that require students to participate in, and evaluate, marginalised forms of movement such as dance, indigenous games and outdoor education. Students *identify inequity* through a number of courses. In both first- and fourth-year courses, they critically examined who was advantaged through the dominant role sports plays in PE programmes. In the second year of the BPE programme the students participated in a week-long, border crossing experience that immersed them in Māori culture, helping them to understand the impact of colonisation. The principle of *participating in a democratic society* is articulated through opportunities to negotiate curriculum and assessment and power sharing through self-assessment. *Taking action for social justice* is possibly the least visible in course work although a major theme for a fourth-year course is *reflecting on your own practice and exploring possibilities for subversion/resistance* (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2011b). These practices heed the advice of previous research such as Hickey's (2001) warning that PETE students come with embodied knowledge that does not readily avail itself in a process of rational inspection and re-ordering and Brown's (1999) suggestion to personalise issues through life history approaches.

The interviews with BPE teacher educators provided further evidence that a critical perspective is enacted into the BPE programme. Most of these PETEs articulated an understanding of critical pedagogy that connected to the principles of either 'examining power', 'teaching for social justice' and/or 'addressing inequity or democratic teaching' (see Table 6.1). Although most of the teacher educators recognised the historical links to critical theory and critiques of class and capitalism, their focus was more closely aligned with issues specific to PE and health such as addressing issues of discrimination through critically examining gender, race, body image and motor elitism. While this evolution will not be welcomed by all (see McLaren, 2000; McLaren & Farahmandpur, 2000), the underpinning principles I have articulated earlier are at the forefront of the faculty's understanding. In

Chapter 6, the teacher educators' descriptions of strategies designed to facilitate critical reflection, disrupting thinking, and teaching for democracy align with the critical discourse alluded to in the documents. It is almost certain that a programme approach to critical pedagogy exists because a critical perspective resides in the teacher educators more so than in the documents. This is acknowledged by Jess, one of the student participants in this study who stated, "those lecturers who strongly believe in looking at the taken-for-granted practices and wanting to tackle them, they really bring it to the forefront of the paper" (Int. 2).

The third data set, interviews with the BPE students, provided further evidence of a programme that included comprehensive enactments of multiple critical perspectives. In Chapter 6, I captured descriptions by students of the problem-posing and dialogic practices of 'Tom'. The students spoke of being confronted by unending questions that were generative of a critical consciousness (Freire, 1970b) as they began to understand how their own values and beliefs have led to their own perspectives on the world. The students spoke of experiences that were 'confusing' and 'frustrating' suggesting engagement beyond the rational. In Chapter 7, there is further evidence that critical pedagogies were enacted in multiple courses by different teacher educators. One student recalls how Andrew^{lxiii} and Karen^{lxiv} helped her understand how to develop equitable assessments. Another, Dillon, recalled how the *noho marae* experience with Lee^{lxv} examined issues of racism. A third student, Amber, described how they explored ideological beliefs in Catherine's^{lxvi} class.

In addition to the BPE courses, the student participants in this study suggested that experiences *outside* of courses aligned with critical perspectives. Amber recounted the importance of being required to complete practicums in a range of diverse schools. She attributed her growing understanding of diversity and culture as an outcome of these experiences. Richard suggested that the diversity of students within the BPE programme allowed for experiences and conversations that provided access to "...so many different

stories”. A return to the programme accreditation documents reveals that these experiences outside of courses, far from being a result of serendipity, are structures that were ensconced in the programme design.

The notion of a critical PETE programme. The evidence across the data sets suggests that the four-year concurrent BPE programme provided a comprehensive series of experiences that aligned with the principles of critical pedagogy. Issues of equity and social justice were privileged across multiple courses. Chapter 6 illustrates that many of the PETEs taught from post-structural perspectives that focused on cultural explanations of inequity. While these perspectives may not address underpinning issues of class and the inequities caused by capitalist economies through a Marxist critique, these multiple perspectives are perhaps more aligned to the life experiences of the students. For example, some PETE students may recognise the power of post-colonial thinking if they are attuned to issues of racial discrimination. Some may be receptive to feminist theorising if they have experienced discrimination based on gender. Others may be receptive to the value that queer theory offers to challenging heteronormative understandings of gender.

From a Bourdieuan perspective, it is vital to pay attention to the habitus of the students when considering critical approaches to PETE. The espoused aim of the BPE programme, “to promote reflective thought and reconstructive action” (1996, p. 12) may require multiple strategies and multiple attempts to engage the habitus of the diverse student body in the BPE. Many studies have concluded that PETE students are influenced by strong positive experiences with sport (Green, 2000, 2002; M OSullivan et al., 2009; Sofu & Curtner-Smith, 2005; Wright, McNeill, & Fry, 2009) that reinforce institutionalised inequality through a focus on competition and domination (Brown, 1999; Hickey, 2008; Karen & Washington, 2010). Brown (1999) claimed that the influence of sport and PE backgrounds goes beyond the intellectual imagination into a body habitus (Bourdieu, 1990);

that embodied dispositions are engrained into and onto the body through practice. Given this challenge, a significant intervention is needed to shift the habitus of the BPE students to enable them to re-imagine PE as teaching practices that privilege inclusion, equity, social justice and involvement (Tinning, 1997).

It is not only the multiple critical teaching strategies that give the BPE programme a sense of coherence; it is also the sequencing of courses. In Chapter 7 I reported that a number of students suggested that the *Sociocultural Foundations of PE* course, a first-year course generally taught in the first semester of the programme, helped to share their understanding of equity and social justice. Tash aptly summarised the importance of this course when she iterated, “that was the beginning of us opening our eyes to the wider issues in PE” (Int. 2).

One student, Holly, suggested that there is coherence to the BPE programme, although this was not visible until the final year. She stated that “although it doesn’t look very structured when you go through it, sitting now in fourth year looking back, everything kind of flows into one another so well, and there is so much cross-over that you do get this big picture really clearly” (Int. 2). In Chapter 7, many students acknowledged the importance that a final year course, ‘*Critical Issues in Health and Physical Education*’ made to their awareness of social justice issues within an education context. It is telling that the students discussed the influence of the course regardless of who the lecturer was. In the case of ‘*Critical Issues in Health and Physical Education*’, four different lecturers were involved in teaching the course. This would suggest that a combination of the positioning of the courses at the start and towards the end of the degree and the teaching strategies used have contributed to their effectiveness.

One example of the collective pedagogical work of the BPE programme is captured in the comments of David, who, in Chapter 7, was able to identify how dance contributed to a more inclusive physical education programme. It is probable that David came to this

conclusion through reflecting on the dominance of sport in PE in year one. It is only as a result of having his understanding of PE as sport questioned, along with the development of pragmatic alternatives for PE beyond sport, that he was able to understand the teaching of dance as a critical pedagogy. While Brown (2005) questioned whether introducing activities such as dance in PETE constituted sufficient exposure to augment or modify habitus, I am suggesting that, when dance is learned within the broader discourse of socially just PE, it more likely to, although not certainly will, kick at the habitus.

The extant literature base suggests that the BPE programme incorporated many of the critical teaching strategies promoted. These included recruiting a diverse student base (Cochrane-Smith, 2010); exploring biographies and the social forces that shape the students' beliefs (Cameron, 2012; Cho, 2006; Devis-Devis & Sparkes; Giroux, 1981; Kirk, 1986, 2009); and exploring dominant ideologies (Bain, 1990; Bartolome, 2004; Legge, 2010). The BPE enacted democratic education (Fernandez-Balboa, 1995; Freire, 1970, 2009b; Macdonald & Brooker; Ross, 2010), investigated taken-for-granted knowledge and teaching practices (Bruce, 2011; Curtner-Smith, 2007; Fernandez-Balboa, 1995; Gore, 1990; Hickey, 2001; Kirk & Tinning, 1990; Shor, 1980; Smythe, 2011; Tinning, 2002, 2004) and included courses that focused on learning non-traditional PE activities enabling new conceptions of PE (Cassidy, 2000). Importantly, this study suggests that some BPE graduates both understand inequities and are committed to teaching for social justice (aka, a critical perspective). In response to the suggestion by Ellsworth (1989), and O'Sullivan et al. (1992) that research on critical pedagogy provided little evidence that it makes a difference, this empirical study foregrounds new possibilities when a critical perspective is enacted across a teacher education programme.

At this juncture in the thesis it is also worth considering what is absent from, or what could be changed within, the BPE programme. Werner (2007) proposed that critical

programmes must recruit students who are committed to teaching in less privileged schools. While the BPE programme does endeavour to “attract students from diverse backgrounds” (Te Ika a Maui University, 2005, p. 13), it is less certain if and how the programme does this, and if there is any effort to select prospective students based on their desire to teach in less privileged schools. Whereas the BPE faculty has an even gender balance, there is little ethnic diversity. In Chapter 5 I highlighted that ‘taking action’ for social justice was an espoused outcome of the programme, yet there was limited evidence of modelling or preparation for how students are meant to take action for social justice in schools. Consistent with most of the research in HPE, the social justice focus in course work highlighted inequities based on race, gender, body size, and physical ability. There was little evidence that the work of Karl Marx and a Marxist critique featured in the BPE programme. Recent research in PETE has suggested other teaching strategies worth considering. A recent self-study by Bruce (2015) highlighted the possibilities and the challenges of course work that involved reflections on ‘service learning’ (Butin, 2011). Bruce reported that the community-based work provided embodied experiences that have the potential to disrupt beliefs.

In addition, a nomenclature change from ‘critical’ to ‘radical’ pedagogy may compensate for the dilution and confusion over the meaning of the word ‘critical’. The intention would be clarifying the transformational possibilities of critical pedagogy, while assuming the same critical agenda. I am less optimistic over how receptive most universities would be to such a name change.

These additional possibilities raise questions as to the breadth and depth of opportunity required to maximise the pedagogical work for social justice. The notion of a coherent, comprehensive critical PETE programme, like critical pedagogy in general, remains elusive as a target or an outcome. What can be learned from this study is that a comprehensive critical programme is most achievable when it is supported by enabling

structures. The BPE programme operates within structures that support a critical orientation. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the BPE programme is situated in a unique context free from the competing interests of sport science (Kårhus, 2010). Most of the BPE teacher educators come from the *field* of education not from the *field* of sport science. The research agendas of many of the teacher educators are located within a critical paradigm. Far from being marginalised, the BPE programme represents a field where critical perspectives and knowledge of social theories have cultural capital. As the interviews with the BPE teacher educators have indicated, most of the participants have an understanding of, and an affinity towards, equity and social justice. It is highly likely that the critical work extends beyond what is reported in this study. Cognisant of Jess's earlier observation that the critical perspective resides in the teacher educators who teach more so than the courses or programme, it is highly likely that critical work beyond the BPE teacher educators who were interviewed is occurring. This breadth of social justice teaching is alluded to by the student participants in this study who suggested that the influences on their thinking about social justice were many and varied.

Bourdieu (1990) suggested that a shared set of beliefs and values is generative of an embodied class or *group habitus* that itself acts as a structuring structure that serves to socialise those who work within these structures. He maintained that a group habitus was possible when individuals embodied a shared history in a particular field, and thereby possessed a collegial *logic of practice*. In the context of this study, there is a long shared history amongst many of the BPE staff. Four of the six teacher educators interviewed in this study have worked within the same institution for more than 20 years. Each of these teacher educators has a long-term investment in the BPE programme. While their practices or pedagogical approaches vary, this "homogeneity" (Bourdieu, 1977) is premised on a shared

logic of the practice (Bourdieu, 1990), that is, a shared commitment to issues of equity and social justice.

It is self-evident that the maintenance of a group habitus is crucial to maintaining a coherent critical PETE programme. While the philosophical underpinnings of the programme documents were constructed within these structural conditions, faculty changes (the individual components of the group habitus) and changes to other structures such as cohort size, course contact time, and programme location have the potential to push the boundaries of the field and ultimately the logic of the practice within it. The socialising influence of habitus relies on retaining a significant proportion of teaching faculty with a critical perspective. While Bourdieu (1990) argued that habitus serves to structure thought and behaviour, group habitus cannot have the same structural impact when the group itself changes. Maintenance of a group habitus amidst change is fraught with challenge. I argue that the continuation of a critical group habitus relies on group stability, with any changes to the group selected from within the logic of the group habitus rather than by external agents.

Theme 2: Making a Different Difference - The BPE Programme does not have the Same Impact on all Students

The second major theme to emerge from this study is one of both optimism and caution, a finding that is, in one sense completely devoid of surprise, while at the same time a reminder of the power and importance of critical teacher education. This study demonstrates that the BPE programme has made a difference to all of the participants in the study. It appears that few students leave the BPE unchanged. The participants claim that the programme has influenced their thinking about PE content (Philpot & Smith, 2011), their beliefs about the importance of reflection (theme 1), their epistemological assumptions about how knowledge is constructed (theme 3), and their understanding of student-centred responsive pedagogies (theme 4). Some students advocate for the need to share power with

students through democratic teaching and a few have the confidence to take action against inequity. Many of these ‘differences’ represent shifts in their *beliefs* about the nature of PE, the nature of knowledge and, to a lesser extent, the nature of quality teaching. Studies in a range of PETE programmes have acknowledged the difficulty of the changing beliefs of PETE students (Doolittle et al., 1993; Matanin & Collier, 2003; Placek et al., 1995; Tsangaridou, 2008; Tsangaridou & O’Sullivan, 2003). These changes signify shifts at the cognitive and the emotional level. Some of these changes are in the minds (thinking), some are in the heart. Both are needed. These changes closely align with Tinning’s (2012) assertion that how PETE graduates *feel* about the place of social justice in physical education is the most important outcome of socially critical PETE. The BPE appears to have made a difference beyond the additional knowledge and skills they have developed. In addition to ‘banking’ (Freire, 1970b) knowledge of content and pedagogy, I argue that the BPE students have become reflective and show evidence of re-thinking ideas about PE and teaching that they have brought with them to PETE.

It is clear however, that the BPE programme makes a *different* difference to students. The varied histories of pre-service teachers are not forgotten as they engage with critical education (Garrett & Wrench, 2011b). But variation can only be partially explained by life histories alone as the intersections between culture, family, schooling, race, gender, age and religion serve to ensure that any predictions as to who will engage with critical pedagogies and espouse a critical perspective and who will be the recalcitrant (Gore, 1990) and escape PETE with little change to their existing beliefs. The use of critical strategies does not guarantee that all pre-service teachers understand and empathise with the nature of diversity.

There are numerous examples in this study of the power of life history in shaping the participants’ ability to recognise inequity. Margaret, through her work with disabled students highlighted the importance of catering for disability. Tash, Holly and Brenda, three non-

European students, advocated for the importance of attending to issues of racial discrimination. As an example, Tash poignantly stated that “any good teacher should be able to recognise [the girl] at the back of the class being excluded because she is a different race” (Int. 2). This study suggests that Tash, Margaret, Brenda and David may be attuned to these specific issues of inequity because of their own lived experiences. This is consistent with the findings of Garrett and Wrench (2011a) who reported that students’ engagement with critical pedagogies in PETE still depended on “how their own subjectivities, histories and experiences come together to create moments of insight” (p. 43). In a self-study by Dowling et al. (2015), the authors acknowledged that their own habitus clouded their ability to see other social justice issues stating, “we have, in fact, been surprised by the persistence of our early private concerns, such as gender or disability, and the ways they continue to colour our engagement with education for social justice, as well as the taken-for-grantedness and often ‘silent’ theoretical viewpoints” (p. 1039).

The BPE programme has served to conscientize (Freire, 1970b) some students. Participants such as Jason, Shane, and George recognised the need to be conscious of how values and beliefs influence their understanding. They recognised the relationship between power and knowledge and speak of engaging students in exploring dominant discourses and questions as to who is advantaged by these discourses. Dillon, Brenda, William and Gail embraced the importance of critical reflection. These students question: ‘Who is advantaged by activity choices?’; ‘Who is disadvantaged by pedagogical choices?’; and ‘What are the assumptions behind the decisions I am making?’ Gail highlighted the importance of more than identifying problems, but also acting on them.

For other participants their understanding of PE and education has become far less certain. In Chapter 6, many students suggested that the BPE programme and the teaching approaches of Tom, in particular, had led them to conceptualise PE as being much broader

than learning sport. These graduating BPE students, to varying degrees, have embraced the value of reflecting on practice and questioning their own teaching. A number of students suggested that teaching PE is a responsive practice that has to adapt to the context and the learners who they teach rather than a technical process or procedure that is learned and reproduced. Does this mean that they have embraced a critical perspective? Possibly not, but the BPE programme has shifted the participants in this study from a position of certainty to a position of less certainty, a position where 'banking' education (Freire, 1970b), the filling up of students with information, has become untenable, replaced instead by teaching strategies that involve constructing, exploring, questioning and challenging knowledge claims. The students have shifted to seeing the world as a socially constructed world where understanding and knowledge is relative and related to power as opposed to objective and absolute.

How will this habitus prosper in the field of HPE?. The evidence from Chapters 5 and 6 demonstrates that the BPE programme foregrounds emancipatory knowledge interests through a range of teaching strategies based on the principles of critical pedagogy. Within the BPE programme, critical perspectives are valued. The ability to critically reflect, co-construct curriculum and take action against inequity are valued and therefore represent cultural capital. The BPE graduates have established a perspective on the field of PE that is different to previous research where PE was viewed as a place to learn motor skills and develop fitness (Griffin & Combs, 2000; Placek et al., 1995), prepare students for life-long physical activity (Matanin & Collier, 2003) and learn to play sport (Philpot & Smith, 2011).

The BPE programme has served to 'kick at' the sporting habitus (Hunter, 2004) of many of the BPE students. It provided a social space that nurtured and encouraged a rethinking of the nature and purposes of PE. During the four-year programme, students were challenged to explore their own beliefs about race, gender, sport, health, and ability and rethink the taken-for-granted social practice of teaching school PE. Neither the BPE

programme nor any ITE programme, can claim certainty in developing a critical perspective that is equally cognisant of, and receptive to, all social issues. It is clear in this study that changes to students' understanding and embodying of critical perspectives were inconsistent between students and, for some students, incremental.

While the field of critical PETE in which the BPE programme is situated values critical perspectives, most of the graduates will work in the associated field of school PE. It is less certain that a habitus that embodies critical dispositions and inscribes practices or actions based on the logic of equity and social justice will carry the same cultural capital within school PE departments. In the field of school physical education, critical perspectives compete for domination alongside many of the discourses students have problematised throughout the BPE. The field of school PE is a different social space that introduces the beginning teacher to a new set of power relations.

The boundaries of a field can be challenged although this occurs within systems of power relations that are likely to resist change. For example, many schools support the value of sport over PE. PE teachers themselves may protect the field boundaries. Studies have shown that many PE teachers come with a gendered sporting habitus that values competition, performance, fitness and sport (Brown, 2005; Hunter, 2004). These teachers have invested in this content and their cultural capital in the field is a result of this investment. Hegemonic masculinity, PE as sport, and performance discourses that privilege white able-bodied males compete with critical perspectives as forms of capital of the field. For example, graduates who are able to foreground the *physical capital* associated with the field of sports, have historically been privileged within the field (Schilling, 1993). Physical capital in school PE is gained through a body shape, weight and size that match hegemonic masculine and feminine norms. Physical capital is captured through a fit and skilled body that can perform in the dominant physical culture of sport (Schilling, 1993). While this form of capital is not

officially sanctioned, it is straightforward to recognise physical educators in a broader group of teachers by body shapes, the clothes they wear, and the language they use. Undoubtedly, it would seem an unwise strategy to openly reject the logic of the field of school PE as one seeks employment in the field. Beginning PE teachers, who do not 'look' like a physical educator and espouse a critical perspective that does not fit into these cultural norms, run the risk of becoming 'a fish out of water'. This dilemma was highlighted by a teacher educator colleague in a New Zealand PETE programme who observed that PETE students who have a very critical orientation tend to not want to go into teaching because they themselves find schools to be oppressive places where they lack agency to take action for social justice.

Bourdieu (1975) noted that newcomers who refuse to accept the established logic of a field cannot expect to benefit, at least in the short run, since the whole logic of the field is against them. Despite the logic of a BPE programme valuing students with critical perspectives, the BPE graduates are employed in the field of PE. Graduates who are able to foreground the physical capital associated with the field of sport have historically been privileged within this field. Undoubtedly this different form of capital continues in schools that value coaches and elite sportsmen and sportswomen. If the BPE graduates enter a field where critical perspectives do not equate to cultural capital, they fail to become that efficient fish in water that is characteristic when there is an alignment between habitus, cultural capital and field.

Kicking the habitus and changing the field. Bourdieu's sage advice about the importance of aligning habitus, capital and field is generative of a number of pragmatic responses that are pertinent to critical education in general and this study specifically.

