1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Implicit and Explicit Pedagogical Practices Related to Sociocultural Issues and Social Justice in
Physical Education Teacher Education Programs

Jennifer L. Walton-Fisette; Kent State University, USA	jfisette@kent.edu
Rod Philpot; University of Auckland, NZ	r.philpot@auckland.ac.nz
Sharon Phillips; Hofstra University, USA	Sharon.R.Phillips@hofstra.edu
Sara Flory; University of South Florida, USA	sbflory@usf.edu
Joanne Hill, University of Bedfordshire, UK	Joanne.Hill@beds.ac.uk
Sue Sutherland; Ohio State University, USA	sutherland.43@osu.edu
Michelle Flemons; University of Bedfordshire, UK	Michelle.Flemons@beds.ac.uk

Abstract

Background: For many years, scholars in PETE have argued for the importance of educating pre-service teachers (PSTs) about equality (e.g., Evans 1990), sociocultural perspectives and issues (e.g., Cliff, Wright and Clarke, 2009; Author 2014) and critical pedagogy (e.g., Fernandez-Balboa 1997; Philpot 2015). Despite this advocacy, we would argue that there are significant differences in how faculty teach about sociocultural issues, and for, social justice. The pedagogical actions through which Physical Education Teacher Educators (PETEs) do this work is the focus of this paper.

Purpose: We investigated the pedagogical approaches and strategies used by PETE faculty to address and educate PSTs about social justice and sociocultural issues related to gender, race, sexuality, (dis)ability, socioeconomic status and religion in their individual PETE programs. In this study, we draw on transformational pedagogy (Ukpokodu 2009; Ovens 2017) as a framework for theorizing the data. Through this study, we highlight the pedagogical practices espoused as those that engender transformative learning.

Data collection and analysis: Data for this interpretive qualitative research study was collected primarily through in-depth semi-structured interviews with over 70 PETEs who work in 48 PETE programs across Australia, Canada, England, Ireland New Zealand, Sweden, and the United States. Furthermore, an informational survey was used to gather demographic data of the participants. The participants, all current PETEs, had a wide range of professional experiences, which included the length of time in the profession, the type of institution employed, educational backgrounds and courses taught. Data analysis was completed using the processes of content analysis and the constant comparative method (Corbin and Strauss 2008).

Findings: Three major themes represent the findings. In the first theme, ‘Intentional and Explicit Pedagogies’ we provide descriptions of the approaches and strategies used by PETEs in this study that were planned in advance of the learning experiences. In the second theme, ‘Teachable Moments’ we provide examples of how PETEs utilized ‘teachable moments’ in implicit and explicit ways to educate PSTs about sociocultural issues. The third theme, ‘Resistance and Constraints’ captures the individual challenges PETE faculty faced within their courses if, and when, they teach for equity and social justice. The findings suggest that social justice struggles to find an explicit presence within many PETE programs and that educating PSTs about sociocultural issues and social justice is lacking in many PETE programs.

Key Words: transformative pedagogy, hidden curriculum, critical pedagogy, international perspectives

Introduction

In many western countries, social justice is ubiquitous (Bialystok 2014) as it is ever-present in government policies, educational policies, and school and teacher education curricula. Nearly 20 years ago, Murphy (1999) suggested that social justice was one of “three powerful synthesizing paradigms” (p. 54) in education. Since that time, it has become increasingly common for education scholars to claim a social justice orientation in their work (Hyttén and Bettez, 2011), with a growing number of teacher education programs oriented around a vision of social justice (e.g., Darling-Hammond, French, and Garcia-Lopez 2002). However, a review of literature reveals a lack of clarity around the nature of the pedagogical practices implemented in the name of social justice (Bialystok 2014). In addition, any quest for social justice requires consideration of what social justice is, and for whom social justice is sought, before attempts can be made in its name (Hackman 2005).

Given these uncertainties surrounding social justice, it is not surprising that approaches to teaching for social justice through courses that examine sociocultural issues in society in pre-service initial teacher education (ITE) programs are far from uniform. Social justice in ITE programs ranges from single stand-alone diversity courses (Ladson-Billings 2001; Nieto 2000; Sleeter 2008) to programs where social justice is explicit in the ITE framework and infused throughout an entire ITE program. Courses that focus on sociocultural and social justice issues may be taught by committed, competent and confident teacher educators and, in other instances, by teacher educators or graduate students who have limited experiences with diversity and are unintentionally complicit in maintaining the status quo (Ukpokodu 2016).

For the purpose of this paper, we call on Bell’s (1997) definition of social justice education as both a goal and a democratic and participatory process. While we recognize the

‘broad’ international social justice issues reported in educational research related to socioeconomics, gender, race, religion and (dis)ability, we are cognizant that context matters. Pedagogies for social justice must be tailored to fit the setting.

Social Justice in PETE

Endeavors to address issues specific to physical education (PE) have been featured in Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) literature for more than 40 years. According to Kirk (1986), the social justice agenda in PETE gained a foothold following Zeichner and Teitlebaum’s (1982) call for social and economic justice to become a part of every ITE program. One of the seminal concepts in PETE and ITE literature that focused on social justice was the hidden curriculum (Bain 1975; Dodds 1985; Fernandez-Balboa 1993). The hidden curriculum is the attitudes, values and understandings that are communicated unintentionally, unconsciously, and unavoidably (Ronholt 2002). The power of the hidden curriculum lies in the fact that the messages are unspoken and unacknowledged, “making them seem natural and inevitable” (Bain 1990, 36).

