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The need for critical pedagogy to be used in physical education has created significant discussion and debate over the last decade. While many scholars advocate for critical pedagogy, there is concern that there is a lack of practical applications. In New Zealand, recent neo-liberal economic imperatives have necessitated the complete revision of the school curriculum. The curriculum revision was designed to ensure that New Zealand was economically competitive on the world stage. In revising the physical education curriculum, the curriculum writers of this document took a socio-critical stance and have produced a document, mandated by the state that advocates for critical pedagogy. This paper explores critical pedagogy within New Zealand's physical education context including the curriculum and discusses how physical education in New Zealand is attempting to address the challenge of engaging in critical pedagogical praxis.
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1. Introduction

Much has been written around critical theory and critical pedagogy. In physical education, a major criticism of such scholarly writings has been the lack of "practical activism". Various commentators, including Hellison (1997), Fernandez-Balboa, (1997), Tinning (2002), and von der Lippe (1997) have argued that critical pedagogy has little relevance unless there is a strong engagement in praxis.

The purpose of this paper is to discuss how physical education in New Zealand is attempting to address the engagement in praxis from a critical perspective. In particular, this paper:

- provides a brief background contextualisation of physical education and the need for critical pedagogy within a framework of the wider economic imperative in society;
- briefly defines critical pedagogy and argues for its justification within a physical education and wider movement context;
- examines how Health and Physical Education in the New Zealand Curriculum [Ministry of Education (1999)] is attempting to address the challenge of engaging in critical pedagogical praxis; and
- analyses the challenges of and impediments to successful implementation that critical pedagogy presents in the New Zealand context.

2. Contextualising Physical Education within the Wider Economic Imperative

The neo-liberal ideology, or sometimes referred to as New Right ideology, that has dominated political thought during the past 20 years both in the industrialised west and in developing countries is based on notions of individualism, competition, rationality and self-interest. Economic and educational reforms have correspondingly emphasised the role of the market, increased competition and production through privatisation, deregulation, and the anomaly of free trade.

Whilst neo-liberal structural changes have been prevalent throughout the world, these were perhaps most clearly evident in the "New Zealand..."
Experiment" of the 1980s and 1990s [Kelsey (1995)]. Radical economic reform required a parallel structural and philosophical reconstruction of the education system. This change had and still does have implications for physical education within New Zealand. The two consequential issues discussed here are (1) the scientisation of physical education, and (2) the national and international economic implications for physical education and the movement culture as a whole.

2.1. The Scientisation of Physical Education

Within New Zealand, market-driven ideology provided a marked shift away from traditional views of education to a view focussed on neo-liberalism. One report advocating this neo-liberal ideology even went so far as to question the value of providing education for students who would be unable to contribute to the economy [Infometrics Business Services, cited in Ballard (1999)]. Such a market-driven concept of schooling has significant implications for the epistemological nature of physical education. Foundational to this epistemology is the scientisation of physical education that privileges the discourse of body control, healthism, health-related fitness, links between physical inactivity and obesity, competition, performance, measurement, and efficiency [Charles (1979); Evans, Rich & Davies (2004); Shilling (1993)]. The dominating theme behind this discourse is that the body is considered as physical capital that needs to be honed for trading in the market-place [Bourdieu, cited in Shilling (1993); Foucault (1990)], and this honing is essentially the responsibility of school physical education.

Neo-liberalism and the corresponding scientisation of physical education are problematic for a number of reasons. Firstly, and perhaps most importantly, these notions reduce physical education to a subject that treats “man as machine” to be trained for economic productivity [Charles (1979)]. This epistemological perspective assumes that a scientific and positivistic approach to the subject is value-free and that the political framework in which physical education operates is unproblematic [Bruce & Culpan (2005)]. The scientisation of physical education is characterised by a reductionist view that dilutes physical education to that of mere physical activity experiences that are mechanistic in nature, largely anti-intellectual in practice and dominated by “content laced with cogent fitness regimes and a bias towards patriarchal middle class traditional games” [Culpan (2000:26)]. In effect, this positioning of physical education reinforces the marginalisation of it and promotes a dualism between the mind and body that is not only outdated thinking but has the potential to remove the education from physical education [Culpan (2005)].