The critical perspective promoted by BPE teacher educators will be most effective if and when the alignment between the field of PETE and the field of physical education narrows. The embodiment of a critical perspective needs to be viewed as a form of capital in

both fields. Moving forward, a recommendation that arises from this study is that the BPE faculty consider how they can influence the social spaces of school PE into legitimising critical perspectives within the school PE field boundaries.

In order for critical practices to gain traction in school PE, the boundaries of the field of PE need to shift. The boundaries of a field are demarcated by the logic of the field. Changing the logic of the field, the shared values and beliefs that inform action, opens up the field to change. Shaking the habitus of PETE students through the BPE programme needs to align with a shaking of the field they will enter. If critical perspectives fail to represent cultural capital in schools and PE departments, the committed critical students will remain ‘fish *out of water*’ (Reay, Crozier, & Clayton, 2009). Nearly 20 years ago Tinning (1997) foreshadowed this when he claimed that changes in PETE needed to be accompanied by changes in the knowledge of the field of human movement studies. To put Tinning’s comments into context, he was claiming that the introduction of new socially critical PE curricula in New Zealand and Australia required changes to both PETE and the field of PE.

To understand the complexity of shifting the field boundaries of PE towards socially critical HPE, it is helpful to return to Bourdieu’s concept of group habitus. For many PE teachers, a sporting habitus subconsciously guides practices toward the teaching of sports techniques (Kirk, 2010). Deeply engrained ways of being cannot be shifted quickly. A long shared history of PE as sport, fitness and performance has served to create a group habitus among PE communities throughout much of the western world (see Green, 2000, 2002; Brown, 2005; Kirk, 2010; Mordel-Moen & Green, 2012). It is not possible for the logic of PE practice to change through a single intervention such as PETE or curriculum changes.

School physical education is described by Brown (2005) and Penney (2013) as a field with uncertain boundaries. Penney (2013) proposed that “PE practice is a site of ongoing struggle for control over meaning, consciousness and possibility in physical education; that

is, what can be thought or imagined in, about and for physical education” (p. 9). An examination of the history of physical education in New Zealand tells us that changes to the field of school PE are almost certain. The practice of PE, and the taken-for-granted logic behind the practice, has changed significantly in the 20th century. In New Zealand, PE has adapted from a form of physical training that included marching with wooden rifles (Stothart, 2012), to a place to learn to swim and keep safe in and around water (Moran, 2010), to a site for academic excellence that enables access into tertiary study (Stothart, 2012). For many years, in the 1940s and 1950s, gymnastics held a privileged position in PE programmes. This was usurped in many western countries including New Zealand by PE as sports-techniques (Kirk, 2010) and most recently by a focus on physical health discourse that attempts to tackle obesity and type II diabetes. It is unlikely that those of us who currently teach in PETE would consider a return to marching with rifles as a conceivable practice in PE. As Bourdieu (1990) suggested, habitus serves to generate only reasonable, common sense behaviours. It follows that the habitus of physical educators must change as the field of PE changes.

Changing the logic of a field is complex work enabled by both internal and external structures. I sense that, at least in the New Zealand context, an amalgam of structures currently exists that ensures the field is still changing. There is evidence that the idea of critical PE is shifting from outside to within the boundaries of school PE. The curriculum document (Ministry of Education, 2007) that supports PE teaching in New Zealand has been described by one of the writers as an attempt to shift the boundaries of PE from a technical imperative to a social critical pedagogy (Culpan & Bruce, 2007). As a starting point, physical education as a subject has been replaced within the *New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 1999, 2007) by a new learning area called Health and Physical Education (HPE). HPE, a merger of health, physical education and home economics (Ministry of Education, 1999, 2007) as an officially sanctioned learning area, has served to destabilise the field of PE.

A new social space has, at least in theory, been created. The field is now the field of HPE (Fitzpatrick, 2011) not PE. The alignment of the National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA), the national assessment system with the socially critical HPE curriculum has resulted in official status being afforded to ‘criticality’. The accountability of national assessments has provided some cultural capital within schools for HPE teachers who embrace critical thinking^{lxvii}. While it appears that HPE teachers interpret the curriculum differently (McIntyre, Philpot, & Smith, 2016)^{lxviii}, there are encouraging signs of shifting boundaries.

Further evidence of changing boundaries in the field of PE in New Zealand was provided at the recent 2015 national physical education conference. The 2015 national conference, attended by 250 delegates, most of whom were primary and secondary school teachers, was a merger between three separate national subject associations: Physical Education New Zealand (PENZ), New Zealand Health Educators Association (NZHEA), and Education Outdoors New Zealand (EONZ). The first keynote address, ‘*Are we there yet? Bridging the Criticality Theory to Practice in Physical Education*’ (McBain, 2015) was supported by seminars and practical workshops focussed on critical pedagogies and sociocultural issues, some of which were led by teachers from within the field of PE rather than teacher educators. Two of the sessions extended beyond the confines of a health classroom into a gymnasium – the traditional domain of physical educators. During a panel discussion on sexuality education in New Zealand the silenced voice of an openly gay male PETE student (Sparkes, 1997) was heard. The conference represents another structure that is helping to define the new field of HPE.

There is some evidence that the BPE teacher educators have contributed to changing the field of PE. The initial BPE accreditation documents (1996) that outlined a critical BPE programme preceded the advent of *Health and Physical Education in the New Zealand*

Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1999). This suggests that critical perspectives in the BPE were being advocated for before the advent of the national HPE curriculum. Sirna, Tinning, and Rossi (2010) proposed that the individuals who challenged the norms of the social field prepared it to accept future social change. It is probable that nearly 20 years of critical work in the BPE has made a contribution to reshaping the field of New Zealand secondary school physical education to accept alternative dispositions. The *pedagogical actions* of the BPE programme have served to offer new possibilities of teaching strategies now align with a critical HPE curriculum (Ministry of Education 1999, 2007). Brown (1999) suggested that a ‘reworking’ of habitus is facilitated by the provision of practical resources and alternative practices. In the 17 years since the introduction of the socially critical HPE curriculum, the BPE programme will have contributed to this shift in group habitus through their own critical approaches.

Looking Back and Moving Forward

Although Bourdieu suggested that habitus *can be shifted*, he offered little guidance to educators in regard to the nature of the life experiences, or more importantly, the educative experiences, more likely to have an impact. This thesis has provided rich descriptions of both the pedagogical actions of the teacher educators and the BPE students’ ‘reading’ of the programme. As such, it provides new knowledge that can be used to build on the existing ITE research base on pedagogical approaches for social justice.

The participants in this study allude to the importance of *starting* the BPE programme with a course that disrupts their preconceptions about teaching and physical education. Early experiences in a field are disproportionately powerful. Bourdieu stated that, “early experiences have particular weight because the habitus tends to ensure its own constancy and its defence against change through the selection it makes within new information” (p. 60). In Chapter 6, Dillon recalled an incident during his *first ever lecture* in a BPE course called

Health and Physical Education in a Diverse Society when the teacher educator challenged him to think about who he was, his own life history, and how this influenced his own perspective on the world. Dillon was adamant that this first lecture impacted on his thinking throughout the four years of the BPE programme. In my own experience, the transition from being a secondary school student to a student at university does leave one as the proverbial ‘fish out of water’. The seminal experiences in the BPE, where questioning your own beliefs and challenging the norms of society *was the norm*, served to put the students in a position of ontological insecurity. In this context, the social capital the students came with, that is, the ability to play sport, represented a currency with limited value.

That is not to say that all students enjoyed the experience. As Connor suggested in Chapter 6, “I disregarded stuff about hegemonic processes at the start. I didn’t understand it at the time. When it came up again later it made sense” (Int. 1). Although Breunig (2006) cautioned that pushing students to think critically too quickly can bring about overt student resistance, I would argue that group resistance is less likely when the group dynamics and a cohort culture are not yet established. The early introduction of critical pedagogies serves to socialise students into questioning knowledge claims and considering ‘other’ perspectives perhaps even more so than simply challenging specific knowledge about PE.

A pedagogy of exploring student values and beliefs is similarly supported by the findings. One example of how this was enacted in the BPE comes from the ‘bold statements’ used in the fourth-year course where students implicated themselves (Segall, 2008) through taking a stand on an issue in education and then defended their position. The success of this strategy lies in the agency that students have to come to their own conclusions. Rather than transmission of knowledge through ‘banking’, this approach aligns with Freire (1970) and Fernandez Balboa’s (1995) call for teachers and students to act as co-investigators. This is a student-centred approach that elicits student engagement and invariably an emotional

response. While this endeavour will continue to meet some resistance, it engages students in thinking outside of their own conscious frame of reference, that is, their own habitus. This pedagogy ‘worked’ in the context of this study because it is enacted across multiple courses and involves the problematisation of multiple issues. Collectively, these approaches may be effective because they problematised the power of dominant discourses without exploiting the power relationship between the teacher educator and the PETE students (Fitzclarence, 1991 cited in Tinning, 2002).

This thesis reiterates the importance of embodied experiences. Although this may be linked to the embodied nature of physical education itself, many researchers in ITE have stressed the importance of real life settings and concrete experiences (Muros Ruiz & Fernandez-Balboa, 2005; Tsangaridou & O’Sullivan, 1997). The dissonance created through living on a marae, practicum experiences working with the cultural ‘others’, and experiences of intentional discrimination by teacher educators in practical contexts may serve to engage what Plato called the voice of *thymos*, a rage against injustice from the voice of the disadvantaged (Tinning, 2002). To embody a critical perspective entails an alignment of values and beliefs that are intolerant of injustice and social inequity. I have identified earlier that some students already come with a heightened consciousness of equities from their own lived experiences. Many BPE students suggested that their lived experiences during their PETE programme have been the catalyst for a change in their beliefs.

The findings of this study also challenge the possibility of picking the right people rather than trying to change the wrong ones (Haberman, 1991). This thesis demonstrates that biographies and habitus are complex. The study concurs with other studies highlighting that it is difficult to know who will develop a critical perspective through critical approaches in ITE (Causey, Thomas, & Armento, 2000; Mills & Ballantyne, 2010), who will be overwhelmed (Causey et al., 2000; Devis-Devis & Sparkes, 1999), and who will resist (Gore, 1990). The

‘gatekeeping’ of ITE based on an ideological screening programme for the ‘right’ disposition strikes me as being as much folly as a search for the one ‘right’ critical pedagogy.

There are long-standing criticisms of critical pedagogy that this study enables me to address. In 1992, O’Sullivan, Siedentop, and Locke suggested that critical pedagogues in PE (specifically) were endeavouring to dichotomise PETE programmes as being either technical or critical. This thesis argues that, notwithstanding the critical orientation of the BPE, technical and critical knowledge can exist within the same programme. The analysis of the learning outcomes using Habermas’ concept of KCI (Table 5.1) conveyed a programme that catered to all three knowledge interests. The BPE course guides refer to content including: PE instructional models; Mosston’s Spectrum of Teaching styles; games from other cultures; and aquatics. Jean, one of the BPE teacher educators interviewed in this study suggested that, in addition to advocating for social justice, it was his responsibility to prepare graduates for the realities of teaching. S/he succinctly summarised this stating, “sometimes they just need to learn to drive the bus” (Int. 1). The differentiation between technical and critical orientations lies in the overarching critical perspective that is brought to technical knowledge. Technical knowledge of *how* to enact a model such as Teaching Games for Understanding (TGfU) is accompanied by questions like, ‘Why you enact TGfU?’, ‘Who would be advantaged?’, and ‘In what contexts would you use the model?’ Technical knowledge is rarely an end in itself. A critical pedagogy in PETE explores questions of ‘how’ and ‘why’ concurrently.

Biesta (1998) has argued that a pedagogy focused on social justice is impossible as the concept of social justice itself is uncertain. While I do not dispute the second half of this claim, the pedagogies in the BPE appear to recognise that social justice is a socially constructed concept that cannot be defined free of context. Returning to Freire, the focus of the programme appears to be the development of a critical consciousness through reimagining the world of PE, health and education. The pedagogies used in the BPE

programme bring to the consciousness many forms of inequity, rather than attempting to privilege a single explanation of inequity or ‘fix’ one specific problem. Indeed, one of the shortcomings of the BPE programme may be the lack of ‘taking action’ against inequities in real educational contexts.

This discussion has served to address, although not completely reconcile, Lather’s (1998) argument that the structure of schools makes it impossible to implement a critical pedagogy in schools. As the graduates of the BPE move from the field of PETE to the field of school PE, they encounter a new context with its own logic of practice. Within a new set of power relations in schools, beginning teachers do not enjoy unlimited *pedagogical agency*. They are not entirely ‘free’ to negotiate curriculum and use self-assessment. To partially paraphrase Bourdieu (1990), it is only in folk tales that the social world offers, “a universe of ‘possibles’ equally possible for any possible subject” (p. 64). In neo-liberal times, where metrics of performance and outcomes rule, where learning outcomes and key performance indicators reign as champions of value, it is uncomfortable to suggest anything but certainty. Predictability is a desired goal, a comfort based on false confidence in recipes that never fail in modelling, until they encounter the complex and unpredictable context of individual habitus and social relations. Yet it is clear that teachers do push back against the constraints of school structures. Fitzpatrick’s (2013) earlier account of ‘Dan’ suggested that, even within conservative school traditions, teachers can enact a critical pedagogy. A recent doctoral thesis (Deerness, 2014) highlighted how teachers who recognised the pressures from structures within the school, continued with their critical practices behind closed doors and windows and away from the evaluative gazes of their peers. There are teachers for whom a critical perspective is enacted in a field where it may not be welcomed.

It is also a significant finding of this study that the aforementioned features of the BPE programme do not impact equally on all students. The BPE makes a different difference

to its graduates. More than 25 years ago, Bolin (1990) suggested that not all students will benefit from reflective education. This study reinforces this claim. Undoubtedly, there were students who enrolled in the BPE, became disenchanted and left. It is likely that there were potential participants for this study who, upon reading the Participant Information Sheet, elected not to be involved. Despite my endeavour to recruit a cross-section of students from the BPE, the 19 student study participants cannot be construed as a random sample of the cohort. There will be BPE graduates who endure four years of kicking at their habitus, with beliefs and values that are shaken but unstirred (Mordel-Moen & Green, 2012).

A coherent critical programme will not necessarily produce critical pedagogues. But is this any different from any other aspect of ITE? More than 25 years ago, Gore (1990) acknowledged that meanings gained from teacher education occur at "...the intersection of discourses and subjectivities" (p. 134). The pedagogical work of the BPE is dependent both on student biography and other experiences during the programme. The BPE programme can best be thought of as an intervention that provides multiple opportunities, through a range of courses and teacher educators and experiences that enable its students to 'kick at' their own habitus. While these pedagogical actions impact on students within the field of the BPE, there is less certainty if it impacts in the field of school HPE.

For the majority of the students in the study I turn back to the metaphor of the seed. The seed for a shift toward a critical habitus has been planted. For the seed to grow and strengthen, a fertile 'field' (in schools and in HPE) is needed. There are participants for whom the BPE has served to nurture and develop an underlying critical habitus or perhaps, in the short space of four years the seed has been planted and germinated. For this smaller number of students, issues of justice and equity have become part of their logic of practice. These students recognise how choice of content can privilege some students and discriminate against others. These students have a deeper understanding of the role of power in knowledge

creation. Indeed, for some of these students the complexities of teaching for social justice in a school context seem overwhelming. George highlighted this when he suggested that, “I’d be happy if everyone had the same opportunity as I did, but I don’t want to lose my own opportunities” (Int. 2). George is aware that as a white European male, greater equity may equate to a loss in white male privilege. He is confronted with a wish to see others have more, without a willingness to have less.

While many scholars stress that ITE faculty should focus on developing an intolerance for injustice and a commitment to critical pedagogy, rather than simply understanding critical pedagogy (Cassidy, 2000; Gore, 1990; Mills, 2009; Muros Ruiz & Fernandez-Balboa, 2005; Tinning, 2002, 2012), I would argue that, in the case of critical PETE, it is equally important that a new logic of practice (Bourdieu, 1990) beyond sport and competition is acquired. It may be, as Cassidy (2000) claims, more productive to spend less time critiquing and more time providing other perspectives, skills and strategies that ITEs can draw on. It may be that the BPE needs a greater explicit focus on ensuring its graduates develop critical teaching strategies in addition to learning through critical practices. A stronger alignment of critical perspectives with appropriate teaching strategy may better enable and empower students to *enact* critical pedagogies in schools. This should not be interpreted as advocacy for ‘the’ or ‘a’ singular critical pedagogy in ITE. Instead, I envision PE graduates who have both the disposition to be empathetic and compassionate, with a range of pedagogical ‘tools’ that will enable them to be proactive and responsive in a variety of contexts.

Limitations

This study set out with the dual aims of exploring the nature of a PETE programme that espoused a critical orientation and with the goal of understanding what sense the PETE students make of such a programme. As articulated in Chapter 1, I have a strong belief in the

importance of social justice and therefore it might be suggested that a limitation of this study was its bias toward findings considered relevant to my own interests.

The methodology, including the methods of data collection, data analysis and the social theories used in this study have served to generate knowledge that is context-bound and a product of its genesis. Early in this chapter, I acknowledged that the research participants were purposely selected rather than randomly selected. In addition, the uniqueness of the context of this study ensures the results are not generalisable to other contexts. The complexity of the context of this study cannot be underestimated. The two cohort groups I interviewed were two separate groups with their own cultures. The annual practicum experiences described by many students as important interventions in their development were different for each student. Annual changes in course allocation to the BPE teacher educators meant that reflections on courses often discussed the impact of different teacher educators. On the other hand, it is envisioned that the findings offer readers who work in ITE with conclusions that can be recontextualised and adapted to their own environments. The findings of this study may serve as lessons learned to inform the structure of other ITE or PETE programmes.

The main sources of data for this study were documents and interviews. I did not observe the teacher educators practising, nor did I observe the BPE students during PETE or in classrooms during practicums. The 'Big D' discourse (Gee, 1999) of the BPE, that is, the actions that may be underpinned by documents and espoused pedagogies were never observed. While this lack of direct observation cannot be fully overcome, the triangulation of multiple data sets that articulate what the programme documents claim happens, alongside the BPE teacher educators' descriptions of their practices and the BPE students' descriptions of their experiences in courses, provides a greater confidence that the findings are dependable and credible (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

As I mentioned previously, in Chapter 7, I have some regrets about my lack of ongoing reflexivity (Berg, 2004) that limited my ability to listen and interpret responses and ask the ‘right’ follow-up questions. Upon reading transcripts, I was left wondering both what was not said, and at times wanting a much richer description to clarify what was stated. As an emerging researcher I am cognisant that my ability to listen and probe and seek clarification is a skill in progress.

I also take some responsibility for creating some tension and perception of power through my questions that may have led the BPE student participants to be reluctant to commit to their own definitions of critical pedagogy through a fear of being wrong. As I reflect on the interviews, as a result of reminding them that their programme was underpinned by a critical orientation, I may have pressured them into endeavouring to, ‘get it right’. They may have been somewhat more circumspect in their answers, wanting to reflect positively on their own teacher education programme.

The selection of concepts from Pierre Bourdieu and critical theory have enabled the understandings and conclusions produced in this study, yet they have served to limit other possibilities. Future studies that wish to examine the influence of power within ITE programmes and in schools may wish to turn to Foucault’s theories on ‘governmentality’ and ‘technologies of the self’. Alternatively, Complexity Theory (Byrne, 1998) may offer theoretical insight that helps make sense of the emergent knowledge and understandings of PETE students as they negotiate PETE. A recent edited book, *Complexity Thinking in Physical Education: Reframing Curriculum, Pedagogy and Research* (Ovens, Hopper, & Butler, 2013) offers relevant literature that examines teacher education contexts.

A way forward from this study and its limitations is to offer suggestions for future research. A longitudinal study that followed PETE students through the four-year programme would offer a more nuanced understanding of the trajectory of each student, along with a

better understanding of the impact of the programme itself. Alternatively, a better understanding of the enactment of critical approaches to teacher education would be gained through ethnographic methods where direct observations are made of espoused critical practices. Along with these changes in research design, unprecedented student access to phones with cameras and audio-recording capabilities have enabled far greater use of visual methods where PETE students could capture significant moments and/or audio files that capture students' thoughts and observations on a daily or weekly basis. This data may offer new insights into the lived experiences of students.