In the ensuing years, scholars in PETE with an interest in social justice have argued for the importance of educating pre-service teachers (PSTs) about equality (e.g., Evans 1990), sociocultural perspectives and issues (e.g., Cliff, Wright, and Clarke 2009; Flory, Tischler and Sanders 2014) and critical pedagogy (e.g., Fernandez-Balboa 1997; Philpot 2015). A growing body of PETE literature highlights issues of racism (Fitzpatrick 2013; Legge 2010), body image (Kirk 2006; Tinning and Glasby 2002), gender (Brown 2005; Dewar 1991; Dowling 2009), and motor elitism (Evans 2004; Mordal-Moen and Green 2012). However, identifying the issues is different from endeavoring to address them in PETE. Scholarship in support of social justice is

not the same as scholarship about the attempts to implement social justice pedagogies (Tinning 2016).

The proliferation of advocacy for social justice in PE related to issues such as gender, race and (dis)ability has few articulations of how PETE faculty actually teach for social justice, that is, what they do in classrooms and through coursework, and for whom social justice is sought. A small number of papers have described attempts at foregrounding social justice in PETE through embodied experiences that have the potential to disrupt beliefs such as enactments of action research (Hickey 2001), border crossing experiences into indigenous cultures (Legge 2010), and critical community-based service learning where students work with cultural ‘others,’ (Bruce 2014). Despite this advocacy, we would argue that there are significant differences in how Physical Education Teacher Educators (PETEs) and PETE programs challenge the hidden curriculum, teach about sociocultural issues, and advocate for social justice. We acknowledge that there are benefits and barriers to these differences, and that addressing issues of social justice within one’s pedagogy and PETE program is challenging and complex. Through engaging in this research, we hope to highlight pedagogies PETEs are enacting in their teaching as well as articulate the complexities PETEs face when enacting a critical perspective.

The focus of this paper is how PETEs attempt to teach for, and about, sociocultural issues and social justice. Specifically, the purpose of this paper is to document the range of pedagogical approaches and strategies, or lack thereof, used to address and educate PSTs about sociocultural issues related to gender, race, sexuality, (dis)ability, socioeconomic status, and religion in their individual PETE programs. The intent is to shed light on what PETEs are currently doing in the name of teaching for social justice, while also providing examples for others. To foreground this

study, we draw on transformational pedagogy (Ovens 2017; Ukpokodu 2009) as a framework for theorizing the data.

Transformative Pedagogy

In all contexts where ITE programmes foreground a social justice orientation, there is a complex challenge of preparing teachers with emerging technical skills and perhaps more importantly, the ability and desire to continually critically reflect on and modify their own teaching practice. Cochran-Smith (1995) proposes that prospective teachers need to reconsider assumptions about race, religion, sexual orientation, and (dis)ability; assumptions that may be perpetuated in PE through the hidden curriculum. In order to incorporate social justice as an underpinning principle, ITE programmes should consider providing opportunities for critical reflection that reveal students' values and beliefs, help them to understand how these have been shaped by their own life histories, and provides opportunities to reconstruct these beliefs. Critical reflection is becoming increasingly important for both the predominantly white middle-class students who are attracted to ITE programs (Bain, 1990; Mills, 2009), and, in the context of PE and PETE, for students who come with a sporting habitus (Brown, 2005).

Mezirow (1990, 2009) calls for transformative learning opportunities that challenge taken-for-granted frames of reference and open them up for possible change.

Transformative learning occurs when a person develops an awareness of their habits of mind, develops new viewpoints and perspectives, and comes to see some aspect of the world in a different way (Ukpokodu 2009). In relation to ITE, a transformative approach would aim to enable neophyte teachers to examine “the educational, moral, and political commitments that help guide their work as professional teachers” (Ukpokodu 2009, 47), and to encourage and engender “reflective thinking, social consciousness, and disposition for social justice” (47). The

process of transformational learning relies on pedagogies that move away from knowledge transmission and toward communicative learning where a learner searches for meaning through reflecting on values, social norms, and assumptions through which a truth claim is made (Mezirow 2009).

Transformative pedagogy with a social justice orientation draws on multiple discourses including democratic education, critical pedagogy, multiculturalism, poststructuralism, feminism, queer theory, anti-oppressive education, cultural studies, post-colonialism, globalization, and critical race theory (Hyttén and Bettez 2011). Transformative pedagogies that address a social justice perspective include developing a multicultural perspective through reading and discussion of multiple texts (Ukpokodu, 2009), border crossing experiences (Legge 2010), shadowing culturally different learners (Ukpokodu 2004), personal narrative inquiry (DeLuca, 2012), and action-research learning (DeLuca 2012).

In the recent *Routledge Handbook of Physical Education Pedagogies*, Tinning (2017), Ovens (2017), Oliver and Kirk (2017), Fitzpatrick and Enright (2017), and Dowling and Garrett (2017), drew on transformational pedagogy as a framework for conceptualising diverse pedagogical work in PETE. Ovens (2017) suggests that transformational pedagogy is both enabled and/or constrained through supporting policy environment, institutional constraints, and pedagogical practice. Ovens (2017) proposes that the collective entanglement of broader educational discourse, curriculum policy, and subjectivities of PETE students and teacher educators shapes the political and cultural arena in which students experience PETE.

Ovens (2017) categorises the transformational pedagogies reported in PETE literature into negotiated learning, storytelling, peer teaching, case studies, and place-based pedagogies. Visual diaries have been used to assist students in understanding gender and identity by engaging

in tasks that include observations from PE, TV, sporting events, and sport media, which focused on PE as a site of gendered practice (Fitzpatrick and Enright 2017). Furthermore, the use of visual methodologies such as the examination of magazines, photographic essays, drawings, and scrapbooking was implemented when focusing on challenging body culture in PE (Oliver and Kirk 2017, Fisette 2011, 2013). Dowling and Garrett (2017) advocated for narrative inquiry as a transformative pedagogy designed to give voice to the marginalized and providing counter-narratives to disrupt dominant ideas about race and gender. Tinning (2017) described transformational pedagogy as “a manifestation of the critical project” (281), due to its alignment with a social justice ethic and a focus on personal change.

In espousing transformative pedagogy in this paper, we support the position that critical education cannot be reduced to a teaching method that is learned through transmission and then enacted with no consideration of the teacher, learner and context (Friere 1970; Ovens 2017). There is no single transformative pedagogy waiting to be discovered. Equally, emerging research is providing examples of practices based on the principles of transformational pedagogy that can be contextualized to different settings. With this caveat, we wish to elaborate on the transformative pedagogies to teaching for social justice in PETE.

Method

The aim of this research project was to explore how sociocultural and social justice issues are addressed and implemented in PETE programs. To explore these issues, we conducted a critical interpretive qualitative research study. This design was based on the social constructivist and transformative worldviews of the authors (Creswell 2014). Specifically, we researched higher education faculty in PETE to seek their understanding of their professional world, identify

their subjective meanings of their experiences, and address issues within PETE that marginalized individuals based on issues of power, social justice, and oppression (Creswell, 2014).

Setting and Participants

Over 70 PETE faculty who work in more than 48 PETE programs across Australia (AUS), Canada, England, Ireland, New Zealand (NZ), Sweden and the United States (US), were the participants of this study. Purposive sampling (Miles and Huberman 1994) was utilized to recruit participants who identified as a physical education and/or health education faculty member in an ITE program. Participants did not need content knowledge of, or experience with, sociocultural issues to become a participant. Recruiting of participants occurred through personal contact made by the research team, and at state, national and international conferences.

Approximately 100 PETE faculty were contacted, with 72 agreeing to participate in the study. Participants had a wide range of professional experiences, which included the length of time in the profession (ranged from one to over 30 years), the type of institution employed (e.g., teaching/research-based, small vs. large institutions), educational backgrounds (all had a terminal degree) and courses taught. Permission to conduct the study was obtained through each of the authors' university Institutional Review Board/Ethics Committee and informed consent was granted prior to the start of the study. Informed consent assured participants anonymity, as pseudonyms were utilized for the names of participants and their respective institutions.

Data Collection

Data were collected through an informational survey and one-on-one semi-structured interviews. A pilot study was conducted with 15 participants in 2015. Based on the data gathered from the pilot, the informational survey was developed and the interview guide revised. The

remainder of the research study was conducted in 2016. All data were collected by the researchers and uploaded to a private research project in Dropbox.

Informational Survey. Upon agreeing to participate in this research study, each participant completed an informational survey to provide context and background knowledge about themselves, which included their geographic living experiences, educational degrees obtained, professional positions held in higher education, and a social identity profile. This informational survey was completed electronically in a word document and sent via email to the researcher.

Individual Interviews. Semi-structured interviews of between 30 and 90 minutes commenced after the completion of the survey. Participants were asked 20 primary questions, with further probing questions added in instances where more information was needed. Questions for the one-on-one interviews focused on their educational background; beliefs, understanding and perspectives about social justice and sociocultural issues; and pedagogy within PETE programs and courses related to social justice and sociocultural issues. The interviews occurred in person (e.g., at their office, at a conference), by SKYPE, or over the phone. All interviews were audio-recorded.

Data Analysis and Trustworthiness

Data analysis occurred using the processes of content analysis and the constant comparative method (Corbin and Strauss 2008). All interviews were transcribed into over 1,000 word document pages. Open coding, or line-by-line analysis, was conducted to develop initial codes. Each researcher then conducted axial coding, which included collapsing the initial codes into primary themes and then providing descriptions for each theme (Corbin and Strauss 2008). At this time, peer debriefing (Creswell 2014) ensued to discuss the identified themes, where refinement and adjustments were made to ensure the essence of the meaning and identity of each

theme. Once the themes were identified, all transcripts were reviewed to select salient quotes that would align with each theme or sub-theme. Simultaneously, the informational surveys and artifacts were reviewed to support and enhance the description of each theme. Trustworthiness of this research study was ensured by utilizing multiple sources of data, engaging in conversations and discourse among the researchers that challenged and questioned one another's perspectives and interpretations, recording in our researcher journals, and maintaining an audit trail.

Findings

Participants shed light on the wide range of pedagogical practices they utilized to educate their students about sociocultural and social justice issues. Examples of these practices and activities included assigning scholarly readings, engaging in dialogue, viewing videos, partaking in role playing, analyzing case studies, participating in field experiences, and exploring personal biographies. Three themes will be presented within this findings section, which focus specifically on how these practices were implemented (or not), as well as the challenges, constraints, and even resistance the participants encountered when engaging in pedagogical practices that focused on sociocultural and social justice issues. In the first theme, 'Intentional and Explicit Pedagogies' we provide descriptions of the approaches and strategies used by the PETE faculty in this study that were planned in advance of the learning experiences. In the second theme, 'Teachable Moments', we provide examples of how PETEs utilized 'teachable moments' in implicit and explicit ways to educate PSTs about sociocultural issues. The third theme, 'Resistance and Constraints' captures the individual challenges PETEs faced within their courses if, and when, they teach for equity and social justice. The findings suggest that educating PSTs about sociocultural and social justice issues is a challenging and complex process. Social justice struggles to find an explicit presence within many PETE programs, that explicating the hidden

269 curriculum and educating PSTs about sociocultural issues and social justice is lacking in many
270 PETE programs.

271 **Intentional and Explicit Pedagogies**

272 Numerous participants in the study were intentional and explicit about educating their
273 students about sociocultural and social justice issues. These approaches were most common
274 amongst PETE faculty in NZ, AUS and England. These participants intentionally and explicitly
275 planned the learning experiences in advance in their course syllabus or as a central theme in
276 individual class lesson plans. Louisa, a faculty member at a NZ institution, explained how she
277 utilized a ‘contextual twist’ to teach her students about sexuality and marginalization:

278 *A contextual twist [is] where you take something that is only said of a few people and*
279 *turn that around so that it’s said about everybody. For example, some of the things that*
280 *might be said about somebody who is lesbian or gay and you take some of those things*
281 *that are said, for example, when did you decide that you would be a lesbian? And then*
282 *you change the words to the mainstream of ‘when did you decide you would be*
283 *heterosexual?’ ...and in doing those sorts of pedagogical approaches, really make people*
284 *absorb how some things are when you talk about a marginalized or a minority group.*

285 Georgia, a health education faculty member within a combined PE and health program at a
286 private institution in the Midwest region of the US, used a different form of pedagogical practice
287 to intentionally teach her students about sexuality. She shared,

288 *I gave my health class this scenario; you’re in a public health department and your boss*
289 *tells you that you have to do an LGBT program about safe sex for the LGBT population.*
290 *But you personally are against it; your religious beliefs are against it. Let’s pretend this*
291 *is you. So how do you handle this situation?*

Georgia used this scenario as a springboard to engage in discussion with her students not only about sexuality, but also on how religion plays an important factor in one's beliefs and decision-making.

Larry (US) and Jeff (England) used case studies to address issues related to inclusion regardless of one's religion. Jeff explained how he critically engaged with his students in class on this issue, particularly in relation to how exclusionary PE can be,

So we have got them thinking, 'Oh, Muslim girls can't do PE because of their Hijab'. Wait a minute, some Muslim girls at school can't do some things in PE because of the way we organize PE and its counter to their religious practices. So getting them to turn it on its head a little bit, and to start thinking structurally and institutionally rather than blaming the individual or the victim...

Before delving into pedagogies that explicitly educate her students about sociocultural and social justice issues, Rachael (NZ) first intentionally requires her students to engage in a self-analysis activity. She described,

The first assignment they do a self-analysis...they identify, analyze and discuss their own social identity and why they are who they are and how it may impact on who they are as a teacher...trying to get them to think about, 'well, if they are white, if they are middle-to upper class, and if they have been educated,' making them aware that they have these privileges and how that may impact when they go into schools.

These examples are a sampling of the intentional and explicit pedagogical practices the participants provide to their students in PETE programs. All of the participants who intentionally and explicitly teach about sociocultural and social justice issues articulated that they were passionate about such issues, had content knowledge, and believed that it was important to

educate students about these issues, especially since these students will become PE teachers and will be in a position of power to perpetuate or explicate the messages about (dis)ability, gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity, religion and other social issues that can be communicated as hidden curriculum. Although these PETEs demonstrated both a clear understanding of how they planned to teach about social justice, and passion for the content, they acknowledged that classroom engagements were complex and far from being unproblematic.

Teachable Moments

Participants identified how they utilized ‘teachable moments,’ that is, situations where an opportunity was presented that related to a socially just or unjust circumstance they felt needed to be explicitly addressed within their PETE courses. For example, Nathan (England) described a situation when he was teaching the Sport Education curriculum model on the gym floor,

I put them into situations that just a normal PE teacher would have...Set up Sport Education and just let it pass. “Right, stop” [claps] “take a look around, what do you see? All the performers are male, all the supporters are female” And they’ve done that themselves. And then you can question. Even though social justice is not a part of the Sport Education session...I’ve come in there and I’ve problematized the situation for the students, then you’ve started to question “well, why is that the case?” And obviously issues of gender, roles, power, things that you can then start to unpick with the students.

Although Nathan did not intentionally *plan* to teach such content, he was aware that sociocultural issues could be present and was intentional within this instructional experience when teaching about the Sport Education curriculum model, mostly because he has content knowledge and potentially a critical perspective about social issues and issues related to power, privilege and marginalization. Content knowledge, according to numerous participants, was

certainly an aspect of whether or not they were able to identify teachable moments related to social issues and inequities.

Some participants used their prior lived experiences to shed light on sociocultural issues that are prevalent in the world, particularly when those experiences occurred in a community or society different to their very own. Kendra, a current faculty member in Ireland who formerly taught in the US, described how she called on her...

...experiences working on the south side of Chicago, working with impoverished, underserved kids, and on the Navajo reservation. Working with students in the south side of Los Angeles was a unique experience, when, every time the kids heard a domestic argument, they hit the playground, flat on the ground, 'cause they thought somebody was gonna get shot.

Kendra used these lived experiences to educate her students about privilege, marginalization and social inequalities. Katie (England) explained how she also uses prior experiences to raise awareness and address social injustices,

Things will pop into my head like a kid came in the PE office and another PE teacher said, "You must be here to sign up for the 100m" and he was Black, and I'll be like 'this is a prime example of racial stereotyping'...And then they go, "Oh yeah that happened to me, yeah we can say, "Oh I bet you're quick because you're Black".

For many of the participants, the teachable moments occurred within field experiences at local schools. Tom and Frank, both from the US, explained how the demographics and diversity of the PSTs' field placements presented opportunities for students to learn about sociocultural issues. Tom intentionally placed students in a wide range of school contexts primarily based on race and social class. Frank, on the other hand, admitted he does not intentionally place students

in schools where there is racial and ethnic diversity; however, he hoped that through these field experiences, his students will understand race-related issues. Frank shared how he engages in conversation with his PSTs when they return to the university after their field experiences and they bring up topics that are social justice issues,

I've tried to get them to understand that culture and background and where the students slept the night before, what they had for dinner influences who they are in your classroom that day because a lot them- and I see this a lot with the teachers- it's, "That child is bad. That's a bad kid." Or, "He is just off-task today." There's no thought about, "Well, that little boy, his mother sells drugs and that's the world he lives in; whereas this little boy, his father is Vice Chancellor of the university and that's the world that he lives in." There's no conversation about that...

Cliff, a faculty member at an urban institution in the US, who also did not explicitly teach about sociocultural or social issues, nor felt the importance in doing so, identified a situation where he felt that it was 'the right place at the right time' to address it with his student teachers:

One of the student teachers told me that this one boy had been in Syria that summer and fighting against ISIS. His father had gone back there and taken him with him. So I raised that issue with the students and said, 'you don't know what the background of these kids are.' The boy was supposedly on the front lines of Syria fighting as a 13-year-old boy. And the teacher brought in some other things in terms of trying to understand the children's backgrounds. That you never know where they are coming from. I mean, that wasn't an overt purposeful thing, it just came up and then we discussed it...in that context.

Interestingly, more participants from NZ and AUS intentionally and explicitly educated their PSTs about sociocultural and social justice issues, whereas, more faculty from the US used

teachable moments to bring awareness and begin to educate their students about issues related to social inequalities.

Resistance and Constraints

Although many of the participants believed it was important to educate PSTs about sociocultural issues, they discussed numerous challenges they encountered when attempting these pedagogical practices. Within this theme, we will bring to life the resistance participants faced from students when they intentionally and explicitly taught about social justice issues. Furthermore, we will describe the individual constraints the participants identified when attempting to or preventing them from addressing sociocultural issues in their pedagogical practices.

Resistance from students. Participants that faced resistance from students were cognisant that engaging in discussion and learning about social issues is a challenging task and often takes repeated attempts to break down personal biases and barriers. Joan, a NZ faculty member, brought to life her perceptions of student resistance,

Not all of them will feel the same way. So you will have some students who will think it is really important to do that and you will have some students who will say this is a waste of time, can we get on with something more important...You expose students to that level of discussion a bit at a time so you are not always doing it. It's like a slow drip.

Russ, a faculty member in the US, shared a similar form of resistance,

You're certainly going to have students that are resistant to, or scared to talk about, sociocultural issues like sexuality or race or class and oppression and they don't want to believe that the world is as contested or ugly as it really is and so sometimes it makes them feel uncomfortable. Sometimes people don't want to acknowledge the privilege that

409 *they speak from and the ways in which other groups of people have been marginalized*
410 *and oppressed, and how that all gives rise to their resistance and the ways in which they*
411 *maybe interact with people who've historically had power positions.*

412 Sarah, a faculty member at the same NZ institution as Joan, talked about how the resistance from
413 students has changed over time as well as how her approach to teaching issues related to social
414 justice has also changed:

415 *They used to be very, very resistant. I remember the first time I started teaching all the*
416 *boys came dressed in skirts to take the micky out of it really...I think the students are*
417 *changing and I think we've gotten better at being less confrontational and more*
418 *facilitative and not as black and white if that makes sense. Homophobia is the*
419 *one...That's the topic that has caused the most angst...I think that's because of dominant*
420 *masculinities of heterosexuality. I think it's also to do with religion. Quite a high*
421 *percentage of students in our degrees are very active Christians and so the odd time*
422 *when you challenge them around homophobia that is really challenging.*

423 Other participants believed that many PSTs do not see the relevance or value of confronting
424 inequity, that, according to Maxie (US) "it is not hitting them in the heart," and that it would not
425 directly influence them unless they were engaging with the social inequalities themselves, as
426 teachers, in the schools.

427 *Navigating challenges and constraints.* Lack of time, whether the faculty believed teaching about
428 sociocultural issues was important, and a lack of content knowledge were a few of the challenges
429 and constraints participants had to navigate when choosing to implement pedagogical practices
430 about sociocultural issues and for social justice. For Eric and Tracey (US), teaching about social
431 issues was not a top priority to them as they felt constrained by the time they needed to teach

other content such as standards and best practices. Louisa (NZ) also felt pressed for time, but more in relation to the depth in which she could take her class in relationship to these very difficult concepts and issues. She explained,

Constantly not enough time to really delve into some of the deeper issues that are really happening in schools. There's the sort of 'once over lightly', you're trying to give them a bit of everything and do we give them anything. You hope that we do but unless you do a research project you don't really know how that transfers.

Where Louisa wanted to transfer the concepts through experiences with research, Ruby (England) felt constrained by teaching her students the theoretical concepts without connecting them to their own lived experiences. Karen (England) and Katie (England), both felt constrained in teaching about certain social identities, particularly about race and the 'appropriate' language to use when teaching on topics related to social identity. Katie questioned her ability to teach about race as a self-identified white woman:

I felt uncomfortable delivering some of the material that I can't relate to so for example, on sexuality and the language that I would use...The same with issues around race and ethnicity. I was probably kind of constraining myself to a certain amount of language because I knew that was safe language...So even saying, 'a Black individual', I would say and think that was appropriate terminology, so I would limit myself to saying 'a Black individual' throughout the session. I spent a long time trying to decide what is the word that I'm going to use to describe homosexuality, and that was the word that I decided to adopt...that's the word I stuck with and I didn't use anything else.

Although Katie and Karen felt uncomfortable teaching about certain social issues, they addressed them regardless, whereas there were other participants, such as Julie (US) and Kate (US) who

felt they did not have adequate content knowledge, nor the pedagogical skills to even consider integrating content on sociocultural issues into their courses.

Henry, a European born faculty member who has worked in numerous regions in the US over the course of his career, questioned whether he should address sociocultural issues with his students, because of his students' religious preferences as well as risk of receiving negative course evaluations. Henry shared,

Working in [southwest region of US], we have a pretty large Mormon community. I see myself as a left-leaning citizen, and [state] is not red; it's almost black in terms of its political orientation. Many of our students, I suspect, have pretty conservative views. I've had to learn that certain things I have to be very careful in terms of do I even mention it? Do I bring it up? If I bring it up, how am I going to bring it up?

Collectively, some participants faced resistance or individual constraints or challenges when teaching their PSTs about sociocultural and social justice issues. Within this group of participants, some chose to intentionally and explicitly engage in pedagogical practices to provide planned learning opportunities for students, despite the resistance and constraints they faced. For others, it hindered them from addressing certain social issues and identities or not engaging in pedagogical practices on these issues altogether.

Discussion

Implicit in the concept of transformational pedagogy is the notion that the encounters will enable one to see the world in a new way. These new meanings, far from being prescriptive, should be about personal searches for individual meaning. The explicit and intentional pedagogical practices reported in this paper (e.g., scholarly readings, engaging in dialogue, viewing videos, partaking in role plays, analyzing case studies, participating in field experiences

and exploring personal biographies) align with transformational pedagogies as they attempt to challenge individual belief systems through presenting knowledge as problematic. For example, Louisa used a contextual twist to make a familiar story unfamiliar. Larry and Jeff used case studies to stimulate dialogue that explored how beliefs influence one's perspectives. Rachael used a more direct approach when she asked students to directly look inward at who they are, and how their own life histories shape the way they see the world. These approaches to social issues and social justice challenge students to think about how *they* see the world. The contextual twist and case studies are used to stimulate dialogue between students that is fraught with risk taking in exposing one's personal perspectives. Ukpokodo (2009) points out that transformative pedagogies require a learning context of trust to enable students to openly and honestly convey their own thoughts. This classroom culture is constructed through democratic classroom practices and skillful scaffolding of students' perspectives and knowledge based on their lived experiences. What is not conveyed in this study, is how these PETEs have created a culture that enables these pedagogical practices to be meaningful and potentially influential in developing a critical perspective.

In addition to the explicit and intentional pedagogies, a number of PETEs indicated that they address sociocultural issues and social justice when teachable moments are presented in various contexts. One interpretation of engaging in such 'unintentional pedagogies' is that these teacher educators have an embodied critical perspective that enabled them to identify sociocultural issues as they arise. Nathan was able to see how students assumed gendered roles in class, which prompted him to challenge the students by questioning them as to why this may be. Kendra used stories of lived experiences to alert students to the importance of context and how each setting and situation provide different opportunities and experiences. Frank was aware that

501 teaching practices in a range of contexts inevitably leads students to draw conclusions based on
502 their own biographies. Both Kendra and Frank were aware that the students' lived experiences
503 did not necessarily enable them to recognize the challenges of working with students who have
504 grown up in poverty and with violence. The transformative potential of these 'teachable
505 moments' is less clear. If a critical perspective that identifies and draws attention to issues of
506 social justice was embodied by many faculty within a single PETE program, these 'teachable
507 moments' for social justice would occur repeatedly over a period of time. A more consistent and
508 broader approach to social justice has the potential to be transformative. If the teachable
509 moments, which appear to have nothing to do with course learning outcomes and assessments,
510 are limited to a single PETE or a single teachable moment, they may be viewed by many
511 students as irrelevant, quirky, and therefore insufficient to challenge beliefs. We would suggest
512 that using teachable moments in isolation limits the opportunities for PETE students to develop
513 "an awareness of their habits of mind, develop new viewpoints and perspectives, and come to see
514 some aspect of the world in a different way" (Ukpokodu 2009, 47). Without a constant challenge
515 to beliefs, without actually examining one's own beliefs, and without an opportunity to
516 deconstruct and reconstruct practice within the framework of new beliefs, 'teachable moments'
517 are unlikely to transform. In saying that, these teachable moments may be significant and
518 powerful to students who have lived experiences of inequality based on the context of the
519 teachable moment or, if the student themselves has a critical perspective of their own. It strikes
520 us that rather than capturing the teachable moments when they occur, PETEs could provoke
521 teachable moments through their actions in the classroom. For example, they could challenge
522 gender norms through the clothes they wear (see Fitzpatrick 2014), how they select groups, the

language they speak, and games that enable different students. In short, PETEs can *create* teachable moments rather than waiting for them to happen.

Implementing and engaging in transformative pedagogies can be daunting, especially, as the participants articulated, if they feel constrained by time to focus on other pedagogical content and practices or are challenged by lacking sufficient content knowledge to employ the critical perspective needed to educate students about sociocultural and social justice issues. These challenges and constraints draws attention to the complexity and lack of fluidity to espousing a socially just critical perspective *and* engaging in transformative pedagogies for social justice. Furthermore, although many participants implemented transformative pedagogies in an intentional and explicit manner or addressed sociocultural issues through teachable moments, there were also participants who did not espouse a critical perspective or educate their students about sociocultural and social justice issues, thus, perpetuating the hidden curriculum. As advocates for enhancing social justice through PETE, we offer the following suggestions for PETE programs and faculty: (1) create a culture whereby social justice is a program-wide responsibility; (2) A program-wide approach to social justice starts with both PETE faculty and students exploring their own biographies to identify ones own social identity, biases and the ways in which you may be privileged or oppressed; (3) engagement in professional development and professional reading will increase both content knowledge and pedagogical practices that explore sociocultural issues. Ukpokodu (2016) recommends that helping students *understand* cultural diversity should be the starting point, before developing the agency to address injustice through a focus on teaching for social justice and equity; and (4) collaborate with colleagues both locally and globally on pedagogical practices related to gender, sexuality, (dis)ability, religion, socioeconomic status as well as many others, along with the challenges and

complexities they encounter when attempting to teach about sociocultural issues and for social justice. Sharing of research *on* practices for social justice to PETEs at conferences, and *of* practices for social justice through workshops with PE teachers at practitioner conferences will be necessary to increase socially just PE experiences for students.

Conclusion

As education systems in many Western countries continue to become increasingly diverse, the need for PETE programs to prepare ITE students with a critical perspective related to sociocultural and social justice issues intensifies. Participants in this study identified a wide range of pedagogical practices that are being utilized in intentional, explicit and unintentional ways. This paper serves to articulate the pedagogical approaches of PETEs who foreground sociocultural issues and social justice to enable other PETEs to address the relevant issues in their own contexts. We hope that all PETEs will engage in explicit pedagogies that educate students about social justice issues or intentionally ‘construct’ teachable moments that provide future PE teachers with opportunities to understand and become aware of inequity and injustice, and ultimately to enact a critical perspective in their own classrooms.

References

- Bain, L. 1975. The hidden curriculum in physical education. *Quest*, 24 (1): 92-101.
- Bain, L. 1990. A critical analysis of the hidden curriculum. In *Physical Education Curriculum and Culture: Critical Issues in the Contemporary Crisis.*, edited by D. Kirk and R. Tinning, 23-42. New York: Falmer Press.
- Bell, L.A. 1997. Theoretical understandings for social justice education. In *Teaching for social justice: A democracy and education reader.*, edited by W. Ayers, J. Hunt, and T. Quinn , xvii-xxvi. New York Teachers College Press.
- Bialystok, L. 2014. Politics without “brainwashing”: A philosophical defense of social justice education. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 44 (3): 413-440, DOI:10.1111/curi.12047
- Brown, D. 2005. An economy of gendered practices? Learning to teach physical education from the perspective of Pierre Bourdieus embodied sociology. *Sport, Education and Society*, 10 (1): 3-23.
- Bruce, J. 2014. On shaky ground: Exploring shifting conceptualisations of knowledge and learning through self-study. In *Self-study in physical education: Exploring the interplay of practice and scholarship*, edited by A. Ovens, and T. Fletcher,, 129-140. London: Springer.
- Cliff, K., Wright, J. and D. Clarke. 2009. What does a sociocultural perspective mean in health and physical education? In *Health and physical education: Issues for curriculum in Australia and New Zealand*, edited by M. Dinan-Thomson,, 165–182. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M. 1995. Color blindness and basket making are not the answers: Confronting the dilemmas of race, culture, and language diversity in teacher education. *American Educational Research Journal* 32 (3): 493-522.

- 586 Corbin, J., ad A. Strauss. 2008. *Basics of qualitative research*. London: Sage.
- 587 Creswell, J. W. 2014. *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*. London: Sage.
- 588 Darling-Hammond, L., French, and S.P. Garcia-Lopez. 2002. *Learning to teach social justice*.
589 New York: Teachers College Press.
- 590 DeLuca, C. 2012. Promoting inclusivity through and within teacher education programmes,
591 *Journal of Education for Teaching* 38 (5): 551-569.
- 592 Dewar, A. 1991. Feminist pedagogy in physical education: Promises, possibilities and pitfalls.
593 *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education* 62 (6): 68-77.
- 594 Dodds, P. 1985. Are hunters of the functional curriculum seeking quarks or snarks? *Journal of*
595 *Teaching in Physical Education* 4: 91-99.
- 596 Dowling, F. 2009. Getting in touch with our feelings: The emotional geographies of gender
597 relations in PETE. *Sport, Education and Society* 13 (2): 247-266.
- 598 Dowling, F. and R. Garrett. 2017. The transformative possibilities of narrative inquiry. In *The*
599 *Routledge Handbook of Physical Education Pedagogies*, edited by C. Ennis, 295-306. New
600 York: Taylor and Francis.
- 601 Evans, J. 1990. Defining a subject: The rise and rise of the new physical education?, *British*
602 *Journal of Sociology of Education* 11: 155-169.
- 603 Evans, J. 2004. Making a difference? Education and 'ability' in physical education. *European*
604 *Physical Education Review* 10 (1): 95-108.
- 605 Fernandez-Balboa, J. M. 1993. Sociocultural characteristics of the hidden curriculum in physical
606 education. *Quest* 45 (2): 230-254.
- 607 Fernandez-Balboa, J. M. 1997. Physical education teacher preparation in the postmodern era:
608 Toward a critical pedagogy. In *Critical postmodernism in human movement, physical*