Secondly, the scientisation of physical education serves to reproduce existing social hierarchies through a continual perpetuation of privileging the already successful and dominant in physical education. In New Zealand, the domination of and the inevitable push for the continuation of the scientised view of physical education has largely been challenged by the Government mandating a new national physical education curriculum statement. This mandate has introduced a socio-critical perspective to physical education. Central to this perspective is the need for a pedagogy that, within a framework of movement, provides opportunities for students to examine the social, cultural, political, economic, ethical and physical implications and meanings of movement on people’s lives. Essentially, the socio-critical perspective that Health and Physical Education in the New Zealand Curriculum [Ministry of Education (1999)] promotes requires pedagogy that is critical in nature and emancipatory in action.

2.2. National and Global Economic Implications

The global growth in neo-liberal ideology and the now exploitative international divisions of labour have important implications for physical education and the movement culture. Here, the phenomena of professionalism in sport and commodification of the body and the entire movement culture are clearly evident, drawing attention to the need for critical thought and action. For example, in developing countries, neo-liberal reforms have resulted in "devastation for the poor, women and children, and the subordinate classes in general, and increasing actual poverty" [Pannu (1996:90]. The aspect of this devastation that is particularly relevant to physical education teachers and professionals within the movement culture is the alarming exploitative nature of the many industries associated with that culture. An example is the huge quantities of clothing and
footwear associated with sport and fitness that are made in numerous developing countries. A recent report [Oxfam (2004)] documented pervasive abuses of employment, including poverty-level wages, forced overtime, no union rights, sexual harassment, excessively long working hours, child labour and poor health and illness attributed to working conditions. Physical educators and professionals within the movement culture need to be aware of these issues and to consider challenging learners to become "critical consumers" who understand the power inherent in their dollar. In the world of "kleptocratic capitalism" (the incessant quest for material gain), many consumers in the west trample unthinkingly on the rights of millions of workers, either unaware of or showing little concern for issues of social justice or social responsibility [McLaren (2000)]. Giroux (2001) in critiquing the pervasiveness of such capitalism calls for an alternative citizenship to that of consumerism.

What is urgently required within the education system is the provision of an alternative vision to a citizenship of consumerism. The implication here for physical education is that there is an urgent need to challenge learners to develop a strong sense of social responsibility and social justice both within and beyond the classroom. A socio-critical curriculum and critical pedagogy can be instrumental in activating such change.

2.3. What is Critical Pedagogy?

The definitions of critical pedagogy, and inferences made to it through critical thinking, by scholars in the literature generally fit into one of two interpretations. The first defines critical thinking associated with critical pedagogy as a process of problem-solving, reasoning and use of higher-order thinking skills [Ennis (1993); McBride (1995); Tishman & Perkins (1995)]. The second emanates from critical theory and defines critical thinking within critical pedagogy as questioning assumptions and power inequalities and examining social relations from an all-encompassing view. Critical pedagogy within this framework is about understanding the relationship between power and knowledge. It is also about identifying inequalities and empowering individuals and groups to take social action to achieve change [Apple (2003); Brookfield (1995); Kirk & Tinning (1990); McLaren (2003)].

We concur with the second position. For us, critical pedagogy has emancipation and social justice as its central aims, and it enables people to obtain the knowledge, skills and power necessary to gain a greater degree of control over their individual and collective lives. Drawing from the critical paradigm, critical pedagogy is concerned with action emanating from examining social, political and historical processes and in understanding how these interrelate to form oppressive structures and social inequalities within a wider society. A characteristic of the critical paradigm is that it has a "big picture" or holistic approach that examines the nature of social relations. Within this paradigm, it is possible to examine and highlight these phenomena and to be encouraged to take overt action to overcome oppression [Carr & Kemmis (1986)].