This study contributes to understanding how varied understandings of critical pedagogy are enacted by teacher educators and 'read' by students. Further scrutiny and research through alternate methodological frameworks may be required to provide the more nuanced descriptions of critical approaches to PETE called for by Tinning (2002). Research beyond the context of ITE is needed to capture the complexity of the challenges faced by new teachers who espouse teaching for social justice in schools. Further use of longitudinal studies that explore changes in teachers' dispositions toward social justice may offer further insight into how, and if, critical perspectives are enacted in schools (see Mills, 2013). Finally, there is no literature for comparing these findings to students from other programmes. Comparative studies between the BPE and other PETE programmes and between the graduates of the BPE and other PETE programmes could provide further insight into both the nature of individual critical pedagogies and the impact of the courses and programmes on the students. Further research is needed into how critical pedagogy can be enacted to maximise the pedagogical work that it does.

Conclusions

For some time now, researchers in PETE have advocated the importance of critical approaches to initial teacher education. The research presented in this thesis has shown that a

coherent programmatic approach to critical pedagogies has the capacity to ‘kick at’ the habitus of PETE students, a group notorious for having embodied identities strongly influenced by competition and sport. For some students, a critical perspective on physical education is taken for granted. What is less certain is why these students demonstrate a critical perspective and others do not.

Ultimately, no teacher education programme can deliver certain outcomes around social justice agendas. This study highlights that students will negotiate critical pedagogies individually. Some students appear to have been shaken, and have emerged from the BPE with the ‘eyes to see’ injustices that were previously invisible to them. The eye can, after all, only see what the mind knows (Bourdieu, 2002). A number of participants have reaffirmed their commitment to social justice issues that resonate with their own experiences.

I finish this thesis with the mixed metaphors of growing the seeds of a critical perspective, while kicking at the roots of an embodied, uncritical habitus. Kicking a habitus is a metaphor that represents a process more than an achievable outcome for ITE. The stability and resolve of habitus is fed by an amalgam of complementary beliefs and values that help one to reject logic that is incompatible with these. What is more certain is that advocacy for equity and social justice must be an explicit aim both from within PETE and from within school HPE. In this study, the BPE has opened its students’ eyes, minds and some hearts to alternate pedagogical practices, providing them with increasing, although by no means absolute, *agency* to be critical educators. The BPE has kicked and prodded and given its students the boots to keep kicking if they should choose to do so. However, in an era where neo-liberal values and principles are pervasive in education (Macdonald, 2011), the seeds for critical perspectives, cultivated in the supportive confines of the BPE programme, are destined to be sown in increasingly inhospitable soil.

References

- Abelson, R. (1979). Difference between belief and knowledge systems. *Cognitive Science*, 3(4), 355 - 366.
- Ackroyd, S., & Hughes, J. (1992). *Data collection in context* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Longman.
- Ailwood, J., & Lingard, B. (2001). The endgame for national girls schooling policies in Australia? *Australian Journal of Education*, 45(1), 9 - 22.
- Alderson, J., & Crutchley, D. (1990). Physical education and the national curriculum. In N. Armstrong (Ed.), *New directions in physical education* (pp. 37-62). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Aldous, D., & Brown, D. (2010). Framing bodies of knowledge within the 'acoustics' of the school: Exploring pedagogical transition through newly qualified physical education teacher experiences. *Sport, Education and Society*, 15(4), 411 - 429.
- Allard, A., & Santoro, N. (2004, December). *Making sense of difference? Teaching identities in postmodern contexts*. Paper presented at the meeting of Australian Association of Research in Education Melbourne, AU.
- Allard, A., & Santoro, N. (2008). Experienced teachers perspectives on cultural and social class diversity: Which differences matter? *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 41(2), 200 - 214.
- Allen, R. I., & Rossatto, C. A. (2009). Does critical pedagogy work with privileged students? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, Winter, 163 - 180.
- Alton-Lee, A. (2003). *Best evidence synthesis: Quality teaching for diverse students in schooling*. Wellington, NEW ZEALAND: Learning Media.
- Anyon, J. (2009). Critical social theory, education research, and intellectual activity. In J. Anyon, M. Dumas, D. Linville, K. Nolan, M. Perez, E. Tuck, & J. Weiss (Eds.),

- Theory and educational research: Toward critical social explanation* (pp. 1-24). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Apple, M. (1976). Commonsense categories and curriculum thought. In R. Dale, G. Esland, & M. MacDonald (Eds.), *Schooling and capitalism* (pp. 174-184). London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Apple, M. (1982). *Education and power*. Boston, MA: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Apple, M. (2000). Can critical pedagogies interrupt rightist politics? *Educational Theory*, 50(2), 229 - 254.
- Apple, M. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.
- Apple, M. (2006). *Education the right way* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Apple, M., Au, W., & Armando Gandin, L. (2009). Mapping critical education. In M. Apple, W. Au, & L. A. Gandin (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of critical education* (pp. 3-19). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Argyris, C., & Schon, D. (1974). *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Armour, K., & Jones, R. (1998). *Physical education teachers lives and careers: PE, sport and educational status*. London, UK: Falmer Press.
- Aronowitz, S. (2008). Foreword. In S. L. Macrine (Ed.), *Critical pedagogy in uncertain times: Hopes and possibilities* (pp. ix-xi). New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2012). *The shape of the Australian Curriculum: Health and Physical Education. August, 2012* Retrieved from http://www.acara.edu.au/verve/_resources/Shape_of_the_Australian_Curriculum_Health_and_Physical_Education.pdf
- Australian Education Council. (1994). *A statement on health and physical education for Australian schools*. Melbourne, VIC: Curriculum Corporation.

- Ayers, D. F. (2009). Institutional contradictions in the community college. *Community College Review*, 37(2), 165 - 184.
- Azzarito, L., & Harrison, L. (2008). White men cant jump: Race, gender and natural athleticism. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 43(4), 347 - 364.
- Azzarito, L., Macdonald, D., Dagkas, S., & Fisette, J. (2016). Revitalizing the physical education social-justice agenda in the global era: Where do we go from here? *Quest*, 1 - 15. doi:10.1080/00336297.2016.1176935
- Azzarito, L., & Solomon, M. (2005). A reconceptualizing of physical education: The intersection of gender/race/social class. *Sport, Education and Society*, 10(1), 25 - 47.
- Bain, L. (1990). A critical analysis of the hidden curriculum. In D. Kirk, & R. Tinning (Eds.), *Physical education, curriculum and culture: Critical issues in the contemporary crisis* (pp. 23-42). London, UK: The Falmer Press.
- Barker, D., Barker-Ruchti, N., Gerber, M., Gerlach, E., Sattler, S., & Puhse, U. (2011). Youths with migration backgrounds and their experiences of physical education: An examination of three cases. *Sport, Education and Society*. doi:10.1080/135773322.2011.632627
- Barker, D., & Rossi, A. (2011). Understanding teachers: The potential and possibility of discourse analysis. *Sport, Education and Society*, 16(2), 139 - 158.
- Bartolome, L. (2004). Critical pedagogy and teacher education: Radicalizing perspective teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 31(1), 97 - 122.
- Bartolome, L. (2007). Critical pedagogy and teacher education: Radicalizing prospective teachers. In J. K. P. McLaren (Ed.), *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?* (pp. 263 - 288). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

- Bates, R. (2013). Education and social justice: A critical social theory perspective. In B. Irby, G. Brown, R. Lara-Alecio, & S. Jackson (Eds.), *The handbook of educational theories* (pp. 1011-1021). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Baxter, J. (2002). Competing discourses in the classroom: A post-structuralist discourse analysis of girls and boys speech in public contexts. *Discourse & Society*, 13(6), 827 - 842.
- Bell, C. (1996). *Inventing New Zealand: Everyday myths of Pakeha identity*. Auckland, NEW ZEALAND: Penguin.
- Bell, L. (Ed.). (2007). *Theoretical foundations for social justice education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Berg, B. L. (2004). *Qualitative research methods for social science* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Berliner, D. (2004). Describing the behaviour and documenting the expertise of expert teachers. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*, 24(3), 200 - 212.
- Berliner, D. (2006). Our impoverished view of educational reform. *Teachers Record*, 108(6), 949 - 995.
- Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity: Theory, research, critique*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Biesta, G. (1998). Say you want a revolution...Suggestions for the impossibility of critical pedagogy. *Educational Theory, Fall 1998* 48(4), 499 - 510.
- Blackmore, J. (2013). Social justice in education: A theoretical overview. In B. Irby, G. Brown, R. Lara-Alecio, & S. Jackson (Eds.), *The handbook of educational theories* (pp. 1001-1010). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Bolin, F. (1990). Teachers beliefs: Helping student teachers think about teaching: Another look at Lou. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(1), 10 - 19.

- Borko, H., Liston, D., & Whitcomb, J. (2007). Genres of empirical research in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(1), 3 - 11.
- Borko, H., & Putnam, R. (1996). Learning to teach. In D. C. Berliner, & R. C. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 758-781). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Bourdieu, P. (1975). The specificity of the scientific field and the social conditions of the progress of reason. *Social Science Information*, 16(6), 19 - 47.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). New York, NY: Greenwood.
- Bourdieu, P. (1988). Vive la Crise! For heterodoxy in social science. *Theory and Society*, 19(5), 773 - 788.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1996). *Rules of art*. Oxford, UK: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian meditations* (R. Nice, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2002). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste* (R. Nice, Trans. 11th ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1979). *Reproduction in education*. London, UK: Sage.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Sage.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (2000). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Sage.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Braun, B., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77 - 101.
- Braun, B., & Clarke, V. (2013). Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Breunig, M. (2006). Critical pedagogy as praxis. *Radical Pedagogy*, 8(1), 1 - 18.
- Breunig, M. (2009). Teaching for and about critical pedagogy in the post-secondary classroom. *Studies in Social Justice*, 3(2), 247 - 262.
- Breunig, M. (2011). Problematizing critical pedagogy. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 3(3), 2 - 23.
- Brookfield, S. (1995a). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco: CA: Jossey Bass.
- Brookfield, S. (1995b). What it means to be a critically reflective teacher *Becoming a critically reflective teacher* (pp. 1-27). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Brown, D. (1999). Complicity and reproduction in teaching physical education. *Sport, Education and Society*, 4(2), 143 - 159.
- Brown, D. (2005). An economy of gendered practices? Learning to teach physical education from the perspective of Pierre Bourdieu's embodied sociology. *Sport, Education and Society*, 10(1), 3 - 23.
- Bruce, J. (2013). Dancing on the edge: A self-study exploring postcritical possibilities in physical education. *Sport, Education and Society*, 18(6), 807 - 824.
- Bruce, J. (2014). On shaky ground: Exploring shifting conceptualisations of knowledge and learning through self-study. In A. Ovens, & T. Fletcher (Eds.), *Self-study in physical education: Exploring the interplay of practice and scholarship* (pp. 129-140). London, UK: Springer.

- Bruce, J. (2015). On racism and prejudice: Exploring post-critical possibilities for service-learning within physical education teacher education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education*, 6(3), 233 - 244.
- Brustad, R. (1997). A critical-postmodern perspective on knowledge development in human movement. In J. M. Fernandez-Balboa (Ed.), *Critical postmodernism in human movement, physical education, and sport* (pp. 87-98). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Bryman, A. (2008). *Social research methods* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Buchanan, I. (2010). *Oxford dictionary of critical theory*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Burbules, N., & Berk, R. (1999). Critical thinking and critical pedagogy: Relations, differences and limits. In T. Popkewitz, & L. Fendler (Eds.), *Critical theories in education* (pp. 45-66). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Burden, J., Hodge, S., & Harrison, L. (2012). Teacher educators' views about social justice pedagogies in physical education teacher education. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, 1(1), 6 - 21.
- Burrows, L. (2000). Old games in new rompers? Gender issues in New Zealand physical education. *Journal of Physical Education New Zealand*, 33(2), 5 - 16.
- Burrows, L., & McCormack, J. (2011). School culture meets sport: A case study in New Zealand. *European Physical Education Review*, 17(3), 301 - 312.
doi10.1177/1356336X11416732
- Butin, D. W. (2011). Service learning as an intellectual movement. In T. Stewart, & N. Webster (Eds.), *Problematizing service learning: Critical reflections for development and action* (pp. 19-35). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

- Butler, J. (1988). Performative acts and gender constitution: An essay in phenomenology and feminist theory. *Theatre Journal*, 40(4), 519 - 531.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble, Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1997). Merely cultural. *Social Text, Queer Transexions of Race, Nation, and Gender* (52/53), 265 - 277.
- Byrne, D. (1998). *Complexity theory and the social sciences*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Cameron, E. (2012). DE/REconstructing my athlete-student-teacher self: A critical autoethnography of resistance in physical education teacher education (PETE). *PHEnex Journal*, 4(2), 1 - 16.
- Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1983). *Becoming critical: Knowing through action research*. Waurm Ponds, VIC: Deakin University Press.
- Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming critical: Education, knowledge and action research*. Geelong, VIC: Deakin University Press.
- Cassidy, T. (2000). *Investigating the pedagogical process in physical education teacher education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Deakin University, Victoria, Australia.
- Causey, V. E., Thomas, C. D., & Armento, B. J. (2000). Cultural diversity is basically a foreign term to me: The challenges of diversity for preservice teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 33 - 45.
- Chetty, R., Friedman, J., & Rockoff, J. E. (2011). *The long-term impacts of teachers: Teacher value-added and students' outcomes in adulthood*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Childs, P., & Williams, P. (2014). *Introduction to post-colonial theory*. London, UK: Routledge.

- Cho, S. (2006). On language of possibility: Revisiting critical pedagogy. In C. A. Rossitto, R. L. Allen, & M. Pruyn (Eds.), *Reinventing critical pedagogy: Widening the circle of anti-oppression education* (pp. 125-141). New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Cho, S. (2013). *Critical pedagogy and social change*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. (1987). Teachers personal knowledge. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 19*(6), 487 - 500.
- Coakley, J. (2001). *Sport in society*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2010). Toward a theory of teacher education for social justice. In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan, & D. Hopkins (Eds.), *Second international handbook of educational change* (Vol. 23, pp. 445-467). London, UK: Springer Science and Business Media.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (2006). Troubling images of teaching in no child left behind. *Harvard Education Review, 76*(4), 668 - 697.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. M. (2005). *Studying teacher education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). London, UK: Routledge
- Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and power*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Cooper, P., Diamond, I., & High, S. (1993). Choosing and using contraceptives: Integrating qualitative and quantitative methods in family planning. *Journal of the Market Research Society, 35*(4), 325 - 339.
- Crawford, R. (1980). Healthism and the medicalization of everyday life. *International Journal of Health Services, 10*(3), 365 - 388.
- Cresswell, J. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative processes*. London, UK: Sage.

- Cresswell, J. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing from five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cresswell, J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Culpan, I. (2000). Getting what you got: Harnessing the potential. *Journal of Physical Education New Zealand*, 33(2), 16 - 29.
- Culpan, I., & Bruce, J. (2007). New Zealand physical education and critical pedagogy: Refocusing the curriculum. *International Journal of Sport and Health Science*, 5, 1 - 11.
- Curtner-Smith, M. (1999). The more things change the more they stay the same: Factors influencing teachers' interpretations and delivery of the national curriculum physical education. *Sport, Education and Society*, 4(1), 75 - 97.
- Curtner-Smith, M. (2007). The impact of a critically oriented physical education teacher education course on preservice classroom teachers. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 26(1), 35 - 56.
- Curtner-Smith, M., & Sofo, S. (2004). Influence of a critically oriented methods course and early field experience on preservice teachers' conceptions of teaching. *Sport, Education and Society*, 9(1), 115 - 142.
- Darder, A. (2005). What is critical pedagogy? In W. Hare, & J. Portelli (Eds.), *Key Questions for Educators* (pp. 113-117). San Francisco, CA: Caddo Gap Press.
- Darder, A., Baltondano, M., & Torres, C. A. (2009). Critical pedagogy: An introduction. In A. Darder, M. Baltondano, & A. A. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (2nd ed., pp. 1-8). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). How teacher education matters. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(3), 166 - 173.

- Darling-Hammond, L. (2004). Inequality and the right to learn: Access to qualified teachers in California public schools. *Teachers College Record*, 106(10), 1936 - 1966.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Holtzman, D., Gatlin, S. J., & Vasquez, J. (2005). Does teacher preparation matter? Evidence about teacher certification, Teach for America and teacher effectiveness. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 13(42), 1 - 51.
- Deerness, S. (2014). *Hidden practices: Reclaiming social justice in neoliberal times* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Denison, J. (1996). Sport narratives. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 2(3), 351 - 362.
- Denzin, N. (1970). The research act in sociology: Theoretical introduction to sociological methods. London, UK: Butterworth.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2000). Introduction. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 1-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Derrida, J. (1992). Forces of law: The mythical foundations of authority. In D. Cornell, M. Rosenfeld, & D. G. Carlson (Eds.), *Deconstruction and the possibility of justice*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Devine, F. (2008). Class reproduction and social networks in the USA. In L. Weis (Ed.), *The way class works: Readings on school, family and the economy* (pp. 100-116). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Devis-Devis, J., & Sparkes, A. (1999). Burning the book: A biographical study of the pedagogically inspired identity crisis in physical education. *European Physical Education Review*, 5, 135 - 151.
- Dewar, A. (1990). Oppression and privilege in physical education: Struggles in the negotiation of gender in a university programme. In D. Kirk, & R. Tinning (Eds.),

- Physical education, curriculum and culture: Critical issues in contemporary society* (pp. 67-100). London, UK: The Falmer Press.
- Dewar, A. (1991). Feminist pedagogy in physical education: Promises, possibilities and pitfalls. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 62(6), 68 - 77.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York, NY: The MacMillan Co.
- Dodds, P. (1985). Are hunters of the functional curriculum seeking quarks or snarks? *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 4, 91 - 99.
- Doolittle, S., Dodds, P., & Placek, J. (1993). Persistence of beliefs about teaching during formal training of preservice teachers. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 12, 355 - 365.
- Dowling, F. (2009). Getting in touch with our feelings: The emotional geographies of gender relations in PETE. *Sport, Education and Society*, 13(2), 247 - 266.
- Dowling, F., Fitzgerald, H., & Flintoff, A. (2015). Narratives from the road to social justice in PETE: Teacher educator perspectives. *Sport, Education and Society*, 20(8), 1029 - 1047.
- Dowling, F., & Flintoff, A. (2015). A whitewashed curriculum? The construction of race in contemporary PE curriculum policy. *Sport, Education and Society*, 1 - 13, doi:10.1080/13573322.2015.1122584)
- Doyle, W. (1990). Themes in teacher education research. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 3-24). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Education Workforce Advisory Group. (2010). *A vision for the teaching profession*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Government. Retrieved from <http://www.minedu.govt.nz/~media/MinEdu/Files/TheMinistry/Consultation/WorkforceAdvisoryGroup/WorkforceAdvisoryGroupFinalReportPDF.pdf>

- Elbaz, F. L. (1983). *Teaching thinking: A study of practical knowledge*. London, UK: Croom Helm.
- Ellis, V. (2010). Impoverishing experience: The problem of teacher education in England. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 36(1), 105 - 120.
- Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 59(3), 297 - 324.
- Emirbayer, M. (1997). Manifesto for relational sociology. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 103(2), 281 - 317.
- Ennis, C. (1999). Creating a culturally relevant curriculum for disengaged girls. *Sport, Education and Society*, 4(1), 31 - 51.
- Ernest, P. (1989). The knowledge, beliefs and attitude of the mathematics teacher: A model. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 15, 13 - 34.
- Evans, J. (2004). Making a difference? Education and 'ability' in physical education. *European Physical Education Review*, 10(1), 95 - 108.
- Evans, J., & Davies, B. (1986). Sociology, schooling and physical education. In J. Evans, B. Davies, & J. Wright (Eds.), *Body knowledge and control: Studies in the sociology of physical education and health*. (pp. 11-37). London, UK: Routledge.
- Evans, J., & Davies, B. (2011). The poverty of theory: Class configurations in the discourse of physical education and health. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 13(2), 199 - 213.
- Evans, J., Davies, B., & Penney, D. (1996). Teachers, teaching and the social construction of gender relations. *Sport, Education and Society*, 1(2), 165 - 183.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Harlow: Longman / Pearson Education.

