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The term pedagogy has become ubiquitous in the field of kinesiology, and sport pedagogy is now firmly established as a credible academic subdiscipline. Notwithstanding the fact that our European colleagues had been using the terms pedagogy and sport pedagogy for many years (see Crum, 1986; Haag, 2005), the English-speaking world of kinesiology has only relatively recently embraced the terms. Increased use, however, does not necessarily equate with coherent or shared understandings of what the terms mean. Accordingly, the purpose of this article is to do some “languaging” (Kirk, 1991; Postman, 1989) to shed some light on the meanings of pedagogy and sport pedagogy and in so doing perhaps stimulate further consideration of their use in kinesiology. I will argue for a notion of pedagogy that is generative in enabling us to think about the process of knowledge production and reproduction across the many subdisciplines of kinesiology, including, but not limited to, sport pedagogy. Finally I will consider the notion of pedagogical work as providing a useful concept for analyzing the contribution of sport pedagogy to understandings related to how we come to know about physical activity, the body, and health.

The term pedagogy (pronounced with a hard g, and then a soft g) has become ubiquitous in the field of kinesiology, and sport pedagogy is now firmly established as a credible academic subdiscipline. Notwithstanding the fact that our European colleagues had been using the terms pedagogy and sport pedagogy for many years (see Crum, 1986; Haag, 2005), the English-speaking world of kinesiology has only relatively recently embraced the terms. Increased use, however, does not necessarily equate with coherent or shared understandings of what the terms mean. Accordingly, the purpose of this article is to do some “languaging” (Kirk, 1991; Postman, 1989) to shed some light on the meanings of pedagogy and sport pedagogy and in so doing perhaps stimulate further consideration of their use in kinesiology. I will argue for a notion of pedagogy that is generative in enabling us to think about the process of knowledge (re)production across the many subdisciplines of kinesiology, including, but not limited to, sport pedagogy. Finally I will consider the notion of pedagogical work as providing a useful concept for analyzing the contribution of sport pedagogy to understandings related to how we come to know about physical activity, the body, and health.
Notwithstanding Yun Lee Too’s claim that “pedagogy is not really a discipline in its own right, and when one tries to constitute it as such, this may lead to embarrassment” (as cited in Cannon, 2001, p. 416), and with due cognizance of the fact that early in their careers both Durkheim and Dewey were professors of pedagogy before they were “requisitioned in the name of ‘real’ disciplines such as sociology and philosophy” (Lee & Green, 1997, p. 10), it is appropriate to consider what is understood by the term pedagogy in the field of kinesiology and whether sport pedagogy really can claim to be a foundational subdiscipline of kinesiology.

**Languaging Pedagogy**

Although Kirk (1991) has previously done some languaging of the meaning(s) of physical education teaching, this article focuses on languaging the terms pedagogy and sport pedagogy. There are multiple ways in which the term pedagogy is used in kinesiology. Silverman (2007), for example, essentially equates pedagogy with physical education, whereas Rink (2007), writing in the same issue of *Quest*, suggested that the field physical education morphed into kinesiology and now physical education is seen as a subdiscipline of kinesiology and as synonymous with pedagogy. In what follows I begin with a brief account of how the term pedagogy is understood generally and then consider the use of the term specifically within sport pedagogy, a term unique to our field.

Twenty years ago, David Lusted (1986) claimed that “pedagogy is under-defined, often referring to no more than a teaching style, a matter of personality and temperament, the mechanics of securing classroom control to encourage learning, a cosmetic bandage on the hard body of classroom contact” (p. 2). Although there are those who still consider pedagogy in these ways and others who resist the term with a passion (for example Cannon, 2001), Edgar Stones (2000) suggested that pedagogy is ubiquitous and resembles an amoeba (shapeless and perpetually changing). Grossberg (1997) argued that “the very concept of pedagogy has been exploded and multiplied” (p. 12), and we get some sense of this explosion when we see the range of references to pedagogy in the fields of education, cultural studies, and feminist studies. We read of pedagogy of the oppressed (Freire, 1972), pedagogical pleasures (McWilliam, 1999), cultural pedagogy (Trend, 1992), critical pedagogy (Giroux, 1989), visual pedagogy (Goldfarb, 2002), border pedagogy (Giroux, 1992), phenomenological pedagogy (van Manen, 1979, 1982), and feminist pedagogies (Ellsworth, 1989; Lather, 1991; Luke & Gore, 1992). In the field of kinesiology we read of pedagogical kinesiology (Hoffman, 1983), sport pedagogy (Crum, 1986; Haag, 1989), physical education pedagogy (Lee & Solmon, 2005), critical pedagogy (Kirk, 1986), feminist pedagogies (Bain, 1988; Dewar, 1991; Scraton, 1990; Wright & King, 1990), critical postmodern pedagogy (Fernandez-Balboa, 1997), pedagogy as text in physical education (Gore, 1990), and performance pedagogy and modest pedagogy (Tinning, 1991, 2002).

Clearly multiple meanings present a problem when trying to work with the term. So what are the ways in which pedagogy is understood? Also, what theoretical perspectives underpin the meanings ascribed to pedagogy by those in different educational camps?
The roots of the term are to be found in the ancient Greek word Pedagogue, which referred to “a man having the oversight of a child or youth, an attendant who led the boy from home to school, a man whose occupation is the instruction of children or youths, a schoolmaster, teacher, preceptor” (Simpson & Weiner, 1989, p. 417). However, as in all language, the meaning of words seldom remains fixed in perpetuity. How the Greeks used pedagogy is not how the word is typically used today. Moreover, how the term is often understood in Anglophone countries is different from how it is understood in Continental Europe or Scandinavia. For example, to some in the Czech Republic, pedagogy is considered a pejorative term connected to the ideological state apparatus of the previous communist state. In Sweden it is common to hear pedagogy in connection with family and child-rearing practices.

Importantly, the Oxford English Dictionary adds that the word pedagogue is “now usually used in a more or less contemptuous or hostile sense, with implications of pedantry, dogmatism, or severity” (Simpson & Weiner, 1989, p. 417). So when one of my colleagues (a neuroscientist) loudly greets those of us in my department who self-define as teacher educators with, “Morning pedagogues,” in what sense is he using this term? Is he using the term as one of affection, respect, or of ridicule?

In considering the meaning(s) given to pedagogy in kinesiology, it is first necessary to engage some of the literature from the field of education in which the term pedagogy has traditionally had the most currency. Although pedagogy as a concept has a long history within European educational discourse up until the early 1960s, there was “no obvious English language pedagogic mainstream . . . with which educationalists could identify” (Gage, 1963, p. 18). In languaging the term, I will draw heavily on the American academic literature but will reference the European context when appropriate.

I begin by briefly considering the popular synonyms for pedagogy and then outline three orienting theoretical perspectives that have been prominent in the research and scholarship related to pedagogy. Although I will draw significantly on mainstream education literature, I will also connect with specific physical education and kinesiology literature when appropriate.

**Synonyms of Pedagogy: Pedagogy = Teaching, Didactics, Instruction?**

When reading about pedagogy in the fields of education and kinesiology, one often sees pedagogy equated with teaching and instruction equated with didactics. This slippage or lack of conceptual clarity is at times confusing, yet making definitive distinctions between these terms is difficult.

According to Hamilton and McWilliam (2001), educational research in the USA up until the 1960s was primarily concerned with didactics, a term which, although seldom used in English-speaking cultures, was originally associated with the art of teaching and focused largely on procedures for the efficient transmission—or inculcation—of received knowledge. However, the rise of behavioral science saw didactics become associated more with a science of teaching, and more recently,
“modern pedagogy . . . broke away from didactics,” with pedagogy becoming seen as a process rather than a technique (Hamilton & McWilliam, 2001, p. 17).

Commenting on the European kinesiology context, German sport pedagogue Herbert Haag (2005) argued that sport didactics is essentially a synonym for sport instruction and relates to “all the factors which are important for an optimal realization of teaching-learning processes” (p. 47). In this quotation we get some sense of the overlap between the terms didactics, instruction, teaching, and pedagogy.

If we go to a dictionary for a clear and useful definition of pedagogy, the Oxford English Dictionary (Simpson & Weiner, 1989) offers “the art or science of teaching” (p. 418) and Encarta World English Dictionary (1999) provides overlapping meanings:

\[
ped·a·go·gy\ n \text{the science or profession of teaching. Also called pedagogics}
\]

\[
di·dac·tics\ n \text{the science or profession of teaching (formal) (takes a singular verb)}
\]

\[
teach·ing\ n 1. \text{the profession or practice of being a teacher. 2. something that is taught, eg., a point of doctrine (often used in the plural)}
\]

\[
in·struc·tion\ n 1. \text{teaching in a particular subject or skill, or the facts or skills taught 2. the profession of teaching or the teaching process}
\]

Considering the use of the term pedagogy in educational research literature in the USA, it is interesting to note that in the first Handbook of Research on Teaching (Gage, 1963), the Second Handbook of Research on Teaching (Travers, 1973), and the third edition of the Handbook of Research on Teaching (Wittrock, 1986) there were no references to the term pedagogy. It was all about teaching.

In the widely cited book Research on Teaching edited by Peterson and Walberg (1979), who synthesized much of the then-current educational research thinking and evidence on the nature of teaching effectiveness, we find only one oblique mention of the term pedagogy. It seemed that for the leading educational researchers in the USA during the late 1970s, the term pedagogy was not part of their lexicon when talking about teaching or research on teaching. This omission of the term pedagogy was not an oversight. Until very recently within the educational literature of the USA, the word pedagogy was rarely used.

It was not until the publication of the fourth edition of the Handbook of Research on Teaching (Richardson, 2001) that we saw the term pedagogy included in the subject index, although most contributors still avoided the term. In this fourth edition we also saw the inclusion of a chapter on research on teaching physical education by Kim Graber (2001), in which, with the exception of a brief discussion of Shulman’s (1986) notion of pedagogical content knowledge, there is no reference to the term pedagogy.

Another term that is often used in conjunction with pedagogy is curriculum. It is instructive to note that in the USA in particular there has been a long tradition of distinguishing curriculum from instruction. Indeed, in many American universities this distinction is formally institutionalized in the official naming of Departments of Curriculum and Instruction. Writing in the Handbook of Research on Curriculum, Walter Doyle (1990), however, suggested that “The meeting point between
these two domains [curriculum and instruction] has always been somewhat fuzzy, in part because these terms denote separate but interrelated phenomena” (p. 486). We now often see reference to the terms curriculum and pedagogy as separate but interrelated concepts.

In the introduction to *The Handbook of Physical Education* (2006), which should be more accurately titled *Handbook of Research in Physical Education*, editors Kirk, Macdonald, and O’Sullivan explained that they “have located the term pedagogy at the centre of [the] handbook, as a means of providing an organizing principle for the text. The notion of pedagogy we are working with here can be defined by its three key elements of learning, teaching and curriculum” (p. xi). They explain that they recognize the three “elements” (they are not really elements) to be interdependent but nonetheless separate them for organizational purposes. Having so defined the focus of the handbook, it is interesting that only 1 of the 65 chapters actually includes the term pedagogy in the title.

As we will see later, the notion of pedagogy I am arguing for tries to avoid artificial distinctions between pedagogy and curriculum and the more reductionistic and instrumental logic that underpins frequently held ideas of pedagogy in kinesiology.

Moreover, and importantly, I will argue for a broader view of pedagogy than one restricted to the practice of teaching physical education or of physical education teacher education (PETE).

**Conceptual Orientations in/on Pedagogy**

The ways in which people think about pedagogy are underpinned or informed by particular knowledge paradigms and ways of seeing the world. Although there are various ways to categorize these different paradigms (see for example section 1 of *The Handbook of Physical Education*, Kirk, Macdonald, & O’Sullivan, 2006), I will briefly discuss three perspectives that influence very different conceptions of pedagogy.

**Pedagogy as the Science of Teaching**

One popular conception of pedagogy is as a science of teaching (see the previous dictionary definitions). Although teachers might not think of their work as a science, educational researchers from the behavioral psychology tradition considered that pedagogical practice was underpinned by behavioral principles that were amenable to scientific study. Mainstream educational research had, during the 1960s and early 1970s, begun to establish a tradition of research that can be characterized as scientific in nature (see for example Gage, 1963; Peterson & Walberg, 1979; Travers, 1973) because it employed scientific methods and sought to identify, analyze, and understand what Gage (1977) called “the scientific basis of the art of teaching” (p. 13). This research tradition was predicated on the perspective that teaching can be reduced to a set of variables that can be observed and measured (see Dunkin & Biddle’s 1974 presage, process, product model).

In a commentary on research in physical education pedagogy, Larry Locke (1977) suggested that there was “new hope for a dismal science” (p. 2). In essence he was referring to the developing state of scientific type research in physical
education pedagogy and comparing it with the growth of research into the science of teaching within mainstream educational research at that time.

Throughout the 1970s and 80s in the field of kinesiology, research in physical education pedagogy was dominated by an attempt to develop a scientific basis to inform pedagogy within formalized institutional teaching (particularly in school physical education classes and PETE programs). The instrumental focus on technical issues related to improving the practice of teaching was characteristic of much of the early work of researchers such as Piéron (1983), Siedentop (1983a), and van der Mars (1987).

Part of the agenda of this article is to move beyond the early critiques of instrumental and technocratic conceptions of pedagogy as a science (see Kirk, 1986; Tinning, 1987) and to offer a broader notion of pedagogy that has greater potential for the pedagogical agendas of kinesiology.

**Phenomenological Pedagogy**

There is a stream of work in pedagogy that connects directly to the particular relationship between the teacher and the child (learner). According to the “father” of this particular conception of pedagogy, Max van Manen (1982), “Pedagogy is the most profound relationship that an adult can have with a child” (p. 290). The pedagogue is the adult who shows the child the way in the world. van Manen suggested that being a pedagogue is a “calling” (p. 285), and as such, pedagogy is essentially conceived as a moral enterprise.

Like van Manen (1982) and Spiecker (1984), Nel argued for a phenomenological analysis of pedagogy that revolves around a special relationship between child and adult (pedagogue). According to Nel (1973), “On the continent of Europe the tendency is to use the term pedagogy for the science or theory of upbringing and schooling of the child, and the term education for the practical activities in the school as teaching, school and class organization etc.” (p. 201). Physical educator Stephen Smith also advocates a phenomenological perspective on pedagogy, and in his book *Risk and Our Pedagogical Relation to Children: On the Playground and Beyond* (Smith, 1998), he argued that “pedagogy connects us with the practice of being with children where there is the intention of guiding them towards ‘mature adulthood’” (p. 27).

With the exception of the work of Smith (1991, 1998), Connolly (1995), and Nilges (2004), we have not seen much of the phenomenological focus on pedagogy in kinesiology.

**Pedagogy and Knowledge (Re)Production**

Influenced variously by the early neo-Marxist work of Bowles and Gintis (1976) and Willis (1977); the critiques of education as social reproduction by Freire (1972), Bourdieu and Passeron (1977), and Bernstein (1975); the sociology of knowledge (e.g., Young, 1971; Bates, 1986); and Habermas’s (1972) knowledge and constitutive human interests, education scholars such as Apple (1982), Aronowitz and Giroux (1985), Carr and Kemmis (1986), Smyth (1987), and Luke and Gore (1992) began to consider pedagogy with the broad frame of knowledge production and reproduction, hereafter called (re)production. They asked questions relating to whose interests are
served by particular curriculum choices and pedagogical practices. In other words, these critical pedagogies gave attention to both the intentions and the consequences of pedagogy. In the field of kinesiology, advocates of critical pedagogies such as Kirk (1986), Bain (1989), Tinning (1988), Dewar, (1990), and Fernandez-Balboa (1995) began to argue for a similar perspective on pedagogy.

According to Goldfarb (2002), Paulo Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1972) inspired three decades of scholarship in education based on the premise that pedagogy is a form of cultural politics, not a science of knowledge transmission. In the 1980s numerous feminist scholars began using the idea that pedagogy is a form of cultural politics and were applying their increasingly sophisticated theorizing to critique the patriarchal underpinnings of education (see for example Ellsworth, 1989; Friedman, 1985; Lather, 1991; Luke & Gore, 1992; Maher, 1985). In kinesiology, some feminist scholars such as Alison Dewar (1990), Jennifer Gore (1990), and Linda Bain (1989) were also using a notion of pedagogy that was informed by the discourses of the emerging field of cultural politics.

In kinesiology, it was Gore (1990) who was the first to problematize the term pedagogy (in the English-speaking world at least) and to begin to use it to refer to a discourse on knowledge production and reproduction. She introduced the idea of pedagogy as text, and using Lundgren’s (1983) concepts, distinguished between texts for pedagogy (texts from which teachers could teach, or the formal curriculum) and texts about pedagogy (texts that theorize or describe pedagogy). Most of the physical education texts at the time were texts for pedagogy. Gore’s work followed how the term was increasingly being used in the then-emerging field of cultural studies, particularly by those in the Birmingham tradition (e.g., Hytten, 1999), and she used the work of David Lusted (1986) as one of the conceptual springboards for her book *The Struggle for Pedagogies: Critical and Feminist Discourses as Regimes of Truth* (1993).

Lusted’s (1986) interpretation of pedagogy specifically relates to knowledge (re)production. According to Lusted (1986), pedagogy is an important concept because “it draws attention to the process through which knowledge is produced” (p. 2, italics in original). It enables us to ask questions concerning “under what conditions and through what means we ‘come to know’” (p. 3). It is Lusted’s conception of pedagogy that I will argue is most useful to kinesiology.

Another conceptual framework used for understanding pedagogy as knowledge (re)production is that provided by Basil Bernstein (1996). Bernstein’s concept of pedagogical practice is “somewhat wider than the relationship that goes on in schools.” (1996, p. 17). His notion on pedagogical practice is as a “fundamental social context through which cultural reproduction–production takes place” (p. 17). In this sense, it is somewhat similar to Lusted’s notion of pedagogy. Bernstein’s work offers an explanation of “the inner logic of pedagogical discourse and its practice” (p. 18). He claims that to understand how “pedagogic processes shape consciousness differentially [we need some] means of analyzing the form of communication which bring this about” (p. 18). In this sense, his work on pedagogical discourse is concerned with the rules of construction, distribution, reproduction, and change of a pedagogic text (Glasby, 2000).

In the view of physical education researchers Evans, Davies, and Penny (1999), “Bernstein (1996) has articulated more eloquently than most how this complex relationship between education and socialization is simultaneously embedded in
the act of teaching” (p. 10). However, notwithstanding this observation, although popular in educational research literature, there have been relatively few scholars in kinesiology who have used Bernstein’s framework to analyze pedagogy from a perspective of knowledge, power, and control (exceptions include Evans, Davies, & Wright, 2003; Glasby, 2000; Hay & lisahunter, 2006; Johns, 2005; Macdonald, 2003; Macdonald, Kirk, & Braiuka, 1999).

The important thing about these examples of conceptual orientations is that each has its own particular (even if broad) notion of pedagogy. There is little common ground, and accordingly, communication across advocates of these perspectives is often difficult.

**Languaging Sport Pedagogy**

To language sport pedagogy it is necessary for me to trace how the terms pedagogy and sport pedagogy have been used in some of the major conferences and texts of kinesiology. But first we need a little languaging of the term sport. It is important to recognize that there is frequently a blurring of the categories of sport and physical education in the context of formal schooling. Sometimes the terms are used as synonyms. As we can see in the pages of *Education Through Sport: An Overview of Good Practices in Europe* (Janssens et al., 2004), in the European context (where sport pedagogy originated), the term sport is a much broader, inclusive term than is commonly understood in Anglophone counties such as the UK or USA.

Sport pedagogy, like pedagogy, is amorphous (Erdmann, 1996). Notwithstanding this, it is now generally accepted that sport pedagogy is a subdiscipline of the field of kinesiology. It is now commonplace to see advertisements for academic positions in sport pedagogy in universities in the USA and the UK. Back in the 1980s such positions would most likely have been advertised as physical education.

The 1996 publication of the UK-based journal *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy* signified the contemporary acceptance of the term sport pedagogy in the Anglophone world of kinesiology. However, because sport pedagogy is often seen as synonymous with physical education pedagogy, perhaps the new journal is seeking to cover all bases—in the UK, Europe, and the USA, where different meanings are attached to the terms pedagogy and sport (see Crum, 1986; Haag, 1989). In general, the European meaning of both pedagogy and sport is much broader than their meaning in the USA and in the Asian countries (such as Taiwan, Korea, and Japan), which look to US scholarship and research for their leadership.

The term sport pedagogy was first used in Germany in the early 1970s (Grupe & Krüger, 1996) and has been in use in the Anglophone world of kinesiology since the late 1970s (see Crum, 1986; Haag, 1989). In 1978, German Herbert Haag wrote that “[s]port pedagogy as one major theoretical field of sport science is in urgent need of clarification of its nature” (p. x). Later (1996) he argued that sport pedagogy is a theory field (like sport biomechanics or sport psychology) and not like (not synonymous with) physical education, which he regarded as a “total academic field.” In Europe, the “total academic field” of physical education is now mostly referred to as sport science (*Sportwissenschaft* in German). Importantly, as Haag pointed out, *Sportwissenschaft* “includes aspects of natural science as well as behavioural science, arts, humanities in relation to movement, play and sport” (p. 1).
Haag (1989) asserted that sport pedagogy is “the description of the field of theoretical research or sub-discipline of sport science which deals with the educational aspects of physical activity: sport, play, games, dance etc” (p. 6). Moreover, “It becomes evident that sport pedagogy has a central position within sport science, in every teaching and learning process in physical activity” (p. 9). Significantly, Haag positioned sport pedagogy as residing between sport science and the science of education. Bart Crum (1986), also giving a European interpretation of sport pedagogy, argued that it is a “field of scholarly work on and disciplined inquiry [into] all educational interventions in the domain of human movement” (p. 212). He forcefully claimed,

There should be no doubt that the subject matter of sport pedagogy (as a field of research) is a pedagogical practice, in particular a sport pedagogical practice, and that the subject matter of research on teaching physical education [sport pedagogy research] is not sport but teaching, in particular the teaching of movement and sport. (p. 212)

Larry Locke (1979) was one of the first Anglophone scholars from the USA to use the term sport pedagogy in an address to an ICHPER (International Council for Health, Physical Education and Recreation) conference in Kiel, Germany. Perhaps the location of the conference motivated Locke to use the term that had currency in Europe. In his paper titled “Teaching and Learning Processes in Physical Activity: The Central Problem of Sport Pedagogy,” Locke clearly argued that “teaching and learning are the processes at the heart of Sport Pedagogy, and research which probes the problem of their nature forms the content of that discipline” (p. 1). This is very similar to how Haag (2005) described the essence of the European term of sport didactics.

Significantly, when sport pedagogy was imported from Germany into North America, the German word for science (geistes) was interpreted in a narrow technical sense, and in the US in particular, sport pedagogy came to be interpreted as a scientific (read technical, empirical) approach to pedagogy in human movement (Crum, 1986). The German term sportpädagogik (sport pedagogy) refers to both educative practice (e.g., school physical education) and to scholarly work about or for such practice. Unfortunately for those of us who are Anglophone, there are numerous resources on sport pedagogy that are only available in German (see, for example, Haag and Hummel’s [2001] edited collection of writings Handbuch Sportpädagogik [Handbook of Sport Pedagogy], cited in Haag, 2005).

In 1982 Purdue University in Indiana hosted a conference under the auspices of the Committee for Institutional Cooperation (CIC) among the Big Ten universities of the USA. The conference was significant because it was the first time that the Body of Knowledge Symposium Committee of the CIC held a symposium on research on teaching in physical education. Previous symposia between 1968 and 1981 had addressed all subdisciplines of the field of kinesiology that had status as an academic research area of study. Ironically, the parent that conceived them all, namely physical education (Haag’s “total academic field,” 1996), was not deemed to have a coherent or emerging research culture until the Purdue conference. This prompted Daryl Siedentop (1983a) to comment that this state of affairs was rather like being part of the family (of physical education) yet being considered to be
more like the bastard child. The conference proceedings (Templin & Olson, 1983) make for interesting reading. Although editors Templin and Olsen claimed that the proceedings reflected information that was “currently at the forefront of pedagogical research in physical education” (p. xii), the word pedagogy was used by only one presenter (Hoffman, 1983) and the term sport pedagogy was not mentioned at all.

Sport pedagogy as a term has long been used in the professional association known as Association Internationale des Ecoles Supérieures d’Education Physique (AIESEP), and some tracing of the conferences of this association is informative.

One of the significant presentations at each annual AIESEP World Congress meeting is the memorial Cagigal lecture. In 1990, American scholar Linda Bain titled her Cagigal lecture “Research in Sport Pedagogy: Past, Present and Future.” Bain began her address with an examination of the differences within sport pedagogy and the continuing struggle over meaning within the field. She identified the three dominant research traditions that have been used in North American sport pedagogy: behaviorist research, socialization research, and critical theory research. In highlighting the gendered nature of the development of sport pedagogy, Bain pointed out that although there were many early female leaders in physical education who had an interest in pedagogy, “most of those who led the effort to transform sport pedagogy into a scientific area of study were men” (p. 32). Perhaps as a consequence, it is the curriculum dimension of sport pedagogy that has become so popular for women.

The following year in Atlanta, German Wolf Brettschneider (1991) titled his Cagigal address “The Many Faces of Sport as a Challenge for Sport Pedagogy and Physical Education.” Brettschneider (1991) suggested that sport pedagogy in the early 1990s was in a crisis. He claimed that “sport pedagogy is at present a discipline without a recognisable core. . . . It is neither sure of its subject matter and its objectives, nor of the direction to take” (p. 60). Two significant issues of the crisis related to the nature of sport (as a narrow or broad conception) and the pedagogical nature of sport (was it purposeful for developing certain human attributes).

American Paul Schempp delivered the Cagigal lecture in 1993 titled “The Nature of Knowledge in Sport Pedagogy.” In the lecture, Schempp turned to the International Council for Sport Pedagogy and their specific publication An Introduction to the Terminology of Sport Pedagogy for clarity on a definition of sport pedagogy. He claimed to have found “no less than six distinct definitions” (p. 123). What was common to all definitions was that “sport pedagogy is constituted in the actors and actions of teaching and learning purposeful human movement” (p. 107). Significantly, Haag, Crum, Siedentop, and Schempp all focus on pedagogy as related to purposeful knowledge. Schempp (1996) used the Habermas (1972) notion of knowledge-constitutive interests in his exploration of the nature of knowledge in sport pedagogy. He described three types of disciplined inquiry that have been used in educational research and sport pedagogy research: empirical analytic (positivist) science, historical-hermeneutic (interpretive) science, and critical sciences (see Carr & Kemmis, 1986; Tinning, 1992).

The conference proceedings of the AIESEP World Sport Science Congress held at Adelphi University, New York, in 1998 reveal a collection of different terminology. There were sections on Pedagogy—Teacher Education, Pedagogy—
Foundations, Pedagogy—Culture, and Sport Pedagogy and Social Issues. Implicit here is a distinction between pedagogy and sport pedagogy, but there is no hint as to what it might be. Moreover, none of the speakers actually used the term sport pedagogy in their presentation titles.

In October 2007 Lynn Housner from the University of Pittsburgh organized a major “pedagogy” conference titled “Historic Traditions and Future Directions in Research on Teaching and Teacher Education in Physical Education.” Arguably this was the largest conference held in the US with a focus on research in physical education and PETE, and although overseas presenters attended, most presenters were American. Of all the presentations, there were only six that used the terms pedagogy or sport pedagogy in their abstract titles. Of these six, only one was from the USA; the other five were from the UK, Norway, Spain, Canada, and New Zealand. Clearly, in the USA at least, the terms pedagogy and sport pedagogy are not preferred when reporting on research in physical education and PETE.

The use of the term within some of the influential textbooks is also informative. Notwithstanding the increased use of the term sport pedagogy as a subdiscipline of kinesiology, there are many textbooks written for the Anglophone audience that avoid the term sport pedagogy and instead continue to use terms such as physical education curriculum and instruction, teaching and learning in physical education, or physical education pedagogy.

In the first edition of Siedentop’s (1990) influential American text *Introduction to Physical Education, Fitness and Sport*, there is a section on the (then) new subdiscipline of sport pedagogy. Actually Siedentop, like Haag (1989), called it the field of sport pedagogy, but because *field* has many broader meanings (for example see Bernstein, 1975; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977), calling it a subdiscipline of the field of kinesiology is more appropriate. According to Siedentop, “Sport pedagogy is the study of the processes of teaching and coaching, of the outcomes of such endeavours, and of the content of fitness, physical education, and sport-education programs” (p. 316). At that time, Siedentop claimed that in the USA at least, the field of sport pedagogy was typically called teacher education or curriculum and instruction. It is interesting to speculate, however, as to why, if sport pedagogy is “a term used widely in international and physical education and sport science” (Siedentop, 1990, p. 316), we find no reference at all to the term in the fourth edition of his famous *Developing Teaching Skills in Physical Education* (Siedentop & Tannehill, 2000). Perhaps, in writing for an American audience, Siedentop considered that the term had little currency given the restricted meanings ascribed to both sport and pedagogy in the USA.

Silverman and Ennis (1996) used the term physical education pedagogy rather than sport pedagogy in their *Student Learning in Physical Education*. They claim that “the field of research in physical education pedagogy, sometimes called sport pedagogy in the international community” (p. 3) is composed of three subareas: curriculum, teaching, and teacher education. Presumably their choice to avoid the term sport pedagogy was a conscious one and was perhaps influenced by the fact that the text was predominantly targeted to the American market.

In the UK, the edited volume by Laker (2003) titled *The Future of Physical Education: Building a New Pedagogy* makes no specific reference to sport pedagogy (with the exception of the chapter by Silverman who self-identifies as a sport pedagogue). Even more interesting is that the Dutch publication *Education*
Through Sport: An Overview of Good Practice in Europe (editors Jan Janssens et al., 2004) also avoids using the term sport pedagogy. Although they use the terms pedagogical perspective and pedagogical action (p. 29), the term sport pedagogy is absent. Perhaps this is because the book was written in English for the Anglophone world rather than a continental European audience.

So it appears that in regard to the systematic use of the term sport pedagogy, all we can say is that some researchers and scholars do (sometimes) and some don’t (sometimes). Because there is no international agreement on the preferred terms (sport pedagogy or physical education pedagogy) it seems that personal preference and local traditions (including national language differences) will continue to largely influence the choice of term. Personal investment in self-defining (e.g., as a sport pedagogist) is also important. Those who have created their careers as physical education pedagogy scholars might be reluctant to relabel their work as sport pedagogy. Whatever the reasons, it seems likely that, at least in the immediate future, sport pedagogy will not become a universal signifier for research and practice in all matters relating to pedagogy and human movement.

The Idea of Pedagogical Work

In what follows I want to make a claim for the use of pedagogical work as a concept that is useful in thinking about pedagogy in kinesiology. I begin by assuming that pedagogy is fundamentally concerned with the processes of knowledge (re)production. As previously outlined, pedagogy often refers to a practice or set of practices, the purpose of which is to pass on or produce knowledge. The idea of purpose or intention is important here. Someone may learn something from an experience or an encounter with a devise or piece of equipment (e.g., a young child finds a football in the backyard and through trial and error learns to kick the ball), but if there was no explicit intention to pass on knowledge by someone (teacher, coach, parent, or other pedagogic device), then there has been no pedagogy and no pedagogical work done. Pedagogical work is a consequence of pedagogical intentions. The reason I have chosen to so limit what stands for pedagogy is that without this restriction, pedagogical work would be everywhere yet nowhere in a similar way that discourse and text sometimes are seen to be all pervasive. It simply makes no practical or theoretical sense to consider all acts of learning to be the result of pedagogy.

This understanding of pedagogy is different from Siedentop’s (1983b) claim that “for pedagogy to have occurred, certain student outcomes must be attained. No outcomes, no pedagogy!” (p. 7). In my view, for pedagogy to have occurred there must be a purposeful encounter between teacher, learner, and subject matter, and the purpose is to (re)produce knowledge. There will always be outcomes (consequences or learnings), but they are often unpredictable and always dependent on meaning-making processes, which are beyond the control of the teacher. This view connects my notion of pedagogy with Giroux and Simon’s (1989) view that “any practice which intentionally tries to influence the production of meaning is a pedagogical practice” (p. 230).

Pedagogical intentions are often unfulfilled. Administrators and teachers (in both schools and universities) are only too familiar with the differences between intentions (curriculum goals) and actual learning outcomes. Considering that
knowledge is what is understood rather than what is intended, I consider that thinking about *pedagogical work* helps take our focus off specific pedagogical practices and focus instead on what is *understood* by the learner as a result of some pedagogical encounter.

Pedagogical work foregrounds the *consequences* of pedagogy rather than the practices or intentions. It is not so much concerned with what particular pedagogical practices are said to do, but rather is concerned with what knowledge(s), ways of thinking, dispositions, and subjectivities are actually (re)produced in or through particular pedagogical encounters.

In the case of kinesiology as formal institutional practice in universities, *pedagogical work* is that effect or influence on ways of thinking, beliefs, practices, dispositions, and identities regarding physical activity performance and participation, bodily practices, and understandings and self-awareness related to health and well-being that is produced by an individual’s encounter with certain prescribed pedagogical practices and devices. When I use the notion of knowledge (re)production, I am including as knowledge not only a taxonomic range of cognitions (e.g., Bloom, 1956) and motoric skills (e.g., fundamental movement skills [see Walkley, Holland, Treloar, & Probyn-Smith, 1993]) but also knowledge as represented in particular ways of thinking, attitudes, beliefs, and dispositions. Importantly, pedagogical work can also apply to the “transformation of consciousness that takes place in the intersection of three agencies—the teacher, the learner and the knowledge they produce together” (Lusted, 1986, p. 3).

**Formal and Informal Sites of Pedagogy**

All cultures attempt to reproduce themselves. They pass on valued knowledge by means of modeling, stories and metaphor, dance, art, books, speeches, billboards, TV, radio, the Internet, and so on. The means of passing on knowledge occurs in both institutional and noninstitutional sites. Sometimes this will be in “formal” institutional sites such as churches, hospitals, universities, schools or factories, sports clubs, theaters, and ski resorts. In all these places there is an explicit attempt to pass on valued knowledge. But we also find pedagogical work done in nonformal sites such as families (e.g., manners training, toilet training, and other forms of behavior shaping), local parks (e.g., in “fitness stations”), playgrounds, and even T-shirts. As in the formal institutional sites, in these nonformal sites, the pedagogical practices or devices are intended to (re)produce valued knowledge. There is an intention to do certain pedagogical work.

Simon (1997) gave a useful example of how a T-shirt can do pedagogical work. He described a T-shirt with a picture of a sailing ship and an inscription “How could Columbus have discovered America when Native Americans were already there?” (p. 125). This shirt is intended to offer a statement of “counter-commemoration,” which refers to the struggle to resist the 500th anniversary of the Columbus landfall as the “discovery” of America. In other words, the T-shirt offers an alternative reading of history, and in doing so, affords the possibility of doing pedagogical work regarding knowledge (re)production regarding history. This example reveals something of the ways in which cultural studies as a field considers pedagogy as a very broad dimension of cultural politics.
Importantly, as the T-shirt example shows, the “teacher” in a pedagogical encounter need not be a flesh-and-blood human or even a computer instructional program. Pedagogical work is done if an individual gains some knowledge (comes to know), either consciously or subconsciously, as a consequence of engaging in a pedagogical encounter that has as its purpose the passing on of certain knowledge/understanding. In the case of the T-shirt example, the intention of the text was to inform/educate about the problematics of the “discovery” of America.

Importantly, however, what is learned in a pedagogical encounter might not be what was intended by those who created the particular pedagogical device or encounter. There is a resonance here with the notion of the hidden curriculum (Dodds, 1993). As Ellsworth (1997) informed us, “All curricula and pedagogies invite their users to take up particular positions within relation of knowledge, power and desire” (p. 2). Moreover, “Pedagogy is a much messier and more inconclusive affair than the vast majority of our educational theories and practices make it out to be” (p. 8).

**Pedagogical Work in Kinesiology and the Potential of Sport Pedagogy**

Kinesiology, as a field of knowledge, is part of the formalized institutional context. Teaching in kinesiology sets out to reproduce knowledge (in the broad sense described earlier) related to the subdisciplines of the field (e.g., biomechanics, motor control, sociology of sport, exercise physiology, exercise and sport psychology, history of physical education and sport). Research in kinesiology endeavors to produce knowledge related to the subdisciplines.

In kinesiology, pedagogical work is done relating to three interrelated dimensions: physical activity, bodies, and health. Basically, the pedagogical practices and devices employed by kinesiology affect and influence the ways of thinking, practice, dispositions, and identities (subjectivities) of those who work in the field of kinesiology. Importantly, however, intentional pedagogical work on or for bodies, physical activity, and health is no longer (not that they ever were) the sole preserve of our field. Other cultural players have vested interests in (re)producing certain knowledge about bodies, physical activity, and health, and such knowledge will, in various ways, impact on the pedagogical work done in kinesiology (Tinning & Glasby, 2002).

If we are to consider sport pedagogy to be a foundational subdiscipline of the field of kinesiology and not just applicable to physical education teaching and sport coaching, then it should be informed by a notion of pedagogy that allows us (professionals of the field) to interrogate and analyze not just the pedagogical practices and devices of formal institutions such as schools, universities, and sports clubs, but also those of nonformal sites such as families, TV, videogames, and T-shirts. It should enable us to gain an understanding of the pedagogical work that is consequential to all pedagogical encounters wherever they take place. It should enable us to better understand how and what knowledge is (re)produced related
to physical activity, bodies, and health by both the field of kinesiology and other cultural players across all possible sites.

Perhaps it is ironic that there has been virtually no systematic study of pedagogy as a process of coming to know used within the subdisciplines of kinesiology such as biomechanics, exercise physiology, sport history, and sport sociology, and accordingly, we actually know very little about the pedagogical work done in those contexts.

If we are to gain a better understanding of the actual impact of our institutional pedagogical work, we also need to understand the pedagogical work done by other cultural players that often undermines the intentional pedagogical work done by kinesiology specialists. Consider, for example, the pedagogical work done in kinesiology related to the issue of obesity (e.g., Sallis & McKenzie, 1991) and also by other cultural players who have vested interests in obesity as a profit-making opportunity (see for example Gard & Wright, 2005).

At this point, it is worthwhile asking if sport pedagogy as a subdiscipline of kinesiology currently allows for an analysis and understanding of such broadly conceived pedagogical work. For example, would the chapter by Saltman (2002) titled “Embodied Promise: The Pedagogy of Market Faith in Bodybuilding” be considered a project of sport pedagogy? Perhaps Haag’s (2005) definitions are broad enough to capture it, but certainly restrictive definitions that confine the focus of pedagogy to an instrumental analysis of instructional processes would not.

Over a decade ago, Zakus and Cruise Malloy (1996) made a thoughtful evaluation of pedagogical approaches in kinesiology and offered praxis-oriented critical pedagogy as a way forward. More recently I have argued for what I called a modest critical pedagogy (see Tinning, 2002) that enables a more sophisticated analysis of pedagogical work done in kinesiology and beyond. Both of these examples represent a challenge to orthodoxy in pedagogy, but more importantly, they offer the possibility for sport pedagogy to move beyond a narrow, yet important, focus on school physical education and PETE and toward a contribution to kinesiology that is foundational.

Pedagogical knowledge relating to teaching skills can indeed be useful for kinesiology (Silverman, 2007); however, the value of pedagogy extends well beyond particular pedagogical practices used in the various subdisciplines of the field. As a foundational subdiscipline of kinesiology, sport pedagogy would need to extend “to the consideration of the development of health and bodily fitness, social and moral welfare, ethics and aesthetics, as well as to the institutional forms that serve to facilitate society’s and the individual pedagogic aims” (Marton & Booth, 1997, p. 178).

Accordingly, in my view, sport pedagogy should embrace a conception of pedagogy that allows us to seek the “multiple connections between things that have [apparently] nothing to do with each other” (Mercer, 1992, p. 39). It should enable us to connect the dots (Klein, 2000) between all pedagogical work that is done relating to the various orientations of our field—to physical activity, the body, and health. A sport pedagogy conceived in this way has the potential to be genuinely foundational to kinesiology and not merely of relevance to physical education teaching and sports coaching.
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