- 609 *education, and sport*, edited by J. M. Fernandez-Balboa, 121-138. Albany: State University of
610 New York Press.
- 611 Fisette, J. L. (2011). Exploring how girls navigate their embodied identities in physical
612 education. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 16(2), 179-196.
- 613 Fisette, J. L. 2013. "Are you listening?": Adolescent girls voice how they negotiate self-
614 identified barriers to their success and survival in physical education. *Physical Education*
615 *and Sport Pedagogy*, 18(2), 184-203.
- 616 Fitzpatrick, K. (2013). *Critical pedagogy, physical education and urban schooling*. New York:
617 Peter Lang
- 618 Fitzpatrick, K. and E. Enright. 2017. Gender Sexuality and Physical Education. In *The Routledge*
619 *Handbook of Physical Education Pedagogies*, edited by C. Ennis, 319-331. New York: Taylor
620 and Francis.
- 621 Flory, S. B., Tischler, A., and Sanders, S. 2014. *Sociocultural issues in physical education: Case*
622 *studies for teachers*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- 623 Friere, P. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder.
- 624 Hackman, H. 2005. Five essential components for social justice education. *Equity and*
625 *Excellence in Education* 38 (2):103-109, DOI:10.1080/10665680590935034
- 626 Hickey, C. 2001. I feel enlightened now, but...: The limits to the pedagogical translation of
627 critical discourses in physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education* 20: 227-
628 246.
- 629 Hyttén, K. and S. Bettez. 2011. Understanding social justice for education. *Educational*
630 *Foundations* Winter-Spring: 7-24.

- 631 Kirk, D. 1986. A critical pedagogy for teacher education: Toward an inquiry-oriented approach.
632 *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 5: 230-246.
- 633 Kirk, D. 2006. The obesity crisis and school physical education. *Sport, Education and Society* 11
634 (2): 121-133.
- 635 Ladson-Billings, G. 2001. *Crossing over to Canaan: The journey of new teachers in diverse*
636 *classrooms. The Jossey-Bass Education Series*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- 637 Legge, M. 2010. E noho marae - Transforming learning through direct Māori cultural
638 experience. In *University teaching reconsidered: Justice, practice, equity*, edited by C. J.
639 Jesson, V. M. Carpenter, M. McLean, M. Stephenson, and Airini, 139-149. Wellington, NZ:
640 Dunmore Publishing Ltd.
- 641 Mezirow, J. 2009. Transformative learning theory. In *Transformative Learning in Practice:*
642 *Insights from community, workplace and higher education*, edited by J. Mezirow, E.W.
643 Taylor and Associates, 18-32. San Francisco: Jossey Bass
- 644 Mezirow, J. 1990. How critical reflection triggers transformative learning. In *Fostering Critical*
645 *Reflection in Adulthood*, 1-20. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- 646 Miles, M. B., and A.M. Huberman. 1994. *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook*. Beverly
647 Hills: Sage Publications.
- 648 Mills, C. 2009. Making sense of pre-service teachers dispositions toward social justice: Can
649 teacher education make a difference? *Critical Studies in Education* 50 (3): 277-288.
- 650 Mordal-Moen, K.M., and K. Green. 2012. Physical education teacher education in Norway: The
651 perceptions of student teachers. *Sport, Education and Society* 19: 806-823.

- 652 Murphy, J. 1999. *The Quest for a center: Notes on the state of the profession of educational*
653 *leadership*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational
654 Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
- 655 Nieto, S. 2005. Schools for the majority: The role of teacher education in hard time. *New*
656 *Education* 1: 26-42.
- 657 Oliver, K. and Kirk, D. 2017. Challenging body culture in physical education. In *The Routledge*
658 *Handbook of Physical Education Pedagogies*, edited by C. Ennis, 307-318. New York: Taylor
659 and Francis.
- 660 Ovens, A. 2017. Transformative aspirations and realities in physical education teacher education
661 (PETE). In *The Routledge Handbook of Physical Education Pedagogies*, edited by C. Ennis,
662 295-306. New York: Taylor and Francis.
- 663 Philpot, R. 2015.
- 664 Rønholt, H. 2002. 'It's Only the Sissies...': Analysis of Teaching and Learning Processes in
665 Physical Education: A Contribution to the Hidden Curriculum. *Sport, Education and*
666 *Society* 7(1): 25-36.
- 667 Sleeter, C. 2001. Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the
668 overwhelming presence of Whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education* 52: 92-106.
- 669 Tinning, R. 2017. Transformative pedagogies and physical education. In *The Routledge*
670 *Handbook of Physical Education Pedagogies*, edited by C. Ennis, 281-294. New York: Taylor
671 and Francis.
- 672 Tinning, R., and T. Glasby. 2002. Pedagogical work and the cult of the body: Considering the
673 role of HPE in the context of new public health. *Sport, Education and Society* 7 (2): 109-119.

- 674 Ukpokodu, O. 2004. The impact of shadowing culturally different students on preservice
675 teachers' disposition toward diversity. *Multicultural Education* 12 (2): 19-28.
- 676 Ukpokodu, O. 2009. Pedagogies that foster transformative learning in a multicultural education
677 course: A reflection. *Journal of Praxis in Multicultural Education* 4 (1): Article 4.
- 678 Ukpokodu, O. 2016. Realizing transformative learning and social justice education: Unpacking
679 teacher education practice . In *Social Justice and Transformative Learning: Culture and*
680 *identity in the United States and South Africa*, edited by S. Tomlinson-Clarke and D.
681 Clarke ,113-143. New York: Routledge.
- 682 Zeichner, K., and K. Teitlebaum. 1982. Personalized and inquiry-oriented teacher education: An
683 analysis of two approaches to the development of curriculum for field-based courses. *Journal*
684 *of Education for Teaching* 8 (2): 95-117.
- 685