- Fairclough, N. (2001). The discourse of New Labour: Critical discourse analysis. In M. Wetherall, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 229-266). Milton Keynes, UK: The Open University.
- Fairclough, N. (2009). A dialectical relational approach to critical discourse analysis in social research. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 162-186). London, UK: Sage.
- Fairclough, N. (2011). Semiotic aspects of social transformation and learning. In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (2nd ed., pp. 119-127). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. van. Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258-284). London, UK: Sage.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (1990). *Conceptual orientations in teacher education*. NCRTL Issue Paper: Michigan State University: National Center for Research on Teacher Education.
- Fernandez-Balboa, J. M. (1993). Sociocultural characteristics of the hidden curriculum in physical education. *Quest*, 45(2), 230 - 254.
- Fernandez-Balboa, J. M. (1995). Reclaiming physical education in higher education through critical pedagogy. *Quest*, 47, 91 - 114.
- Fernandez-Balboa, J. M. (1997a). Knowledge base in physical education teacher education: A proposal for a new era. *Quest*, 49(2), 161 - 181.
- Fernandez-Balboa, J. M. (1997b). Physical education teacher preparation in the postmodern era: Toward a critical pedagogy. In J. M. Fernandez-Balboa (Ed.), *Critical postmodernism in human movement, physical education, and sport* (pp. 121-138). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

- Fernandez-Balboa, J. M. (2009). Bio-pedagogical self-reflection in PETE: Reawakening the ethical conscience and purpose in pedagogy and research. *Sport, Education and Society*, 14(2), 147 - 163.
- Fernandez-Balboa, J. M., & Muros, B. (2006). The hegemonic triumvirate: Ideologies, discourses and habitus in sport and physical education: Implications and suggestions. *Quest*, 58(2), 197 - 221.
- Fine, M. (2012). Witnessing whiteness/gathering intelligence. In M. Fine, L. Weis, L. P. Pruitt, & A. Burns (Eds.), *Off white: Readings on power, privilege, and resistance* (pp. 245-256). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fischman, G., & McLaren, P. (2005). Rethinking critical pedagogy and the Gramscian and Freirean legacies: From organic to committed intellectuals of critical pedagogy, commitment and praxis. *Cultural Studies: Critical Methodologies*, 5(4), 425 - 443.
- Fitzpatrick, K. (2010). A critical multicultural approach to physical education: Challenging discourses of physicality and building resistant practices in schools. In S. May, & C. Sleeter (Eds.), *Critical multiculturalism: Theory and praxis* (pp. 177-190). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fitzpatrick, K. (2011). Brown bodies, racialisation and physical education. *Sport, Education and Society*, 1 - 19.
- Fitzpatrick, K. (2013). *Critical pedagogy, physical education and urban schooling*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Fitzpatrick, K., & Santamaria, L. J. (2015). Disrupting racialization: Considering critical leadership in the field of physical education, physical education and sport pedagogy. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 20(5), 532 - 546.
- 10.1080/17408989.2014.990372

- Fitzpatrick, K., & Tinning, R. (2012). Thinking about research frameworks. In K. Armour, & D. Macdonald (Eds.), *Research methods in physical education and youth sport* (pp. 53-65). London, UK: Routledge.
- Fitzpatrick, K., & Tinning, R. (2014). *Considering the politics and practice of health education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Flintoff, A. (2015). Playing the Race card: Black and minority ethnic students' experiences of physical education teacher education. *Sport, Education and Society*, 20(2), 190 - 211. doi:10.1080/13573322.2012.745397
- Flory, S., & Walton-Fisette, J. (2015). Teaching sociocultural issues to pre-service physical education teachers: A self-study. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education*, 6(3), 245 - 257.
- Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2000). The interview: From structured questions to negotiated text. In N. Denzin, & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 645-672). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice interruptis: Critical reflections on the postsocialist condition*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Freire, P. (1970a). *Cultural action for freedom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.
- Freire, P. (1970b). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Seabury Press.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Cultural action for freedom*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Freire, P. (1989). *Education for the critical consciousness*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1997). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (20th anniversary ed.). New York, NY: Continuum Publishing.
- Freire, P. (1998a). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy and civic courage*. Landham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Freire, P. (1998b). *Politics and education*. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Latin American Centre Productions.
- Freire, P. (2009a). From pedagogy of the oppressed. In M. B. A. Darder, R. Torres (Ed.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (pp. 52-60). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Freire, P. (2009b). *Pedagogy of the oppressed: (30th anniversary ed.)*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Friesen, M. (2006). *Perceptions of social justice in New Zealand*. Auckland, NEW ZEALAND: Maxim Institute.
- Frith, H. (2000). Focusing on sex: Using focus groups in sex research. *Sexualities*, 3(3), 275 - 297.
- Gard, M., & Wright, J. (2005). *The obesity epidemic: Science, morality and ideology*. New York, NY: Routledge
- Garrett, R., & Wrench, A. (2011a). Making physical education a fairer, safer and happier place: Putting critical practices into action. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Physical Education*, 2(2), 35 - 50.
- Garrett, R., & Wrench, A. (2011b). Negotiating a critical agenda in middle years physical education. *The Australian Association for Research in Education*, 38, 239 - 255.
- Gee, J. P. (1990). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. London, UK: Falmer Press.
- Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (2011). *How to do discourse analysis: A toolkit*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gee, J. P., Michaels, S., & OConnor, M. C. (1992). Discourse analysis. In M. D. LeCompte, W. L. Millroy, & J. Preissle (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research in education* (pp. 227-291). San Diego, CA: Academic.

- George, S. (1999, March). *A short history of neoliberalism*. Paper presented at the meeting of Conference on Economic Sovereignty in a Globalising World, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Gillespie, L., & Culpan, I. (2000). Critical thinking: Ensuring the educational aspect is evident in physical education. *Journal of Physical Education New Zealand*, 33(3), 84 - 96.
- Gillespie, L., & McBain, S. (2011). A critical analysis process – Bridging the theory to practice gap in senior secondary school physical education. *Teachers and Curriculum*, 12(1), 65 - 72.
- Giroux, H. (1981). *Ideology, culture, and the process of schooling*. London, UK: Falmer Press.
- Giroux, H. (1986). Critical theory and the politics of culture and voice: Rethinking the discourse of educational research. *Journal of Thought*, 21(3), 84 - 105.
- Giroux, H. (1992). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. (1993). *Border Crossings*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. (1997). *Pedagogy and the politics of hope: Theory, culture and schooling*. Boulder, CO: Westfield Press.
- Giroux, H. (2007). Democracy, education and the politics of critical pedagogy. In P. McLaren, & J. Kincheloe (Eds.), *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?* (pp. 1-5). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Giroux, H. (2009). Critical theory and educational practice. In A. Darder, M. Baltodano, & R. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (pp. 27-51). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. (2010). Rethinking education as the practice of freedom: Paulo Freire and the promise of critical pedagogy. *Policy Futures in Education*, 8(6), 715 - 721.

- Giroux, H., & Giroux, S. (2006). Challenging neoliberalisms new world order: The promise of critical pedagogy. *Cultural Studies - Critical Methodologies*, 6(6), 21 - 32.
- Glaser, B. (1978). Theoretical sensitivity: Advances in the methodology of grounded theory. Mill Valley, CA: Sociological Press.
- Gore, J. M. (1990). Pedagogy as text in physical education teacher education: Beyond the preferred reading. In D. Kirk, & R. Tinning (Eds.), *Physical education, curriculum and culture: Critical issues in the contemporary crisis* (pp. 101-138). London, UK: The Falmer Press.
- Graber, K. (1995). The influence of teacher education programs on the beliefs of student teachers: General pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and teacher education course work. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 14, 157 - 178.
- Graber, K. (2001). Research on teaching in physical education In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (4th ed., pp. 491-519). Washington DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). Selection from the prison notebooks. In Q. Hoare, & G. N. Smith (Eds.), *Selections from Political Writing* (pp. 5-23). New York, NY: International Publishers.
- Grant, B., & Pope, C. (2007). Sport and education: Sport in secondary schools for all or for some? In C. Collins, & S. Jackson (Eds.), *Sport in Aotearoa/New Zealand society* (pp. 246-262). Albany, NY: Cengage Learning.
- Green, K. (2000). Exploring the everyday philosophies of physical education teachers from a sociological perspective. *Sport, Education and Society*, 5(2), 109 - 129.
- Green, K. (2002). Physical education teachers in their figurations: A sociological analysis of everyday philosophies. *Sport, Education and Society*, 7(1), 65 - 83.

- Greene, M. (2009). In search of a critical pedagogy. In A. Darder, M. Baltodano, & R. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (pp. 97-112). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Grenfell, M. (1996). Bourdieu and initial teacher education- A post-structuralist approach. *British Educational Research Journal*, 22(3), 287 - 303.
- Grenfell, M. (2015). Foreword. In lisahunter, W. Smith, & e. emerald (Eds.), *Pierre Bourdieu and physical culture* (pp. viii- xii). London, UK: Routledge.
- Griffin, L. M., & Combs, C. S. (2000). Student teachers perceptions of the role of the physical educator. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 71(4), 42 - 45.
- Griswold, O. (2007). Achieving authority: Discursive practices in Russian girls pretend play. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 40(4), 291 - 319.
- Gubrium, J., & Holstein, J. (2000). Analyzing interpretative practice. In N. Denzin, & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 487-508). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Haberman, M. (1991). Can cultural awareness be taught in teacher education programs? *Teaching Education*, 4(1), 25 - 31.
- Habermas, J. (1972). *Knowledge and human interests* (J. Shapiro, Trans.). London, UK: Heinemann.
- Hattam, R., McInerney, P., Lawson, M., & Smyth, J. (1999). *Enhancing teachers learning: Teachers' learning project investigation series*. Adelaide, SA: Flinders Institute for the Study of Teaching.
- Hayes, D., Mills, M., Christie, P., & Lingard, B. (2006). *Teachers and schooling make a difference: Productive pedagogies, assessment and performance*. Crows Nest, NSW: Allen & Unwin.

- Heilig, J. V., & Jez, S. J. (2010). *Teach for America: A review of the evidence*. Education and the Public Interest Center & Education Policy Research Unit. Retrieved from <http://epipolicy.org/publication/teach-for-america>
- Held, D. (1980). *Introduction to critical theory: Horkheimer to Habermas*. Berkely, CA: University of California Press.
- Hellison, D. (2011). *Teaching personal and social responsibility*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hickey, C. (2001). I feel enlightened now, but...: The limits to the pedagogical translation of critical discourses in physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 20, 227 - 246.
- Hickey, C. (2008). Physical education, sport and hyper-masculinity in schools. *Sport, Education and Society*, 13(2), 147 - 161.
- Hill, D. (2004). Books, banks and bullets: Controlling our minds – The global project of imperialistic and militaristic neo-liberalism and its effect on education policy. *Policy Futures in Education*, 3(3 & 4), 504 - 522.
- Hinchey, P. (2006). *Being a critical educator: Defining a classroom identity, designing a critical pedagogy*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Hinchman, K., & Young, J. P. (2001). Speaking but not being heard: Two adolescents negotiate classroom talk about text. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 33(2), 243 - 268.
- Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. (1995). *The active interview*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- hooks, b. (1984). *Feminist theory from margin to center*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- hooks, B. (1991). Essentialism and experience. *American Literary History*, 3(1), 172 - 183.
- hooks, B. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- hooks, b. (2010). *Teaching critical thinking: Practical wisdom*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Horkheimer, M., Adorno, T. W., & Noerr, G. S. (2002). *Dialectic of enlightenment: Philosophical fragments*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Howden-Chapman, P. (2005). Unequal socio-economic determinants, unequal health. In K. Dew, & P. Davis (Eds.), *Health and society in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 51-68). Melbourne, VIC: Oxford University Press.
- Hunter, L. (2004). Bourdieu and the social space of the PE class: Reproduction of doxa through practice. *Sport, Education and Society*, 9(2), 175 - 192.
- Hutchison, C. (1993). Prospective teachers perspectives on teaching physical education: An interview study on the recruitment phase of teacher socialization. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 12, 344 - 354.
- Jager, S., & Maier, F. (2009). Theoretical and methodological aspects of Faucauldian critical discourse analysis and disposition analysis. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 34-61). London, UK: Sage.
- Jay, M. (1973). *The dialectical imagination*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.
- Juan, J., Turner, T., & Irving, E. (2010). Factors influencing university entrance success rate. 1-33. Retrieved from <http://www.education.auckland.ac.nz/webdav/site/education/shared/about/research/images/Factors%20influencing%20University%20Entrance%20success%20rate.pdf>
- Kagan, D. (1992). Implications of research on teacher beliefs. *Educational Psychologist*, 27(1), 65 - 90.
- Karen, D., & Washington, R. (2010). Sport: The game and the field. In D. Karen, & R. Washington (Eds.), *The sport and society reader* (pp. 1-8). London, UK: Routledge.
- Kårhus, S. (2010). Physical education teacher education on the education market - who's defining what physical education teachers need to know? *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 15(3), 227 - 241.

- Kelly, D. M., Brandes, G. M., & Orlowski, P. (2004). Teaching for social justice: Veteran high school teachers perspectives. *Scholar Practitioner Quarterly*, 2(2), 39 - 57.
- Kemmis, S. (1994). Action research and the politics of reflection. In D. Boud, R. Keogh, & D. Walker (Eds.), *Reflection: Turning experience into learning* (3rd ed., pp. 139-164). London, UK: Routledge.
- Kilgore, D. W. (2001). Critical and postmodern perspectives on adult learning. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 89, 53 - 61.
- Kincheloe, J. (2007). Critical pedagogy in the twenty-first century. In P. McLaren, & J. Kincheloe (Eds.), *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?* (pp. 9-42). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Kincheloe, J. (2008a). *Critical pedagogy primer* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Kincheloe, J. (2008b). Knowledge and critical pedagogy: An introduction. London, UK: Springer.
- Kincheloe, J. (2011). Exposing the technocratic perversion of education. In K. Hayes, S. Steinberg, & K. Tobin (Eds.), *Key works in critical pedagogy* (Vol. 32, pp. 1-19). Boston, MA: Sense Publishers.
- Kincheloe, J., & McLaren, P. (2000). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. Denzin, & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 279-313). Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Kincheloe, J., McLaren, P., & Steinberg, S. (2012). Critical pedagogy and qualitative research: Moving to the bricolage. In S. Steinberg, & G. Cannella (Eds.), *Critical qualitative researcher reader* (pp. 14-32). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Kincheloe, J., & Steinberg, S. (1997). *Changing multiculturalism*. Bristol, UK: Open University Press.

- Kirk, D. (1986). A critical pedagogy for teacher education: Toward an inquiry-oriented approach. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 5, 230 - 246.
- Kirk, D. (2006). The obesity crisis and school physical education. *Sport, Education and Society*, 11(2), 121 - 133.
- Kirk, D. (2009). A critical pedagogy for teacher education: Towards an inquiry-oriented approach. In R. Bailey, & D. Kirk (Eds.), *The Routledge physical education reader* (pp. 207-224). London, UK: Routledge.
- Kirk, D. (2010). *Physical education futures*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Kirk, D., Macdonald, D., & Tinning, R. (1997). The social construction of pedagogic discourse in physical education teacher education in Australia. *The Curriculum Journal*, 8(2), 271 - 298.
- Kirk, D., & Tinning, R. (1990). *Physical education, curriculum and culture*. London, UK: The Falmer Press.
- Kohli, W. (1998). Critical education and embodied subjects: Making the poststructural turn. *Educational Theory*, 48(4), 511 - 519.
- Kornfeld, J., Grady, K., Marker, P., & Riuddell, M. (2007). Caught in the current: A self study of state-mandated compliance in a teacher education education programme. *Teachers College Record*, 109(8), 1902 - 1930.
- Kreber, C., & Cranton, P. (2000). Exploring the scholarship of teaching. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(4), 476 - 495.
- Kruegar, R. A. (2000). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and whats it doing in a nice field like education. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(1), 7 - 24.

- Larson, J. (2014). *Radical equality in education: Starting over in US schooling*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lather, P. (1998). Critical pedagogy and its complicities: A praxis of stuck places. *Educational Theory*, 48(4), 487 - 497.
- Lather, P. (2001). Ten years later: Yet again. In K. Weiler (Ed.), *Feminist engagements: Reading, resisting, and revisioning male theorists in education and cultural studies* (pp. 183-196). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lawson, H. (1983). Toward a model of teacher socialization in physical education: The subjective warrant, recruitment, and teacher education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, Spring, 3 - 15.
- Lawson, H. (1987). Teaching the body of knowledge: The neglected part of physical education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 58(7), 70 - 72
- Lawson, H. (1998). Rejuvenating, reconstituting, and transforming physical education to meet the needs of vulnerable children, youth and families. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 18(1), 2 - 25.
- Leahy, D., OFlynn, G., & Wright, J. (2013). A critical 'critical inquiry' proposition in health and physical education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education*, 4(2), 175 - 187.
- Legge, M. (2010). E noho marae - Transforming learning through direct Māori cultural experience. In C. J. Jesson, V. M. Carpenter, M. McLean, M. Stephenson, & Airini (Eds.), *University teaching reconsidered: Justice, practice, equity* (pp. 139-149). Wellington, New Zealand: Dunmore Publishing Ltd.
- Leistyna, P. (2007). Neoliberal non-sense. In P. McLaren, & J. Kincheloe (Eds.), *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?* (pp. 98-123). New York, NY: Sage.

- Lichtman, M. (2006). *Qualitative research in education: A users guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- lisahunter, Smith, W., & emereld, e. (2014). *Pierre Bourdieu and physical culture*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Llewellyn, A. (2009). Gender games: A post-structural exploration of the prospective teacher, mathematics and identity. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education*, 12(6), 411 - 426.
- Lorente, E., & Kirk, D. (2013). Alternative democratic assessment in PETE: An action-research study exploring risks, challenges and solutions. *Sport, Education and Society*, 18(1), 77 - 96.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *School teacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Luke, A. (2002). Curriculum, ethics, meta-narrative: Teaching and learning beyond the nation. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 22(1), 49 - 55.
- Macdonald, D., & Brooker, R. (1999). Articulating a critical pedagogy in physical education teacher education. *Journal of Sport Pedagogy*, 5(1), 51 - 64.
- Macdonald, D., & Kirk, D. (1999). Pedagogy, the body and Christian identity. *Sport, Education and Society*, 4(2), 131 - 142.
- Macdonald, D., Kirk, D., Metzler, M., Nilges, L., Schempp, P., & Wright, J. (2002). It's all very well, in theory: Theoretical perspectives and their applications in contemporary pedagogical research. *Quest*, 54(2), 133 - 156.
- MacDonald, K., & Tipton, C. (1996). Using documents. In N. Gilbert (Ed.), *Researching social life* (pp. 187-200). London, UK: Sage.

- Macedo, D. (1994a). *Literacies of power: What Americans are not allowed to know*. Boulder, CO: Westfield Press.
- Macedo, D. (1994b). Preface. In P. McLaren, & C. Lankshear (Eds.), *Politics of liberation: Paths from Freire*. (pp. xiii-xviii). London, UK: Routledge.
- Macedo, D. (2009). Introduction In *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th anniversary ed., pp. 11-27). New York, NY: Continuum.
- Marginson, S. (1993). *Education and public policy in Australia*. Melbourne, VIC: Cambridge University Press.
- Marshall, G. (1998). *Oxford dictionary of sociology*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Marshall, K., & Rossman, G. (1995). *Designing qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Martinez, E., & Garcia, A. (2000). What is neo-liberalism: A brief definition. Retrieved from http://btw.mayfirst.org/sites/default/files/whatisneoliberalism_7230.pdf
- Maslow, A. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370 - 396.
- Matanin, M., & Collier, C. (2003). Longitudinal analysis of preservice teachers beliefs about teaching physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 22(2), 153 - 168.
- May, T. (2011). *Social research: Issues, methods and processes*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Maycut, P., & Morehouse, R. (1994). *Beginning qualitative research: A philosophic and practical guide*. London, UK: Falmer Press.
- McArthur, J. (2010). Achieving social justice within and through higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 15(5), 493 - 504.

- McCarthy, C. (1988). Rethinking liberal and radical perspectives on racial inequality in schooling: Making the case for nonsynchrony *Harvard Educational Review*, 58(3), 265 - 279.
- McDonald, M. A. (2005). The integration of social justice in teacher education: Dimensions of prospective teachers opportunities to learn. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(5), 418 - 435.
- McIntyre, J., Philpot, R., & Smith, W. (2016). HPE teachers' understanding of socially critical pedagogy and the New Zealand Health and Physical Education curriculum. *The Physical Educator: Te ao Kori Aotearoa*, 49(2), 5 - 9.
- McLaren, P. (1989). *Life in schools*. New York, NY: Longman.
- McLaren, P. (1998). Revolutionary pedagogy in post-revolutionary times: Rethinking the political economy of critical education. *Educational Theory*, 48(4), 431 - 462.
- McLaren, P. (2000). *Che Guevara, Paulo Freire, and the pedagogy of revolution*. Boulder, CO: Rowan and Littlefield.
- McLaren, P. (2003). *Life in schools*. Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.
- McLaren, P. (2009). Critical pedagogy: A look at the major concepts. In A. Darder, M. Baltodano, & R. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (pp. 61-83). New York, NY: Routledge.
- McLaren, P. (n.d.). Critical pedagogy against capitalist schooling: Towards a socialist alternative. An interview with Peter McLaren. In *Global Education Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.globaleducationmagazine.com/critical-pedagogy-againstcapitalist-schooling-socialist-alternative-interview-peter-mclaren/>
- McLaren, P., & Farahmandpur, R. (2000). Reconsidering Marx in post-Marxist times: A requiem for postmodernism? *Educational Researcher*, 29(3), 25 - 33.

