# SHIFTING THE GAZE IN HIGHER EDUCATION: THE IMPORTANCE OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION TO CRITICAL THEORY

**By**

**David Wayne Phillips**

**A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements**
**for the degree of Master Of Arts**
**Department of Theory and Policy Studies in Education**
**Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the**
**University of Toronto**

**SHIFTING THE GAZE IN HIGHER EDUCATION: THE IMPORTANCE OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION TO CRITICAL THEORY**

**Master of Arts (2003)**

**David Wayne Phillips**

**Department of Theory and Policy Studies in Education**
**University of Toronto**

## Abstract

Although science/technology allow for increasing control over bodies, knowledge about what bodies are is heavily debated. Whereas social construction viewpoints have yielded discursively constructed bodies, the body, as a material phenomenon, has been an "absent presence" (Shilling) in postmodern theory. This thesis will explore embodiment in theories of critical pedagogy within higher education literature. Beginning with Giroux and McLaren, the author will employ Ellsworth and Lather as points of departure and examples of engaged, embodied critical pedagogy. Where Reagon foregrounds the importance of coalition work, Mohanty calls for seeing ourselves as activists with an ethical connection to our pedagogical practices.

The author will explore his particular body as curriculum; specifically, his body as a site of teaching/learning, as a site of healing/caring and as a site of resistance. At stake is the articulation of critical pedagogy as physical education, thereby grounding the personal as centrally political in an ethical framework.

**Acknowledgements**

I am greatly indebted to Jamie-Lynn Magnusson, Associate Professor in Higher Education, Department of Theory and Policy Studies, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT), for her supervision of this thesis. She has given her personal time freely and generously not only in the meticulous critique of my work but also in nurturing guidance as a colleague. What I have gleaned from her as a true academic is incalculable.

To Maureen Ford, Assistant Professor in Philosophy of Education, Department of Theory and Policy Studies, OISE/UT, for her ability to confine my ideas to the task at hand while allowing me the freedom to explore through discussion issues of critical importance to my future work. For her unbelievable spirit, her competitiveness, her stick-with-it-ness, her laughter - even in the deepest, darkest moments of this process.

To Linda Muzzin, Associate Professor in Higher Education, Department of Theory and Policy Studies, OISE/UT, whose dogged interest in confronting the daily institutional mechanisms that trouble feminists is inspiring. Her insights and comments on various projects have tuned not only my sense of the tensions within/among the theorists I chose to locate in my work, also, among the productive capacities that such tensions yield.

To Dieter Misgeld, Professor in Philosophy of Education, Department of Theory and Policy Studies, OISE/UT, for his personal insights and experiences as an activist-philosopher and his approach to the reading and interrogation of text.

To Kathryn Morgan, Associate Professor in the Department of Philosophy, University of Toronto, who greeted me with open hands in a feminist class on metaphysics and provided me with the space and opportunity to learn.

To Roxanna Ng, Associate Professor in the Department of Adult Education, OISE/UT, who displays courage and intuition in bringing martial arts into the graduate classroom and whose reading exercises taught me to examine my practice of reading.

I especially appreciate my Recurring Issues study group (consisting of OISE/UT colleagues Cherylyn Cameron, Glenys LaFrance, Ann Mathews, Mary Patton, Helen Simson, and Zha Qiang) as well as our spin-off running group. Our conversations and day-to-day interactions challenged, informed and inspired my work. I have functioned as a sponge in these encounters. My thanks to all who feed my head and my spirit.

To Helen Simson, who as a self-proclaimed white, heterosexual woman, helped me see beyond my identity(ies) as a gay man of color - or in her words - just the happy, purple guy. Her strength and experience as a feminist inside and outside of the academy - as well as just holding my hand when I needed it most - will always and forever be treasured.

To Joe and Peter, whose friendship and laughter remains the key to my "not taking myself too seriously". I certainly have experienced "coming out of my own skin" so as to become comfortable both in and with it!

To Karen-Elaine Edge, whose advice helped me to (circum)navigate the waters of higher education and whose "table-like" approach guided me through the day-to-day.

To Moira Grant, whose quiet strength allows her to "walk her talk" in ways that I have come to respect, admire and emulate.

To Kerrie Kennedy, whose kind words, constant encouragement and timely thoughtfulness has not gone unnoticed. The constant supply of treats, edible and otherwise, fed my soul and lifted my spirits when I most needed it.

To Karen Sihra, for her subtle strength and unbelievable patience. You came into my life when I most needed a friend and gave selflessly.

To Maria Euchner, who gave unselfishly of her time and energy in her strife for perfection in the editing and production process of this manuscript. Your friendship and kind words, your brilliance and charm were all instrumental to my ability to see myself through this process.

To Darren Nickerson, whose friendship and support have been of tremendous consequence, beyond what words can express, and who reminds me that each of us supports not in ways that are expected of us but in the manner in which we can truly give of ourselves.

To my aunt, Dr. Fern Rodmell, whose tireless professional devotion served as a beacon as well as inspiration to my personal desire to pursue graduate work.

## (In) Definitions

***Author's Note:***

The very notion of "operationalizing" constructs erases or dismisses certain possibilities. It either "unqueers" a concept or legitimizes its abstraction. I agree with Lather (1991) who suggests that "Any effort at definition domesticates, analytically fixes, and mobilizes pro and contra positions" (p. 5). In the definitions that follow, I have attempted to capture a semblance of how these terms are used within the literature and by various theorists, recognizing that their use also possesses antagonistic strands and productive tensions.

***Giroux's border pedagogy***[1]

For Giroux (1992), border pedagogy represents the "…politically strategic issue of engaging the ways in which knowledge can be remapped, reterritorialised and decentred" (p. 28). Giroux's interest lies in creating a democratic public philosophy that is both transformative and emancipatory; one which is also both modern and postmodern. It is modern in its rationalist assumptions about the individual's capacity to reason and postmodern in its concern with agency in a world devoid of grand narratives and metaphysical guarantees. However, in order to appreciate the complexity of his concept, it is necessary to unpack it by examining what is meant by each of its terms.

Borders represent epistemological spaces (within and peripheral to the academy) that are forged in practices of domination; they also represent the acknowledgement, formation and transgression of identities and identity categories. Pedagogy in this sense refers to the importance of pedagogical processes and pedagogical conditions. The former is vital as a site of cultural criticism; the latter reflects upon the circumstances under which students "…become border crossers in order to understand otherness in its own terms" (p. 28).

To practice border pedagogy, or to become a border crosser per se, is multi-faceted, complex and necessarily reflexive in nature. It is to transgress while maintaining

---

[11] Anzaldúa (1987) in, *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza,* as with much of her work, theorizes borders and has a different conceptualization of border pedagogy, which will be taken up in Chapter Three.

an awareness of the situatedness of knowledge and the notion that as individual crossers, one only has partial access. It allows both teacher and student the capacity to make "…visible the historically and socially constructed strengths and limitations of those places and borders we inherit and that frame our discourses and social relations" (p. 28).

***Classical critical theory***

In its classical sense, critical theory is an interdisciplinary project developed in the 1940s and 1950s, announced by Horkheimer and practiced by the members of the Frankfurt School and their successors (Benhabib, Adorno, Habermas, Lukacs). The Frankfurt School was a school of thought developed at the Institute for Social Research in Frankfurt, Germany in 1923. Drawing upon the ideas of Marx in its studies of domination and authority in society, classical critical theory departs from Marxism in locating the sources of domination in the realms of culture and ideology, not solely in the economic structure of society. For example, critical theory examines ideology in attempting to uncover the distorting ways of thinking, in an attempt to liberate people from illusions and constraints of their own making.

***Critical theory***

By the 1960s, critical theory had abandoned the Marxist belief that the proletariat would be the agent of human emancipation and focused on the role of disenfranchised or marginal groups, believing that they held the key to social transformation. In other words, theory that is critical in nature seeks to empower the powerless and transform existing social inequalities and injustices. Critical theory is now more a general term, under which research projects in the social sciences and humanities attempt to bring truth and political engagement into alignment. Guess (as cited in, Payne, 1999)offers the following definition:

> (1) Critical theories have special standing as guides for human action in that: (a) they are aimed at producing enlightenment in the agents who hold them, i.e., at enabling those agents to determine what their true interests are; (b) they are inherently emancipatory, i.e., they free agents from a kind of coercion which is at least partly self- imposed….
>
> (2) Critical theories have cognitive content, i.e., they are forms of knowledge.

(3) Critical theories differ epistemologically in essential ways from theories in the natural sciences. Theories in natural science are objectifying; critical theories are reflective. (pp. 118-9)

An example of a critical theorist is Habermas, whose main contribution to philosophy has been the development of a theory of rationality. Considered to be the most influential contemporary German social theorist and a leading representative of the Frankfurt School, Habermas' (1982) critique of Horkheimer and Adorno in his re-reading of the *Dialectic of Enlightenment* signals his belief that "something went wrong in the evolution of Critical Theory during the 1940s" (p. 4). Habermas felt that what was at stake was in fact a shift in the critique of ideology from a Marxist one, whereby truth claims are to be questioned because they reflect the self interest of the theorist and his/her "class", to that of a radical model resulting in a critique of reason that denounces reason itself (p. 14). Habermas suggests that this radical critique of reason undermines the possibility of critical reflection itself. Instead, he proposes a rationality that is a form of "communicative action" oriented towards attaining agreement with others through language whereby persons can put forward moral and political claims and defend them on the basis of rationality alone. His intent is to replace a transcendental philosophy based on a subject-object theory of self-consciousness with a transcendental philosophy based on language.

***Curriculum***

Common usage of the term curriculum defines it as a program of study, a classroom text or a course syllabus (*The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary*, 1979). The hidden curriculum refers to the unintended outcomes of the schooling process, in particular, the outcomes of the learning process that are not openly acknowledged to the learners. In other words, the hidden curriculum refers to ways in which knowledge is constructed, both outside the boundaries of formal classroom materials and lesson plans and inside the practices, expectations and representations which privilege some groups over others (Darder, Baltodano, & Torres, 2003, p. 86).

Popkewitz (1997) suggests that curriculum is "…a particular, historically formed knowledge that inscribes rules and standards by which we 'reason' about the world and

our 'self' as a productive member of that world" (p. 132). He also suggests that it is "…a disciplinary technology that directs how the individual is to act, feel talk, and "see" the world and "self". As such, curriculum is a form of social regulation" (p. 132).

***Discourse***

Norris (as cited in, Payne, 1999) suggests that discourse, in a post-structuralist sense, is the:

> …working premise that subjectivity is constructed in and through language, since quite simply there is nothing (no possible appeal to the Kantian transcendental SUBJECT, to *a priori* concepts, self-evident truths, primordial intuitions, facts of experience, or whatever) that would offer a secure vantage point beyond the play of discursive representations. (p. 145)

In a similar vein, Foucault (1972; 1973) treats discourses, a central concept in his analytical framework, as practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak. Discourses shed light on what is possible to be uttered as well as to be thought, and about who has the authority or privilege to speak such thoughts. Discourse is an instrument and effect of power, whether sovereign or productive, as well as a site where its resistance can be examined.

***Epistemology***

A term derived from the Greek *episteme*, meaning "knowledge", and *logos*, meaning "explanation" (*The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary*, 1979), epistemology is the study of the nature of knowledge and justification and the viability of skepticism about knowledge and justification.

***Ethics***

Ethics is derived from the Greek word "*ethos*", meaning character, and is concerned with the investigation into the fundamental principles and basic concepts that are, or ought to be, found in a given field of human thought and activity (*The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary*, 1979).

Rodmell (1988) suggests that a distinction should be made between ethics and morals. She sees ethics as "…formal, theoretical statements which intellectualize morals and involve professional values, such as those seen in Codes, theories, research or

enquiry" whereas "…morals refer to values or principles which are less formal, and more personal or subjective" (p. 8-9). For her, "morality is concerned with the conduct men □sic□ ought to follow" (p. 8-9).

***Feminist epistemology***

From a feminist perspective, feminist epistemology investigates both the importance and relevance that gender (difference) of the researcher/holder of knowledge possesses in relation to the content of what is to be known (Codes, 1991; Collins, 1990; Harding, 1986). Because the knowers are situated diversely in relation to gender (as well as race and class) as well as in social relations of identity and power, feminist epistemology contests the notion of a unitary subject while simultaneously challenging scientific epistemologies.

***Modernity (ism)***

Modernity, in its original use, is a category of aesthetics and refers to a particular experience of time. In a broad sense, it is associated with the ideas of innovation, progress and fashion (Payne, 1999, p. 346). Within sociological discourse, the term is associated with bureaucracy, industrialization and the advent of the city. For example, Durkheim viewed modernity as the shift from "mechanical" to "organic" form of solidarity as a consequence of, among other shifts, the increasing division of labor. Lyotard (1979) use of the term is to designate "any science that legitimates itself with reference to a metadiscourse of this kind making an explicit appeal to some grand narrative" (p. viii).

Modernity is associated with "…a monolithic world in which everything is subsumed under a universal principle…this monolith is capitalism itself, utterly triumphant in the West and almost completely triumphant (through economic imperialism) throughout the rest of the world" (McGowan, 1991, p. 13). This universal principle is captured in grand narratives or metadiscourses. For Laclau (1988),

> If something has characterized the discourses of modernity, it is their pretension to intellectually dominate the foundation of the social, to give a rational context to the notion of the totality of history, and to base in the latter the project of a global human emancipation. As such, they have been discourses about essences and fully present identities based in one way or another upon the myth of a transparent society. (pp. 71-2)

***Postmodernity (ism)***

While there is no agreed upon meaning for this term, a survey of how theorists either refer to, critique or utilize it in discourse is illuminating. Essentially anti-foundationalist in its critique, the term postmodernity (ism) has been the subject of different ideological appropriations and marked by a wide variety of interpretations. It is committed to the transformation of the existing Western social order, and in so doing, generally adheres to the following concepts: a challenge to the ideas of grand narrative, historical inevitability, Euro-centrism, dualism and the "death of the subject". Postmodernism also recognizes the significance of local politics as sites of political resistance, and actively celebrates difference (Payne, 1999, p. 428).

McGowan (1991) sees the four most prominent variants of postmodernism as post-structuralism, the new Marxism, neopragmatism and feminism (p. ix). Queer theory and post-colonialism are also burgeoning theoretical fields within/out the academy. He also believes that postmodernism "…refers to a distinct shift in the way that humanistic intellectuals view the relation of their cultural work to society at large" (p. 1). For Laclau (1988), postmodernism calls into question the ontological status of the central concepts of the various discourses of modernity (pp. 71-2). Some critics view postmodernism's loss of faith in absolute facts and universal values as a most unfortunate circumstance while others like Giroux (1990) celebrate its rejection of the "totalizing theories of Marxism, Hegelianism, Christianity and any other philosophy based on notions of causality and all-encompassing global resolutions regarding human destiny" (p. 17).

***Praxis***

From the Greek *prasso*, meaning "doing" or "acting", praxis refers to the theory-practice relationship and the tensions associated with "doing science". Praxis, by nature, is reflexive, interpretive and potentially liberatory. It represents a dialectical view of knowledge, where theory and practice are commensurably linked to how we *know* the world and what we do with *how we know*. There is a sense that praxis is ongoing, iterative practice between dialogue and action.

It potentially engages issues of sexuality, identity, difference, agency, voice and pedagogy. It is politically grounded and seeks to undermine the traditional dualism between theory and practice. "The consequent philosophical task becomes that of

understanding human thought and action against the backdrop of the everyday communicative endeavors, habits and skills, and social practices that make up our inheritance in the world" (Audi, 1999, p. 731). Mayo (1993) suggests not all forms of praxis lead to emancipation or resistance. There is a need to link the classroom context with a form or possibility of social movement, or else, left in isolation, liberatory education leads to a form of "intellectual praxis" as opposed to "revolutionary praxis" (p. 15).

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

## Dedication

To my mother, Dawn, with all my love.

My mother's home
A trusting place
A secure place

A place of refuge and of salvation
A place where I understand the world and
Where I fit within its fold
Like fresh rain 'pon dry groun'

Returning to my roots
If there is or can ever be such a thing
Feels most special
Yet at times most unremarkable
Like fresh rain 'pon dry groun'

I know not how to put this into words
For why should they be so placed
I gravitate to her feeling
Like fresh rain 'pon dry groun'

She smells and I breathe her in
My mother's home
Like fresh rain 'pon dry groun'

To Mary Ann, my mum' away from home.

To Sue, my mentor and friend.

To Jean, my compatriot-in-arms.

To Robyn and Catherine, the two most beautiful godchildren in the world – how I adore you both.

This performance is *for* all the *great* women in my life. As a feminist, I am always surrounded by them, deeply embedded within their love and continually flourishing underneath their flame. It has been a long struggle in order to get these words onto the pages even though the message they carry has been as fundamental to who I am as where I come from.

## Chapter One: Introduction

> …we can think of postmodern social theories as revising the "politics" of inclusion/exclusion. While recognizing that our social world involves an unequal playing field, social theories pay attention to the principles generated that qualify or disqualify individuals for participation and action.…*Choice* assumes erroneously that the available distinctions are equally available for all people in all social circumstances. (Popkewitz, 1999, p. 31)

### *To In(corp)orate*

As teachers, we are all physical educators.