2.4. Justification for Critical Pedagogy

Fernandez-Balboa (1997), Ingram and Simon–Ingram (1992) and McLaren (2003) argue that using critical theory and the pedagogies emanating from it provide a different approach to the analysis of knowledge construction in regards to the economic, social, political and moral beliefs and structures that are dominant in western thinking. Indeed, as Bain (1990) and Sparkes (1996) argue, the adoption of a more critical perspective allows the establishment of new visions, voices and intellectual curiosities. Fernandez-Balboa (1997) similarly considers these new visions and insights will inevitably happen and that the new era will usher in changes in every aspect of our lives, including the movement culture. He writes: "If we acknowledge the need to renew our common world, and if we agree that human movement professionals can contribute to this process, then we can begin by adopting ‘critical pedagogy’" [Fernandez-Balboa (1997:137). Apple (2003) likewise sees the development of critical pedagogies as challenging the conservative modernisation of society. These viewpoints strongly suggest that the employment of critical pedagogy in physical education will provide us with a tool to challenge attempts to mandate the promotion of mass health and fitness within schools as an unproblematic practice.
2.5. Critical Pedagogy, Physical Education and the Movement Culture

The adoption of critical pedagogy in physical education can also address and rectify what Evans (1987) identifies as a common and characteristic problem associated with the teaching of physical education, namely that schools generally teach this area of the curriculum in a vacuum that ignores wider societal moral and political influences and issues. Sage (1993) concurs, giving this reason for the inclusion of critical pedagogy within contemporary physical education programmes:

by not employing a socially critical perspective to human movement practices, we are unable to see the extent to which physical education practices are socially constructed by particular interests: we have difficulties recognizing how hegemonic political and economic interests shape and mould the values of our world and how human movement practices reinforce and reproduce these same values. [Sage (1993:153)]

According to Sparkes (1996), the new visions that result from the use of critical pedagogy within physical education assists the development of certain understandings:

1. The physical education culture comprises groups with power and privilege and groups without power and privilege.
2. Social structures within the culture of physical education perpetuate this power imbalance.
3. The power and privilege people have in physical education is a vested interest in maintaining the status quo.
4. The powerless and under-privileged in physical education have a vested interest in social change.
5. The competing interests within physical education create an inherent tension that lies just beneath the surface of harmony and contentment.
6. The critical position in physical education asks questions that will lead to change. These questions are designed not for mere description but for raising consciousness.
7. Critical theorists believe that in changing individual and group consciousness towards physical education, change will occur.

[Adapted from Sparkes (1996:40)]

The implementation of pedagogies associated with the critical paradigm provides physical education with a clear purpose. As Culpan (1996/97) explains, these pedagogies promote critical thinking and questioning about physical activity within society. They also, he goes on, lead to informed actions regarding issues in the movement culture that affect individuals personally and the social communities in which they live. Lawson (1999) and Macdonald (2003), argue that physical educators and sport educators who use critical pedagogy have the opportunity not only to serve the skilful, talented, and gifted movers (who are generally from the middle classes) but to be more inclusive as well, by addressing the specific needs of the disadvantaged. Lawson (1999) concludes by warning that if physical educators do not do this, they run the risk of becoming redundant and irrelevant.

3. Critical Pedagogy and the New Zealand Health and Physical Education Curriculum

A socio-critical perspective was introduced into physical education for the first time through Health and Physical Education in the New Zealand Curriculum [Ministry of Education, (1999)]. In addition to developing movement skills and healthy lifestyles the curriculum states that students will develop the skills that will enable them to enhance their relationships with other people, and they will participate in creating healthy communities by taking responsible and critical action [Ministry of Education (1999:5)]

Essentially the new curriculum sought to redress the dominant focus on the scientisation of movement and its corresponding emphasis on individualism which was philosophically woven into the previous national curriculum statement. As a result of this redress, a socio-critical stance of the type favouring critical pedagogy was promoted in this new context. It was promoted through the four underlying concepts of

- **Well-being, (hauora)**
  The concept of well-being (hauora) encompasses the physical, mental and emotional, social and spiritual dimensions of health. This concept is recognised by the World health Organisation. Hauora is a Maori philosophy of health unique to New Zealand. [Ministry of Education (1999:31)]

- **Health promotion,**
  Health promotion is a process that helps to
create supportive physical and emotional environments in classrooms, whole schools, communities and societies. [Ministry of Education (1999:32]

- the socio-ecological perspective,

Through this perspective students "can help to create the conditions that promote their own well-being and that of other people and society as a whole". [Ministry of Education (1999:33]

- the importance of attitudes and values that promote well-being.