- McMurtry, A. (2008). Complexity theory 101 for educators: A fictional account of a graduate seminar. *McGill Journal of Education*, 43(3), 265 - 281.
- Merriam, S. B. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mills, C. (2009). Making sense of pre-service teachers dispositions toward social justice: Can teacher education make a difference? *Critical Studies in Education*, 50(3), 277 - 288.
- Mills, C. (2013). A Bourdieuan analysis of teachers changing dispositions towards social justice: The limitations of practicum placements in pre-service teacher education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(1), 41 - 51.
doi10.1080/1359866X.2012.753985
- Mills, C., & Ballantyne, J. (2010). Pre-service teachers dispositions towards diversity: Arguing for a developmental hierarchy of change. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(3), 447 - 454. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2009.05.012
- Ministry of Education. (1999). *Health and physical education in the New Zealand curriculum*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (2007). *The New Zealand curriculum*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Moore, R. (2004). Cultural capital: Objective probability and cultural arbitrary. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25(4), 445 - 456.
- Moran, K. (2010). *The shaping of swimming and water safety education in New Zealand*. Warkworth, NEW ZEALAND: Tradewinds.
- Mordal-Moen, K., & Green, K. (2012). Neither shaken nor stirring: A case of reflexivity in Norwegian physical education teacher education. *Sport, Education and Society*, 19(4), 415 - 434.

- Murdoch, E. (1986). Future trends in physical education curriculum. *British Journal of Physical Education*, 17, 83 - 86.
- Muros Ruiz, B., & Fernandez-Balboa, J. M. (2005). Physical education teacher educators' personal perspectives regarding their practice of critical pedagogy. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 24, 243-264.
- Nash, R. (1990). Bourdieu on education. *British Journal of Sociology*, 11(4), 431 - 447.
- Navarro, V. (2007). Neoliberalism as a class ideology; or, the political causes of the growth of inequalities. *International Journal of Health Services*, 37(1), 47 - 62.
- Nespor, J. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 19(4), 317 - 328.
- Neuman, W. L. (2003). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. New York, NY: Pearson Education Inc.
- Newton, P., & Burgess, D. (2008). Exploring types of educational action research: Implications for research validity. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 7(4), 18 - 30.
- Nolan, K. (2012). Dispositions in the field: Viewing mathematics teacher education through the lens of Bourdieu's social field theory. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 80(1-2), 201 - 215.
- North, C. (2006). More than words? Delving into the substantive meaning(s) of social justice in education. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(4), 507 - 535.
- Oliver, K., & Hamzeh, M. (2010). The boys won't let us play: Fifth-grade mestizas challenge physical activity discourse at school. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 81(1), 38 - 51.

- Olofsson, E. (2005). The discursive construction of gender in physical education in Sweden, 1945-2003: Is meeting the learner's needs tantamount to meeting the market needs? *European Physical Education Review*, 11(3), 219 - 238.
- OSullivan, M. (2005). Beliefs of teachers and teacher candidates: Implications for teacher education. In F. C. da. Costa, M. Cloes, & M. G. Valeiro (Eds.), *The art and science of teaching in physical education* (pp. 149-164). Cruz Quebrada-Dafundo, Portugal: Faculdade de Motricidade.
- OSullivan, M., MacPhail, A., & Tannehill, D. (2009). A career in teaching: Decisions of the heart rather than the head. *Irish Educational Studies*, 28(2), 177 - 191.
- OSullivan, M., Siedentop, D., & Locke, L. (1992). Toward collegiality: Competing viewpoints among teacher educators. *Quest*, 44, 266 - 280.
- Ovens, A. (2004). The (im)possibility of critical reflection: The lived reflection of reflective practice in teacher education (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD.
- Ovens, A. (2010). The New Zealand Curriculum: emergent insights and complex renderings. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education*, 1(1), 27 - 32.
- Ovens, A., Hopper, T., & Butler, J. (2013). Complexity thinking in physical education: Reframing curriculum, pedagogy and research New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ovens, A., & Tinning, R. (2009). Reflection as situated practice: A memory-work study of lived experience in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(8), 1125 - 1131.
- Parker, A. (1996). The construction of masculinity within boys' physical education. *Gender and Education*, 8(2), 141 - 157.

- Patel Stevens, L. (2011). Locating the role of the critical discourse analyst. In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (pp. 183-202). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Penney, D. (2002). Gender and physical education: Contemporary issues and future directions. London, UK: Routledge.
- Penney, D. (2010). Health and physical education in Australia: A defining time? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education*, 1, 5 - 12.
- Penney, D. (2013). Points of tension and possibility: Boundaries in and of physical education. *Sport, Education and Society*, 18(1), 6 - 20.
- Penney, D., & Evans, J. (1999). *Politics, policy and practice in physical education*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Peske, H. G., & Haycock, K. (2006). Teaching inequality: How poor and minority students are shortchanged on teacher quality. Washington, DC: Education Trust.
- Philpot, R. (2009). A comparison of the beliefs about, and understanding of, physical education of entering and graduating PETE students (Unpublished Master's Thesis). The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Philpot, R. (2015a). Critical pedagogies in PETE: An Antipodean perspective. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 34(2), 316 - 332.
- Philpot, R. (2015b). Making a different difference: Students reading of critical pedagogies in PETE. In D. Garbett, & A. Ovens (Eds.), *Teaching for tomorrow today* (pp. 431-438). Auckland, New Zealand: Edify.

- Philpot, R. (2016). Shaking students' cages: A Freirean pedagogy that influenced PETE students' beliefs about physical education. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 7(1), 143 - 164.
- Philpot, R., & Smith, W. (2011). Beginning and graduating teachers beliefs about physical education: A case study. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education*, 2(1), 33 - 50.
- Placek, J., Dodds, P., Doolittle, S., Portman, P., Ratliffe, T., & Pinkham, K. (1995). Teaching recruits physical education backgrounds and beliefs about purposes for their subject matter. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 14, 246 - 261.
- Pohan, C. A. (1996). Preservice teachers beliefs about diversity: Uncovering factors leading to multicultural responsiveness. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 29(3), 62 - 69.
- Powell, D. (2014). Childhood obesity, corporate philanthropy and the creeping privatisation of health education. *Critical Public Health*, 24(2), 226 - 238.
doi:10.1080/09581596.2013.846465
- Presley, J., White, B., & Gong, Y. (2005). *Examining the distribution and impact of teacher quality in Illinois*. Illinois Education Research Council. Retrieved from <http://ierc.siue.edu/documents/Teacher%20Quality%20IERC%202005-2.pdf>
- Pringle, R. (2001). Competing discourses: Narratives of a fragmented self, manliness and rugby union. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 36(4), 425 - 439.
- Punch, K. (2005). *Introduction to social research: Quantitative and qualitative approaches* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Sage.
- Punch, K. (2014). *Introduction to social research: Quantitative and qualitative approaches* (3rd ed.). London, UK: Sage.
- Queensland School Curriculum Council. (1999). *Health & physical education Years 1 to 10 syllabus*. Brisbane, Australia: Education Queensland.

- Reay, D., Crozier, G., & Clayton, J. (2009). Strangers in paradise: Working-class students in elite universities. *Sociology*, *43*(6), 1103 - 1121. doi:10.1177/0038038509345700
- Redelius, K., Fagrell, B., & Larsson, H. (2009). Symbolic capital in physical education: To be or not to be? That is the gendered question. *Sport, Education and Society*, *14*(2), 245 - 260.
- Rennert-Ariev, P. (2008). The hidden curriculum of performance-based teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, *110*(1), 105 - 138.
- Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula, T. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 102-119). New York, NY: MacMillan.
- Richardson, V. (2003). Teacher beliefs In J. Raths, & A. C. McAninch (Eds.), *Teacher beliefs and classroom performance: The impact of teacher education* (pp. 1-22). Greenwich, CN: Information Age.
- Riessman, C. (1993). *Narrative analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Rink, J. (1993). Teacher education: A focus on action. *Quest*, *45*, 308 - 320.
- Rizvi, F. (2011). Contesting criticality in a scholarly diaspora. In R. Tinning, & K. Sirna (Eds.), *Education, social justice and the legacy of Deakin University: Reflections on the Deakin diaspora* (pp. 145-156). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Roberts, K. (2009). *Key concepts in sociology*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rockoff, J. E. (2004). The impact of individual teachers on student achievement: Evidence from panel data. *American Economic Association*, *94*(2), 247 - 252.
- Roe, K. (2003). The importance of teacher quality as a key determinant of students' experiences and outcomes of schooling. *Australian Council for Educational Research*, 15 - 23.

- Rogers, R., Malancharuvil-Berkes, E., Mosley, M., Hui, D., & O'Garro Joseph, G. (2005). Critical discourse analysis in education: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(3), 365 - 416.
- Rogers, R., & Mosley, M. (2008). A critical discourse analysis of racial literacy in teacher education. *Linguistics and Education*, 19(2), 107 - 131.
- Rokeach, M. (1968). Beliefs, attitudes and values: A theory of organization and change. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Romanowski, M. (2014). A Habermasian analysis of Qatars national teacher professional standards. *International Journal of Education*, 6(1), 108 - 127.
- Ross, B. H. (2001). Visions and phantoms. *Journal of Physical Education New Zealand*, 34(1), 3 - 14.
- Ross, B. H. (2010). Student self-assessment with a Freirean pedagogy. In J. Jesson, V. M. Carpenter, M. McLean, M. Stevenson, & Airini (Eds.), *University teaching reconsidered: Justice, practice, inquiry* (pp. 202-214). Wellington, New Zealand: Dunmore Publishing.
- Ross, E. W., & Gibson, R. (Eds.). (2007). *Neoliberalism and educational reform*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Ross, E. W., & Vincent, K. (2013). Resisting neoliberal education reform: Insurrectionist pedagogies and the pursuit of dangerous citizenship. *Cultural Logic: Marxist Theory and Practice*, 17 - 45.
- Rossatto, C. A. (2006). Is religion still the opiate of the people? Critical pedagogy, liberation theology, and the commitment to social transformation. In C. A. Rossatto, R. L. Allen, & M. Pruyn (Eds.), *Reinventing critical pedagogy: Widening the circle of anti-oppression education* (pp. 111-124). Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littleman.

- Rossi, T., Sirna, K., & Tinning, R. (2008). The process of becoming a health and physical education teacher: The HPE subject department office as a site of performance. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(4), 1029 - 1040.
- Rossi, T., Tinning, R., McCuaig, L., Sirna, K., & Hunter, L. (2009). With the best of intentions: Discourse analysis of physical education curriculum materials. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 28*, 75 - 89.
- Rossman, G., & Rallis, S. (1998). Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ryan, G., & Bernard, R. (2000). Data management and analysis methods. In N. Denzin, & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 769 - 802). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ryan, M., & Bourke, T. (2013). The teacher as reflexive professional: Making visible the excluded discourse in teacher standards. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 34*(3), 411 - 423.
- Rymes, B., Cahnmann-Taylor, M., & Souto-Manning, M. (2008). Bilingual teachers performances of power and conflict. *Teaching Education, 19*(2), 93 - 107.
- Sahragard, R., Razm-Joo, S. A., & Baharloo, A. (2014). The practicality of critical pedagogy from Iranian EFL instructors' viewpoints: A cross sectional study. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 5*(2), 178 - 193.
- Saltman, K. (2006). The right-wing attack on critical and public education in the United States: From neoliberalism to neoconservatism. *Cultural Politics, 2*(3), 339 - 358.
- Sanderson, S., & Ellis, L. (1992). Theoretical and political perspectives of American sociologists in the 1990s. *American Sociologist, 23*(2), 26 - 43.
- Sato, T., Fisette, J., & Walton, J. (2013). The experiences of African American physical education teacher candidates at urban schools. *Urban Review, 45*, 611 - 631.

- Schilling, C. (1993). *The body in social theory*. London, UK: Sage.
- Schleicher, A. (2014). *Equity, excellence and inclusiveness in education: Policy lessons from around the world*. Paris, France: OECD.
- Schon, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Scott, J. (1990). *A matter of record: Documentary sources in social research*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Scriven, M., & Paul, R. (1987). *Defining Critical Thinking*. Retrieved from <http://www.criticalthinking.org/pages/defining-critical-thinking/410>
- Segall, A. (2008). Why teaching critical social theory as theory might not be enough. In J. Diem, & R. J. Helfenbein (Eds.), *Unsettling beliefs: Teaching theory to teachers* (pp. 15-30). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Shields, P. M., Esch, C. E., Humphries, D. C., Wechsler, M. E., Chang-Ross, C. M., Gallagher, H., Woodworth, K. R. (2003). *The status of the teaching profession 2003*. Santa Cruz, CA: The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning.
- Shor, I. (1980). *Critical teaching and everyday life* (1st ed.). Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Shudak, N. (2014). The re-emergence of critical pedagogy: A three-dimensional framework for teacher education in the age of teacher effectiveness. *Creative Education*, 5, 989 - 999. doi10.4236/ce.2014.511113
- Sibley, C. (2011). *New Zealand Attitudes and Values Study*. Retrieved from www.psych.auckland.ac.nz/uoa/new-zealand-attitudes-and-values-study
- Sicilia-Camacho, A., & Fernandez-Balboa, J. M. (2009). Reflecting on the moral bases of critical pedagogy in PETE: Toward a Foucaultian perspective on ethics and the care of self. *Sport, Education and Society*, 14(4), 443 - 463.
- Siedentop, D., & Tannehill, D. (2000). *Developing teaching skills in physical education*. Mountainview, CA: Mayfield.

- Silverman, D. (2003). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Simon, R. (1992). *Teaching against the grain*. New York, NY: Bergin & Garvey.
- Sinkinson, M. (2011). Back to the future: Reoccurring issues and discourses in health education in New Zealand schools. *Policy Futures in Education*, 9(3), 315 - 327.
- Sirna, K., Tinning, R., & Rossi, T. (2010). Social processes of health and physical education teachers' identity formation: Reproducing and changing culture. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 31(1), 71 - 84.
- Sleeter, C. (1995). White preservice students and multicultural education course work. In J. M. Larkin, & C. E. Sleeter (Eds.), *Developing multicultural teacher education curriculum* (pp. 17-30). Albany, NY: State University of New York.
- Smith, W. (2008). Physical education teacher education and the programmatic and personal effects of institutional change (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD.
- Smith, W. (2014). Using Bourdieus reflexive sociology to uncover physical education teacher education practices. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 19(1), 7 - 14.
- Smyth, J. (1989). Developing and sustaining critical reflection in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(2), 2 - 9.
- Smyth, J. (2011). *Critical pedagogy for social justice*. New York, NY: Continuum International.
- Smyth, J., Down, B., & McInerney, P. (2014). *The socially just school: Making space for youth to speak back* (Vol. 29). New York, NY: Springer.
- Sofa, S., & Curtner-Smith, M. (2010). Development of pre-service teachers' value orientations and beliefs during a secondary methods course and early field experience. *Sport, Education and Society*, 15(3), 347 - 365.

- Spade, D. (2003). Resisting medicine, re/modeling gender. *Berkeley Womens Law Journal*, 18(1), 15 - 37.
- Sparkes, A. (1990). Curriculum change and physical education: Towards a micropolitical understanding. Geelong, VIC: Deakin University Press.
- Sparkes, A. (1996). *Research in physical education and sport*. London, UK: Falmer Press.
- Sparkes, A. (1997). Ethnographic fiction and representing the absent other. *Sport, Education and Society*, 2(1), 25 - 40.
- Spring, J. (1996). *American education* (7th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Staszak, J. (2008). Other/otherness. In R. Kitchin, & N. Thrift (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of human geography* (pp. 43-47). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier. doi.org/10.1016/B978-008044910-4.00980-9
- Steinberg, S. (2012). Whats critical about qualitative research? In S. Steinberg, & G. Cannella (Eds.), *Critical qualitative research reader* (Vol. 2, pp. ix-x). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Stothart, B. (2012). For the record: An encyclopedia of historical aspects of New Zealand physical education. Christchurch, New Zealand: University of Canterbury.
- Sweet, S. (1998). Practicing radical pedagogy: Balancing ideals with institutional constraints. *Teaching Sociology*, 26(2), 100 - 111.
- Tatto, M. (1996). Examining values and beliefs about teaching diverse students: Understanding the challenges for teacher education. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 18(2), 155 - 180.
- Tatto, M. (2007). International comparisons and the global reform of teaching. In M. Tatto (Ed.), *Reforming teaching globally* (pp. 7-18). Oxford, UK: Symposium Books.
- Taylor, S. (2004). Researching educational policy and changes in new times: Using critical discourse analysis. *Journal of Education Policy*, 19(4), 433 - 451.

- Taylor, S. J., & Bogdan, R. (1984). *Introduction to qualitative research: The search for meanings* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Te Ika a Maui College of Education. (1996). *Proposal for approval and accreditation: Bachelor of Physical Education*. Auckland, New Zealand: Te Ika a Maui College of Education
- Te Ika a Maui University. (2010). *Te Ika a Maui University 2010 calendar* Auckland, New Zealand: Norcross.
- Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education. (2005). *Application to the Teachers' Council for approval for the Bachelor of Physical Education*. Te Ika a Maui Faculty of Education. Auckland, New Zealand.
- Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education. (2011a). *EDCURRIC 131 Physical education practice 2* (Course handbook). Auckland, New Zealand: School of Critical Studies in Education.
- Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education. (2011b). *EDCURRIC 430 Curriculum issues in health and physical education* (Course handbook). Auckland, New Zealand: School of Critical Studies in Education.
- Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education. (2011c). *EDPRAC 203: Health and physical education practicum 1* (Course handbook). Auckland, New Zealand: School of Learning, Development and Professional Practice.
- Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education. (2011d). *EDUC 133 Concepts underpinning skilled movement* (Course handbook). Auckland, New Zealand: School of Critical Studies in Education.
- Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education. (2011e). *EDUC 142 Health and physical education in a diverse society* (Course handbook) Auckland, New Zealand: School of Critical Studies in Education.

- Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education. (2011f). *EDCURRIC 430 Curriculum issues in health and PE*. Auckland, New Zealand: School of Critical Studies in Education.
- Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education. (2012). *Bachelor of physical education handbook*. Auckland, New Zealand: Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education
- Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative research: Analysis types and software tools*. Basingstoke, UK: Falmer Press.
- Thomas, S. (2002). Contesting education policy in the public sphere: Media debates over policies for the Queensland school curriculum. *Journal of Education Policy*, 17(2), 187 - 198.
- Thompson, P. (2000). The sorcery of apprenticeships and new/old brooms: Thinking about theory, practice, the practicum and change. *Teaching Education*, 11(1), 67 - 74.
- Tierney, W. (2000). Undaunted courage: Life history and postmodern challenge. In N. Denzin, & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 537 - 553). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tinning, R. (1985). Physical education and the cult of slenderness: A critique. *ACHPER National Journal*, 107(Autumn), 10 - 14.
- Tinning, R. (1987). *Improving teaching in physical education*. Geelong, VIC: Deakin University Press.
- Tinning, R. (1988). Student teaching and the pedagogy of necessity. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 7, 82 - 89.
- Tinning, R. (1991). Teacher education pedagogy: Dominant discourses and the process of problem solving. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 11(1), 1 - 20.
- Tinning, R. (1992a). Action research as epistemology and practice: Towards transformative educational practice in physical education. In A. Sparkes (Ed.), *Research in physical*

education and sport: Exploring alternative visions (pp. 188-209). London, UK: Falmer Press.

Tinning, R. (1992b). Reading action research: Notes on knowledge and human interests.

Quest, 44, 1 - 14.

Tinning, R. (1997). Performance and participation discourses in human movement: Toward a socially critical physical education. In J. M. Fernandez-Balboa (Ed.), *Critical post-modernism in human movement, physical education and sport* (pp. 99-119). New York, NY: Suny Press.

Tinning, R. (2000). Seeking a realistic contribution: Considering physical education within HPE in New Zealand and Australia. *Journal of Physical Education New Zealand*, 33(3), 8 - 21.

Tinning, R. (2002). Toward a modest pedagogy: Reflections on the problematics of critical pedagogy. *Quest*, 54, 224 - 240.

Tinning, R. (2004). Rethinking the preparation of HPE teachers: Ruminations on knowledge, identity, and ways of thinking. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 32(3), 241 - 253.

Tinning, R. (2006). Theoretical orientations in physical education teacher education. In D. Kirk, D. Macdonald, & M. OSullivan (Eds.), *The handbook of physical education* (pp. 369-385). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tinning, R. (2008). Pedagogy, sports pedagogy, and the field of kinesiology. *Quest*, 60, 405 - 424.

Tinning, R. (2010). *Pedagogy and human movement: Theory, practice and research*. London, UK: Routledge.

- Tinning, R. (2011). Introduction. In R. Tinning, & K. Sirna (Eds.), *Education, social justice and the legacy of Deakin University* (pp. xv-xxv). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Tinning, R. (2012). A socially critical HPE (aka physical education) and the challenge for teacher education. In B. Down, & J. Smythe (Eds.), *Critical voices in teacher education: Teaching for social justice in conservative times* (pp. 223-238). Dordrecht: The Netherlands: Springer.
- Tinning, R. (2014). Teacher education for health and physical education (HPE): Caught in a disjunctive position. In K. Fitzpatrick, & R. Tinning (Eds.), *Health education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 575-588). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Tinning, R., & Glasby, T. (2002). Pedagogical work and the cult of the body: Considering the role of HPE in the context of new public health. *Sport, Education and Society*, 7(2), 109 - 119.
- Tinning, R., & McCuaig, L. (2006). Making a certain citizen: Schooling and HPE. In R. Tinning, L. McCuaig, & Lisahunter (Eds.), *Teaching health and physical education in Australian schools* (pp. 3-8). Frenchs Forest, NSW: Pearson.
- Tolich, M., & Davidson, C. (2011). *An introduction to research methods: Getting started*. Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson.
- Torres, C. A. (1998). *Democracy, education, and multiculturalism: Dilemmas of citizenship in a global world*. Oxford, UK: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Tsangaridou, N. (2006). Teacher beliefs. In D. Kirk, D. Macdonald, & M. OSullivan (Eds.), *The handbook of physical education* (pp. 486-501). London, UK: Sage.
- Tsangaridou, N. (2008). Trainee primary teachers beliefs and practices about physical education during students' teaching. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 13, 131 - 152.

- Tsangaridou, N., & OSullivan, M. (2003). Physical education teachers theories of action and theories in use. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 22, 132 - 152.
- University of Auckland. (2011). Statute and guidelines for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD). Retrieved from <https://cdn.auckland.ac.nz/assets/central/about/the-university/how-the-university-works/policy-and-administration/Supervision/2011-phd-statute-and-guidelines.pdf>
- Van Dijk, T. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London, UK: Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. (2009). Critical discourse studies: A sociocognitive approach. In R. Wodak, & W. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 62-86). London, UK: Sage.
- Van Heertum, R. (2006). Marcuse, Bloch and Freire: Reinvigorating a pedagogy of hope. *Policy Futures in Education*, 4(1), 45 - 51.
- Wadsworth, B. J. (1996). Piagets theory of cognitive and affective development: Foundations of constructivism. White Plains, NY: Longman Publishing.
- Walker, R. (Ed.). (1980). The conduct of educational case studies: Ethics, theories and procedures. London, UK: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Warren, S. (1984). Contemporary dialectical theory: The voice of critical theory. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.
- Weis, L. (2004). Class reunion: The remaking of the American white working class. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Werner, E. (2007). Critical pedagogy and the crisis of imagination. In P. McLaren, & J. Kincheloe (Eds.), *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?* (pp. 56-77). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- White, B. (2011). *Mapping your thesis*. Camberwell, VIC: Acer Press.

- Wilkinson, R., & Pickett, K. (2010). *The spirit level* New York, NY: Bloomsbury Press.
- Wilkinson, S. (2004). Focus group interviews. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 177-199). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wink, J. (2005). *Critical pedagogy: Notes From the real world* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Wodak, R. (2007). *Critical discourse analysis*. London, UK: Sage.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: History, agenda, theory and methodology. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 1-33). London, UK: Sage.
- Wrench, A., & Garrett, R. (2012). Identity work: Stories told in learning to teach physical education. *Sport, Education and Society*, 17(1), 1 - 19.
- Wright, J. (2004a). Analysing sportsmedia texts: Developing resistant reading positions. In J. Wright, D. Macdonald, & L. Burrows (Eds.), *Critical inquiry and problem-solving in physical education* (pp. 227-243). London, UK: Routledge.
- Wright, J. (2004b). Critical inquiry and problem solving in PE. In J. Wright, D. Macdonald, & L. Burrows (Eds.), *Critical inquiry and problem solving in physical education* (pp. 3-15). London, UK: Routledge.
- Wright, J. (2004c). Post-structural methodologies: The body, schooling and health. In B. Davies, & J. Wright (Eds.), *Body knowledge and control: Studies in the sociology of physical education and health* (pp. 19-32). London, UK: Routledge.
- Wright, J., & Burrows, L. (2006). Re-conceiving ability in physical education: a social analysis *Sport, Education and Society*, 11(3), 275 - 291.
- Wright, J., & King, R. C. (1990). I say what I mean, said Alice: An analysis of gendered discourse in physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 10(2), 210 - 225.

- Wright, J., McNeill, M., & Fry, J. (2009). The tactical approach to teaching games from teaching, learning and mentoring perspectives. *Sport, Education and Society, 14*(2), 223 - 244.
- Yost, D., Sentner, S., & Forlenza-Bailey, A. (2000). An examination of the construct of critical reflection: Implications for teacher education programmes. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51*(1), 39 - 49.
- Young, M. (1971). *Knowledge and control*. London, UK: Collier-Macmillan.
- Young, M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Zack, J., Mannheim, A., & Alfano, M. (2010). I didn't know what to say: Four archetypal responses to homophobia rhetoric in the classroom. *The High School Journal, 33*(3), 98 - 100.
- Zeichner, K. (1983). Alternative paradigms of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 34*(3), 3 - 9.
- Zeichner, K. (1996). Educating students for cultural diversity. In K. M. Zeichner, S. Melnick, & M. Gomez (Eds.), *Currents of reform in preservice teacher education* (pp. 133-175). New York, NY: MacMillan.
- Zeichner, K. (2003). The adequacies and inadequacies of three current strategies to recruit, prepare, and retain the best teachers for all students. *Teachers College Record, 105*(3), 490 - 519. doi:10.1111/1467-9620.00248
- Zeichner, K. (2005). A research agenda for teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith, & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 737-760). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Zeichner, K. (2010). Competition, economic rationalization, increased surveillance, and attacks on diversity: Neo-liberalism and the transformation of teacher education in the US. *Teacher and Teacher Education*, 26, 1544 - 1552.

Zeichner, K. (2014). The struggle for the soul of teaching and teacher education in the USA. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 40(5), 551-568. doi:10.1080/02607476.2014.956544

Zeichner, K., & Flessner, R. (2009). Educating teachers for critical education. In M. Apple, W. Au, & L. A. Gandin (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of critical education* (pp. 296-311). New York, NY: Routledge.

Zeichner, K., & Teitlebaum, K. (1982). Personalized and inquiry-oriented teacher education: An analysis of two approaches to the development of curriculum for field-based courses. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 8(2), 95 - 117.

Appendix 1 : Participant Information Sheets



EDUCATION AND
SOCIAL WORK

Participant Information Sheet

(Bachelor of Physical Education students)

Project Title: Kicking at the habitus: Exploring staff and student 'reading' of a socially critical physical education teacher education (PETE) programme

Researcher: Rod Philpot

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Dear Bachelor of Physical Education students

I would like to invite you to participate in a research project I am conducting. My research will focus on examining the Bachelor of Physical Education (BPE) and your 'reading' of the courses and programme. The specific research questions ask:

1. To what extent is the delivery of the BPE programme consistent with the programmes espoused socially critical philosophy?
2. What sense do PETE students make of courses in relation to the socially critical philosophy of the PETE programme?
3. How do student biographies influence their 'reading' of the PETE programme?

The research will involve contributions from four teacher-educators and 16 year four students from the BPE programme, eight from the 2012 cohort and a further eight students from the 2013 cohort. Teacher educators will participate through semi-structured interviews while students will contribute through participation in one focus group interview and two semi-structured interviews. Data from programme and course documents will also be used to inform the study. The total time required of students will be approximately four hours.

The initial focus group interviews for your cohort will take place early in semester 1 2013. Two follow up semi-structured interviews will occur in later in the semester.

All interviews will be held on the Epsom Campus at the University of Auckland in a classroom. A convenient time that suits you and other participants will be arranged. Interviews will be recorded. Even if you agree to be recorded, you may choose to have the recorder turned off at any time.

Interview transcripts will be emailed to you for checking. You may edit or erase any information on your transcript and return it with corrections and additions within 30 days.

Your involvement in the study is completely voluntary. Choosing to participate or not participate in this study will in no way affect your grades, degree progress or professional relationships at the university. You may withdraw at any time from the interviews and from the study without explanation. However, please be aware that because focus group discussions will involve multiple people, your viewpoints cannot be removed from the discussion if you withdraw from the study. This means that after you participate in the first focus group discussion, the ideas you contribute will be part of the study even if you decide to withdraw.

The findings of this study will inform the delivery of the Bachelor of Physical Education programme and other academic programmes in Health and PE at the University of Auckland. The findings will be published in a PhD thesis, as well as academic journals, Faculty of Education staff seminars and at research conferences. While the research is intended to produce knowledge to share with the wider community, participation in this project will provide you with an opportunity for you to reflect on your own learning through the BPE.

Interviews will be transcribed by a university approved transcriber who has signed a confidentiality agreement. Interview records and transcriptions will be stored for six years by the researcher or one of the supervisors. Use will be restricted to the research thesis and publications relating to the project or further study by myself.

While participants' names will not be disclosed, the small sample of students may allow speculation as to the source. Every effort will be made to ensure that your identity will remain anonymous including the following:

- Your name will not be identified in front of your peers, nor will your name be used in the thesis.
- You will be asked to not discuss the focus group interview with others.
- Transcripts will be coded to prevent your name, and information that may identify you, from being used in any written report/ research document.
- All data will be stored using pseudonyms on a single computer for six years (within a password protected file) and accessible only to the research team. Any hardcopies will be retained in a locked cabinet.
- After six years the files will be shredded and digital files deleted.

If you agree to participate in this research I will ask you to sign a consent form. You will be offered a \$20 Westfield voucher at the conclusion of the last interview as a small token of my appreciation. This voucher is yours even if you wish to withdraw your data.

If you have concerns at any point please do not hesitate to contact me. At any time if you have concerns about the research project you can contact Mike Truman (BPE Programme Manager), Dr. Wayne Smith or Professor Richard Tinning (supervisors), Professor Judy Parr (Head of the School of Curriculum and Pedagogy) or the University of Auckland counselling service. (x48631)

If you are willing to put yourself forward as a *possible* participant in this research, please contact the principal researcher using the contact details below.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you.

Rod Philpot

Researcher

Rod Philpot
School of Curriculum and
Pedagogy
Faculty of Education
Private Bag 92601
Symonds Street, Auckland 1150
Tel: 623 8899 extn. 48147
Email: r.philpot@auckland.ac.nz
Office: N528

Supervisors

Dr. Wayne Smith
School of Curriculum and
Pedagogy
Private Bag 92601
Symonds Street, Auckland 1150
Tel: 623 8899 extn. 48760
Email:
wayne.smith@auckland.ac.nz

Professor Richard Tinning
School of Curriculum and
Pedagogy
Faculty of Education
Private Bag 92601
Symonds Street, Auckland 1150
Tel: 623 8899 extn. 48675
Email: r.tinning@auckland.ac.nz

Head of School

Professor Judy Parr
School of Curriculum and Pedagogy
Faculty of Education
Private Bag 92601
Symonds Street, Auckland 1150
Tel: 623 8899 extn. 88998
Email: jm.parr@auckland.ac.nz

For any queries regarding ethical concerns you may contact the Chair, The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee, The University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142, Telephone: 09 3737599 extn. 83711

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE
ON

14 February 2012 for 3 years, Reference number 7736



Participant Information Sheet

(Bachelor of Physical Education Faculty)

Project Title: Kicking at the habitus: Exploring staff and student 'reading' of a socially critical physical education teacher education (PETE) programme

Researcher: Rod Philpot

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Dear Teacher Educators

I would like to invite you to participate in a research project I am conducting. My research will focus on examining the Bachelor of Physical Education (BPE) and students 'reading' of the courses and programme. The specific research questions ask:

1. To what extent is the delivery of the BPE programme consistent with the programmes espoused socially critical philosophy?
2. What sense do PETE students make of courses in relation to the socially critical philosophy of the PETE programme?
3. How do student biographies influence their 'reading' of the PETE programme?

The research will involve contributions from four teacher-educators and 12 - 16 year 4 students from the BPE programme.

Teacher educators will participate through semi-structured interviews while students will contribute through participation in one focus group interview and two semi-structured interviews. Data from programme and course documents will also be used to inform the study.

All interviews will be held on the Epsom Campus at the University of Auckland in a classroom. A convenient time that suits you will be arranged. Interviews will be recorded. Even if you agree to be recorded, you may choose to have the recorder turned off at any time.

Interview transcripts will be emailed to you for checking. You may edit or erase any information on your transcript and return it with corrections and additions within 30 days.

The total time required of teacher educators will be approximately ninety minutes.

Your involvement in the study is completely voluntary. Choosing to participate or not participate in this study will in no way affect your employment or professional relationships at the university. You may withdraw at any time from the interviews and from the study without explanation.

The findings of this study will inform the delivery of the Bachelor of Physical Education programme and other academic programmes in Health and PE at the University of Auckland. The findings will be published in a PhD thesis, as well as academic journals, Faculty of Education seminars and at research conferences.

Interviews will be transcribed by a university approved transcriber who has signed a confidentiality agreement. Interview records and transcriptions will be stored for six years by the researcher or one of the supervisors. Use will be restricted to the research thesis and publications relating to the project or further study by myself.

While participants' names will not be disclosed, the small sample of teacher educators may allow speculation as to the source. Every effort will be made to ensure that your identity will remain anonymous including the following:

- Your name will not be identified in front of your peers, nor will your name be used in the thesis. Pseudonyms that do not indicate gender will be used.
- Transcripts will be coded to prevent your name and information that may identify you being used in any written report/ research document.
- All data will be stored using pseudonyms on a single computer for six years (within a password protected file) and accessible only to the principal researcher. Any hardcopies will be retained in a locked cabinet.
- After six years the files will be shredded and digital files deleted.

If you agree to participate in this research I will ask you to sign a consent form.

If you have concerns at any point please do not hesitate to contact me. At any time if you have concerns about the research project you can contact Mike Truman (BPE Programme Manager), Dr. Wayne Smith or Professor Richard Tinning (supervisors), Professor Judy Parr (Head of the School of Curriculum and Pedagogy) or the University of Auckland counselling service. (x48631)

If you are willing to put yourself forward as a *possible* participant in this research, please contact the principal researcher using the details below.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you

Rod Philpot

Researcher

Rod Philpot
School of Curriculum and
Pedagogy
Faculty of Education
Private Bag 92601
Symonds Street, Auckland 1150
Tel: 623 8899 extn. 48147
Email: r.philpot@auckland.ac.nz

Supervisors

Dr. Wayne Smith
School of Curriculum and
Pedagogy
Private Bag 92601
Symonds Street, Auckland 1150
Tel: 623 8899 extn. 48760
Email:
wayne.smith@auckland.ac.nz

Head of School

Professor Judy Parr
School of Curriculum and Pedagogy
Faculty of Education
Private Bag 92601
Symonds Street, Auckland 1150
Tel: 623 8899 extn. 88998
Email: jm.parr@auckland.ac.nz

Professor Richard Tinning
School of Curriculum and
Pedagogy
Faculty of Education
Private Bag 92601
Symonds Street, Auckland 1150
Tel: 623 8899 extn. 48675
Email: r.tinning@auckland.ac.nz

For any queries regarding ethical concerns you may contact the Chair, The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee, The University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142, Telephone:09 3737599 extn. 83711

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE
ON

14 February 2012 for 3 years, Reference number 7736



Participant Information Sheet

(Dean of Faculty)

Project Title: Kicking at the habitus: Exploring staff and student 'reading' of a socially critical physical education teacher education (PETE) programme

Researcher: Rod Philpot

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Dr. Graeme Aitken

I am requesting permission to carry out a research project that involves students and staff from the Bachelor of Physical Education programme. My research will focus on examining the Bachelor of Physical Education (BPE) and students 'reading' of the courses and programme. The specific research questions ask:

1. To what extent is the delivery of the BPE programme consistent with the programmes espoused socially critical philosophy?
2. What sense do PETE students make of courses in relation to the socially critical philosophy of the PETE programme?
3. How do student biographies influence their 'reading' of the PETE programme?

The research will involve contributions from four teacher-educators and 12-16 year four students from the BPE programme.

Teacher educators will participate through semi-structured interviews while students will contribute through participation in one focus group interview and two semi-structured interviews. Data from programme and course documents will also be used to inform the study.

All student interviews will take place in semester 1, a point in time where I do not teach the Year 4 cohort. Interview questions will be emailed to students a week before the interviews. Students will complete a short questionnaire at the conclusion of the focus group that will inform subsequent interviews. Two follow up semi-structured interviews will occur later in the semester.

All interviews will be held on the Epsom Campus at the University of Auckland in a classroom. A convenient time that suits the participants will be arranged.

The total time required of teacher educators will be 90 minutes while student involvement will be for approximately four hours.

Student and staff involvement in the study is completely voluntary. The Head of School will be asked to initiate contact with staff while a BPE lecturer and the BPE Programme Manager will recruit students. Staff and students will be made aware that choosing to participate or not participate in this study will in no way affect employment, grades, or professional relationships here at university. All participants may withdraw at any time from the interviews and from the study without explanation.

The findings of this study will inform the delivery of the Bachelor of Physical Education programme and other academic programmes in Health and PE at the University of Auckland. The findings will be published in a PhD thesis, as well as academic journals, Faculty of Education staff seminars, and research conferences.

Interviews will be transcribed by a university approved transcriber who has signed a confidentiality agreement. Interview records and transcriptions will be stored for six years by the researcher or one of the supervisors. Use will be restricted to the research thesis and publications relating to the project or further study by myself.

While participants' names will not be disclosed, the small sample of staff and students may allow speculation as to the source. Every effort will be made to ensure that identities will remain anonymous including the following:

- Names will not be identified in front of their peers, nor will their names be used in the thesis. Staff pseudonyms will not indicate gender.
- Transcripts will be coded to prevent names and information that may identify students and staff being used in any written report/ research document.
- All data will be stored using pseudonyms on a single computer for six years (within a password protected file) and accessible only to the research team. Any hardcopies will be retained in a locked cabinet.
- After six years the files will be shredded and digital files deleted.

Staff and students who agree to participate in this research will be asked to sign a consent form. Students will be offered a \$20 Westfield voucher at the conclusion of the last interview as a small token of appreciation.

Staff and students will be advised that if they have concerns about the research project they can contact Mike Truman (BPE Programme Manager), Dr Wayne Smith or Professor Richard Tinning (supervisors), Professor Judy Parr (Head of the School of Curriculum and Pedagogy) or the University of Auckland counselling service. (x48631)

The University of Auckland will not be named in the study however it is also possible that readers of publications may speculate as to the name of the institution.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me using the details below.

Thank you.

Rod Philpot

Researcher

Rod Philpot
School of Curriculum and
Pedagogy
Faculty of Education
Private Bag 92601
Symonds Street, Auckland 1150
Tel: 623 8899 extn. 48147
Email: r.philpot@auckland.ac.nz
Office: N528

Supervisors

Dr. Wayne Smith
School of Curriculum and
Pedagogy
Private Bag 92601
Symonds Street, Auckland 1150
Tel: 623 8899 extn. 48760
Email:
wayne.smith@auckland.ac.nz

Professor Richard Tinning
School of Curriculum and
Pedagogy
Faculty of Education
Private Bag 92601
Symonds Street, Auckland 1150
Tel: 623 8899 extn. 48675
Email: r.tinning@auckland.ac.nz

Head of School

Professor Judy Parr
School of Curriculum and Pedagogy
Faculty of Education
Private Bag 92601
Symonds Street, Auckland 1150
Tel: 623 8899 extn. 88998
Email: jm.parr@auckland.ac.nz

For any queries regarding ethical concerns you may contact the Chair, The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee, The University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142, Telephone: 09 3737599 extn. 83711

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE
ON

14 February 2012 for 3 years, Reference number 7736



Participant Information Sheet

(Head of School)

Project Title: Kicking at the habitus: Exploring staff and student 'reading' of a socially critical physical education teacher education (PETE) programme

Researcher: Rod Philpot

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Professor Judy Parr

I am requesting permission to carry out a research project that involves students and staff from the Bachelor of Physical Education programme. My research will focus on examining the Bachelor of Physical Education (BPE) and students 'reading' of the courses and programme. The specific research questions ask:

1. To what extent is the delivery of the BPE programme consistent with the programmes espoused socially critical philosophy?
2. What sense do PETE students make of courses in relation to the socially critical philosophy of the PETE programme?
3. How do student biographies influence their 'reading' of the PETE programme?