I know this to be true because we all use our bodies in different ways to communicate how it is we come to know the world to those around us who would hear.

I know this to be true because none of us can impart knowledge to others without implicating our own bodies in the process along with the bodies of those who receive that knowledge.

I know this to be true because, on a daily basis, we deal with bodies of knowledge that prescribe and proscribe particular notions about our knowledge of particular bodies.

I know this to be true because we believe that our work with people *moves* them, in emotional, physical, spiritual…and, of course, intellectual ways.

I know this to be true because the interaction and experiences that come from the work we perform moves us ourselves.

I know this to be true because I call the work of education dirty, arduous, draining, liberating, soulful, inspiring, breath-taking, to name just a few…

This is language full of physical sensations. This is language which moves us to: rise from our beds when we are too tired so as to be at school earlier than our keenest students; to situate ourselves in positions of discomfort in order to make a difference; to work on other people's behalf, often when they have not asked or seen the need for us to do so; to go the proverbial distance, often at huge financial and personal cost to ourselves. This is language borne of a belief in the integrity and worth of each person whose lives we touch and whose lives they in turn might affect.

As teachers, we are all educators in, of and through the physical.

So, what does my knowing this mean? What does my knowing this foreclose? What does it disallow? Where is the space to be uncertain? Where is the space for movement – the space for shifting embodiment - a cherished belief so embedded within my praxis that there must always be room for it, room to maneuver? The issues and tensions I have just raised encompass more than can be addressed within the scope of this work but they are, nonetheless, unrelentingly present as I *perform* this study of critical pedagogy as physical education.

To be (un)certain, I have heard and witnessed several possible reasons as to why all educators don't view themselves as physical educators. The first rationale (which I admit always raises a silent chuckle in me) is most probably accorded to a common, yet misguided notion, that physical education is the stuff of sport, athletics and recreation. It's what those people are doing out there in the field, in the gymnasium, on the court. It's about increasing your fitness level or learning to hit a proper forehand. After all, there are different kinds of teachers engaged in different kinds of performance…or are we? Another common justification for this disjuncture is that concerns about the body or about issues of embodiment in the classroom and within pedagogical practices are risky as well as messy; in fact, many a teacher would consider it ideal or best if they could leave their bodies and those of their students outside of the classroom. Yet another troubling conversation I often overhear or experience in my own faculty of "education" is the following: "It's not really education, or at least not the type of education we need concern ourselves with. It doesn't necessarily apply to what we are doing here, in this building, in this faculty. After all, it's extra-curricular".

By extension, physical education and the body can be disregarded, denounced and ignored – and yes, even *disciplined*! How do I come to know this? I know this because I have experienced this time and again. It surfaces in conversations with colleagues as we go about our days as academics amidst the stress and (un)health that marks daily practice. It surfaces in the polarization of the student body against the funding of new, and much needed, athletic facilities. The errors implicit in these disavowals of physical education, which is to say, the body, proliferate throughout the everyday lived experiences of graduate studies.

***To Notice***

So begins my thesis project: shifting the gaze in higher education so as to question the importance of physical education to critical theory. I should indicate clearly that the performance[2] that you are about to read is not centered around the original question I had intended to investigate. I was interested in undertaking a genealogical approach to the professionalization of Faculties of Physical Education. In some ways, that question was not even very interesting to consider. The conversation seemed so obvious to me that I was sure it must have been written up and theorized elsewhere, unbeknownst to me. Having prepared a fairly detailed and somewhat ambitious outline for my supervisor about MY project, I was quite disheartened to hear her say, and here I paraphrase: "That's great! I agree. I'm so with you. But let me ask you this, …Why should higher education as a field of study, and the academics who theorize within it, pay attention to physical education? Of what importance is sport to critical theory?"

The ground, in which I am always firmly planted, seemed to just fall away – no, to actually erode from beneath me. We had somehow shifted from a friendly yet challenging rally (of ideas and suggestions); for some reason I perceived her to be on the attack and I seemed to be retreating. That's ok, I said to myself as I picked myself up and prepared to break serve, (for the easiest time to break is after you have just been broken[3]; it's usually when your opponent is either overly confident or too relaxed). The only problem, or at least the one that troubled me most, was that my supervisor wasn't competing. And truth be told, neither was I.

Months passed, and each day I renewed her challenge. I asked myself time and again, "What is it that I am interested in as a physical educator?" To be certain, I have always been interested in fostering emancipatory spaces that support the development of individuals as critical citizens. I have always been attracted to the "queering" (Britzman, 1995; Bryson & de Castell, 1993; Zuckerman, 2001) of knowledge as well as of the

---

[2] Considering my background in sport, as an athlete and as a professional coach, writing is not the physical type of performance I am used to or well "schooled" in; this point will be taken up throughout the thesis.

[3] In tennis, "breaking serve" refers to winning a game when your opponent is serving; 'to be broken" is its complement – that is, to lose the game when you are delivering the serve.

spaces in which knowledge is produced, institutionalized and disseminated, even before I knew what "queering" was about. I have enjoyed making the commonsense problematic and the problematic commonsense, and I have lived for the connections and connectedness associated with teaching and coalition building.

Above all else, I know that as a physical educator I have always been interested in ethical practice – which I believed to be about taking seriously how what I did affected those to whom and with whom I did it. My work has always had an ethical dimension; I spoke about it in staff meetings, I argued about it with parents of athletes I trained and I thought about it as I sat watching tennis match after tennis match, weekend after weekend.

I also know that as a fledging feminist then, and as a graduate student now, I can articulate that I am, and always have been, interested in the epistemological dimension(s) of my work. In fact, through my experiences in higher education, I presently realize that, as I move from classroom to classroom, from lecture to casual coffee shop conversation, from locker room to dinner settings, I have always been engaged in critical pedagogy. I just never knew it as such. I could not have named it intellectually nor could I have identified it as a formal system of knowledge within(out) which I could recognize or (re)locate myself and my practices .

The process of arriving just before the commencement of my ten-minute default warning (an impending thesis deadline) - which of course is no way to approach your matches - has been personally unsettling. That the journey into critical pedagogy involved an alienation of me from my own body, in essence a self-policing of my own skin, is telling and problematic. The main substance of my thesis will exhibit a reaffirmation of my location as a physical educator doing critical pedagogy, both within and outside the academy. The question that superceded my original concern is now the question that is addressed by the performance of this thesis: "What must I "do" to put my body (physical education) into critical pedagogy?"

Below, I speak about the work that is accomplished in each of the following thesis chapters. Each one examines a particular aspect of the journey I undertook in order to respond to my supervisor’s question. What has changed since the time of that challenge is my awareness of the importance of her challenge and also my acceptance of the necessity

to mount a serious, and embodied, reply. The personal shift has been difficult and problematic and I do not claim at any point to have arrived, but only to be in a different place from which to reflect on my practices and, as well, this thing called critical pedagogy.

## *Mapping My Journey…and being mapped in return*

### *Chapter two summary*

In Chapter Two, I introduce and define critical pedagogy and discuss its location in relation to critical theory. I demonstrate its development and growth in terms of quantity and diversity, within both the academic literature in higher education and sets of practices within educational settings (such as within the realm of a graduate department of education and in the context of sport coaching). I then examine a specific terrain within the literature identified by its central proponents: Henry A. Giroux (1990; 1992) and Peter McLaren (1988; 1996). I represent the Giroux/McLaren discourse as a "critical pedagogy empire" and offer an account of their work that draws upon their own self-portraits, portrayals generated by secondary literature and consideration of the critical pedagogy discourses marginalized by their exclusion from the "empire". I pay special attention to the limitations and closures these "choices" entail.

Once the particular vision of these critical theorists is established, I centre the discussion on my journey in graduate studies through which I come to understand my particular "absent presence" within the Giroux/McLaren discourse of critical pedagogy. Although I consider several other critiques that emphasize the lack of attention to, or erasure of, the physical body in the language and practice of the "critical pedagogy empire", of ultimate importance to this exposition is the following: What must I, as a critical pedagogue, do in order to get to the point where, I can consider the physical as well as the linguistically ideal body?

This question is of concern for two interrelated yet distinct reasons. First, I am interested, as is Lather (1991), with the mind/body dualism reinforced in the literature as a result of the ontological framing of emancipation as a problem of knowledge. Second, I am troubled by language, largely postmodern, that speaks about the body and a set of practices performed/imposed on the body without considering the effects of these

practices on particular bodies, including those of the theorists themselves. To facilitate an extended discussion of my journey, I introduce the work of Elizabeth Ellsworth, whose paradigm shaking article, *Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering?: Working Through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy* allows me to focus on questions of where the physical, material, fleshy body is located and theorized in critical pedagogy. The Ellsworth piece is particularly useful for the purposes of this chapter because of the discourse it spawned, including a response by Giroux (1988) and McLaren (1988) and a rejoinder by Lather (1991).

Finally, I conclude the chapter with a summary of the issues generated by consideration of the body and foreshadow how these will be addressed throughout this thesis from three perspectives: the body (1) as a site of teaching and learning, (2) as a site of healing and caring and (3) as a site of resistance.

***Chapter three summary***

In Chapter Three, I locate my position[4] within the cultural, political and social space of Toronto, Ontario, most specifically by examining my experiences in postsecondary education and in sport. I address my personal location as the author and frame specific dilemmas encounter(ed) with producing narrative and reflexivity in the performance of this thesis. Using standpoint epistemology (Harding, 1998), I discuss and problematize the material conditions from which I undertake this commentary and the question of identity politics versus a politics of identity.

In the second section of the chapter, I interrogate my professional experiences as a critical pedagogue within the academy and in the world of professional sport coaching. This examination positions my specific body within sites (both traditional and non-traditional) where critical pedagogy is enacted and potentially embodied. Specifically, I am concerned that without the material, fleshy, body, and without theoretical and pedagogical practices that are ethically connected to these particular material bodies, critical pedagogy, as a form (or possible incarnation) of critical theory, may not only be politically sterile but also potentially harmful.

---

[4] I make use of Anzaldua's (1989) term which not only stakes a specific historical and social position but also suggests elements of transgression (i.e., borderlands) - which she connects to the necessity of naming her physical embodiment as a survival mechanism.

In part three, I continue this interrogation of the body as curriculum by examining my experiences as a graduate student. I explore my exposure to learning and "doing" feminism and the tyranny of reading practices, both of which facilitate an investigation of the connection between theory in the academy and my coaching/teaching praxis. From this discussion, I revisit my professional life as a sport coach to investigate practices associated with developing athletes and professional coaches. Once again, these examples are framed in accordance with the categories: my body (1) as a site of learning and teaching, (2) as a site of caring and healing and (3) as a site of resistance. For me, the body is not abstract; it is the surface upon which I invest the materiality of everyday life. Ultimately, this chapter revisits the central thesis question, "What must I do to put my body (physical education) into critical pedagogy?" It articulates a personal recognition of an absent presence (Shillings, 1983) of my own body in the literature and the ways in which I have had to (re)insert/(re)assert my particular body within the discourse of critical pedagogy.

***Chapter four summary***

In the concluding chapter of my thesis, I return to the question of an embodied critical pedagogy, and summarize how the epistemological and ontological, the material, physical body is made present. I reinforce the preceding chapters' issue that emerges as engagement with ethical and practical considerations of pedagogical empowerment. I outline certain conflicting principles and productive tensions which presently trouble, engage and are pertinent to educators working with these concerns. I then suggest key areas of research in queer theory and anti-racist, anti-oppressive education that examine these problematics. At this point I have traveled a long way to answer a challenge set out originally by my supervisor; that of, "Why should higher education pay attention to physical education?" I believe I have responded well enough to engage in the next series of questions which address the issues surrounding professionalization, disciplines and boundaries, and whether Faculties of Physical Education should be more closely linked to Faculties of Education. Stay tuned!

### *A digression*

The following two conversations represent pieces of layered reflection and introspection. They have been profoundly difficult to articulate. While they may seem out of place to you, the reader, they are for me, the author - and the performer - of vital importance to communicate. And yet I concede that even in my best attempt at communication, I will possibly have missed the essence of what distresses me and the reasons it has the effects on me that it does. I also want to articulate the shifts that taking this thesis seriously have required of me. There are shifts in thinking about how I reflect and what I choose to reflect on; essentially, these shifts in some way represent what I have privileged and by doing so, taken seriously.

There are shifts in thinking about the authenticity with which I communicate about my contemplation. There are shifts in how I describe my journey and recount when and where I become aware of what and whom. Most importantly, there have been shifts in how I talk and feel about my relationship with my supervisor – what has been said between us and what can be said to have been "overstood" (Sykes, 2001). In what follows I will speak about my relationship with my supervisor as well as my self (re)presentation in hindsight. Before I engage in these two discussions, I would first like to address your "reading" of my thesis.

### *The serious reader ought to…*[5]

Whereas in Chapters Two and Three I discuss the politics of referencing and citational practices (Magnusson, 1999) as well as concerns about the audience (Wartenberg, 1998), at this juncture there are significant pieces of that conversation that I would like to consider and expand upon. I would like to contend with my overall sensitivity to authorial location and the possible communities that I address in my writing. I would also like to address the presentation of my selves in hindsight and try to pay attention to the other selves that are not noticed. These developments have been a direct result of daily conversations with a committee member, her comments on drafts of individual chapters, as well as her suggestions for readings, even at this late stage in

[5] Taken from a discussion in Shogan's (1993) reflection of the teaching of feminist ethics.

thesis production. They are important because they layer my awareness both during the performance of the chapters and in reflection upon them. Though it will be obvious to some, frustrating to others, and unimportant to a few, my claims to identity are coupled with my attempts to over and underlay the performance that is my thesis with the more intricate and gross journeys I have undertaken. Most performances are constrained, and this particular performance is no different. Throughout this performance, you will be aware of my movement within(out) certain specific subject positions as well as my analysis from specific standpoints.

One particular reading with which I whole-heartedly resonate is Shogan's (1993) discussion about writing and authorial responsibility entitled, *"Doing" Feminist Ethics in a Feminist Ethics Seminar*. In this piece, Shogan speaks about the importance of "engaging with authors of texts and scrutinizing one's relations both intimate and otherwise outside the seminar while being sensitive to interactions with those in the seminar" (p. 445). I think in many ways this responds to my concern about choosing to highlight the relationship between myself and my supervisor at the expense of more close scrutiny of the relationship with my colleagues; as well, it deals with the various influences on my reading and re-reading, on my "rewriting as I read" (p. 445). Shogan also speaks to the use of layers within the text (e.g., footnotes, prefaces, etc.). While on the one hand, they permit the author to "respect differences among readers" (p. 445), on the other hand, they may actually force a particular kind of reading or direct the reader in certain directions which "actually foreclose on differences" (p. 445). I am concerned about this tension because my use of text, subtext and footnotes, along with reflective passages and sections of previous work are done with the intention of highlighting two important factors: (1) the journey in "doing" critical pedagogy and "becoming" a critical pedagogue and (2) the necessity to leave often visibly flawed language or careless representations juxtaposed against a "growing awareness" so as to reveal authenticity in my own learning and reflective practices. Perhaps what is most powerful for me is Shogan's discussion about the author's ethical responsibility in "written interaction" (p. 441). By this, I understand her concern with the tension between the author's attention to her reading community as well as her need to make obvious her interests (political and

otherwise) since she is not speaking, and never does speak, to a non-existent a-characteristic audience. I hope for the following:

> Personal transformation of theory by readers is, then, another way that feminist ethics is reflexive. A *serious reader* of a text of feminist ethics will be, or will want to be, aware of her political position relative to the author of the piece….A serious reader of feminist ethics is involved in a process of self-reference. (emphasis added, p. 433)

Anyone who has written a thesis understands the limitations[6] that are placed on the writer in terms of style, content and form. The limitations act so as to produce a certain type of knowledge, which is then taken up in certain ways. I hope the reader is able to introduce layers to the text that I myself was not aware of at the time of its writing, whether consciously or otherwise.

***My friend and colleague***

To be obvious, for sometimes the obvious must be uttered, the working relationship between a graduate student and his/her supervisor (as well as other professors) is multi-layered and complex. My relationship with my supervisor is no exception. Ours is complex, giving and frustrating; dynamic, engaging and at times overwhelming. It has never been contained within the boundaries of student/teacher; and I can't remember a time when either of us tried to squeeze it into that box. I cannot speak for her reasons and motivations, only for my own. I cannot reflect on her desires, only on my own. I cannot know her intentions, only try to come to grips with what mine have been.

Above, I spoke of a series of discussions with my second committee member. One of the issues discussed at some length was the relationship with my supervisor. Specifically, I wanted to be able to reflect her work as a feminist within the academy while being sensitive both to our relationship, to her project and to the relations/limitations within which we are all embedded. Foucault (1980) asserts: "Power is always there. One is never outside it; there are no margins for those who break with the

---

[6] Truth be known, I have never come across anyone who "understands" the limitations/prescriptions imposed upon thesis production, other than to articulate its purpose in terms of some archaic rite of passage to professional academic life.

system" (p. 141). Shogan (1993) remarkably brings this into focus for me in her conversation about "doing" feminist ethics. She affirms,

> …appreciating that many of our behaviors as women living in oppressive communities have been cultivated as survival techniques and realizing that to blame any women for this is to contribute to her oppression. (p. 445)

To keep this "present in mind"/"presence of mind" was a source of frustration as well as anxiety. How does one engage with one's supervisor in a dialogue about supervisory relationships given the structural power dynamics embedded within that relationship? How does one locate this dialogue within a piece of academic writing that names both people? How do both parties shelter their egos? How can the boundaries of trust and mutual respect be upheld? In these last days leading up to my thesis deadline, our relationship has been strained on many levels. For my part, although this thesis has been long in the coming, I suppose I have been performing it all my life. And this performance has been problematic. Above, I discussed Shogan's particular notion of written interaction. In this particular case, my concern and anxiety stemmed from the sensitivity to speaking to or reinforcing differences of power between myself and my supervisor, with both of us performing as feminists in the academy. Then, as I was reading a paper of which my other committee member was a co-author, I came across a line that seemed to clarify my intentions as well as free me from the (w)hole I had dug for myself. Ford (1998) notes: "I locate this thesis and my work within the moral community of our friendship" (p. 445).