Through this concept students will develop "a positive and responsible attitude to their own physical, mental and emotional, social, and spiritual well-being; ... respect for the rights of other people... care and concern for other people in their community and for the environment.... a sense of social justice". [Ministry of Education (1999:34]

The curriculum statement provides clear opportunities for teachers and students to promote critical thinking—to challenge and question assumptions concerning the movement culture and its relationship to the individual and society. In so doing, it encourages a critical pedagogy rarely evident in previous physical education practices. Hegemonic in nature, these practices focus on health-related fitness, mass health, body image, body shape, the scientific underpinnings of performance in sport, masculine interpretations of the body, and excessive competition and performance. The net result of these underlying, yet dominating, content areas is to alienate many students from the educative process, from movement experiences and from their own bodies. Until recently, these practices have gone largely unchallenged and few have seen them as problematic or as privileging in manner.

In contrast, the pedagogy inherent in the new New Zealand curriculum statement positions physical education so that it has the potential to promote more meaning around physical activity, the importance of deliberate exercise, how people use, shape and view their bodies, and how sport influences and reproduces power relations and privileges dominant groups in society. In essence, the curriculum adopts a pedagogy that encourages and empowers students not only to experience and learn through physical activity, games and sport but also to ask critical questions about physical activity within society, to locate themselves in their community. This pedagogy also seeks to develop individuals and groups who can critically reflect on their actions and their likely effects [Bruce & Culpan (2005); Culpan (2004); Wright, (2004)].

Figure 1 illustrates the pedagogical shift that the new curriculum requires if learning in physical education is to better serve the needs of students. While many aspects of the scientised or technocratic pedagogical model have some merit, physical education professionals in New Zealand need to include critical pedagogy.1

Central to moving toward critical pedagogy is the need for teachers and students to explore questions that challenge assumptions, expose inequalities and seek out and establish practices that are more socially equitable. Examples of such questions raised during professional development discourse around New Zealand include the following [adapted from Brookfield (1995) and Smyth (1992) by Gillespie and Culpan (2000:91)]:

- What do we know about this topic?
- How did we come to know this?
- What is the evidence for our knowledge?
- What are my/our beliefs about this knowledge? Why do I/we believe this?
- What information is missing from the picture?
- Why is this information missing?
- Whose voice is heard in this writing/article/class room/activity?
- Whose interests are being served?
- Who is being advantaged?
- Who is not being heard or served?
- Who is being disadvantaged?
- What needs to change and how can I/we contribute to that change?

As discussed previously a socio-ecological perspective is one of the four underlying concepts of the ‘new’ curriculum and is vital for the successful use of critical pedagogy within physical education in New Zealand. This perspective provides a philosophical base by which teacher and student can challenge constructs and assumptions within the discipline of physical education, and expose power relations. The central premise behind the socio-ecological perspective is that movement, in all its cultural forms, is not alienated, separated or

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientised or Technocratic Model of Physical Education</th>
<th>Moving towards a Critical Pedagogy</th>
<th>Socio-critical Model using Critical Pedagogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous NZ Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td>The 'new' New Zealand Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The focus is on physical skill development</td>
<td></td>
<td>The focus is on all aspects of the movement culture: i.e., learning in, through and about movement and taking into account the physical, social, spiritual and mental and emotional aspects of well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health promotion is for physical health through physical activity and fitness development, generally on a mass scale</td>
<td></td>
<td>Health promotion is conceptualised in its broadest sense, emphasising the holistic nature of health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmes are dominated by movement orientations dedicated to sport. There is no time to explore other forms of movement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Movement is conceptualised in its broadest sense, with the significance, influence and functions of movement from both an individual and a societal perspective being studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching is characterised by the direct style: &quot;This is how you do it&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>The teaching style is inquiry-based and reflective in nature. It encourages critical thought and challenges existing practice, and examines assumptions. It is emancipatory with a strong action component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characterised by a very scientific view of movement, in which skills and fitness are measured for performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensures that the scientific, physical, social, economic, ethical and political dimensions of movements are explored and critically examined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1** Pedagogical Perspectives

isolated from broader social, political, economic, moral and cultural relations, contexts and histories. Such influences affect how people view meanings and practices around physical activity and how they exercise, use, shape and view their bodies. They also elucidate the competing interests that are evident in movement, and how sport influences and reproduces power relations and privileges the dominant group at both individual and societal levels. Examples of these in the curriculum statement are:

Students will be encouraged to question their own decisions critically and work towards improving practices relating to physical activity within the school and wider community. [Ministry of Education (1999:42)]

Students will come to understand the social, cultural, economic and environmental factors that influence attitudes, beliefs, and practices
associated with sport. They will critically examine sport from the viewpoints of the school and society as a whole. [Ministry of Education (1999:44)]

Students will develop skills for identifying and critiquing the contributions that science, technology and the environment make to sporting performance. [Ministry of Education (1999:42)]

Other Ministry of Education statements in material published to support the curriculum document reinforce these messages by encouraging teachers to use critical pedagogy which includes developing learning opportunities whereby students:

- Critically analyse this incident (students select an Olympic incident) in relation to the philosophy of Olympism, considering the issues both from a personal viewpoint and at a wider social level. [Ministry of Education (2004:70)]
- Identify and analyse ways in which commonly held beliefs about exercise, fitness and health affect themselves, other people, and society and evaluate these effects. [Ministry of Education (2004:70)]
- Critically analyse societal attitudes and practices that shape the physical activity patterns of society. [Ministry of Education (2004:71)]

4. The Challenge of Critical Pedagogy in New Zealand

When considering issues of implementation of critical pedagogy within the New Zealand physical education context, we are mindful of the criticisms against this pedagogy for being rich in rhetoric and academic debate and light on the practicalities and realities of implementation [Macdonald (2003); Tinning (2002)]. There is a pressing need for research to be carried out that explores these issues further, particularly in the New Zealand PETE (physical education teacher education) context. Specifically, we highlight in this section three areas requiring further thought and investigation:

1. The challenge of moving beyond critical thinking to taking social action.
2. The need to ensure that critical pedagogy is not diluted through an alienation from the political climate in which it is framed.
3. The scientised and technocratic projects within New Zealand that are distracting people from the urgent need to embrace a critical pedagogy that challenges both the status quo and contrary future directions.

4.1. Beyond Thinking to Praxis

Physical education curricula that have socio-critical positionings present numerous challenges to the teacher profession and, in particular, to the field of teacher education. These challenges arise because critical epistemology is a shift away from the 20th-century, scientised, functionalist domination of physical education and the movement culture. In New Zealand, teachers implementing the Health and Physical Education in the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1999) are required to acquire knowledge about oppressive political and social practices within the movement culture and (specifically) the physical education context. Furthermore, so that change will occur within these contexts, teachers are required to take social action, engaging in the discipline of praxis for transformation [after Freire (1974)]. Knowledge acquisition is the easy part. Praxis is the most challenging. In order for this to occur, it is likely that both teachers and students will first have to experience a significant philosophical, paradigmatic shift. If such a shift occurs, it will result in a change in values, beliefs and, consequently, actions. Tinning (2002), commenting on the work of Dinan-Thompson (2001) and Cassidy (2000), brings into play a factor integral to this process when he stresses that emotional commitment must be present in the learners during it.

A small number of physical education teacher education (PETE) programmes within New Zealand in recent times have begun to focus on “conscientisation”, or the process of raising critical consciousness [Freire (1974)]. This has taken place through a raft of sociological courses that seek to critically examine macro-structures that impact upon the movement culture and through in-service professional development programmes. However, most teaching about critical pedagogy in PETE programmes is more evident in post-graduate studies. The challenge now for PETE programmes in New Zealand is to embrace and develop further the entirety of the critical pedagogy cycle. By this we mean, that while developing critical thinkers is an important first step, the potency of critical
pedagogy is in the praxis conceived from such thinking. Because this includes both reflection and action, it moves people forward from critical thinking to developing pathways for social action. These, in turn, lead to transformation within the physical education context, within schools, and within the movement culture both locally and globally. The questions listed below could guide further development in this area [adapted from Culpan (2005:12)].

- To what extent do PETE programmes examine philosophical positions in physical education?
- Has critical pedagogy been introduced to PETE programmes?
- Are teacher educators held accountable for understanding pedagogical theories that are consistent with and applicable to the curriculum?
- In what ways do PETE programmes provide examples of praxis that impact upon the larger community?
- Do PETE programmes foster balanced development of physical education content, particularly in terms of the biological sciences and the socio-cultural aspects of movement?
- What do physical education teachers know about becoming critical consumers within the movement culture?
- In an age of ubiquitous consumerism, are PETE programmes teaching social responsibility, contextualised locally and globally?

4.2. Depoliticising Critical Pedagogy

When considering the use of critical pedagogy as a tool in physical education, it is important to note that there has been a dilution of critical pedagogy internationally across different curricula. McLaren (2003) attributes this "domestication" to numerous factors, including New Right politics, the prominence and, arguably, the distraction, of post-modern thought, and the rise of liberal humanism. In debating PETE and drawing on the works of numerous authors, including Lather (1998), Gore (1990), and Kohli (1998); Tinning (2002) questions the relevancy and grandiose claims of earlier interpretations of critical pedagogy. By engaging in what he terms the discourse of the "folly of certainty", Tinning (2002) enters the realm of post-modern distractions and heeds caution to those critical pedagogues who take the "high moral ground" when advancing notions of social justice and responsibility. Similarly, when critiquing critical pedagogy from a post-modern perspective, Macdonald (2003:183) queries whether a "grand theory, that relies upon structures such as class, sex, and race as does critical theory, is . . . sufficiently sensitive or sophisticated to understand and address complex issues of personal experience and diversity." Conversely, McLaren (2003) challenges the dilution and depoliticisation of this pedagogy.

There has clearly been a strong movement among many critical educators infatuated by postmodern and poststructuralist perspectives to ignore profound changes in the structural nature and dynamics of late capitalism in the United States. Why should political economy be of concern to educators in this era of post-Marxist sympathies and multiple antagonisms? [McLaren (2003:167)]

Of course, political economy is of concern to physical education teachers who are delivering the 'new' physical education curriculum in New Zealand, but it is also essential knowledge for their understanding of how both local and global decisions impact upon the movement culture. If this means that taking the "high moral ground" is necessary to activate much needed social, economic and political change then surely this is to be welcomed. A cogent example here again relates to that of teaching students awareness of the power they have as consumers within the movement culture to bring about changes to the exploitation and gross inequalities of recent international divisions of labour.

4.3. Technocratic Distractions

Within New Zealand, there are currently numerous scientised and technocratic approaches to physical education and the movement culture that perpetuate body control ideology concomitant with a market-driven economy. Examples include elite sports performance models and early talent identification programmes that aim to provoke nationalism and enhance professionalism and the commodification of sport. The current physical activity initiatives combating alleged ill health further illustrate this technocratic emphasis [Culpan (2005); Gatman (2005)]. Recent concern within New
New Zealand about a growing level of inactivity among children has seen a move to mandate increased children’s level of physical activity when at school. This directive has stimulated significant debate about the relationship between physical activity and physical education in schools. The obvious risk, of course, is that a focus on physical activity alone may result in the dilution of physical education, essentially removing the education component from physical education. As Gatman (2005:2) points out, “schools are in the business of education and, consequently, physical activity as an educative process ... needs to be distinguished from physical activity outside of the educative process.” Interpretations to the contrary are likely to see a regression to 20th-century technocratic approaches to physical education that are dualistic and seriously limit the holistic epistemology of physical education currently being developed.

5. Concluding Remarks

In this article, we have argued that one way in which schools can use physical education to develop and better address the learning needs of our young people is to employ critical pedagogy within this discipline. In acknowledging that physical education and other aspects of the movement culture are located within a wider socio-political and global economic context, we hope we have provided a brief justification for having physical education learning programmes embrace a critical pedagogy. Such a pedagogy is one that encourages students to engage in praxis relevant to movement-related contexts. We have also briefly outlined how the new curriculum in New Zealand, mandated by the state, has attempted to grapple with a more socio-critical stance to physical education. Our outline provided a selection of statements from the country’s new health and physical education curriculum to highlight specific examples of how we might [to use Macdonald’s (2003:186) words] “make the familiar strange and the strange familiar”.

While we acknowledge the challenges involved in instituting critical pedagogy, the central thrust of our argument has been that not to engage in such attempts may well bring an end to physical education. The all-pervading thrust of the scientisation of movement and the imperatives of the market-place have created a culture of consumerism that generally fails to prepare our young people to be critical consumers of movement, and strongly inhibits their development as socially responsible citizens.
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