The research will involve contributions from four teacher-educators and 12 - 16 year four students from the BPE programme.

Teacher educators will participate through semi-structured interviews while students will contribute through participation in one focus group interview and two semi-structured interviews. Data from programme and course documents will also be used to inform the study.

All student interviews will take place in semester 1, a point in time where I do not teach the Year 4 cohort. Interview questions will be emailed to students a week before the interviews. Students will complete a short questionnaire at the conclusion of the focus group that will inform subsequent interviews. Two follow up semi-structured interviews will occur later in the semester.

All interviews will be held on the Epsom Campus at the University of Auckland in a classroom. A convenient time that suits the participants will be arranged.

The total time required of teacher educators will be 90 minutes while student involvement will be for approximately four hours.

Student and staff involvement in the study is completely voluntary. I would like to request that you initiate contact with staff, while the BPE Programme Manager will be asked to recruit students. Staff and students will be made aware that choosing to participate or not participate in this study will in no way affect employment, grades, or professional relationships at university. All participants may withdraw at any time from the interviews and from the study without explanation.

The findings of this study will inform the delivery of the Bachelor of Physical Education programme and other academic programmes in Health and PE at the University of Auckland. The findings will be published in a PhD thesis, as well as academic journals, Faculty of Education seminars and research conferences.

Interviews will be transcribed by a university approved transcriber who has signed a confidentiality agreement. Interview records and transcriptions will be stored for six years by the researcher or one of the supervisors. Use will be restricted to the research thesis and publications relating to the project or further study by myself.

While participants' names will not be disclosed, the small sample of staff and students may allow speculation as to the source. Every effort will be made to ensure that identities will remain anonymous including the following:

- Names will not be identified in front of their peers, nor will their names be used in the thesis. Staff pseudonyms will not indicate gender.
- Transcripts will be coded to prevent names and information that may identify students and staff being used in any written report/ research document.
- All data will be stored using pseudonyms on a single computer for six years (within a password protected file) and accessible only to the research team. Any hardcopies will be retained in a locked cabinet.
- After six years the files will be shredded and digital files deleted.

Staff and students who agree to participate in this research will be asked to sign a consent form. Students will be offered a \$20 Westfield voucher at the conclusion of the last interview as a small token of appreciation.

Staff and students will be advised that if they have concerns about the research project they can contact Mike Truman (BPE Programme Manager), Dr Wayne Smith or Professor Richard Tinning (supervisors), yourself, or the University of Auckland counselling service. (x48631).

The University of Auckland will not be named in the study; however, it is also possible that readers of publications may speculate as to the name of the institution.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me using the details below.

Thank You

Rod Philpot

Researcher
Rod Philpot
School of Curriculum and
Pedagogy
Faculty of Education
Private Bag 92601
Symonds Street, Auckland 1150
Tel: 623 8899 extn. 48147
Email: r.philpot@auckland.ac.nz

Supervisors
Dr. Wayne Smith
School of Curriculum and
Pedagogy
Private Bag 92601
Symonds Street, Auckland 1150
Tel: 623 8899 extn. 48760
Email:
wayne.smith@auckland.ac.nz

Head of School
Professor Judy Parr
School of Curriculum and Pedagogy
Faculty of Education
Private Bag 92601
Symonds Street, Auckland 1150
Tel: 623 8899 extn. 88998
Email: jm.parr@auckland.ac.nz

Professor Richard Tinning
School of Curriculum and
Pedagogy
Faculty of Education
Private Bag 92601
Symonds Street, Auckland 1150
Tel: 623 8899 extn. 48675
Email: r.tinning@auckland.ac.nz

For any queries regarding ethical concerns you may contact the Chair, The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee, The University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142, Telephone:09 3737599 extn. 83711

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE
ON

14 February 2012 for 3 years, Reference number 7736



Participant Information Sheet

(Bachelor of Physical Education Programme Leader)

Project Title: Kicking at the habitus: Exploring staff and student 'reading' of a socially critical physical education teacher education (PETE) programme

Researcher: Rod Philpot

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Mike Truman

I am requesting permission to carry out a research project that involves students and staff from the Bachelor of Physical Education programme. My research will focus on examining the Bachelor of Physical Education (BPE) and students 'reading' of the courses and programme. The specific research questions ask:

1. To what extent is the delivery of the BPE programme consistent with the programmes espoused socially critical philosophy?
2. What sense do PETE students make of courses in relation to the socially critical philosophy of the PETE programme?
3. How do student biographies influence their 'reading' of the PETE programme?

The research will involve contributions from four teacher-educators and 12 - 16 year four students from the BPE programme.

Teacher educators will participate through semi-structured interviews while students will contribute through participation in one focus group interview and two semi-structured interviews. Data from programme and course documents will also be used to inform the study.

All student interviews will take place in semester 1, a point in time where I do not teach the Year 4 cohort. Interview questions will be emailed to students a week before the interviews. Students will complete a short questionnaire at the conclusion of the focus group that will inform subsequent interviews. Two follow up semi-structured interviews will occur in later in the semester.

All interviews will be held on the Epsom Campus at the University of Auckland in a classroom. A convenient time that suits the participants will be arranged.

The total time required of teacher educators will be 90 minutes while student involvement will be for approximately four hours.

Student and staff involvement in the study is completely voluntary. The Head of School will be asked to initiate contact with staff, while I would like to request your assistance in recruiting students. Staff and students will be made aware that choosing to participate or not participate in this study will in no way affect employment, grades, or professional relationships at university. All participants may withdraw at any time from the interviews and from the study without explanation.

The findings of this study will inform the delivery of the Bachelor of Physical Education programme and other academic programmes in Health and PE at the University of Auckland. The findings will be published in a PhD thesis, as well as academic journals, Faculty of Education seminars and research conferences.

Interviews will be transcribed by a university approved transcriber who has signed a confidentiality agreement. Interview records and transcriptions will be stored for six years by the researcher or one of the supervisors. Use will be restricted to the research thesis and publications relating to the project or further study by myself.

While participants' names will not be disclosed, the small sample of staff and students may allow speculation as to the source. Every effort will be made to ensure that identities will remain anonymous including the following:

- Names will not be identified in front of their peers, nor will names be used in the thesis. Staff pseudonyms will not indicate gender.
- Transcripts will be coded to prevent names and information that may identify students and staff being used in any written report/ research document.
- All data will be stored using pseudonyms on a single computer for six years (within a password protected file) and accessible only to the research team. Any hardcopies will be retained in a locked cabinet.
- After six years the files will be shredded and digital files deleted.

Staff and students who agree to participate in this research will be asked to sign a consent form. Students will be offered a \$20 Westfield voucher at the conclusion of the last interview as a small token of appreciation.

Staff and students will be advised that if they have concerns about the research project they can contact yourself (BPE Programme Manager), Professor Judy Parr (Head of the School of Curriculum and Pedagogy), Dr. Wayne Smith or Professor Richard Tinning (supervisors), or the University of Auckland counselling service. (x48631)

The University of Auckland will not be named in the study; however it is also possible that readers of publications may speculate as to the name of the institution.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me using the details below.

Thank you

Rod Philpot

Researcher

Rod Philpot
School of Curriculum and
Pedagogy
Faculty of Education
Private Bag 92601
Symonds Street, Auckland 1150
Tel: 623 8899 extn. 48147
Email: r.philpot@auckland.ac.nz

Supervisors

Dr. Wayne Smith
School of Curriculum and
Pedagogy
Private Bag 92601
Symonds Street, Auckland 1150
Tel: 623 8899 extn. 48760
Email:
wayne.smith@auckland.ac.nz

Head of School

Professor Judy Parr
School of Curriculum and Pedagogy
Faculty of Education
Private Bag 92601
Symonds Street, Auckland 1150
Tel: 623 8899 extn. 88998
Email: jm.parr@auckland.ac.nz

Professor Richard Tinning
School of Curriculum and
Pedagogy
Faculty of Education
Private Bag 92601
Symonds Street, Auckland 1150
Tel: 623 8899 extn. 48675
Email: r.tinning@auckland.ac.nz

For any queries regarding ethical concerns you may contact the Chair, The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee, The University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142, Telephone: 09 3737599 extn. 83711

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE
ON

14 February 2012 for 3 years, Reference number 773



Appendix 2 Consent Forms

Consent form: Bachelor of Physical Education students

(NB: THIS FORM WILL BE HELD FOR A PERIOD OF 6 YEARS)

Project Title: Kicking at the habitus: Exploring staff and student 'reading' of a socially critical physical education teacher education (PETE) programme

Researcher: Rod Philpot

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

- I have had the research project explained to me. I have read and understand the information sheet given to me.
- I understand why I have been selected and I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to my satisfaction.
- I understand that all interviews and focus group discussions will be digitally recorded and transcribed.
- I understand that my involvement in the study is completely voluntary and that choosing to participate or not participate in this study will in no way affect my grades, degree progress or professional relationships at the university.
- I understand that I am free to withdraw my participation at any time during the interviews without explanation.
- I understand that if I wish to withdraw completely from the research I can do so at any time. However, if I withdraw after the focus group discussion I understand that my contributions to the focus group discussions will remain in the study.
- I understand that the researcher will make every effort to obscure my identity in research reports, including using a pseudonym and not disclosing any personal information about me. I do, however, understand that because focus groups involve several people that there is a possibility that my identity may not remain confidential.
- I understand that a transcriber will be used and s/he will sign a confidentiality agreement.
- I understand that copies of the information I give will be stored securely at the University of Auckland and then destroyed after 6 years.
- I understand that the data from this research will be used in a PhD thesis, and could also be used in academic articles, conference presentations and to inform the BPE programme at the University of Auckland. In none of these will my name be used.
- I understand that I can contact Rod Philpot, Dr. Wayne Smith, Professor Richard Tinning or Professor Judy Parr if I have any questions.

I agree to be part of this research project

Name..... Email.....

Signed Date

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE
ON
14 February 2012 for 3 years, Reference number 7736


Consent Form: Bachelor of Physical Education teacher educators

(NB: THIS FORM WILL BE HELD FOR A PERIOD OF 6 YEARS)

Project Title: Kicking at the habitus: Exploring staff and student ‘reading’ of a socially critical physical education teacher education (PETE) programme

Researcher: Rod Philpot

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

- I have had the research project explained to me. I have read and understand the information sheet given to me.
- I understand why I have been selected and I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to my satisfaction.
- I understand that interviews will be digitally recorded and transcribed.
- I understand that my involvement in the study is completely voluntary and that choosing to participate or not participate in this study will in no way affect my employment or professional relationships at the university.
- I understand that I am free to withdraw my participation at any time during the interviews without explanation.
- I understand that if I wish to withdraw completely from the research I can do so at any time.
- I understand that the researcher will make every effort to obscure my identity in research reports, including using pseudonyms that do not indicate gender and by not disclosing any personal information about me. I do, however, understand that my identity may not remain confidential due to the small number of teacher educators in the BPE programme.
- I understand that a transcriber will be used and s/he will sign a confidentiality agreement.
- I understand that copies of the information I give will be stored securely at the University of Auckland and then destroyed after 6 years.
- I understand that the data from this research will be used in a PhD theses, and could also be used in academic articles, conference presentations, and to inform the BPE programme at the University of Auckland. In none of these will my name be used.
- I understand that I can contact Rod Philpot, Dr. Wayne Smith, Professor Richard Tinning or Professor Judy Parr if I have any questions.

I agree to be part of this research project

Name Email

Signed Date

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE

ON

14 February 2012 for 3 years, Reference number 7736



EDUCATION AND SOCIAL WORK

Consent form: Dean of faculty

(NB: THIS FORM WILL BE HELD FOR A PERIOD OF 6 YEARS)

Project Title: Kicking at the habitus: Exploring staff and student ‘reading’ of a socially critical physical education teacher education (PETE) programme

Researcher: Rod Philpot

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

- I have had the research project explained to me. I have read and understand the information sheet given to me.
- I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to my satisfaction.
- I understand that interviews will be digitally recorded and transcribed.
- I understand that the researcher will make every effort to obscure the identity of students, staff and the university in research reports, including using pseudonyms and not disclosing personal information. I do, however, understand that there is a possibility that these identities may not remain confidential.
- I understand that a transcriber will used and s/he will sign a confidentiality agreement.
- I understand that copies of the information given will be stored securely at the University of Auckland and then destroyed after 6 years.
- I understand that the data from this research will be used in a PhD thesis, and could be used in academic articles, conference presentations, and to inform the BPE programme at the University of Auckland. In none of these publications or presentations will the names of the university or individuals be used.
- I understand that I can contact Rod Philpot, Dr. Wayne Smith, Professor Richard Tinning or Professor Judy Parr if I have any questions.

I agree to be part of this research project

Name Email

Signed Date

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE
ON
14 February 2012 for 3 years, Reference number 7736



EDUCATION AND SOCIAL WORK

Consent form: Head of School

(NB: THIS FORM WILL BE HELD FOR A PERIOD OF 6 YEARS)

Project Title: Kicking at the habitus: Exploring staff and student ‘reading’ of a socially critical physical education teacher education (PETE) programme

Researcher: Rod Philpot

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

- I have had the research project explained to me. I have read and understand the information sheet given to me.
- I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to my satisfaction.
- I understand that interviews will be digitally recorded and transcribed.
- I understand that the researcher will make every effort to obscure the identity of students, staff and the university in research reports, including using pseudonyms and not disclosing personal information. I do, however, understand that there is a possibility that these identities may not remain confidential.
- I understand that a transcriber will used and s/he will sign a confidentiality agreement.
- I understand that copies of the information given will be stored securely at the University of Auckland and then destroyed after 6 years.
- I understand that the data from this research will be used in a PhD thesis, and possibly academic articles, conference presentations, and to inform the BPE programme at the University of Auckland. In none of these will the names of the university or individuals be used.
- I understand that I can contact Rod Philpot, Dr. Wayne Smith, or Professor Richard Tinning if I have any questions.

I agree to be part of this research project

Name Email

Signed Date

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE
ON
14 February 2012 for 3 years, Reference number 7736



EDUCATION AND
SOCIAL WORK

Consent form: Bachelor of Physical Education Programme Leader

(NB: THIS FORM WILL BE HELD FOR A PERIOD OF 6 YEARS)

Project Title: Kicking at the habitus: Exploring staff and student ‘reading’ of a socially critical physical education teacher education (PETE) programme

Researcher: Rod Philpot

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

- I have had the research project explained to me. I have read and understand the information sheet given to me.
- I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to my satisfaction.
- I understand that interviews will be digitally recorded and transcribed.
- I understand that the researcher will make every effort to obscure the identity of students, staff and the university in research reports, including using pseudonyms and not disclosing personal information. I do, however, understand that there is a possibility that these identities may not remain confidential.
- I understand that a transcriber will used and s/he will sign a confidentiality agreement.
- I understand that copies of the information given will be stored securely at the University of Auckland and then destroyed after 6 years.
- I understand that the data from this research will be used in a PhD thesis, and possibly academic articles, conference presentations, and to inform the BPE programme at the University of Auckland. In none of these will the names of the university or individuals will be used.
- I understand that I can contact Rod Philpot, Dr. Wayne Smith, Professor Richard Tinning or Professor Judy Parr if I have any questions.

I agree to be part of this research project

Name Email

Signed Date

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE
ON
14 February 2012 for 3 years, Reference number 7736



EDUCATION AND
SOCIAL WORK

Appendix 3 Transcriber confidentiality agreement

Project Title: Kicking at the habitus: Exploring staff and student ‘reading’ of a socially critical physical education teacher education (PETE) programme

Researcher: Rod Philpot

Supervisors: Dr. Wayne Smith / Professor Richard Tinning

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

I agree to transcribe the audiotapes for the above research project and understand that the information contained within them is absolutely confidential and must not be disclosed to, or discussed with, anyone other than the researcher.

Name:..... Date:.....

Signed:

This confidentiality form will be stored for six years in a locked filing cabinet in before being destroyed.

Appendix 4 BPE interview guide: Student focus group one

1. Introductions. Please state your name and the year group you are in?
2. The first thing I would like to know is how and why you ended up enrolling in the programme? What other programmes did you consider?
3. Thinking about the programme as a whole, how would you describe the BPE programme?
4. What do you believe is the University of Auckland BPE brand? How do you think lecturers would answer this question, “the qualities that characterise graduates from our programme are.....?”
5. Do you ever consider why the BPE is in a Faculty of Education and not say in a science department or its own PE school as in Otago? How much impact do you think, the fact that the BPE is in a Faculty of Education has on your understanding about HPE?
6. How do you think your peers, and/or lecturers (the common characteristics, dispositions, interests accepted behaviours) influence your thinking about HPE? What similarities and differences do you perceive? What are the characteristics of these people that you recognise as being influential?
7. Given these influences, how do you think you have changed over the years you have been here (factors specifically related to these variables)?
8. The Bachelor of Physical Education programme is made up of a wide variety of courses. Thinking about the whole four years that you have been in the BPE programme:
 - a. Why do you think these courses have been included in the programme?
 - b. Do you think that they complement one and other?
 - c. Are there contradictions within the programme / between courses?
9. What makes a course meaningful or important?
10. Are there any ‘ways of teaching’ that you value most for your own learning? What enables you to learn best? Why?
11. Thinking *beyond* courses, what other opportunities does the BPE programme provided that you value?
12. Thinking about connections and conflicts:
 - a. What connections between courses and other experiences do you value (or not)?
 - b. What conflict between courses and other programme experiences do you value (or not)?
 - c. In what ways do you believe the BPE prepares students for teaching in our diverse society? What else could be done? What could be done differently?

Appendix 5 Interview guide: Student semi-structured interview one

1. Do you think you have a clear understanding of critical pedagogy? Do you think you can enact it in your teaching? Explain?
2. Thinking about the BPE programme... Do you think it has delivered on its promise to *engage you in intellectual scholarship & inquiry about socially critical issues*?
 - a. Did 'it' (the BPE) *problematise the everyday taken-for-granted practises of school HPE*?
 - b. Did it *examine the taken for granted knowledge about fitness, health and sport and ask you to think differently*?
 - c. Did it *examine the way in which vested interests are sedimented into school practices*? (ie. Dominance of white males.)
3. Do you think that the BPE has made you more aware of inequity and disadvantage and does it give you the tools to deal with it?
4. Do you have any strongly held belief about teaching that have changed during the BPE programme?
5. In what ways do you believe the BPE prepares students for teaching in our diverse society? What else could be done? What could be done differently?
6. In terms of the BPE programme as a whole:
 - a. Do you think that critical pedagogy has been marginalised in the BPE?
 - b. Do you think sport and exercise science dominate?
 - c. Do you think the dominant message of the programme was related to participation or performance (sport, fitness)?
7. Do you think that the BPE programme can create both an aware of, and a desire to do something about, social inequalities in students, especially in white middle class students?
8. Do you think that it is possible to be aware of inequity and disadvantage unless you have been disadvantaged yourself?
9. Do you think that socially critical courses are an important part of initial teacher education?
 - a. Can you be an effective teacher without being critical?
 - b. Do teachers have to operate with a critical 'hat' on?
10. Finally, this is your chance to ask any questions or suggestions?

Appendix 6 Interview guide: Student semi-structured interview two

1. Where did you grow up?
2. How would you describe your lifestyle growing up?
3. What interests did you have a child? Sport? Outdoors? Recreation? Games?
4. How much involvement did your family have in these activities / hobbies / interests?
5. What are your memories of school?
6. What are your memories of physical education?
7. How important are the following values as guiding principles in your life? Explain your answer.
 - a. AUTHORITY (the right to lead or command)
 - b. EQUALITY (equal opportunity for all)
 - c. SOCIAL JUSTICE (correcting injustice)
8. How strongly you agree or disagree with each statement. Remember: the best answer is your opinion.
 - a. Everyone in New Zealand has a fair shot at wealth and happiness, regardless of race or ethnicity.
 - b. To a large extent, a person's race biologically determines his or her abilities.
 - c. Some of the best people in the country are those who are challenging our government, criticizing religion, and ignoring the "normal way" things are supposed to be done.
 - d. We should do more to equalise conditions for different groups.
9. What do you think is the main purpose of school? Why do you think that?
10. What do you think the main purpose of physical education is? Why do think that?
11. What influence (if any) do you think your school years have had on the way you think about teaching? About physical education?
12. What influence do you think your family / upbringing has had on the way you think about teaching? About physical education?
13. What influence has PETE had on the way you think about teaching? About physical education?

Appendix 7 PETE teacher educator interview guide

1. Please share with me your background in regard to tertiary study, teaching and lecturing.
2. What are your research interests?
3. What are your interests in physical education teacher education? What courses do you teach?
4. Thinking about each of the courses you teach within the BPE, what contribution do you think they make to the PETE programme? What important knowledge, skills and values are developed?
5. What are the dominant pedagogical tools / ways of teaching in each course? What is your rationale behind how you teach?
6. Are there any barriers that impact on the delivery of your courses?
7. The BPE programme approval documents state that the BPE is “underpinned by a socially critical orientation”. How do you interpret that?
8. Does this (underpinning philosophy) have an influence on what you teach? How you teach?
9. Do you think the BPE programme is different in any way to another PETE programmes? If so, how?
10. What do you believe are the key qualities that characterize graduates from this PETE programme?
11. What do you think is / are the most important contribution(s) the BPE programme makes in preparing the BPE students for teaching?

Appendix 8 Interview guide: BPE – Programme of study outline

Bachelor of Physical Education - Year 1

EDCURRIC 130	Physical Education Practice 1
EDCURRIC 131	Physical Education Practice 2
EDCURRIC 132	Bio-Physical Foundations of Health and Physical Education
EDCURRIC 133	Concepts Underpinning Skilled Movement
EDCURRIC 134	Expressive Movement and Physical Education
EDPRAC 103	The Professional Teacher: Health and Physical Education
EDUC 142	Health and Physical Education in a Diverse Society
+ 1 General Education	

Bachelor of Physical Education - Year 2

EDCURRIC 135	Socio-Cultural Foundations of Health and Physical Education
EDCURRIC 200	Biophysical Concepts in Physical Education
EDCURRIC 230	Physical Education Ngā Kākano
EDCURRIC 231	Physical Education Practice 3
EDCURRIC 233	Youth Health Education
EDPRAC 203	Health and Physical Education Practicum 1
EDPROFST 203	Teaching Health and Physical Education 1
EDPROFST 214	Assessment for Learning and Teaching

Bachelor of Physical Education - Year 3

EDCURRIC 232	Physical Education Practice 4
EDCURRIC 234	Physical Activity and Health
EDCURRIC 235	Senior School Health and Physical Education
EDCURRIC 236	Teaching Outdoor Education
EDCURRIC 333	Advanced Youth Health Education
EDPRAC 303	Health and Physical Education Practicum 2
EDPROFST 303	Teaching Health and Physical Education 2
+ 1 General Education	

Bachelor of Physical Education - Year 4

EDCURRIC 334	Exercise and Physical Education
EDCURRIC 335	Research Study in Health and Physical Education
EDUC 321	Politics, Philosophy and Education
EDCURRIC 430	Curriculum Issues in Health and Physical Education

EDCURRIC 431	Physical Education Pedagogy
EDPRAC 403	Advanced Health and Physical Education Practicum
+ 2 electives from:	
EDCURRIC 237	Recreation and Leisure
EDCURRIC 239	Teaching and Coaching Sport
EDCURRIC 432	Research Project in Health and Physical Education
EDCURRIC 433	The Health Educator

Appendix 9 Interview guide: Critical Pedagogies

- Problem Posing
- Dialogue
- Creating an environment that is neither hierarchical nor dichotomous
- Identifying and interrogating ideological beliefs
- Implicating oneself through public reflection
- Border Crossing
- Action Research
- Problematisation of the relationship between education and politics
- Critically examining knowledge and its construction
- Recruiting a diverse teaching force
- Interrogating ITE students' assumptions, values and beliefs
- Interrogating curriculum and pedagogy
- Acknowledging diverse contexts
- Recruiting teachers committing to working in less privileged schools
- Rich learning experiences in contrast with opportunities to assess.



Appendix 10 Ethics Approval

Office of the Vice-Chancellor
Research Integrity Unit

UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE
28-Nov-2011

MEMORANDUM TO:
Dr Wayne Smith
Critical Studies in Education

Re: Application for Ethics Approval (Our Ref. 7736)

The Committee has received your application for ethics approval for your project titled

Kicking the habitus: Exploring staff and student 'reading' of a socially critical physical education teacher education (PETE) programme.

This application is now under consideration. All communications with the UAHPEC regarding this application should indicate this reference number: **7736**.

(This is a computer generated letter. No signature required.)

Secretary
University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee

c.c. Head of Department / School, Critical Studies in Education
Mr Roderick Philpot
Ms Sharon Boyd
Dr Katrina Fitzpatrick

Appendix 11 Permission to include published works

RE: Philpot, R. A. (2015). Critical Pedagogies in PETE: An Antipodean perspective. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*. 34(2), 316-332. doi. [10.1123/jtpe.2014-0054](https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2014-0054)

From: Rod Philpot

Sent: Monday, 16 May 2016 11:15 a.m.

To: Ben Dyson

Subject: Consent to include a published paper in a thesis

Hi Ben

I am about to submit my PhD for examination under the University of Auckland 2011 doctoral statutes which allows the inclusion of published or submitted papers in the doctorate. To meet these statutes, I require consent from the relevant journals. I am emailing you to seek permission to include one of the published articles in my doctorate:

Philpot, R. (2015). Critical Pedagogies in PETE: An Antipodean Perspective. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 34 (2), 316-332. doi:10.1123/jtpe.2014-0054

Thank you for your consideration. I am more than happy to send you any further information.

Regards Rod

Greetings Rod,

Good to hear from you and congratulations on your fine contribution to the research in the area of Physical Education.

I write this email to give you permission to include your published article from the *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education* in your doctorate: Philpot, R. (2015). Critical Pedagogies in PETE: An Antipodean Perspective. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 34 (2), 316-332. doi:10.1123/jtpe.2014-0054.

Kind regards, Ben.

Ben Dyson, Ph.D.

Editor of the *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*

Associate Professor Health and Physical Education

School of Curriculum and Pedagogy

The University of Auckland

Private Bag 92601, Symonds Street, Auckland 1150, New Zealand

Email: b.dyson@auckland.ac.nz

Ph: 64-9-623-8899 Ext 48337

RE: Philpot, R.A. (2015) Physical education initial teacher educators' expressions of critical pedagogy(ies): Coherence, complexity or confusion. *European Physical Education Review*. 22(2), 260-275. doi:10.1177/1356336X15603382

From: Rod Philpot [mailto:r.philpot@auckland.ac.nz]
Sent: 16 May 2016 00:32
To: Nollaig McEvilly
Subject: permission to include a published paper in a thesis

Hi Nollaig,

I am about to submit my PhD for examination under the University of Auckland 2011 doctoral statutes which allows the inclusion of published or submitted papers in the doctorate. To meet these statutes, I require consent from the relevant journals. I am emailing you to seek permission to include one of the published articles in my doctorate:

RE: Philpot, R. (2016). Physical education initial teacher educators' expressions of critical pedagogy(ies): Coherency, complexity or confusion? *European Physical Education Review*, 22(2), 260-275.

Thank you for your consideration. I am more than happy to send you any further information.

Regards Rod

From: Nollaig McEvilly [mailto:n.mceville@chester.ac.uk]
Sent: Tuesday, 17 May 2016 10:17 p.m.
To: Rod Philpot
Subject: RE: permission to include a published paper in a thesis

Hi Rod,

Thanks for your email. I've been in touch with my contact at SAGE Publications and she said the following:

Yes, this is fine, although it is a requirement that he acknowledge the article, and our rights team has preferred wording, as below. (I assume his institution/supervisor is happy with reproducing an article as a chapter as I know some have different rules about it.)

This chapter has been published as an article in *European Physical Education Review*, Vol 22 Issue 2, May 2016 by SAGE Publications Ltd, All rights reserved. © Author 2016. doi: 10.1177/1356336X15603382 <http://epe.sagepub.com/content/22/2/260.abstract>

I hope this is helpful, and I wish you all the best with your PhD examination.

Best wishes,

Nollaig.

Dr. Nollaig McEvilly (BSc, MA, PhD)
Editor of *European Physical Education Review*
Lecturer in Sociology of Sport and Exercise
University of Chester, UK
<http://www.chester.ac.uk/departments/ses/staff/c/n-mceville>
Office: Tower 607
Phone: 0044-1244-513387
Twitter: @Dr_McEvil

EPER Thematic Collection on Physical Education and Health (July 2015):
http://epe.sagepub.com/site/includefiles/Virtual_Special_Issues.xhtml

RE: Philpot, R. (2016). Shaking Student's Cages: A Freirean pedagogy that challenged PETE students' beliefs about physical education. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy* 7(1), 143-164.

On Sun, May 15, 2016 at 7:36 PM, Rod Philpot <r.philpot@auckland.ac.nz> wrote:

Hi Leila,

I am about to submit my PhD for examination under the University of Auckland 2011 doctoral statutes which allows the inclusion of published or submitted papers in the doctorate. To meet these statutes, I require consent from the relevant journals. I am emailing you to seek permission to include one of the published articles in my doctorate:

Philpot, R. (2016). Shaking Student's Cages: A Freirean pedagogy that challenged PETE students' beliefs about physical education. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy* 7(1), 143-164.

Thank you for your consideration. I am more than happy to send you any further information.

Regards Rod

From: Leila Villaverde [mailto:levillav@uncg.edu]
Sent: Monday, 16 May 2016 1:08 p.m.
To: Rod Philpot
Subject: Re: permission to include a published paper in a thesis

Hi Rod,

Absolutely, permission granted. Best of luck!

Regards, lv

Appendix 12 PhD timeline

(Based on part time PHD study: Aug 2010 – Aug 2016)

August – December 2010

Enrol in PhD

Develop PhD proposal

Jan – June 2011

Complete PhD Proposal

July – December 2011

Complete and submit ethics proposal

Develop literature review

Complete Pilot interviews

Present PhD proposal in HPE seminar series

January - March 2012

Year 4 student participants recruited

Focus Group 1 Interviews (year 4 students)

Interview transcription

April-June 2012

Focus group interviews with students (x2)

Transcribe Interviews transcribed

Initial themes generated

Questions developed for semi-structured student interviews

July-November 2012

Semi-structured interviews with students

Transcription of interviews

December 2012 -January 2013

Semi-structured interviews with teacher educators

Transcription of teacher educator interviews

Analysis of PETEs interviews

February-June 2013

Analysis of BPE programme documents

Year 4 student participants recruited

Focus Group 1 (year 4 students)

Interview transcription

July – December 2013

Semi-structured Interviews with year 4 students

Interview transcription & Document analysis

Analysis of PETE student interview data

Complete draft methodology chapter

January-July 2014

Complete findings Chapter 5 (document analysis)

Present findings at AIESEP Conference

July- December 2014

Complete findings Chapter 6 (PETEs and critical pedagogy)

Present findings at AARE Conference

January – June 2015

Complete findings Chapter 7 (PETE students and critical pedagogy)

Present Chapter 7 (paper 5) findings at ISATT Conference

July- December 2015

Complete revisions of Chapters 1-7

Begin discussion and conclusions

February 2016

Complete discussion

Submit draft thesis to supervisors

March-June 2016

Complete revisions and submit thesis

Present Chapter 7 (paper 6) findings at AIESEP conference

September 2016

Submit theses for examination

FOOTNOTES

ⁱ In statistics an ‘outlier’ is an observation point that is distant from other observations. I use this term in a less scientific sense to mean that I am interested in teaching for students who have not achieved lofty outcomes and those who are not served well by a narrow focus on standardised outcomes as the single measure of educational success.

ⁱⁱ The New Zealand Ministry of Education uses a decile rating (ranking) system for school funding purposes. A decile 1 rating indicates that families in the school have low socio-economic backgrounds. Schools in decile 10 have the lowest proportion of these students.

ⁱⁱⁱ The same employment opportunities did not exist for women.

^{iv} In the last 25 years the forest industry has almost disappeared in my home town.

^v In Canada, ‘hockey’ is played on ice and ‘field hockey’ is played on a field. In New Zealand and Australia, I played ‘ice hockey’.

^{vi} Habitus is described by Bourdieu (1977, 1990) as durable dispositions predisposed to act as ‘structuring structures’. These structures act as principles which generate and organise practice. Habitus will be discussed at length later in the literature review and will be an integral part of the social theory that informs this study.

^{vii} A sociocultural perspective is used to describe an awareness of circumstances that surround an individual (e.g., cultural, historical, economic, environmental and social). A sociocultural perspective is used to explain how one’s actions and behaviours are affected by social and cultural factors.

^{viii} The notion of a ‘group habitus’ suggests that a group may embody similar dispositions that produce structures that generate similar practice.

^{ix} Bourdieu did not self-identify as a critical theorist.

^x Pseudonym.

^{xi} The BPE programme prepares teachers of health and physical education. It is more accurately described as an HPETE programme. For the purposes of this thesis, I will stick with the more familiar acronym PETE.

^{xii} The pseudonym, Te Ika a Maui University, is used to ensure the anonymity of the university, as per the accepted ethics application.

^{xiii} Māori are the indigenous race in New Zealand.

^{xiv} Pasifika refers to students from the Pacific Islands including Samoa, Tonga, Cook Islands, Niue, Tuvalu.

^{xv} All students at Te Ika a Maui University are required to complete two ‘general education’ courses. Both of these courses must sit outside their major field of study.

^{xvi} A marae is a meeting area on the tribal land of a Māori tribe.

^{xvii} The eight learning areas in the *New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 2007) are: English, The Arts, Health and physical education, Learning languages, Mathematics and statistics, Sciences, Social sciences, Technology.

^{xviii} See <https://ncea.tki.org.nz/Resources-for-Internally-Assessed-Achievement-Standards/Health-and-physical-education/Physical-education>

^{xix} Further descriptions of critical thinking and critical pedagogy follow in Chapter 3. For a detailed examination of the similarities and differences, see Burbules & Berk (1999).

^{xx} The Queensland HPE Syllabus (Queensland School Curriculum Council, 1999) divides the HPE learning area in three strands: Strand 1, Promoting the health of individuals and communities; Strand 2, Developing concepts and skills for physical activity; and Strand 3, Enhancing personal development.

^{xxi} Some academics differentiate between liberal and radical humanism. Liberal humanism is focusing on helping others *within* the realm of existing power structures. Radical humanism seeks to change the social conditions of power that impact on the lives of humans. In this way, radical humanism is more akin to socially critical or critical pedagogy.

^{xxii} Subjectivity is used to mean the self-conscious perception a person has of themselves (G. Marshall, 1998).

^{xxiii} Ideology is defined by Buchanan (2010) as “a set of beliefs, convictions or ideas which both binds a particular group of people together and determines the actions they take” (p. 243).

^{xxiv} Part of the literature review that introduces critical pedagogy has been removed from this paper to reduce unnecessary repetition. For the full paper see <http://journals.humankinetics.com/jtpe-back-issues/jtpe-volume-34-issue-2-april/critical-pedagogies-in-pete-an-antipodean-perspective>

^{xxv} Freire uses ‘critical consciousness’ as a translation of the word *conscientization*.

^{xxvi} Wright (1997) describes subjectivities as the ‘cultural baggage.’ She suggests that subjectivities constrain what individuals say and mean by their position in relation to the knowledge and practices of the culture they engage in.

^{xxvii} *Te ao kori* translates from Māori to mean ‘the world of movement’. *Te ao kori* in New Zealand PE includes traditional Māori games, dance, creative movement and recreational activities. See <http://health.tki.org.nz/Key-collections/Exploring-te-ao-kori/What-is-te-ao-kori> for a detailed description.

^{xxviii} Habitus was described in the study as “the durable and generalized disposition that suffuses a person’s action throughout a domain of life, or in extreme circumstances, throughout all of life” (Mordal & Green, 2012, p. 5).

^{xxix} I have used the term ‘biographical interviews’

^{xxx} Some of the questions used in the interview guide were acquired from the New Zealand Attitude and Values Study (NZAVS) (Sibley, 2011). While the NZAVS was designed as a longitudinal study to measure changes in attitudes and values, the questions were used here to explore PETE students’ attitudes and values toward diversity.

^{xxxi} Although *Pacifika* is a term often used in education, students typically identify with the specific Pacific country in which they were born. Three of the students in the study indicate that they are of Samoan heritage; they were all born in New Zealand.

^{xxxii} The terms ‘critical teacher education’ and ‘critical pedagogy’ are both used here on the understanding that they are taken to mean a focus on issues of social justice and equity.

^{xxxiii} Building on the work of Feiman-Nemser (1990), Doyle (1990), and Zeichner (1983), Tinning (2006) identifies a critical orientation as one of five possible orientations to PETE: (1) traditional/craft; (2) behaviourist; (3) personalistic; (4) critical; and (5) academic, with each orientation offering different skills, pedagogies, and teaching strategies.

^{xxxiv} For the purpose of this study, ‘text’ will be restricted to the written texts in the documents.

^{xxxv} The calendar provides a full description of the university regulations, policy, staff, programmes and courses available at the university. The course calendar descriptions are short statements that describe the course content, the points awarded for the course and course prerequisites.

^{xxxvi} Course booklets (syllabus) are provided to each student on enrolment. All course booklets contain: course learning outcomes; lecture schedules; assessment schedules; and course readings.

^{xxxvii} Practicums are planned and supervised teaching experiences in schools.

^{xxxviii} Edprofst 203, Edprofst 303, and Edcurric 431 are described in the BPE programme accreditation documents as ‘pedagogy’ courses. Edcurric 230 *Physical Education Nga Kakano* requires students to teach traditional indigenous games as part of course work.

^{xxxix} Critical pedagogy is not simply a strategy; rather it is a perspective on education that privileges social justice through challenging inequity and inequitable structures. The teaching strategies identified as ‘critical pedagogies’ in this paper are teaching strategies that align with a critical perspective.

^{xl} Pseudonym.

^{xli} Ethics approval for this project required anonymity for the institution. In order to maintain anonymity, statements used from either published or unpublished papers of “Tom Rose” will be referenced as (Rose, n.d.) or described as statements by or about Tom Rose.

^{xlii} The BPE students have practicum experiences each year.

^{xliii} Touch is a form of non-contact rugby.

^{xliv} Pseudonym for one of the BPE lecturers.

^{xlv} Humanism focuses on ‘self-actualisation’, a psychological theory that prioritises the need for self-fulfilment of human needs. Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy of needs proposes that human needs start with basic physiological needs such as food and sleep.

^{xlvi} These practices include: Problem posing and dialogue (Freire, 1970), border crossing (Giroux, 1993), action research (Kirk, 1986), problematise the relationship between education and politics (Fischman & McLaren, 2005), and identifying and interrogating ideological beliefs (Bartolome, 2007; Cho, 2006).

^{xlvii} While the lock-step nature of course work is very similar, the students’ practicum experiences may be very different as each student will attend five different schools with sixth additional ‘work based’ experience that may be completed outside of a school. Given the historical significance and value that students’ place on practicum experiences (Ovens, 2004), it is likely that these individual experiences serve to colour subsequent course work in the BPE.

^{xlviii} To reduce the repetition of information, the research setting, methodology and a full description of the Bourdieuan concepts used in this paper have been removed.

^{xlix} Pseudonym.

^l Pseudonym.

^{li} Pseudonym.

^{lii} Pseudonym.

^{liii} Pseudonym.

^{liv} Pseudonym.

^{lv} Pseudonym.

^{lvi} Pseudonym.

^{lvii} Pseudonym.

^{lviii} Pseudonym.

^{lix} Pseudonym for a private Christian school.

^{lx} Māori and Pacifica students in the BPE programme (2013 = 41%, 2012 = 43%, 2011= 30%, 2010 = 38%). Source: Te Ika a Maui Faculty of Education Contact Centre.

^{lxi} I have elected to use the words ‘not apparent attempts’ as the participants seemed unaware that the BPE programme documents advocate for diverse student cohorts and deliberately require students to have practicums (teaching experiences) in a range of contexts (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2005).

^{lxii} Pseudonym for a socio-economically deprived suburb in South Auckland with a large Pacifica community.

^{lxiii} Pseudonym.

^{lxiv} Pseudonym.

^{lxv} Pseudonym.

^{lxvi} Pseudonym.

^{lxvii} As discussed earlier, critical thinking is not critical pedagogy as it does not necessarily foreground issues of social justice. However, the move toward critical thinking does represent a move away from the biophysical foundations of PE and toward sociocultural explanations about physical culture.

^{lxviii} Slippage in the understanding of ‘critical’ has led to a form of academic PE that does not necessarily include social justice aims. The notion of ‘critical’ in the HPE national assessments better aligns with definitions of critical thinking.