At this point, I want to acknowledge my supervisor's integrity, both personal and political; her respectful collaboration; her tremendous insights; her guidance in navigating graduate life; and her unquestionable support. She has been, and continues to be an inspiration.

Perhaps the place to start this is to first consider why my supervisor's question engaged me so powerfully. Was it the question or the questioner? Why is it that she is so important to me in this work? What was it about the importance of her challenge that made it necessary to mount a response? I suppose that I was on a journey of desires and resistances that set me up to respond to her as someone who could both irritate as well as challenge me. It is a moment of arrival as well as of departure.

We are all in places of constant contradiction, always challenged to make choices which pit equally important values, beliefs and practices against one another. Butler (1993) speaks of performativity as more than a singular, deliberate act but rather a reiterative and citational practice. Sedgewick (1990) notes that the epistemology of silence is one that accrues particularity by fits and starts. Perhaps our relationship can be characterized in the same spirit. We will continue to go about creating and taking advantage of the existence of such counter-discursive practices across sites of semiotic production, which I believe to be a vital ingredient in helping to coalesce particular groups of people into expressions of identity and solidarity required for specific struggles for equality and possibility.

## Chapter Two: Where is the Body in Critical Pedagogy?

### *Introduction*

In this chapter I introduce critical pedagogy as a line of inquiry within higher education literature. I demonstrate its development and growth, in terms of quantity and diversity, within both the academic literature and sets of practices in educational settings. I also establish a specific terrain within the literature (Giroux; McLaren), paying special attention to the limitations and closures these "choices" entail. I then explore key claims and assertions related to critical pedagogy and highlight some of the self-identified problems, issues and dilemmas that this particular literature addresses. Once the particular vision of these critical theorists is established, I then investigate the absent presence (Shilling, 1993)[7] of the material, physical body from this literature and its concepts, and discuss key departures from critical theory. Specifically, I am concerned that in the absence of the material, fleshy body, and without theoretical and pedagogical considerations that are ethically connected to these particular material bodies, critical pedagogy, as a form (and possible incarnation) of critical theory, may not only be politically sterile but also practically harmful (Mohanty, 1994).

I proceed by centering the discussion on specific critiques that emphasize the lack of attention to, or erasure of, the physical body in the language and practice of critical pedagogy, as these theorists have outlined and envisioned it. Of ultimate importance to this exposition is the following: What must I do to put my body (physical education) into critical pedagogy? My interest in this question is motivated by two interrelated yet distinct reasons. First, I am interested, as is Lather (1991), with the mind/body dualism reinforced in the literature as a result of ontologically framing emancipation as a problem of knowledge. Second, I am troubled by language, largely postmodern, which speaks about the body and a set of practices performed/imposed on the body without considering

[7] The notion that persists throughout Shilling's works is that although the body is always present as an object of analysis (e.g., Durkheim and suicide), there is an absence of dealing with (theorizing about) a specific, material and fleshy body within social theory. For example, a current manifestation of the same issue is Namaste's (2000) critique of Butler (1993)for not having considered the material and lived consequences of transgendered and transsexual peoples.

the effects of these practices on particular bodies, including those of the theorists themselves. A discussion focussing on where the physical, material, fleshy body is located and theorized in these texts will conclude this chapter and foreshadow how issues of the body will be considered in the following chapter from three perspectives: (1) as a site of teaching and learning, (2) as a site of healing and caring and (3) as a site of resistance.

### *(In)definite*

The very notion of defining a concept erases or dismisses certain possibilities. It may either "unqueer"[8] it or legitimize its abstraction. I agree with Lather (1991) who suggests that "Any effort at definition domesticates, analytically fixes, and mobilizes pro and contra positions" (p. 5). In what follows, I attempt to capture a semblance of the possibilities that are attached to the meaning and application of the term critical pedagogy. To accomplish this, I begin by investigating more generally how each term is deployed, and then address the applications (and connotations) that their "use in combination"[9] brings to mind. I then outline a specific conception and usage of the term, which will appear throughout the thesis, treating its foreclosure genealogically.

The term *critical*, as used in educational theory brings to mind an attachment to, derivation of, or departure from, critical theory. When considering its colloquial, and by this I mean its everyday conversational use[10], critical encompasses varying notions. To be critical is: (1) to look for or point out faults, (2) to express criticism such as the art of making judgements on literature, (3) to be decisive, crucial or a turning point, perhaps even relating to death or (4) to be characterized by risk or uncertainty[11]. Interestingly

---

[8] By this, I mean to fix its location or identity within particular Western-centric meaning making binaries.

[9] In figure skating, jumps are given a higher value when done in combination. Generally, the more difficult jump is executed first in the sequence. Queer theory attempts to rescue the latter term, pedagogy, by drawing specific reflection about the "…wishful assumptions about what pedagogy is and what pedagogy can do" (Luhmann, 1998, p. 147).

[10] One of the critiques levelled against critical pedagogy literature is its inaccessibility in terms of academic terminology. I am interested in interrupting/resisting this process.

[11] Merriam-Webster Online (2003).

enough, when used in conjunction with another word (as in the present case)[12], critical adds a measure of significance and implied power such as: (1) the quickest or most efficient order as in "critical path" or (2) being in or approaching a state of crisis, as in a "critical shortage". A meaningful denotation of the term, is: "…of or relating to the judgement of critics…exercising or involving careful judgement or judicious evaluation…including variant readings and scholarly emendations"[13]. Employing the word implies that not only those who speak from this perspective are worthy of speaking (i.e., viewed as an authority) but also that this ascribed expertise further authorizes their being in the "know"[14] and their right to define and police its borders. I will weave this notion of the "staking the territory" of critical pedagogy throughout the rest of the chapter.

The term *pedagogy* refers to "the art, science, or profession of teaching"[15]. Simply put, it is the "how to" of teaching. Although commonly used to reference teaching across all contexts, pedagogy actually pertains to the teaching of children, while androgogy is the correct term used for teaching in postsecondary contexts. For the purposes of this argument, pedagogy will be used as a blanket term to encompass teaching of all ages and in all contexts. General usage of the term encompasses teaching methods or knowledge transmission strategies such as (1) how learning tasks are designed and (2) how teachers and students participate together in the learning process. "Pedagogy, when attached to signifiers such as *feminist, anti-racist, radical*, or *anti-homophobic*, is critical of mainstream education as a site for the reproduction of unequal power relations" (Luhmann, 1998, p. 142). Thus, pedagogy assumes an active role, as opposed to its passive voice when used with the term critical. For instance, Luhmann (1998) expresses concern with the linking of the term queer with pedagogy (i.e., queer pedagogy). She notes:

---

[12] In this case, the word critical is a modifier (an adjective).
[13] Merriam-Webster Online (2003).
[14] Since language is defined through difference or in reference to an "other", I rummaged through my always handy thesaurus for both related and dissimilar words. "Cursory", "shallow" or "superficial" are adjectives that contrast with the term critical whereas "discerning" and "penetrating" are given as related words.
[15] Merriam-Webster Online (2003).

> …both terms are under threat from their earlier reputations, and they share the common fate of reduction – of being rendered superfluous, and not taken seriously…even teachers dedicated to critical pedagogy when speaking about their pedagogy might refer to little else than their teaching style, their classroom conduct, or their preferred teaching methods. (p. 142)

Although not the main point of discussion at this time, it is worth noting the use of the term in similar academic combinations (contexts) such as transformative and emancipatory - which potentially have similar considerations as in the case of queer .

### *A Question of Centrality*

A central use of the term critical pedagogy is found in Henry A. Giroux's (1983) *Theory and Resistance in Education*[16]. At the very least, any examination of U.S.-centric "mainstream" emancipatory education literature confirms that he has secured top billing[17] and continues to territorialize[18] the terrain[19]. Giroux, and colleagues Peter McLaren and Roger Simon[20], with whom he has co-authored numerous publications, have successfully

---

[16] Giroux's centrality is continuously asserted and reinforced in the literature. A category search of the Social Sciences Citation Index (from 1980 to present) reveals countless thousands of entries in each year and for each of his publications. It could be said that centrality begets authority; continuous citation begets continuous citation. In a parallel discussion by Readings (1996), the discourse of excellence is examined for its self-referential imperialism; after all, no one would argue with wanting to be excellent. Not only does excellence lack of content; it is also equally transferable across sites and contexts. As a case in point, Maclean's, for the past eleven years, has ranked Canadian universities, basing 20% of its ranking on reputation, which naturally improves in proportion to achieving a higher ranking (Maclean's, 2002).

[17] He has authored/co-authored in excess of 20 books and 200 journal articles.

[18] Pronger (1998) "plays" with the notion of territory and space, suggesting a reflexivity necessary for males, if they are to move towards feminist consciousness/praxis.

[19] An example of this is a recent book by Darder, Baltodano and Torres (2003) *The Critical Pedagogy Reader*, which pays homage to exactly this type of historical representation of critical pedagogy; in addition, the contributors, although dealing with the "operationalizing" of critical pedagogy, still use as their springboard Giroux and McLaren. On the back cover, a testimonial given by author Jean Anyon states: "The editors pull together *classics* from the history of critical pedagogy, and *freshen them up* with insightful commentary and lists of questions for discussion. This is a collection of *the best work in the field*, and should introduce a new generation of students and teachers to the powerful messages of critical pedagogy scholarship" (emphasis added).

[20] Simon's (1992) *Teaching Against the Grain*, shared much concern with the call for cultural workers to take seriously a "pedagogy of possibility". For the purposes of this

created what I will refer to from this point forward, as a "critical pedagogy empire". This empire will be of importance later in my discussion. At this moment, I will backtrack slightly in order to address my rationale for choosing these particular theorists as "the chief architects" of critical pedagogy as opposed to defining the field in any other number of manners. This genealogical exposition highlights both my personal entrance-way into the field as well as a striking point of departure. Next, I will sketch broad conceptions of critical pedagogy with which most adherents are in general agreement. This will be contrasted with Giroux and McLarens' particular "brand"[21] of critical pedagogy and their specific mapping of the concept.

***Critical Pedagogy Anyone?***

There are numerous critical pedagogies, several in mainstream educational literature, and many others operating on the margins and in the trenches[22]. I have and will continue to reference them within the body of this work. However, the specific manner with which I assert the dominance of a particular brand of critical pedagogy, namely Giroux et. al., is informed by certain personal experiences in the academy as well as other specific choices that relate to my professional practice. In other words, I have chosen this particular brand as both a point of critique and departure. So why these authors? Why this terrain? In my selectivity, what am I (and can I be aware) of missing by virtue of not noticing (and can I com to awareness of the gaps in hindsight)? In response to these concerns, I make use of Foucault's (1983; 1986) genealogical approach as a reflective tool. To be clear, I am not "doing" a genealogy, though some starting points for future

---

chapter, I consider Giroux and McLaren, since Simon has shifted the focus of his work - which I find more embodied, and his position as an academic more clearly articulated. I will return in Chapter Three to several of his earlier concepts, such as "pedagogy of possibility".

[21] The notion of intellectual property is legally grounded in patent legislation. Elsewhere I argue that patent laws reward individual innovative efforts, whereas collective efforts, representative of communal knowledge, are treated as "prior art" and therefore not patentable (Phillips, 2003).

[22] There is irony is the juxtaposition between "being and doing" critical and yet having some forms of this enactment as "marginal or invisible" instead of "in the mainstream".

projects may arise from this discussion; rather, I feel ethically obliged to account for my choices and (de)limitations.

So what constitutes a genealogical approach? "Genealogy introduces the problem of how, by becoming constituted as subjects, we come to be subjected within particular configurations" (Tamboukou, 1999, p. 208). It is a Nitzschean phenomenon to the extent that it refuses to separate truth from the procedures of its production. It suggests that an examination of events or statements can reveal an environment wherein certain things can be said and others things not. In fact, by examining those statements that cannot be uttered or actualised, a possible sense emerges of how a particular concept appears or is shaped. Although Foucault's intention is not to delineate a specific methodology or blueprint for undertaking a genealogy[23], it is intentional and shaped by an investigation into the emergence of surfaces and sites that demarcate "conditions of possibility".

By genealogy, I have the following understanding. First and foremost, genealogy is clearly a political critique (Tamboukou & Ball, 2001, p. 5). Although the initial impetus to investigate the work of these particular theorists arose out of continual exposure to their writings in graduate course curriculum, my departure from their terrain is inextricably tied to my inability to "see" my particular, situated body in their descriptions and to "feel" my particular, situated experiences in their prescriptions for pedagogical practice. Second, genealogy is a way of criticizing the present by reflecting upon the ways that discursive practices of the past continue to affect the constitution of the present. My exploration into feminist as well as queer theory opened the possibility not only of a different orientation to this "thing" called critical pedagogy, but also illustrated the existence and necessity of counter-hegemonic space even with the most critical of theories. The politics of publication, the gamesmanship of citational practices (Magnusson, 1999) and the possibility of staking a different claim will be explored in the critiques of these theorists below.

---

[23] This is not to suggest that reflecting in a genealogical manner is without rhyme or reason; "…the genealogical method has its internal rules of performance despite the fact that there is no blueprint about procedure. Procedure is very much a matter of knowing what would be inappropriate given the epistemological and ontological assumptions being made by Foucauldian scholars" (Meadmore, Hatcher, & McWilliams, 2000, p. 466).

***"Essentially" critical pedagogy***

Certainly, there is consensus as to the "lack" of any monolithic, homogeneous approach to the category of critical pedagogy. There is a proliferation of discourses of emancipatory education[24]. This being the case, as diverse as its adherents, there are common elements to most incarnations of critical pedagogy as well as specific points of departure[25]. For example, depending on the situatedness of any particular brand of critical pedagogy, it is both modern and postmodern to varying degrees and depending on the stakes it claims. It is modern because it clings to enlightenment ideals such as rationality and the capacity of agents to think critically; it is postmodern because of its refusal of grand narratives, universal representation and the notion of a transcendental subject.

More generally, critical pedagogy applies a critical perspective to the practice of teaching, challenging educational workers (e.g., theorists and practitioners) to examine our teaching practices. It takes as its central concern the issue of power in the teaching and learning context. At its core lies the desire to transform critical thought into emancipatory action. In other words, theory that is critical in nature seeks to empower the "powerless"[26] and transform existing social inequalities and injustices. Critical pedagogy provides support mechanisms and tools for advocacy - it is interested in the emancipation of the economically disenfranchised and the culturally marginalized. By exposing the supposed neutrality by which knowledge/power sustains asymmetrical relations[27], thereby maintaining and reinscribing multiple and intersecting oppressions, critical pedagogy provides a framework and a lens for "others" to challenge the historicity (and

---

[24] For example, queer theory (Britzman, 1995; Bryson & de Castell, 1993; McWilliams, 2000; Pinar, 1998); anti-racism (Dei, 1999; Mohanty, 1997; Razack, 1995); post-colonialism (Brah, 1996; McClintock, 1994); and feminism (Dewar, 1996; Gore, 1990; hooks, 1990). These are mainstream in their own right and have specific audiences within which they address and circulate.

[25] I readily admit the difficulty of teasing out generalities from the overwhelmingly situated U.S. radical educational history that delineates not only the emergence of the concept but its specific conditions of possibility. I have not encountered a discourse that either negates or revisions these surfaces of emergence.

[26] I firmly recognize that no one is "powerless". I wish to maintain a sense of the following: (1) the existence and bounds of agency and (2) the necessity to facilitate so that others may "speak" or "act" for themselves.

[27] By focusing on how and in whose interests knowledge is produced and circulated (i.e., disseminated, passed on,…).

situatedness) of knowledge, thereby exposing the existence/duality/tenuousness of conditions which are oppressive and yet, at the same time, potentially transformative.

A more concrete articulation of critical pedagogy, which will serve to introduce Giroux and his critical pedagogy empire, is the following: (1) education is not, and has never been, neutral, (2) transformation within society can be brought about by raising critical consciousness and (3) praxis connects liberatory education with social transformation. "Pedagogy in the critical sense illuminates the relationship among knowledge, authority and power" (Giroux, 1994, p. 30). In other words, there is no *tabula rasa* upon which some mythical, disinterested teacher inscribes apolitical, unsituated, "objective" knowledge.

***To be more specific: Introducing Mr. Henry A. Giroux***

Giroux has arduously labored in the field of education, exploring and broadening our understanding of the relationship between education (schooling)[28], citizenship and human possibility. In what follows, I address specific themes that best illustrate his philosophy of and approach to critical pedagogy. To this end, I weave his specific words, derived from interviews and his publications, with external portrayals that characterize his work. I want to be sensitive not only to the messiness inherent in pedagogical praxis but also to the importance of maintaining the context within which his words are uttered[29].

Before I begin, I want to situate Giroux historically within the critical pedagogy movement in the U.S. beginning in the 1960s. To better understand his notions of critical

---

[28] Popkewitz (1997) discusses schooling that names the child as learner. "The child as learner has become so natural in the late twentieth century that it is difficult to think of children as anything else but learners; yet in the sociological sense, the 'making' of the child-as-leaner involved particular transformations in the social reasoning that we now associate with modernity…The categories of 'student' and 'pupil', for example, did not exist in the early nineteenth century when talking about schooling. The child was called a scholar…The modern child is also seen by "others" and understands him or herself as a rational, 'problem-solving' and 'developing' person" (p. 134).

[29] I want to pay special attention to McLaren's (1988, p. 72) warning and admonishment. This was incited in response to his accusation of the use of decontextualized quotes in Ellsworth's (1989) discussion of her experience "enacting" critical pedagogy in the classroom.

pedagogy, it is crucial to briefly explore the intellectual climate within curriculum discourse and educational philosophy.

> The Critical Pedagogy tradition begins from a very different starting point. It regards specific belief claims, not primarily as propositions to be assessed for their truth content, but as parts of systems of belief and action that have aggregate effects within the power structures of society. It asks first about these systems of belief and action, who benefits? The primary preoccupation of Critical Pedagogy is with social injustice and how to transform inequitable, undemocratic or oppressive institutions and social relations. (Giroux & McLaren, 1994, p. i)

Although the particular strain of critical pedagogy that Giroux and McLaren have theorized is undoubtedly Western-centric in nature and focus, its profile and orientation has been heavily shaped by the writings of Brazilian Paulo Freire (1973). Considered to be the most influential educational philosopher in the development of critical pedagogical thought and practice, Freire is insistent and persistent in his belief in the inextricable linkages between education and a socio-political life. Other influences on and contributions to Giroux's critical pedagogy include Apple (1979; 1982), Dewey (1916) and Gramsci (1994). Apple interrogated the social administration of individuals via schooling (e.g., reproduction theory); he also supported the Marxist notion of the economy as central to the maintenance and proliferation of exploitive relations. In contrast, Dewey's connection between schooling and democracy, premised on the necessity of providing a "language of possibility", provided an important stimulus for the theorizing of agency in educational settings. Lastly, Gramsci's notions about ideology as something people *inhabit* in very daily, material ways provided a backdrop against which to think about the constraining and productive aspects of culture.

"At the center of Giroux's writing and teaching lies a moral commitment to a set of democratic practices that engages all citizens[30] in common governance" (Giroux, 1992, p. 149). As problematic as notions of democracy are[31], this sentiment, which was taken

---

[30] "To call our actions as those of a 'citizen' in a 'political democracy', a 'consumer', or as part of a 'caring' culture is to place our immediate practices within the principles of abstract systems of knowledge" (Popkewitz, 1997, p. 142).

[31] By this I mean to say how people engage, theorize and conceptualize the term. As examples: (1) there are a multitude of democracies (Cunningham, 2002) and (2) liberal democratic discourse, as practiced in North America, is predicated on and through exclusionary practices.

from an interview, illustrates to some extent a proclivity towards and awareness of the necessity in building coalitions; it situates him within a particular moral community. Without a doubt, this particular thought most closely describes the potential and vision I believe that Giroux's critical pedagogy has to offer. For instance, in quoting Hartsock (1987)[32] in the following passage, he identifies with the feminist concern regarding postmodernism's decentring and death of the subject.

> Why is it exactly at the moment when so many of us who have been silenced begin to demand the right to name ourselves, to act as subjects rather than objects of history, that just then the concept of subjecthood becomes "problematic?" (p. 196)

In an effort to move beyond the overly deterministic model of reproduction theory, Giroux embraces dialectical theories whereby the individual both creates and is created, produces and is produced[33]. He is intent on reconciling modernism with postmodernism. Especially influenced by post-structuralism, he believes that critical pedagogy can draw on the best insights of both (1990, p. 9). This

> …necessitates combining the modernist emphasis on the capacity of individuals to use critical reason to address the issue of public life with a postmodernist concern with how we might experience agency in a world constituted in differences unsupported by transcendent phenomena or metaphysical guarantees. In that way, border pedagogy can reconstitute itself in terms that are both transformative and emancipatory. (Giroux, 1992, p. 29)

By adopting modernist and postmodernist theoretical applications, critical pedagogy actively transforms itself and modifies its ways.

> In order to retain a relationship between postmodern discourse and the primacy of the political, it is imperative that the notion of totality be

---

[32] As quoted in Giroux (1990, pp. 27-28).

[33] The concern with individuals as intending agents is part of the project of the Enlightenment. Popkewitz (1997) cautions against the epistemological privileging of actions, which unquestionably maintains "…the epistemological assumption that inquiry must identify the actors as causal agents who bring or suppress social change" (p. 131). He continues, "…In current discourse, words like 'empowerment', 'agency' and 'resistance' signify an historical view that invest power in the actions of people as they struggle to change their world for the better. As with reformist traditions, *a foundational assumption is that progressive change cannot occur without knowledge that first identifies the actors who will bring about or prevent that change*" (p. 137).

> embraced as a heuristic device rather than an ontological category….We need theories that express and articulate difference, but we also need to understand how the relations in which differences are constituted operate as part of a wider set of social, political and cultural practices. (Giroux, 1990, p. 19)

Throughout his work, Giroux vacillates between these tensions in an effort to develop a version of critical pedagogy that is a "border pedagogy of postmodern resistance" (Giroux, 1990, p. 34).

> *At its worst, critical pedagogy* as a form of educational criticism has been overly shaped by the discourse of modernism…some versions of critical pedagogy reduce its liberatory possibilities by focusing almost exclusively on issues of dialogue, process and exchange. In this form, critical pedagogy comes perilously close to emulating the liberal-progressive tradition in which teaching is reduced to having students merely express or assess their own experiences. In this case, teaching collapses into a banal notion of facilitation…*At its best, critical pedagogy* is developed as a cultural practice that enables teachers and others to view education as a political, social and cultural enterprise…it refuses to subordinate the purpose of schooling to narrowly defined economic and instrumental considerations. This is a notion of critical pedagogy that equates learning with the creation of critical, rather than merely good, citizens. This is a pedagogy which links schooling to the imperatives of democracy. (emphasis added, Giroux, 1990, pp. 32- 3)

In this particular vision, the school is to be viewed as a site of indoctrination or self-empowerment and therefore potentially a site and source of transformation[34]. Giroux not

---

[34] The articulation of schools as sites for critical citizenship and emancipatory education is problematic. It is also ironic that Giroux, in employing post-structuralist thought, has not reconciled or addressed these debates. Hunter (1996) for example, in *Assembling the School*, states: "Where Foucault's work has been taken up in education, it has been largely as a supplement to existing 'critical' sociological approaches. Usually it is Discipline and Punish that fills this role…pronounced in the American-based 'critical pedagogy' movement…one finds Foucault effortlessly absorbed into the progressive emancipatory project. It is precisely Foucault's criticism of the notion of emancipation that critical pedagogy absorbs into its emancipatory project; and it is his insistence on the interdependency of power and knowledge that it uses to criticize the educational 'ideologies' of capitalism, patriarchy, racism" (p. 144). Using a genealogical investigation of the school system, he argues that "…the modern school system is not the historical creation of democratic polities or of popular political struggle. Neither, on the other hand, can it be understood as the instrument through which the aspirations of rational individuals or self-realizing classes have been defeated, through the cold calculations of the State acting on behalf of an inhuman economic system"(p. 147).

only wants to "reclaim" schools as political sites, but also wants to bring public attention to the matter. In light of this positioning, forms of pedagogy that incorporate difference while simultaneously defining teachers as engaged intellectuals are central to radical political and cultural debate. I concur with this particular concern as I have parallel interests in my current work and association with a newly formed initiative at OISE/UT. This project[35] is concerned not only with the defense of "public" education but, more importantly, desires to defend what is good about public education by articulating to the broader public for whom and what public education is and can be.

Giroux also speaks at length in each of his publications about the intricacies and complexities surrounding the language of critical pedagogy[36]. When asked to comment on this specific concern in an interview on August 4, 1990, he shared the following insights.

> Many people reading pedagogical language mistakenly say that you simply have to explain it or write it in a style that is clear and uncomplicated. This position is too reductionist. Actually, we are talking about how educational paradigms begin to generate new language and raise new questions[37]. These points shouldn't be confused. We're pointing to a theory that examines how you view the very realities you engage. When people say that we write in a language that isn't as clear as it could be, while that might be true they're also responding to the unfamiliarity of a paradigm that generates questions suppressed in the dominant culture. When you discuss language, you must consider what public you are addressing. Is there one public? (Giroux, 1992, pp. 150-1)

---

[35] I am currently a graduate assistant and assistant coordinator of the Office for Public Education. This office is a joint initiative between OISE/UT and several large education and labor organizations throughout Canada.

[36] McNally (2001) critiques the prevailing tendency of social theorists to abstract language from human bodies. He asserts that "…linguistic idealism involves the subsuming of concrete entities and relations – bodies, objects, social practices – under a set of conceptual practices…to banish the body, to repress it, as the new idealism does, is not to eliminate it, but merely to forget it" (p. 3). To be certain, if emancipation derives from material concerns (e.g., the economically disenfranchised), then "begin from the site of bodies we must" (p. 4).

[37] "One part of the 'linguistic turn' is to recognize that when we 'use' language, it may not be us speaking. Our speech is language historically formed and then brought into the present. It is, to borrow from Bakhtin, overpopulated with the intention of others" (Popkewitz, 1997, p. 137)

In the following quotation from an earlier work, he seems to delve more deeply into the problematic contradictions between theory and practice.

> Language is always constructed with respect to the specificity of the audience and should be judged not only in pragmatic terms but also with regard to the theoretical and political viability of the project it articulates…the intimacy of the dialectic between theory and practice is reduced to an opposition between theory and complexity, on the one hand, and practice and clarity, on the other. (Giroux, 1988, pp. 4-5)

To be fair, within these "conversations", Giroux admits to several oversights as well as points of resistance. By conversations, I mean both articles as well as scripted interviews. For instance, he readily admits to "…vastly underestimating both the structural and ideological constraints under which teachers labor" (Giroux, 1992, p. 1). As well, he speaks to the resiliency of conservatism (and its ideological control of curriculum), which continues to narrowly prescribe as well as proscribe teacher's roles in the restrictive sense of professionalism while simultaneously treating pedagogy as "extra-curricular"; that is, as what is left over after the content and substance of the curriculum has been determined (Giroux, 1992, p.80).

***Coming to understand my absent presence***

Giroux (1990) notes: "…there is also an attack on those intellectuals who would designate themselves as the emancipatory vanguard" (p. 18). To be (un)certain, pushing the boundaries of any discipline, of any activity, of any pursuit - is challenging at the best of times - and often without reward. By reward, I don't mean to imply that one necessarily engages in this process for some external, material compensation or recognition (though there is satisfaction in receiving some, since teaching is often not financially lucrative). The sense of what I mean to capture is the inner drive, the necessity of "knowing" that something "needs" to be done and that it "feels" right when it is pursued. At this juncture, I resonate with certain aspects of Giroux's issues regarding the difficulties of language, of expressing one's concerns, and of the incapacity to control how one is "read". As well, those who choose (if one chooses this sort of thing) to extend the limits of their endeavors often do so at great cost, personally and professionally. To extend the limits in any arena, to ask questions, especially those that others would rather not have asked - is precarious.

This being the case, what disturbs me with Giroux's critical pedagogy is my frequent inability to understand what it is he is trying to say, and to whom. I recognize that not all academic writing can be accessible to all audiences; I battle with this very concern with each paper I compose. In light of his audience (i.e., cultural workers[38] ), however, his language and collusion of theoretical paradigms can be confusing and, at its worst, performs the very form of pastiche he wants to reject.

To be certain, I do not see Giroux in Giroux's work. At least, not very often.

> I don't want to argue simply that as a white, middle-class intellectual I have no right to do anything but listen to the voices of the oppressed. That suggests that social location and identity politics absolutely determine and guarantee the way one takes up political questions. I have no trouble at all in exercising authority as long as I'm constantly self-critical about the limits of my own knowledge. (Giroux, 1992, p.157)

What I mean by this is that I do not hear about his personal experiences in schooling, in postsecondary education and in his continual professional development practices. I don't read about his personal life experiences and how they come to bear on his personal and professional aspirations. I don't experience his struggles in education, whether in the classroom or as a worker in larger institutions. Perhaps his "white, middle class" background affords him the privilege of not noticing these things[39]. Whatever his intentions or personal motivations in choosing how and when to locate himself, for me, Giroux is an *absent presence* in his own work.

I also do not *feel* Giroux in Giroux's work. I do want to pay attention here to my not seeing, because this may be a moment of unintelligibility[40] that allows me to move outside/beyond his discourse to encounter others that might embody aspects of experience and understanding with which I resonate, discourses that I, myself, can embody. Giroux seems not to be looking for me, to be looking for others. He seems to be speaking at me, telling me how things are, and offering literally thousands of pages of

---

[38] Giroux and others refer to cultural workers in what used to be termed education in the broader sense; this includes teachers and others outside of traditional classroom settings or formal institutions.

[39] Britzman (1995) speaks of tolerance as the privilege of not having to notice based on one's position/location.

[40] Britzman (1995).

"how to" recipes. These are the very "recipes for pedagogy" for which he encourages educational theorists and practitioners alike to shift their thinking about.

More importantly, I cannot find how *he* positions *himself* in relation to *others*. His referencing practices serve to borrow from feminists such as Anzaldúa, Mohanty or hooks, but rarely does he engage in conversations with these theorists[41]. Whether he employs their critiques and theories to lend authority to what he says is debatable. The fact that I cannot find publications where the conversations are side by side or within the body of his articles (especially since dialogue lies at the heart of his critical pedagogy) is disturbing.

To be certain, I can not find *my* body in Giroux's critical pedagogy, but I can find his, at least in one interesting respect. Returning to Giroux's words in the preceding section, I want to draw attention to another aspect of his proclamation. The phrase "who would designate themselves" (Giroux, 1990 ,p. 18) feels shallow, but certainly not disembodied. And so I turned elsewhere: to queer theory, to anti-racism and post-colonialism literature, all while still expanding my interest in feminism and feminist ethics. It was in this endeavor, that I came upon an interesting conversation and one that would affect not only my politics but allow me to (re) insert *my* body back into critical pedagogy.

### *Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering?[42]…I "Know" Exactly What You "Mean"*

I found *my* body in Ellsworth's (1989) wonderfully messy account of her experiences and her reflections on "doing" critical pedagogy in a university classroom. Ellsworth taught a course at the University of Wisconsin, Madison called "Media and Anti-Racist Pedagogies" that, from the outset, was "grounded in a clearly articulated

---

[41] In the Ellsworth section to follow, it is interesting to note the timing and location of publications. Ellsworth's paper was originally present at the *Tenth Conference on Curriculum Theory and Classroom Practice* in Dayton, Ohio on October 26-29, 1988. The article was subsequently published in the *Harvard Educational Review* in August of 1989. Giroux and McLaren's articles critiquing Ellsworth's piece were published in the *Journal of Education* at the end of 1988. Giroux was the guest editor for that edition (Volume 170, Number 3) and he authored two articles that book-ended the journal with McLaren's article as the third chapter.

[42] (Ellsworth, 1989).

political agenda" (p. 297)[43]. What intrigues me about her writing was the reflexive, feminist approach she undertakes, giving the reader access not only to her actions, but also to the instances which are beyond her control.

It is because Ellsworth is invested in the hopes and consequences of critical pedagogy that she demonstrates her concern for the potential consequences of these practices; namely, these "repressive myths":

> As I began to live out and interpret the consequences of (sic) discourses of "critical reflection"…I found myself struggling against (struggling to unlearn) key assumptions and assertions of current literature on critical pedagogy, and straining to recognize, name and come to grips with crucial issues of classroom practice that critical pedagogy cannot or will not address. (p. 303)

Her arguments are twofold: (1) "that the discourse of critical pedagogy is based on rationalist assumptions that give rise to repressive myths" (p. 297) and (2) "that if these assumptions, goals, implicit power dynamics, and issues of who produces valid knowledge remain untheorized and untouched, critical pedagogues will continue to perpetuate relations of domination in their classroom" (p. 297).

What first struck me about my encounter with Ellsworth's article was the insertion of her specific body into a particular location, or, as Lather (1991) notes, "…her situated problematizing of the abstract prescriptions of critical pedagogies" (p. 41). Rather than speaking from a non-relational context, Ellsworth was contextualized and grounded her body, first, within a classroom, as a white, middle-class woman and professor, and then, later, within a particular set of politics in a university. She says: "…I brought to the classroom privileges and interests that were put at risk in fundamental ways by the demands and defiances of student voices" (p. 309).

As I considered Ellsworth's self-location and referencing to "others", I began to make intelligible many of the concerns and discomforts I had previously experienced with Giroux & McLaren's critical pedagogy. These were accounts that, on some visceral

---

[43] Her decision to reject use of the term "critical pedagogy" in the title of the course represented a desire to be forthcoming about the circumstances that arise when agendas such as anti-racism, anti-elitism, anti-sexism, etc. clash with each other in the classroom (Ellsworth, 1989, pp. 300-1).

level, were being encountered yet, on a verbal/intellectual level, had no space for articulation.

One of my primary concerns with Giroux, and many other critical theorists, is that I, the reader, have been given no access to the specifics that would and should allow me to engage with them as colleagues in transformative practice. *In other words, my relationship with them and to them is disembodied*. Ellsworth (1989) explains:

> …the overwhelming majority of academic articles appearing in major educational journals, although apparently based on actual practices, rarely locate theoretical constructs within them. In my review of the literature I found, instead, that educational researchers who invoke concepts of critical pedagogy consistently strip discussions of classroom practices of historical context and political position. (p. 300)

She continues, questioning how one might "operationalize" critical pedagogy within the classroom, as prescribed by the literature and by "key and repeated claims, assumptions, goals and pedagogical practices that currently set the terms of the debate" (p. 298):

> …I mean that when participants in our class attempted to put into practice prescriptions offered in the literature concerning empowerment, student voice, and dialogue, we produced results that were not only unhelpful, but actually exacerbated the very conditions we were trying to work against….To the extent that our efforts to put discourses of critical pedagogy into practice led us to reproduce relations of domination in our classroom, these discourses were "working through" us in repressive ways, and had themselves become vehicles of repression. To the extent that we disengaged ourselves from those aspects and moved in another direction, we "worked through" and out of the literature's highly abstract language ("myths") of who we "should" be and what "should" be happening in our classroom, and into classroom practices that were context specific and seemed to be much more responsive to our own understanding of our social identities and situations. (pp. 298-9)

In Ellsworth, I found my body, as a *site of teaching and learning* and as a *site of healing and caring*. Ironically, given the title of her paper, her descriptions felt honest, troubled and hopeful. One particular account resonated with my graduate school experience. It concerned her commentary on coalition building, inside and outside of the classroom, in formal and informal ways, and with the formation of "unpredictable" groups of individuals who coalesced around specific issues in the institution.

> The differences among the affinity groups that composed the class made communication within the class a form of cross-cultural or cross-subcultural exchange rather than the free, rational, democratic exchange between equal individuals implied in critical pedagogy literature. (p. 318)

I also found *my* body in Ellsworth as a *site of resistance*. In two specific articles, Giroux (1988) and McLaren (1988) attack Ellsworth, labelling her "post-critical"[44] and her argument "decontextualized" and "theoretical". I find these particular words peculiar, given the nature of my experience with their (i.e., Giroux and McLaren) work. McLaren (1988) states: "Ellsworth attempts to discredit a select group of critical educational theorists by showing how their work actually undermines the process of liberation" (p. 72). In fact, in a rather backhanded compliment, Giroux (1998) notes:

> In doing so, she (Ellsworth) succumbs to the familiar academic strategy of dismissing others through the use of strawman tactics and excessive simplifications which undermine not only strengths of her own work, but also the very nature of social criticism itself. This is "theorizing" as a form of "bad faith", discourse imbued with the type of careerism that has become all too characteristic of many left academics. (p. 178)

This particular commentary begs the question. Is this not a ploy to include Ellsworth in the critical pedagogy empire rather than to expand the alternatives and conversation?

In defense of Ellsworth's project, Lather (1991), expresses concern about the necessary and sufficient intellectual space with/in critical practice, noting the following:

> Rather than attacking the work of others, Ellsworth's project can be read as an example of how deconstruction can serve to problematize critical pedagogy in ways that resituate our emancipatory work as opposed to destroy it….I read his (Giroux's) accusation as saying more about his own continued investments in the liberal struggle for equality and identity politics via the mediations of critical pedagogy….I read his statements about "careerism" and the undermining of "the very nature of social criticism itself" as ironically repositioning himself and the other (largely male) architects of critical pedagogy at the center of his discourse. (p. 48)

Though it would be interesting to continue exploring the political implications with/in academic circles as well as the politics of publishing, it is beyond the scope of my present discussion. I am comforted that one of Lather's primary interests seems to be articulating

---

[44] McLaren (1988) notes: "Unable to speak with any certainty, or with an absolute assurance that his or her pedagogy is untainted by any form of domination, the 'post-critical' educator refuses to speak at all" (pp. 71-2).

a space within the literature where Ellsworth and others are free to explore and comment. In this way, she "politely" reminds Giroux and McLaren about the kinds of aspirations they have for all other cultural workers in contemporary radical educational theory.

> As long as the literature on critical pedagogy fails to come to grips with issues of trust, risk, and the operations of fear and desire around such issues of identity and politics in the classroom, their rationalistic tools will continue to fail to loosen deep-seated, self-interested investments in unjust relations. (Ellsworth, 1989 ,pp. 313-4)

***Towards My Particular Body***

In this chapter, I focussed on a particular type of representation of critical pedagogy which is central to the literature in higher education. While in many respects I discovered a set of shared goals with these authors, on some level it became necessary, in fact vital, that I leave them, to look beyond. In this process I have encountered discourses that not only *foreground my body* but also speak to my experiences. They present an *opportunity to (re)insert my material, physical body into my theorizing of critical pedagogy*.

One such critical pedagogue is Chandra Talpade Mohanty. Like the model Ellsworth presents, Mohanty's theorizing of difference and her connection of practices to institutional contexts have provided me with specific tools to interrogate notions of curriculum and pedagogy.

> The *struggle to transform our institutional practices* fundamentally also involves the grounding of the analysis of exploitation and oppression in accurate history and theory, *seeing ourselves as activists in the academy* – drawing links between movements for social justice and our pedagogical and scholarly endeavors and *expecting and demanding action from ourselves, our colleagues, and our students at numerous levels*. This requires working hard to understand and to theorize questions of knowledge, power, and experience in the academy so that *one effects pedagogical empowerment as well as transformation*. (emphasis added, p. 162)

In the next chapter I situate my particular body, both within a graduate department of education and also in the context of professional sport coaching, in order to explore the ethical dimensions of critical pedagogical practice as well as the effects on those with

whom we practice. I draw specific attention to the experiences, resistances and (un)certainties that arise when one pays close attention to the body.

## Chapter Three: My Body As Curriculum

### *Introduction*

In Chapter Two, I defined the concept of critical pedagogy, both in relation to critical theory and in terms of the assertions proposed by key critical theorists in education (Giroux and McLaren). I represented their discourse as a "critical pedagogy empire" and offered an account of their work that draws upon their own self-portraits, portrayals generated by secondary literature and consideration of the critical pedagogy discourses marginalized by their exclusion from the "empire". I discussed current issues and dilemmas that recur in the literature and provided critiques of critical pedagogy which highlight the lack of attention to or erasure of the physical body in the language and practice of critical pedagogy. To facilitate an extended discussion of these critiques, I introduced the work of Ellsworth (1989), whose paradigm shaking article, *Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering?: Working Through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy* allows me to focus on questions of where the physical, material, fleshy body is located and theorized in critical pedagogy. The Ellsworth piece was particularly useful because of the discourse it spawned, including a response by Giroux (1988) and McLaren (1988) and a rejoinder by Lather (1991). Finally, I concluded the chapter with a summary of the issues generated by consideration of the body and the effects of the practice of critical pedagogy on particular bodies.

In this chapter, I interrogate my professional experiences as a critical pedagogue within the academy and in the world of professional sport coaching. In both environments, I strategically use my body in specific ways: (1) as a *site of learning and teaching*, (2) as a *site of caring and healing* and (3) as a *site of resistance*. For me, the body is not abstract; it is the surface upon which I invest in the materiality of everyday life. My body is the curriculum. Once again, in this chapter I pose the question: "What must I "do" to put my body (physical education) into critical pedagogy?"

I am mindful of two concerns: (1) using personal experience as a case in point and (2) Foucault's (1984) critique of the *oeuvre*. First, I begin with my individual experience, not because I believe that it is more important or pervasive, but because it is closest to me

and therefore a useful entrance to engage in this discussion. I will employ standpoint epistemology as a tool for reflection and for self-examination. Harding (1998) states,

> A standpoint is not a perspective; it does not just flow spontaneously from the conditions of women's existence. It has to be wrestled out against the hegemonic dominant ideologies that structure the practices of daily life as well as dominant forms of belief, and that thus hide the very possibility of the kind of understanding that thinking from women's lives can generate. (p. 185)

Although Harding expresses this concern in relation to the category of woman, I am interested in the epistemological value and application of standpoint theory. More generally, I am cautious not to give priority to one oppression while neglecting others[45]. The everyday activities and experiences of individuals are shaped by their multiple positions along various axes of power (e.g., age, class, ability, ethnicity, gender and sexuality).

Second, I am sensitive to Foucault's comments regarding the *oeuvre*; in particular, I am conscious (as much as one can be aware) of what specific parts of my "work" is privileged and therefore "counts". As a case in point, I will not examine my notes from the following sources: classes, lectures, and informal conversations.

In this chapter, I examine two aspects of my work: (1) my graduate experiences and (2) my professional praxis as a sport professional. In terms of my experiences as a graduate student, I reflect on my work in my Masters program in Higher Education for several reasons: (1) it addresses and responds to the aforementioned critique leveled against critical pedagogues vis-à-vis the de-personalization of writing (i.e., the lack of their personal bodies or stories); (2) it points to a process, a to-ing and fro-ing, a personal and professional struggle, which is inherent in the development and embodiment of critical pedagogical practices; and (3) it locates my struggle with(in) key literature and its philosophical underpinnings. The purpose of examining my praxis as a sport professional is twofold: (1) it represents a ground (i.e., physical education), a context (i.e., educating the physical), and an ethical relation (e.g., how my practices are displayed on particular bodies); and (2) it allows me to situate myself within relations of power and institutional practices which limit as well as provide space for my practices as a critical pedagogue**.**

***Body = Curriculum…Has Been, Is, As, and (Perhaps) Always Will Be***

I am a physical educator. I educate people about and through use of the physical body. I influence others through physical contact, in the environment I participate in creating, in the ways I develop staff, in the curriculum I produce and in the daily practices I explore[46]. While at the American Educational Research Association conference in New Orleans, April 1-5, 2002, I sat in a session mounted by the Gay and Lesbian Special Interest Group. As a panel of academics presented their work on specific chapters of a forthcoming edited book, I listened attentively, sometimes in agreement and sometimes in contempt, to various analyses of the body; not the general body, but specific bodies, identities, and the constraints/possibilities within which they exist and interact. These presentations spoke directly to my experiences or to the stories other colleagues had shared. The second to last speaker, on a panel of approximately 14 speakers (I admit to being tired by this point), was a Chicana, dyke teaching assistant from York University. Excited at the appearance of a fellow Canadian, I perked up in my seat to see what she had to say. As she spoke, I was impressed with how she said things, presented herself, "wore her skin". Then a lightbulb exploded, and she named my experiences - rather, she articulated her personal orientation to her students in a manner that seemed to bring into focus what my practices had been about.

I had always intrinsically considered my body to be intimately connected to my practices, and not just in terms of the "presentation of self" (Goffman, 1967). It is more than just "walking the talk" and pressing slightly beyond "being comfortable in your own skin", for these practices/beliefs/mantras don't suggest a positive, informed and intentional spirit with which I use my body in my practices. That I name myself, that I allow others the privilege of knowing my identities, that I am vulnerable, that I get

---

[45] See Kumashiro (2001) for a discussion of multiple and intersecting forms and systems of oppression.

[46] Though clearly I am not the only agent in this production, the agency I am investigating at this point of the chapter is my own.

disappointed, that I deceive, that I desire, that I care. We need to use our bodies in specific ways of caring and as strategically as we can[47].

***The Trouble with Our Identities***

The postmodern (pre)occupation with an author's location, while delineating an ethical space from which one can speak and others may "read", is problematic in terms of identity formation and the "telling of one's story". It is a river, a continual process; it is also a survival tactic. Anzaldúa (1998) proclaims, "Naming is how I make my presence known, how I assert who and what I am and want to be known as" (p. 264). In this chapter, rather than address my location and learning in a clearly defined space, I weave its turbulent and non-linear (r)evolution throughout the discussion of my personal and professional development.

I proceed with caution and a bit of trepidation. First, I want to highlight the tension between a "politics of identity" and "identity politics". I see this as an important clarification because we are all faced with this predicament on a minute by minute basis as we struggle on the front lines for increased visibility and social change versus long-term, broad-based societal transformations. Hill and Wilson (2003) succinctly delineate these concepts as well as address their limitations. For them, a politics of identity is a localized, bottom-up process which:

> …refers more to issues of personal and group power, found within and across all social and political institutions and collectivities, where people sometimes choose, and sometimes are forced, to interact with each other in part on the basis of their shared, or divergent, notions of their identities. (p. 2)

Identity politics, on the other hand, depends a great deal on top-down processes and on the application of political or economic power by larger institutions across society. These "entities attempt to mold collective identities, based on ethnicity, race, language, and place, into relatively fixed and "naturalized" frames for understanding political action and the body politic" (Hill & Wilson, 2003, p. 2). Simply put, identity politics is intended to achieve certain concrete, more immediate political changes

---

[47] Pendleton, Karleen J. 2002. *Can of Worms: A Queer Teacher in Teacher Ed*. In Getting ready for Benjamin: Preparing teachers for sexual diversity. (Paper Presented at Session 30.46 of AERA 2002 Annual Meeting).

whereas a politics of identity is often regarded as a more private, subversive means of naming oneself, one's accomplishments or one's suffering.

Second, my intention in naming myself and exploring my identity is as much a reflexive process as an interest in thinking against, as Britzman (1995) suggests, "one's thought of one's conceptual foundations" (p. 155). She goes on to speak about this notion in learning environments.

> Pedagogical thought must begin to acknowledge that receiving knowledge is a problem for the learner and the teacher, particularly when the knowledge one already possesses or is possessed by works as an entitlement to one's ignorance or when the knowledge encountered cannot be incorporated because it disrupts how the self might imagine itself and others. (p. 159)

I now invest considerable time in the following example, which highlights not only this process within my teaching practices but also reflects on an "imagining" of myself. It is taken from a reflective piece I wrote as I entertained queer theory and its ability to "support the other" (Phillips, 2002a).

> *No one was safe not just because anyone can be called queer, but because something queer can happen to anyone*. (emphasis added, Britzman, 1995, p. 162)
>
> Several years ago, during the midst of ladies'[48] team practice (doubles), I noticed something quite unusual. Let me qualify that – it might not have been so unusual for the ladies but struck me as peculiar. As was the case in all our previous sessions, we were in the midst of working on "teamwork". However, not the standard sort of teamwork one finds at the training sessions most professionals run for their teams.
>
> This type of teamwork depends upon each individual's recognition of tactical mistakes. What makes these particular tactical mistakes special (i.e., worthy of notice) is that they do not represent the "norm"; in other words, they are not the types of mistakes that are readily recognized. These mistakes are the result of lost opportunities rather than the result of

[48] As I insert this piece from an earlier paper, I am made aware of my use of language and the essentializing of identity. I have left it mostly untouched to reflect the process of "becoming", among other things, a feminist doing critical pedagogy.

misplay(c)ed shots. An opportunity to attack forgone, one or both players are positioned less effectively and the point continues beyond where it could have been ended. What makes this doubly difficult to learn is that in each players' mind, this type of tactical error does not seem to herald the "end of the world" that I, the coach, make it out to be. After all, the ball is still "in play" and "not attacking" also means not taking the chance of making a mistake. The old "be consistent at all costs" mantra rears its ugly and, in this case, ineffective head! However, as players improve in level of play, attacking opportunities are more vital, points are shorter, and one needs to "seize the moment" rather than be "seized by the moment".

I think it goes without saying that one needs to trust your coach. Others are often asked to believe what it is that can't quite be seen or grasped. But one also needs a phenomenal amount of trust in others. Not just the trust that they will do what is expected of them on court (e.g., your doubles partner), but also that they will assist you in your tasks as well. You see, the paradox inherent in the aforementioned teaching moment is this: the reason it occurs so frequently is not just out of a "misconception" of consistency but rather a lack of trust that your partner will, given the opportunity, seize the moment. This lack of trust is displayed as "covering" for your partner. However, each "covered moment", though seeming to support your partner by creating an illusion of teamwork, is actually nothing but a "false positive". Of course, there are other (possibly innumerable) dynamics at play that I bring into the conversation: (1) risk-taking, (2) getting along, (3) wanting everyone to feel OK and (4) the ultimate fear of not wanting to be perceived as "aggressive" (for they are women after all!)[49].

As I discussed each of the above with the ladies that morning, I found out why teaching could never become stale and why human nature

[49] This moment serves two purposes: first, my noticing in hindsight of possible resistance and second, the dichotomy between essentializing aggressiveness along masculine/feminine boundaries versus aggression as a tactic in sport.

> would never become predictable. I felt Foucault's return to the power of the norm "at play". You see, a great majority of the ladies felt uncomfortable allowing their partner to fail. By covering the missed opportunity, the failure would be (in)visible to the "(un)knowing player". And after all, if they could create the opportunity once, then it could be created again[50]. Needless to say, this discussion, and the ones in years to follow, have radically altered what these particular people, myself included, believe "support" and "failure" to be. (Phillips, 2002b)

Although my reading of feminist and equity literature has created a heightened awareness, the example above highlights my investment in and resonance with queer theory. I believe it has the potential for flexibility and manoeuvrability. It is a place from which to plant one's feet. Anzaldúa (1998) states, "Reading is one way of constructing identity…One always writes and reads from the place one's feet are planted, the ground one stands on, one's particular position, point of view" (p. 272)…"The more entrances, the more access for all of us" (p. 274).

*Why should queer theory be relevant to pedagogy?* Scholl (2001) notes that identity categories are both profoundly important and yet ultimately inadequate mechanisms for describing the complexities of our lives (p. 156). He continues, quoting from an interview with a participant:

> All those identities are profoundly formative of who I am and can be in the world, and they are also inadequate and only superficially descriptive of my identity in the sense that they do not directly reflect my personal experiences, affiliations, life choices, or political struggles. It seems to me that for all of us, identity categories both shape us and fail to contain our life experiences. (p. 141)

In my instance, within educational settings, my race, color, class and sexuality interplay in an interdependent web[51]. To be brown, middle-class and gay is different than to be black, middle-class and gay. Color accounts for more than just the shade of my skin, how I am "read" or if I can "pass". In terms of physicality, I have even acquired the ability to

---

[50] I recognize in hindsight that my written account signals my ascribing of intentions or presumed dispositions to others. Much of this does come out in open conversation during and after practices and matchplay.

conceal my Jamaican accent when instrumental. Perhaps I fit in even in ways I am not conscious of choosing. Anzaldúa (1998) rightly asserts that "Our ethnic communities deal differently with us" (p. 264). With this in mind, I begin the journey, first through my experiences as a student in higher education and then with my praxis as a sport professional.

### *Reflecting on, Reflexing on My Academic Work*

In this section, I discuss aspects of my graduate school career that relate to my interest in returning to graduate school as well as my growth as an academic through interaction with colleagues and coursework. I have chosen these to demonstrate both a career transition and the interplay between my professional practices and my burgeoning academic career.

I returned to higher education in the fall of 1998. This was a difficult but inevitable choice; difficult because I was leaving a successful career in sport coaching and management as well as a comfortable income and lifestyle. It was an inevitable passage, for reasons I was not even aware of at the time but which have surfaced during the course of graduate studies. As I had never finished my undergraduate degree, I was required to return and revisit Economics after 12 years of absence. If that was not already a challenge, most graduate schools required a four-year honors degree. This necessitated completing an entirely new major in one year so as to avoid further delay and the further loss of income.

I suppose my initial interest in graduate school was born of two seemingly unrelated events: (1) boredom with coaching and its uninspiring, quasi-intellectual work environment and (2) the completion of post-graduate work[52] by several former students. So, with my undergraduate degree in hand, I began the process of applying to graduate programs, in Canada and in the United States. My initial interest lay in U.S. universities such as Teacher's College at Columbia, where I was accepted into a double master's in business and education. I felt this program best addressed my background as a manager

---

[51] I explored these notions in a paper entitled *Just Who Are the Skin Police?*

[52] One aspect of my coaching involved acquiring scholarships in the U.S. for top-ranked athletes, who would then go on to work as a Graduate Coaching Assistant in order to complete post-graduate work.

as well as my aspirations in education. I was also accepted into the Higher Education program in the Department of Theory and Policy Studies (T.P.S.) at the OISE/UT.

At OISE/UT, based on my stated interests, a supervisor was assigned to me and I proceeded with contact and an initial meeting as I had already done for other institutions. During this meeting, which was the only face to face encounter I had with a prospective supervisor, I discussed my aspirations, goals and reservations. My supervisor listened intently and provided me with each piece of information I requested. At the end of the meeting, I asked her to recommend a few sources which spoke not only to her philosophy of teaching but to her professional interests and the direction of her work. Among the books she recommended was hooks' (1994) *Teaching to Transgress. Education as the Practice of Freedom*.

I went away from this meeting excited at the prospect of working with this particular individual but still hoping for a journey to the U.S. for graduate work. In the weeks that followed, I read the suggested literature, and the rest as they say, is history. I was sold, hook(s), line and sinker! I registered and began the program in the fall of 2000 and am still a graduate student in the department, a place I now fondly call home.

### *To Be…(Un)certain*

> The point of postmodern critique is not to replace one form of "normal science" with the structure of a scientific abnormality but to introduce a constant instability into our assumptions about "doing research" and making theory. We must learn to research and to act without the comfort of epistemological certainties. (Tamboukou & Ball, 2001, p. 8)

My journey in higher education is marked by three distinct yet interrelated aspects: (1) encountering feminism, (2) learning reading practices and (3) discovering the connections between academic theory and my already existing practices. Though they are all equally important examples of my growth as an academic, they also represent struggles that I continue to experience on a daily basis. In fact, perhaps my encounter with feminism has been the most troubling.

#### *"Doing" feminism as a man*

My personal growth as a feminist within the academy has come at a high price, and yet as I utter these words, I also recognize the unimaginable and incalculable cost

that others have born and continue to bear. Although I had previously encountered feminism in my professional life (to be discussed later in this chapter), and already considered myself to be a feminist, I was not familiar with feminist literature, with what it meant to be a feminist, much less a feminist man, in the academy. Herein lies a particular struggle. My use of the phrase feminist man[53] implies several interconnected notions: (1) to practice feminism in the academy (May, 1998), (2) to be a man who reflects upon his privilege and status in a patriarchal society (Sterba, 1998), (3) to be a man incorporating and exploring feminism and feminist pedagogical practices (Kimmel, 1998; Wartenberg, 1998) (4) to reflect on the roots of my feminism (Bordo, 1998; Hopkins, 1998) and (5) to be a man who has encountered the possible impossibility of male feminism (i.e., as oxymoronic) (Kahane, 1998; Pronger, 1998).

One might ask, why the struggle? Two primary experiences arose from this exploration. The first involved countless discussions with my supervisor and other colleagues about my place within this discourse as well as my positioning as one who could take up this discourse in his academic work. For me, as for others, to be a man practicing feminism represented a commentary about the ability and frequency of tenured, well-positioned male academics to assume an epistemologically radical identity when desirable and then to retreat into the realm of their status and privilege when threatened/uneasy. As well, it exemplified the common practice of co-optation of the academic avant-garde[54]. The second experience that arose during my struggle involved questioning and reflecting on my accomplishments and credentials, both personal and professional in nature. Could I be certain that my masculinity, my bearing the privileges associated with "being male", had no effect on these "triumphs"? Kahane (1998) best expresses this sentiment in the following passage:

> In coming to recognize the operations of patriarchy, a man would learn some troubling things not only about his society, but about his own life. He would learn that he has internalized patriarchal affects, habits, and desires, in more ways than can be traced or changed; that he has benefited

---

[53] In hindsight, I recognize the privileging in my reading of men who "do" feminism (and their accounts) as opposed to balancing accounts with women reflecting/critiquing men "doing" feminism.

[54] See Mclintock (1994) for further discussion on the marketability of academic discourses.

> and continues to benefit from male privilege (thought this will be differently inflected depending on his situation with repect to other axes of oppression and identity); that he has oppressed and continues to be complicit in the oppression of women in general and of particular women in his own life; and this his every gaze and sentence and interaction is inflected, in large or small ways, by sexism and patriarchal privilege. (p. 221)

I respect Kahane's sensitivity to multiple and intersecting identities and oppressions. As well, I recognize not only the difficulty (impossibility!) of relinquishing my male privilege, since I am endowed with this at birth, but the double difficulty of letting go, as I have had to work hard to assert aspects of my maleness, given my non-white skin and gay orientation.

Kahane drives the point home with the following:

> Absent a feminist analysis, a man easily can regard his accomplishments as proportionate to his abilities; his relationships as emotionally rich; his sexual experiences with women[55] (sic) as mutually consensual and pleasurable; and the space allowed him in conversations as commensurate with his knowledge and wit. A feminist analysis retells these stories in unflattering ways, showing a man harms in which he has participated in and will continue to participate.…The shock awaiting a man with thorough knowledge of feminism would be acute: he'd lose his sense of secure grounding in the world – his faith in his own judgements, emotions and desires. Every aspect of his self would become suspect, and also potentially impositional or harmful. (p. 222)

The aftermath of this particular (and at the time seemingly harmless) venture, which lasted for over a year, and still (fore)shadows me, was insecurity, as well as feelings of despondency and isolation - and this from the most genuinely confident, outgoing and energetic of guys, or so I thought. Though I have not resolved this dilemma with any degree of certainty or comfort (ironic that I should desire this particular certainty), I am comforted by Bérubé (2001), in *How Gay Stays White and What Kind Of White It Is*, as he discusses the importance of keeping these uncertainties in mind and at play. He notes, "I'm so much more aware of my failures in this area, I can't even see the accomplishments…using the slack our whiteness gives us to take a break from racism's direct consequences" (pp. 254-5). It has been a difficult sojourn, to say the least, fraught with perils, many of which incapacitated my ability to write for almost a year. In

retrospect, it has been a journey well worth taking. It has taught me how to listen without silencing those around me (and how I might silence them); how to speak without claiming epistemological privilege; and to listen to how I might silence those whom I support without condescending. Most of all, it has increased my sensitivity to the struggles of my fellow colleagues and citizens, to those who have laid the groundwork, to those who work in the trenches, to those who go unmentioned, and to the battle that lies ahead of us all.

***A connection to reading practices***

One interesting experience arising from my despair was an "almost" meeting with a recognized feminist professor. I made an appointment, hoping to work through some of the professional as well as practical aspects of feminism within our institution and within the broader context of academia. I longed for some comfort, some resolution to my crisis. The appointment never happened. Why it never came about is related to citation and reading practices.

In *Five Easy Games of Referencing*, Magnusson (1999) addresses referencing practices in academic literature, and playfully compares them to common games such as Monopoly, Risk and poker. She contends that citations and footnotes not only reflect academic social reality, at its best and worst, but are also aspects of the politics of the performative (p. 9). In an important footnote to a section on the use of citations in empire building (like that of a feminist coalition) she notes:

> Before writing this section I undertook an exhaustive literature review and found, surprisingly, that this particular topic has not been previously discussed in the academic literature. As a graduate student, it was explained to me that the strategy described here was an important tactic in attaining tenure in high profile research universities. It seems then that this practice is an aspect of academic culture, particularly in the positivistic sciences, but is reproduced informally, through apprenticeship, rather than formally, through readings. (p. 7)

Assembling alliances and building coalitions ensures control of the discourse, who is permitted access to it, and under what conditions[56]. Magnusson is quite in tune with the culture of scholarly work. Magnusson is also my supervisor. Through our

---

[55] Notice the heteronormative assumption(s).

conversations about this particular set of politics as well as the critical reading practices she encouraged in the rest of my work, I visited several works of the feminist professor, paying close attention to his referencing style and content. What I learned was that most of his references were to men, even though the context and line of his work was clearly not only feminist in nature but supported by the work of feminist philosophers (who were often not cited)[57].

***From practice to theory – praxis?***

At this point, I turn the discussion away from my encounter with feminism (though it remains a constant theme) and towards reflexion/reflection on my academic papers, many of which are not traditionally "academic" in nature or style, all of which though, are performances (i.e., the physical ability to organize and assimilate ideas in this form). Here, reading practices that involve analyses of tone, audience and inclusion grow in importance and clarity.

> That is, I simply saw myself as a reader of a text and never acknowledged the fact that my being addressed by the text, or my taking the text as one to which I could respond, meant that I was a person in a certain social group. Prior to this realization, that act of reading had been transparent to me. I had not seen it as itself contributing to the establishment of the meaning of the text. In a sense, what I began to see was the need to problematize the act of reading itself, to render it non-transparent. (Wartenberg, 1998, p. 137)

It is perhaps interesting and telling that I wrote papers for courses that at times had little or nothing to do with the specific material of the course. I wrote papers about identity formation (*Just Who Are the Skin Police?*) as well as the erasure of certain types of knowledge and identities (*Economics as Ideological Fantasy: Dispensability of Man By Way of Changing the Nature of Ideas*). In one paper I explored my invisibility or marginality as a sport professional (*The Social and Political Construction of Excellence As Instrumental to the Marginalization of "Excellent Practitioners": An Examination of Professional Sport Coaching in Tennis*) while in others I examined representation in sport (*Looking for Whites…in all the wrong places*) and my practices as a critical pedagogue

---

[56] Ellsworth, Giroux and McLaren, as a case in point.

[57] I even notice in hindsight how insidious these kind of referencing dynamics can be as I am noticing how Giroux remains "central" even as I attempt to decenter him.

(*The Production of Radical Athletes: Challenging Competitive Discursive Practice in Sport Pedagogy. Canadian Tennis as a Case in Point*).

One might ask what the purpose of these papers was? What was I trying to accomplish? Were these simply a means to an end, i.e., as coursework? I believe that I was attempting to grapple with the literature, to speak to the authors I was reading, and to see how those authors spoke to me. I invested heavily in this process because of my belief in *grounding experience in the body*, not so that it may be validated but so that it can be lived and felt – experienced physically. In effect, each of these papers is tantamount to negotiating my own identity within narratives which explore changing notions of gender, race, class, ethnicity and nationalism. At this point, of this I can be certain: (1) identity is a double-edged sword and (2) our reading practices need to be problematized.

To this point in the chapter, I have reflected on my return to graduate school as well as my journey in higher education. Now, I turn my attention to my experiences as a critical pedagogue in my professional life as a sport coach. As my career spans over 15 years, this exposition is not meant to be exhaustive by any means, nor generalizable; it is deliberately narrow in focus. Like McWilliam (1999), my interest is not in understanding teaching in ways that refuse closure around the matter of what good teaching ou(gh)t to be; in other words, "think(ing) of all good teachers as working properly rather than in some universally ethical way" (p. 13). This is a refusal of the lure of some universal ethical way. She argues for "moving out" of the comfort zone provided by the idea of pedagogy as always progressing (p. 12).

### *Interrogating My Praxis: An Example of Critical Pedagogy, Its Struggles and Its Potential*[58]

> I have often wondered why the farthest-out position always feels so right to me; why extremes, although difficult and sometimes painful to maintain, are always more comfortable than one plan running straight down a line in the unruffled middle. (Lorde, 1982, p. 15)

---

[58] This section of the chapter is the result of an earlier paper entitled *The Production of Radical Athletes: Challenging Competitive Discursive Practice in Sport Pedagogy. Canadian Tennis as a Case in Point*. Some elements have remained unchanged, so as to reflect the process of "becoming" a critical pedagogue as well as the learning and "letting go" demanded in "doing" critical pedagogy as physical education.

The purpose of this analysis is both conceptual and practical in nature. It is an examination of, and reflection upon, the concepts of "teaching to transgress" (hooks, 1994), "borderlands" (Anzaldúa, 1987), "queer pedagogy" (Britzman, 1995) and a "curriculum of irreverence" (Zuckerman, 2001) as applied to the professional development of tennis coaches and the athletic development of tennis players in a Canadian context. These emancipatory/transgressive themes represent a growing body of literature and practice, within higher education (Ellsworth, 1989; Lather, 1991; Magnusson, 1998; Mohanty, 1997), and within feminist/queer approaches in sport pedagogy (Dewar, 1996; McWilliam, 1999; Sykes, 2001) that espouse empowerment, healing and "queering" as viable approaches to the development of individuals as "critical" citizens.

Recent social theory supports the notions of difference, diversity and the social constructedness of our identities/realities. In spite of this body of knowledge, the standard professional development of coaches and broadly accepted practices of athlete development propagate discourses such as elitism, expert knowledge and specialization while simultaneously supporting structures which maintain heterosexist, gendered and racist norms. For sport practitioners, there is a constant tension between the sociological approach to pedagogy as suggested by Schempp (1996) and the achievement of sport-specific performance (e.g., international results, rankings, records). There is a general belief that in order to achieve "optimal" or "excellent" performances/results, the socio-philosophical approach to the development of bodies must be of secondary importance.

Perhaps more important is the question of who it is that holds such beliefs. I argue that, specifically in the case of tennis, pedagogy has been divorced from curriculum[59] in the specific sense that the content of learning, i.e., its body of knowledge, is disembodied from the methodology of teaching and its "performative" (Butler, 1993) milieu. Morgan (1996), using Foucault's "techniques of self", elaborates on this notion by noting that "where bodies are disciplined as a means to an end … the focus of teaching, … is the knowledgeable and ultimately disembodied mind of the learner" (p. 24). Arguably, the

[59] My use of this term extends not only to the "hidden curriculum", Kohlberg (1971), but especially to the learning environment, the competitive arena and all contexts that fall in between.

purpose or philosophy of coaching, namely that of "using sport as a means of helping participants develop in a holistic way" by "providing a positive sport experience" so that "participants achieve their full potential" (Coaching Association of Canada, 1998), in fact acts in multiple ways to constrain possibilities, limit voice, and align each individual's identity to the demands of the "power of the norm" (Foucault, 1980).

In order to ground my conceptual analysis, I interrogate my personal experience as a coach, facility manager, volunteer and athlete. From the standpoint of the "athlete become professional"[60], I discuss the use of "co-operation"[61] as a methodology for professional and athletic development through the (1) horizontal integration of the sport professional workplace and (2) the "opening" of traditional athlete development contexts. My coaching praxis provides a pedagogically useful example for engaging and interrupting inequities and injustice in sport while embodying many of the anti-oppressive (e.g., anti-heterosexist and anti-racist) educational strategies similar to those suggested by Kumashiro (2001).

***Reflecting on my professional roots***

In retrospect, I fell into teaching and coaching at the age of eighteen while in my second year of university studies. What began as summer employment in the Department

---

[60] In this specific place I employ the term standpoint to cover both considerations of knowledge and practice. Though I discuss athlete and professional development, I entertain the notion of a singular standpoint, as in the Marxist sense of the proletariat. Organically speaking, athletes become professionals in many ways; in fact, a coach (or sport administrator, manager, agent) is more often than not an athlete at a different developmental stage. I also borrow from May's (1998) notion of the "progressive male standpoint" in the sense that critical reflection upon experience can bring awareness of individual and collective complicity in certain social arrangements.

[61] It is with trepidation that I employ the term co-operation. While seemingly unproblematically and "progressively" associated with the notion of sharing and the flattening of hierarchies (team-centred, less individualistic ideology), it is still utilized to support liberal democratic discourse. This discourse is conflated with the spirit of capitalism, which reinforces tendencies towards achievement, competitiveness and "rugged individualism". My use of the term serves as an attack on competitive learning/training environments, which I claim are counterproductive to development (certainly through the early/mid stages); competition is essentially a socially negotiated reality. My use also serves as an attack on the reductionist approach to the development of the individual, which currently frames athlete and professional development as

of Physical Education at the University of Toronto at Scarborough blossomed into a full-time career in sport coaching and management spanning fifteen years. An administrator in the department at the time informed and influenced my approach to teaching and education; indeed our conversations continue to be as lively and provocative to this day. As a physical educator, she supported approaches to physical activity that respected both the physical and mental well being of participants, emphasizing the complete development of each person. She promoted physical activity and recreation as a vehicle through which individuals could experience themselves and others in "safe" environments. In this setting, I experienced what Zuckerman (2001) refers to as a "queerness", a sensuality, the creation of a "curriculum of irreverence". By queer, I do not mean gay. I mean an environment where people had room to explore, to be creative, to express, to fail and to fly. This did not mean that I did not experience racism or homophobia. Inadvertently, "Part of the curriculum…[was about] making obvious that which will make one comfortable as a community participant" (p. 24).

The Department encouraged my participation in the National Coaching Certification Program (NCCP)[62], acknowledging the need for recognition via credentials and the development of sport-specific technical skills. At the same time, my administrative supervisor spent considerable time with me addressing the difference between education and instruction. Where instruction implied the modelling, delivery and acquisition of skills, education[63] affirmed a broader and more inclusive approach to programming and teacher-student interactions. In order to facilitate the professional development of student leaders, mentoring and leadership models were designed that supported leaders in our daily instructional delivery while reinforcing the notion of "teacher-in-a-state-of-continual-learning".

---

mutually exclusive objects and professes a person-centered approach while maintaining authority/knowledge in hierarchical, top-down processes.

[62] Administered by the Coaching Association of Canada, the NCCP is a nationally devised and provincially administered credentialing program for coaches and professionals in over 60 sports. Each level of certification has a theory, technical and practical component, though the method of delivery of these components varies from sport to sport. *This could also be referred to as the "sport pedagogy empire".*

Criticism of this "soft" approach to physical education and sport, claiming that it subordinates the pursuit of performance to socio-philosophical factors, is both present in today's commentary of elite coaching[64] and rooted in the historical professionalization of the sport sciences. Dating back to the 1970s, Canadian sport and recreation witnessed both the severing of physical education faculties from faculties of education and the promotion/financial support of high performance sport by the federal government (MacIntosh & Whitson, 1990). Neo-liberal[65] restructuring of higher education has, and continues to alter the landscape of funding and mandates (Newson & Buchbinder, 1988; Phillips, 2003). Post-secondary institutions were required to "account" for their activities in utilitarian terms (Newson & Polster, 1998) and, through funding mechanisms, were encouraged to seek research dollars from non-governmental sources. Partnership building with corporate entities[66] and the introduction of an alternative set of motives[67] promoted a shift in the focus of sport from physical education towards exercise science and biomechanics, both of which ignore or obscure the experiential dimensions of sport. Sport scientists[68] sought to

> …construct a science of human performance on the model of the natural sciences and to present scientific knowledge of sport as clearly superior to the practical and personal knowledge of an earlier generation of coaches. (MacIntosh & Whitson, 1990, pp. 113)

---

[63] Educational models of sport leadership focus on the growth and development of the individual (athlete-centred); stress the importance of learning how to play the game (process-oriented); and utilize experiences as vehicles to enhance self-understanding.

[64] The NCCP is currently undergoing a shift to a two-stream approach to certification. In tennis, this shift rearticulates the Coach stream and the term coach as geared towards "high-performance" athlete development and the term club professional as more "managerial and administrative" in nature thereby further decentering this discussion.

[65] Neo-liberalism is an ideological stance, manifested in economic theory and the politics in most conservative parties around the world during the mid-1970s. Neo-liberal policies and programs "represent the conscious retrenchment of national state intervention in the spheres of social reproduction", promote the dismantling of the welfare state, and support a Westernized approach to globalization (Teeple, 2000).

[66] See (Canadian Association of University Teachers, 2001-2002).

[67] See (Polster, 1999) for a general discussion on this issue.

[68] Sport science is an interdisciplinary field, varying in scope depending on each institution. Its sub-disciplines include physiology, sociology, biomechanics, philosophy, psychology and history, as well as the fields of coaching, physical education and sport management.

This is an example of "boundary work" as described by Gieryn (1983) . Sport became a lab for the analysis of human movement:

> The sport scientists and "performance technocrats" promote a positivist, technically oriented knowledge structure which seeks to map the way to increased levels of achievement in high performance sport. Research in the sport sciences pushes back the frontiers of physical and technical performance while social science becomes focused on athlete selection instruments, behavior management, and the management of organizational change. (MacIntosh & Whitson, 1990, pp. 113, 116)

In many respects, this shift parallels Zuckerman's (2001) discussion of a progressive urban elementary school and its transition in culture from a community of sensuality to one of sexuality and a politics of identity: "The queerness of the school, the sensuality of the school, the early days of the school being composed of people with bodies…was being replaced by a more sensually conservative culture, a culture that in some ways was distancing itself from its bodies" (p. 26). The aforementioned shift in sport from socio-philosophical concerns to the "mapping" of bodies of knowledge and knowledge of bodies parallels Zuckerman's discussion: a shift from a pedagogy concerned with a general relationship to knowledge, where everything including the possibility of "truth" is worth questioning, to one where the limits of heteronormativity and the "thinkable" (Britzman, 1995) are realized.

***How tennis professionals understand the nature of their expertise***

The meaning of expert[69], whilst traditionally defined by experience and success, came to be recognized through the acquisition of credentials. The NCCP, created during the 1970s, institutionally realized this rearticulation via sport-specific certification programs which, in the case of tennis, were developed nationally by Tennis Canada and administered provincially by the Ontario Tennis Association (O.T.A.). Professional accomplishment and mobility was, and continues to be, structured based on the systematic movement through levels of certification. The content and distribution of technical knowledge within these levels has evolved considerably in the last ten years. An example of this is the new two-stream approach to coaching education/certification.

The structure and composition of each level in various sports is not homogeneous. In tennis, entry-level certification (i.e., Instructor/Coordinator) qualifies an individual to teach beginners of all ages; the technical content is focused on fundamentals such as ball controls whereas the pedagogical content is geared towards creating learning environments that facilitate the introduction of participants to the game. It should be noted that "coach" has replaced the term "level" as a course descriptor. Currently, the certification designations proceed from Instructor/Coordinator to Coach One; from Coach One, the professional chooses between Club Professional Two and then Three or Coach Two, Three and eventually Four. At Coach Three and Coach Four[70], certified professionals usually occupy positions as head professionals in clubs, provincial and national coaches, and administrative positions within provincial and national sport organizations[71]. The content of certification at this level is primarily geared towards the training and development of high-performance athletes.

At present, the certification process is the primary tool for professional development[72]. From a pedagogical perspective, this is problematic given that the majority of current tennis professionals are not graduates of physical education programs or coaching institutes where one might encounter a broader spectrum of issues outside of a technical, sport-specific education (Gilbert & Trudel, 1999, p. 1-2). In my experience as a course conductor, I have observed that as participants engage in course material and simulated teaching environments, the focus on personal development and learning as an end in and of itself is clearly secondary, especially given the overwhelming distraction

---

[69] An expert is "someone whose knowledge or skill is specialized and profound, especially as the result of much practical experience" (http://www.coach.ca/cbet/gloss_e.htm).

[70] To date, the highest level offered, especially since the Club Professional stream courses have not yet been administered,

[71] I am a Level 3 Coach in squash and tennis, a candidate in the Coach 4 program in tennis and Tennis Canada Course Conductor. I have also held positions of General Manager and Head Tennis/Squash Professional at numerous private and seasonal facilities, served as Vice-President of Player Development of the O.T.A. and traveled as one of Ontario's provincial coaches.

[72] Other opportunities include national coaching conferences (nominal participation rates) as well as certification systems in the United States (e.g., USPTR and USTA).

that the technical examination poses. The potential of examination failure[73], which has immediate economic ramifications such as lower per hour remuneration and the loss of potential professional opportunities, is also heavily influenced by peer pressure and performance anxiety, both during the course as well as upon completion. In addition, courses are content rich and delivered in such a manner as to limit the assimilation of material prior to examination on the final day. This consideration ties readily into the existing "culture of completion", which heavily favors those participants who already possess the necessary experience and technical knowledge (especially at higher levels of certification). In addition to these determinants, and bearing in mind the ideological shift from physical education to sport sciences, how then do tennis professionals develop and become informed through the course of their career? How do they come to understand the nature of their expertise?

> In the model of 'professionality' that now dominates Canadian physical education, the young sport scientist or sport manager is encouraged to see his or her job as the production of performance (individual or organizational performance) and is seldom seriously introduced to the social and political questions that surround the concentration of resources on elite sport. Sport science is constructed unproblematically as the science of improvement of human performance and physical well being… (MacIntosh & Whitson, 1990, p. 120)

There are limited formal opportunities for professional development outside of the certification process. This is problematic given that existing notions, techniques and "ways of knowing/being" (hooks, 1989) are imitated and modelled, essentially (re)indoctrinating and (re)affirming the status quo. In fact, most professionals gather their expertise from a variety of informal sources, the most common of which is characterized by employment with more experienced or credentialed professionals (Coaching

[73] There are several tasks/components to be passed at each level (e.g., professionalism). The two main sport specific tasks are the technical and the practical components. The technical components may involve a written examination or a take home workbook. The practical examination involves on court demonstration of technical skills, systematic teaching methodology and facility with specific actions method language (this is not an exhaustive list). Failure usually requires retaking some aspect of the course, rewriting the written examination or retaking the on-court teaching demonstration. Failure represents a

Association of Canada, 1996; Gould, Giannini, Krane, & Hodge, 1990). In these environments, daily "interaction rituals" frame how individuals and collectives communicate and learn (Goffman, 1967). More recently, Bordo (1993) speaks of cultures' "direct grip" on our bodies through repetitive and habitual action (p. 16) and Morgan (1996) examines techniques of (self) surveillance in personal training. She notes that "Repeated practice leads to habit; when this becomes 'ingrained' as the very material of our life forms, it becomes an ethos, a way of life. The Greeks understood well that our habits become our disposition" (p. 36).

Unfortunately, in these quasi-apprenticeship relationships, the onus for development lies squarely on the individual. She/he teaches classes physically independent of the head professional. Should feedback be provided, it usually takes one of two forms: sweeping comments such as "I would like to see more activity on your court" or in economic discussions relating to participant attrition. In the instances where the assistant teaches alongside the head professional in the same instructional environment, the majority of interaction between them is based on a top-down delivery of information, which the assistant must execute precisely and unquestioningly. Formal lesson plans, pre-clinic debriefing meetings or consistent professional development sessions are virtually unheard of in most clubs.

In these working environments, a burgeoning (i.e., assistant) instructor spends little time acquiring new skills or engaging in philosophies of development, in effect maintaining and reproducing the status quo. "The process of how coaching experience is transformed into coaching expertise remains a mystery" (Gilbert & Trudel, 1999).

***Emancipation as a personal and professional orientation***

> We adults cannot hope to transmit our values and engage in dialogue with children that transforms both groups' perceptions by making these cross-generational translations without finding ways to see through children's eyes instead of the eyes of our own childhoods. Without children, the adults are left to our own reminiscent views of the present which misperceive the current context fettered by old truths. Without adults, children are left blind to the perspective history lends the present. (Zuckerman, 2001, p. 15)

---

delay in passing, which is costly and timely; timely, especially at the higher levels due to large gaps between offered courses and opportunities for re-examination.

I am, and have always have been, a passionate individual who treasures challenging existing views of the way things are and should be. My mother's shaping of my character, coupled with other strong West Indian female influences, remain central to my intellectual and political identity. I resonate with Digby (1998) in his discussion about how childhood experiences lend themselves to a less "masculinist" persona.

> I thus learned two important lessons: (1) that there were means other than team sports to bolster my masculine status, and (2) that gender loyalty was not crucial to being a successful heterosexual. This was clearly not a trajectory that was to lead inexorably to my becoming a feminist. Yet both of those lessons did enrich and complicate an ambivalence toward the cult of Real Manhood that had begun in my early childhood. That ambivalence may have created a sort of "readiness" for the feminist interventions in my life. (p. 5)

I believe that teachers ought to be always in motion, always in a state of change, always continually adapting their approach. Although there are numerous instances illustrative of my shift to a more philosophical approach to teaching, the following examples capture my desire to (re)construct professional communities both on-court and off-court. As previously stated, early influences of "teacher as ongoing student" affirmed within me a growing belief that professional development must be an aspect of daily life, positioned as an inclusive feature of one's work. As such, it not only remains foremost in one's thoughts but also is not susceptible to changing financial and/or temporal demands, which tend to redefine and redistribute professional development activities as superfluous or extra-curricular.

As my professional interests and roles expanded to include volunteer work at the O.T.A., club and facility management and assisting athletes in attaining university scholarships, so too did my awareness of how sport and education are situated within the larger social and political context. Exposure to individuals and organizations with varying agendas and perspectives challenged my views and informed my practice. Parental abuse, eating disorders and attrition among adolescent females, alongside other day to day issues in the lives of the people I teach, demanded critical reflection and investigation into our individual, systemic and structural complicity in harmful practices and ways of being. As a certified coach involved in athlete development at the local, provincial and national level, I have resisted harmful policies and practices resulting in professional

censure and marginalization. This reflective performance represents the beginning of coming to terms with previously experienced dilemmas in my sport-specific professional community as well as a conscious shaping of future strategies for the development of generations of athletes and coaches who teach to transgress.

As a gay man of color, feminist pedagogical practices that incorporate difference, critique authority relations, commit to non-hierarchical classrooms, and value students' experiences are central to my approach as an educator (Weedon, 1987). Conversations and interactions with colleagues contributed to my growth in feminist and equity perspectives; I learned how to interpret my experiences politically in terms of interlocking and intersecting systems of oppression. I came to understand how these oppressions were politically, economically and pedagogically constituted. This facilitated the development of a text of interpretation that would inform my praxis, my understanding and provide me with a framework for continued development as a pedagogue.

### *Achieving complete tennis[74]: praxis and coalition work*

> The liberal idea to help people speak, but not to attack the structures and categories that create disablement, falls far short of what I am suggesting. The critical postmodernist assumes that the act of redefinition, of necessity, brings into question norms and values that have anchored society and formed the basis of oppression. (Tierney, 1995, p. 63)

Retrospective examination of key features in my approach to the development of athletes and coaches reveals specific instances of co-operation as a currency, i.e. a methodology for professional and athletic development. From this particular standpoint (the athlete become professional), co-operation accomplishes much in the way of the feminist project (Smith, 1987). In each and every aspect of the program, I consistently attempted to challenge normalized horizons through a variety of techniques and mechanisms. Zuckerman (2001) suggests: "Maybe queering is about being at the limit of

---

[74] ACT (Achieving Complete Tennis ©) is a program I developed, *first in coalition with* Sue Rosenthal; it has taken shape throughout the course of my career. Although concerned with the physical, tactical and technical components of development, the psychological (that is, how we feel about ourselves, our environment and others around us), is the most important. By emphasizing this component, we can help participants develop a healthy sense of themselves, both on and off the court.

the socially comfortable and not turning away" (p. 33). These activities often met with resistance, from within the club and in that larger professional community. For example, I intentionally hired more female coaches at all levels of expertise, motivated initially by my preference for working with women. In spite of my original motivation, the achievement of an unusually well-balanced representation of gender among the staff addressed opportunity and inequity for women as well as provided athletes with role models and mentors. I also created and utilized self-evaluative and reflective tools in formal and informal ways. I purposefully interrupted pre-existing hierarchies (e.g., authority, knowledge, etc.) which existed between myself, the head professional, members of the staff and athletes. These practices, addressed below in more detail, fostered trust and a sense of family, challenged and supported different ways of knowing/being (hooks, 1994; Shiva, 1993), and facilitated learning through different modes or styles. My programs embodied emancipatory learning processes, sanctioning opportunities for athletes and coaches to find and exercise their voice, discover a personal style and transgress tradition roles and relationships.

This approach continues to be challenging and at times frustrating. Co-operative approaches to professional and athletic training environments are both ontologically and epistemologically problematic. Primarily, these approaches are ontologically antagonistic to sport ideologies. On the surface, they run counter to sport's competitive practice, its historical discourse of military preparedness and its current discourses of optimal human performance. This aside, a closer examination of current sport science paradigms reveals serious ontological dilemmas between the structure and practice of sport and societal values. For example, our society values the concept of investment (e.g., financial, educational, emotional, etc.) and yet sport practices privilege and rewards those who acquire early success, even in light of negative long term realities (e.g., injury, burnout, stunted development). As well, while biomechanics promotes optimal performance, the practices of sport coaches are not necessarily informed, up-to-date or flexible with regards to individuals and their unique growth patterns. This essentializing tendency of sport science, which treats all bodies as homogeneous[75], has costly effects when

[75] Sameness reflects the dominant representations of maleness, whiteness, and heteronormativity.

articulated on young bodies (e.g., osteoporosis, injuries, etc.). Most ironic however is the lack of flexibility in both coaching methodology and competitive structures when posed in opposition to cutting-edge research findings[76].

In addition to these quandaries, there also exists a kind of illusion or, as Zizek describes, an "ideological fantasy". For example, tournaments and other competitive arenas, while seeming to pit athletes in battle under "equal" conditions like those of the "free market", are in fact landscapes of illusion. These environments are filled with factors that include the privileging of: (1) those who acquire early success (and therefore preferential treatment, tournament seeding as well as additional competitive and travel opportunities); (2) those with access to the economic and geographic means necessary to train and compete in a winter context (access and cost of indoor coaching and courts); and (3) those associated with politically well-positioned coaches and programs. In *Gaps In The Sport Systems in B.C. And Canada*, Balyi (2001) addresses this situation, although with certain emphasis on producing a more centralized Canadian sport science system of athlete development, yielding results at the international level (e.g., the Olympic Games).

> …Competitive calendar *planning* is not *based on* technical knowledge, but on *traditions and improvisations*…The *best coaches work at the elite level* in the B.C. sport system. Volunteers or Level 1 coaches coach the FUNdamental and Training to Train stages. However, this is ironic because it is the FUNdamental and Training to Train stages that are the most critical to long-term development. Coaching at these levels requires knowledgeable and experienced coaches who can correctly perform and demonstrate skills for the children…*Due to the shortcomings of athlete development during the FUNdamental*, Training to Train, and Training to Compete stages, many *athletes will never reach their optimal performance levels* or genetic ceilings/potentials… A *high ratio of competition* to training activities *inhibits optimal athletic development…Male training programs are superimposed on female athletes*. This is inappropriate in light of the physiological and developmental differences between the genders…A*dult training programs are superimposed on young athletes*. This is detrimental because it means that coaching is conducted without regard for the principles of childhood development….*Adult competition schedules are superimposed on young athletes*. As a result, too much time is spent competing and not enough time is spent learning and mastering basic and sport-specific skills…*A focus on winning rather than*

[76] This dilemma is remarkably similar to the critique of "accountability" as a discursive practice within postsecondary education and its characteristic time lag with up-to-date practices in corporate management. See (Bensimmon, 1995; McCoy, 1999).

> *development characterizes the preparation of the developmental athlete*. (emphasis added, pp. 26-7)

From an epistemological perspective, within the current sport science paradigm, co-operative approaches are problematic on numerous levels. For instance, Mannicom (1992) states, "sharing assumes a set of equal relations. This assumption renders invisible the very present operations of power" (p. 378). This is evidenced by the humanist (Lombardo, 1987) and invitational (Purkey & Stanley, 1991) models of coaching which profess an athlete-centered approach but are merely disguised as highly structured, subtly executed coach-centered approaches whose practice is best categorized as the "professional model of coaching". In fact, competent coaching, "defined as the coach's capacity to assess the needs of a specific coaching context and intervene effectively within the boundaries of an ethical framework of practice" (Coaching Association of Canada, 1998), can be more accurately characterized as an authoritarian styled, product-oriented management of individuals. Sport pedagogy and the professional development of coaches is not only dominated by the interests of the coach but also fervently supports structures and practices which maintain authority and power in the role of the coach and his/her ability to exercise it at will.

Without a doubt, "troubling" our practices is problematic. Kumashiro (2001), while interested in empowerment and anti-oppressive practices, asserts that "changing multiple oppressions and embracing multiple differences are necessarily paradoxical processes" (p. 2). The "adding of difference" or the "management of diversity" (Mohanty, 1994), regardless of intention, is a dangerous but potentially fruitful territory. I believe that co-operation, informed by a political analysis of coalition[77] as a methodology creates and supports a "social imaginary" - essentially a "way of naming, ordering and representing social and physical reality whose effects simultaneously enable and constrain a set of options for practical action in the world" (Simon, 1992, p. 37)[78].

---

[77] See Bernice Johnson Reagon (1983). Also see Ford (1995, p. 190) for a discussion of the use of term "coalesce".

[78] I will return to the promise of what Simon's "social imaginary" calls for.

***My approach to the professional development of coaches***

The introduction, inclusion and maintenance of professional development in the daily routine of coaches is both challenging and problematic.

> The liberal idea to help people speak, but not to attack the structures and categories that create disablement, falls far short of what I am suggesting. The critical postmodernist assumes that the act of redefinition, of necessity, brings into question norms and values that have anchored society and formed the basis of oppression. (Tierney, 1995, p. 63)

Horizontal integration of the workplace is fundamental to the deconstruction of traditional authority relationships and the legitimation of other ways of knowing/being. Two key roadblocks to accomplishing this end were (1) affecting attitudinal changes of club owners, themselves former coaches, as well as that of the coaching staff and (2) the inherent nature and composition of the instructional staff. As Head Professional, I walked a continual tightrope between accountability to club owners concerned with profitability and coaches whose lived realities in tennis are individualistically and competitively oriented.

The following discussion references my last position at a winter tennis facility where part-time[79] teaching professionals, most of whom were Level 1 instructors, composed the majority of the instructional staff[80]. This group of individuals included high school and university students, women with children, and seasonal workers. Their priorities and external commitments restrict common meeting times as well as interest in further skill development since teaching tennis for many of them was a convenient and well-paid job rather than a career. Combating entrenched attitudes regarding professional development was challenging and ironic. Professionals of all levels of certification under my supervision[81] taught a full range of participants, ranging from beginners to high performance athletes. This kept Level 2 and 3 coaches, who normally restrict themselves to advanced groups, in touch with the challenges and qualitative differences in beginner/intermediate lessons. For Level 1 coaches, participation in programs specifically

---

[79] Part-time refers to professionals who teach fewer than ten hours per week.
[80] Part-timers usually account for at least 85% of the instructional staff at most facilities.
[81] In hindsight, I am noticing places where I have not adequately addressed resistance from my staff and athletes nor the claiming of my epistemological privilege.

geared towards high performance athletes[82] was a major component in their professional development. During high-performance clinics[83], these coaches shared the leadership and responsibility for each type of instructional component (e.g., technical, tactical, etc.). My role as Head Professional gradually evolved into facilitation, guiding the learning process of the athletes alongside that of the instructors; this was at first an unconscious shift that became a conscious technique and political strategy.

Tierney (1995) asserts that "cultural learning" involves listening and working so that others may speak for themselves. This pedagogical style afforded me great liberty in circulating on all training courts, tailoring my observation and feedback to each situational context. As opposed to traditional environments wherein the best coaches and athletes end up on the same court (i.e., court #1), the second best of each group on the next court, and so on, our approach combined different levels of both groups. Not only were there major qualitative differences in this approach, but also some intended and unintended consequences. An opportunity to experience the long-term effects of well taught and learned fundamentals sharpened each coach's technical skills and informed the delivery of these elements in all their classes. This enhanced athlete development at the grassroots level (e.g., schools' programs, etc.). Over the course of several program years, a surprisingly positive change in the attitude of parents and athletes also occurred with respect to these coaches. Participants and their families became more confident in the

---

[82] ACT provides programming which recognizes the distinction between high performance and high achieving recreational athletes. Traditionally, elite or high performance athletes are defined as individuals who commit considerable resources to sport-specific specialization, participate in competitive opportunities (e.g., tournaments) and are oriented towards a college scholarship or life as a professional athlete. Normally, these athletes are separated from the general program population and accorded standing, prestige and perks in the club environment. In my program, I blended these athletes with those who were equally athletically and mentally skilled, but whose orientation was not specialization in one sport and whose goals were more recreational in nature. These individuals may also have been high performance athletes in other sports.

[83] Tennis Canada designations are Under 12, Under 14 and Under 18; this classification refers to ideal development stages expressed in terms of athlete age but does not necessarily imply that older athletes may not participate in a program of a lower age designation. In my program, these programs were renamed Champions in Development and High Intensity Performance. Athletes were organized based on technical, physical and emotional factors, not chronological age.

abilities of these coaches, a factor which had reciprocal effects on each groups' level of confidence.

Coaches were also given responsibility for other parts of the program, including leagues, round robins, and tournament travel. They were encouraged to participate in inter-club leagues, providing fun at work while further enhancing their competitive playing abilities. This not only facilitated their growth as "complete" professionals but also solidified their sense of ownership within and outside our program. As a result of their increased participation and responsibility, I was able to deviate from standard pay schemes based on credentials and remunerated based on factors such as leadership, commitment, experience and self-evaluation tools. These tools were used to focus biweekly staff meetings, geared towards improvement of their playing and technical abilities.

What I have described in this section captures only part of the picture of inclusivity and expansion of the professional roles of the staff I have worked with. Our mutual development as "students of the game" reinforced notions of continual sharing and learning, while flattening hierarchies of authority and knowledge.

***Negotiating traditional curricular contexts in athlete development***

Participation in sport is constructed as a discursive practice which idealizes the development of the athlete as healthy and well-balanced, one who experiences and learns values important to capitalist relations such as commitment, personal achievement and struggle. In contrast, the discourse of specialization is entrenched in young athletes, their parents and the sport, and is antagonistic to the pursuit of virtues such as balance and health. Athletes are encouraged and supported to pursue this illogical and unhealthy ideal at any cost.

Before proceeding, a brief clarification of the distinction between high-performance and high achieving recreational athletes is necessary. Traditionally, elite or high-performance athletes are defined as individuals who commit considerable resources to sport-specific specialization, participate in competitive opportunities (tournaments), and are oriented towards a college scholarship or life as a professional athlete. Normally, these athletes are separated from the general program population and accorded standing, prestige and "perks" in the club. In my programs, I coupled these athletes with those who

were equally athletically and mentally skilled who were not oriented toward specialization in one sport, and whose goals were more recreational in nature; these individuals may also have been high-performance athletes in other sports. Although marked by moments of friction and unease, this "open" concept lent opportunities to gain perspective to both sets of athletes, deconstructed barriers to learning and development, and brought "fun" into an otherwise rigorous training environment.

Epistemologically speaking, training programs approach athlete development through a series of skill acquisition moments designed to attack, counter-attack or defend against the "other" (i.e., the opponent). This diverts the athletes' and coaches' attention away from coming to understand the more important "other" (i.e., themselves and their potentialities). With this in mind, developing a sense of personal playing style as well as voice was accomplished through a variety of mechanisms. It must be noted that these approaches met with constant opposition from athletes who are generally more comfortable with the top-down delivery of information (e.g., "just tell me how to do it!") and tend to attend to coaches who are accomplished players[84].

One such mechanism was self-evaluation; these tools were employed as a means of self-directed learning, goal setting and getting to know the "other" (i.e., the inner-self). As well, I wove two fundamental themes through all aspects of the curriculum: (1) "winning in practice doesn't count for anything" and (2) "As my opponent, my "other", I want you to play your best because that challenges me to be my best". Students experienced an environment where power was diffused among coaches and learning was available from a variety of sources. The principle of learning through games and match-like situations  directed the training process.

> We said that in the classroom, there could be "no consumers and no voyeurs" and therefore in articulating possibilities for dialogue, each of us would have to develop a clear "ethics of consumption" and a "reflexive gaze". (Bryson & de Castell, , page 289-291)

This runs counter to traditional approaches in coaching, which are implemented in the reverse fashion: the coach decides what technical goals will be taught, trains the

[84] Although my intention was to engage the bodies as well as the minds pf ,the participants, in hindsight, I recognize the constraints and restrictions (lack of agency) I imposed in this process.

acquisition of skills and then builds toward the appropriate implementation of these techniques in a practical context. This forms the essential definition of "problem solving as a competency" (Coaching Association of Canada, 1998). Any "leaps" are essentially re-articulated into the existing paradigm and "naturalized" or referred to as common sense. Our approach begins with the context and then demands that each athlete use their skill set to solve the problems presented (e.g., the technical/tactical context). Practically speaking, this forces engagement of each athlete throughout the class and allows for the possibility of different combinations of solutions (e.g., better tactics, hitting a technically superior shot, using fitness to wear the opponent down, etc.). Athletes then gravitate towards a particular court, which is now non-hierarchical in nature, based on their approach to the context and the resulting theme to be trained. The dynamic character of this environment lends itself to co-operative learning in its "truest" sense.

***Que(e)r(y)ing Our Practices***

My practical experiences, along with my current exploration of critical theory, clearly suggest that reducing teacher/student and head professional/"other" professional authority does not imply that other relations of domination and subordination within our club or within Sport remained uninterrupted. For instance, although increased women's participation and retention was noted in all levels of the program, sensitivity to ongoing issues and the maintenance of safe environments made intervention necessary. "To deconstruct authority is not to do away with it but to learn to trace its effects, to see how authority is constituted and constituting" (Lather, 1991, p. 144). As well,

> …while one may strive to develop an organization of classroom work that is for example, nonclassist, nonsexist, or nonracist, this by no means will eliminate the effects of capitalism, patriarchy, and colonialism from the classroom. That one is constantly being positioned within such relations while striving to stand outside them is often a great source of frustration and despair…(Simon, 1992, p. 67)

Simon (1992) goes on to say that the "emergence of conflict and difference should be expected. Within a pedagogy of possibility, cooperative learning is not to be reduced to a productive harmony" (p.64). However, by not viewing socio-philosophical questions as technical ones and thereby depoliticizing them, my teaching has created and continues to support a belief in other versions of human purpose that go beyond performance and

optimal output. The flattening of professional hierarchies not only produces a synergy of leaps but also facilitates the creation of counter-hegemonic spaces where individuals can explore and discover the other (i.e., themselves, their potentialities, their colleagues, their coaches, and their opponents). As I persist with my writing and integrating radical critique into my teaching, I continue to learn about the political risks associated with challenging power relations. Like Haraway (1992), I am interested in the "insistence on irreducible difference and radical multiplicity of local knowledges"; essentially the "ability partially to translate…live in meanings and bodies that have a chance for the future" (p. 187). In other words, it is not necessary to give up performance to achieve learning and agency.

## Chapter Four: Reflections and Productive Tensions

### *In Conversation with Others*

This performance began, and continues, with a series of conversations with my supervisor, Jamie Magnusson. Those conversations yielded a particular set of questions: "Why should higher education pay attention to physical education and physical educators? Why is sport important to critical theory?" Although many other conversations occurred with colleagues, the next conversation discussed in this work is with Karleen Pendleton at the conclusion of her presentation in the Gay and Lesbian SIG at AERA 2002. This encounter helped put into focus the relationship between my body, my pedagogical practices and the theory/literature in critical pedagogy. Fast forwarding to the month leading up to the completion of my thesis, my conversations with my second committee member Maureen Ford have informed my thinking about feminist ethics and what it means to "do" something, to "do" anything at all really.

Specifically, my struggle with the writing of this conclusion and my difficulties with her challenge center around the following questions: "What is your 'meta-project'?" "What is the 'work' that this thesis does?" Initially, faced with the need to write a concluding chapter, I sat down and composed one section of this chapter entitled *Holding myself accountable*. I was quite proud to have once again met the arduous challenge of reflecting on my work and my practices, of reflecting on my performance, of literally holding myself accountable. (I will leave this section in as a layer in my performance, though it does not necessarily flow.) None of this seemed difficult since for an athlete and sport professional, self-analysis and reflection are an integral part of training and development.

I handed her my work, pleased as punch about having met another challenge, and this one under tremendous time pressure. Although pleased with the narrative, she remarked that it still had not captured the essence of my "meta-project", much less the "work" of my thesis. She sat down with me once more, as I feverishly wrote on her chalk-board, hoping that the physical act of moving around and talking things through would bring this performance to a close.

I went away from this encounter worried, concerned and physically sick. For the past several weeks we had both pushed our bodies, and our minds, to the limits of exhaustion. When I returned home, I lay in bed and decided to pick up an article on coalition politics by Bernice Johnson Reagon that Maureen had given me several days prior to "coming down the homestretch". I had not had time to read it, but now seemed as good a time as ever. What follows is a "coalescing" of those thoughts and conversations.

***Creating space for coalition work***

Bernice Johnson Reagon, in a book section entitled *Coalition Politics: Turning the Century*, spoke about exactly the kinds of struggles that this thesis has been about. Part of her words, woven into the conversation of this chapter, are from two decades ago. Where have they been "hiding" and why are they not in the current conversation about theorizing critical pedagogy?

> