

SHAKING STUDENTS' CAGES: A FREIREAN PEDAGOGY THAT CHALLENGED PETE STUDENTS' BELIEFS ABOUT PHYSICAL EDUCATION

ROD ALLAN PHILPOT
THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND, NEW ZEALAND

Abstract

This paper reports on the findings of a study that explored the influence of a four-year physical education teacher education (PETE) programme on the beliefs about physical education of the graduating students. These students suggested that a single teacher educator (TE) with a Freirean pedagogy had strongly influenced their beliefs and understanding of physical education. The TE used problem posing and dialogue in his lectures to raise the critical consciousness of the PETE students. The TE challenged the students' beliefs about the relationship between sport and physical education. This paper focuses on the pedagogy of the teacher educator and the students' reading of the pedagogy. This study uses data from interviews with PETE students and the writing of the TE to describe the practice, and student 'reading', of a Freirean pedagogy in a PETE programme.

Keywords: critical pedagogy, initial teacher education, physical education teacher education

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 marginalize groups in society (Macedo, 1994).

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' (PETEs') 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 PETEs having "little idea of the tactics, strategies, structures and organizational 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 conceptualized 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 term ‘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, Davies, & Penney, 1996; Graber, 1995; Matanin & Collier, 2003; Mordal-Moen & Green, 2012; Tsangaridou, 2008; Tsangaridou & O’Sullivan, 2003).

FREIREAN PEDAGOGY

Perhaps the name most synonymous with critical pedagogy is Paulo Freire. Freire (1997) calls for education that goes beyond “banking”; that is, the depositing of unquestioned knowledge into a compliant suppository, the student. Freire (1998) promotes teaching skills beyond technical skills, arguing that teachers should recognize inequality and take action to create healthy, responsive, and self-empowering teaching contexts.

Freire calls 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, 1970).

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, 1970). 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, 1970).

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, 1970, 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 (1970) concepts of dialogue, problem posing and critical consciousness to present findings on how a critical pedagogy was enacted in PETE by one teacher educator (TE) 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 TE discussed in this study has been given the pseudonym Tom Rose¹. 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 “conceptualizes 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 TEs 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 which is unavailable in many other contexts.

The Bachelor of Physical Education (BPE) courses taught by Tom are compulsory for all students. The courses, which occur in the first and the fourth and final years of the programme, focus on critically examining the nature of teaching and PE (Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education, 2011a, 2011b). 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, 2011b, 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, 2011c, p. 1). These course learning outcomes suggest that the courses are 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 conceptualizing 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 eight female participants were in their fourth and final years of the PETE programme. Eleven students identified as European, three as Samoan, two as Maori² while one student identified as both Maori and Samoan. 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 a Freirean pedagogy with the PETE's intentions to foster critical thinking.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

In this section I report on the findings of the interviews with the 18 graduating PETE students. In the first section I summarize the students' views that their understanding and beliefs about physical education have changed during the PETE programme, with the claim that

this TE had been particularly influential. The second section, “Tom’s Freirean Pedagogy,” conveys the students’ reading of the pedagogy of the TE, 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 recognize PE as being more than sport and suggest that this is a change in their thinking from when they began their PETE programme.

Tim represents the views of many students who began the PETE programme suggesting that “I thought it was going to be coaching sport and teaching sport and playing sport...” (Int. 1). Similarly, Cameron 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, Tim states, “I’ve pretty much changed completely” (Int. 1), while James concurs, adding that, “whereas at uni[versity] I realized that, OK, there is more to PE than that [sport]” (Int. 1). Charlotte, a female student with a similar affinity to sport, recognizes 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 challeng-

ing 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” (Rebecca, Int. 1).

Their reflective comments typically included phrases such as: “I’m fully influenced by Tom of course” (Rebecca, Int. 1) and Darren’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). Gemma 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). Sharon reflects 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 suggest 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. While it is difficult to separate the impact of a course from influence of the lecturer, Rebecca was adamant that it was “definitely Tom’s class” (Int. 2) that served to shape her beliefs. Lizzie 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). Cameron 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. Rebecca reflects 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 chal-

lenging 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 recognized 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. (Gemma, Int. 1)

Cameron observes 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).

James describes 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 teachingHe [Tom] just questions the things that we take for granted (Int. 2)

Darren 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?

Darren: Darren.

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

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

In hindsight, Darren recognized 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 characterize 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.

Gemma describes 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)

Charlotte 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 recognized, 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 recall 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 reflect 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” (Rebecca, 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” (p. 90). For Freire, critical consciousness is the “consciousness of consciousness” (p. 60). It is a means to recognize and revolt against the conditioning forces in the world.

Connor describes how Tom enacted critical consciousness and introduced students to Gramsci’s (2009) 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. (Cameron, Int. 2)

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

...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 report 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. (Lizzie, 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 inter-

view 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.

CONCLUSION

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 conceptualize 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 (1970) 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 TE 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, Bo-

lin (1990) cautions 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.

REFERENCES

- Allen, R. I., & Rossetto, C. A. (2009). Does critical pedagogy work with privileged students? *Teacher Education Quarterly, Winter*, 163-180.
- Aronowitz, S. (2008). Foreword. In S. L. Macrine (Ed.), *Critical pedagogy in uncertain times: Hopes and possibilities* (p. xii). New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Bolin, F. (1990). Helping student teachers think about teaching: Another look at Lou. *Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(1), 10-19.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (2000). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Sage.
- Brown, D. (1999). Complicity and reproduction in teaching physical education. *Sport, Education and Society, 4*(2), 143-159.
- Cassidy, T. (2000). *Investigating the pedagogical process in physical education teacher education* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Deakin University, Melbourne, VIC.
- Cho, S. (2006). On language of possibility: Revisiting critical pedagogy. In C. A. Rossetto, R. L. Allen, & M. Pruyun (Eds.), *Reinventing critical pedagogy: Widening the circle of anti-oppression education* (pp. 125-141). New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Cochrane-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. M. (2005). *Studying teacher education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and power*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Cresswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative processes*. London, UK: Sage.
- Cresswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing from five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cresswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 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*, 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.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). Introduction. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 1-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 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.
- Evans, B. (2006). Gender, place and culture: A journal of feminist geography. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 13(5), 547-561.
- 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*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Evans, J., Davies, B., & Penney, D. (1996). Teachers, teaching and the social construction of gender relations. *Sport, Education and Society*, 1(2), 165-183.
- Fernandez-Balboa, J. M. (1995). Reclaiming physical education in higher education through critical pedagogy. *Quest*, 47, 91-114.
- 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.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Seabury Press.
- Freire, P. (1997). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (20th anniversary ed.). New York, NY: Continuum Publishing.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy and civic courage*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- 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.

- 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.
- 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.
- Gramsci, A. (2009). Hegemony, intellectuals, and the state. In J. Storey (Ed.), *Cultural theory and popular culture: A reader* (4th ed., pp. 75-80). Harlow, England: Pearson Education.
- 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.
- Gubrium, J., & Holstein, J. (2000). Analyzing interpretive practice. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 487-508). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 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.
- Hinchey, P. (2006). *Being a critical educator: Defining a classroom identity, designing a critical pedagogy*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. (1995). *The active interview*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- 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.
- 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. (2010). *Physical education futures*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Macedo, D. (1994a). *Literacies of power: What Americans are not allowed to know*. Boulder, CO: Westfield Press.
- Macedo, D. (1994b). Preface. In P.L. McLaren & C. Lankshear (Eds.) *Paths from Freire*. London, UK: Routledge.
- 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.
- Maycut, P., & Morehouse, R. (1994). *Beginning qualitative research: A philosophic and practical guide*. London, UK: Falmer Press.
- Merriam, S. B. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- 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.
- O'Sullivan, M. (2005). Beliefs of teachers and teacher candidates: Implications for teacher education. In F. C. D. 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.
- O'Sullivan, 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.
- Philpot, R., & Smith, W. (2011). Beginning and graduating teachers' beliefs about physical education: A case study. *Asia-Pacific Journal of 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.
- 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 Publishing..
- Rossman, G., & Rallis, S. (1998). *Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 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.
- Shor, I. (1980). *Critical teaching and everyday life* (1st ed.). Boston, MA: South End Press.
- 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.
- Smyth, J. (2011). *Critical pedagogy for social justice*. New York, NY: Continuum International.
- Te Ika a Maui College of Education. (1996). *Proposal for approval and accreditation: Bachelor of Physical Education*. Auckland, NZ: Te Ika a Maui University.
- Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education. (2005). *Application to the Teachers' Council for Approval for the Bachelor of Physical Education*. Auckland, NZ: Te Ika a Maui University.
- Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education. (2011a). *EDCURRIC 135 Socio-cultural foundations of health and physical education (course handbook)*. Auckland, NZ: School of Critical Studies in Education.

- Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education. (2011b). *EDUC 142 Health and physical education in a diverse society (course handbook)*. Auckland, NZ: School of Critical Studies in Education.
- Te Ika a Maui University Faculty of Education. (2011c). *EDCURRIC 430 Curriculum issues in health and physical education (course handbook)*. Auckland, NZ: School of Critical Studies in Education.
- Tinning, R. (1988). Student teaching and the pedagogy of necessity. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 7, 82-89.
- 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. (2002). Toward a “modest pedagogy”: Reflections on the problematics of critical pedagogy. *Quest*, 54, 224-240.
- Tsangaridou, N. (2006). Teacher beliefs. In D. Kirk, D. Macdonald, & M. O’Sullivan (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., & O’Sullivan, M. (2003). Physical education teachers’ theories of action and theories in use. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 22, 132-152.

(Endnotes)

- 1 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.
- 2 The indigenous people of New Zealand.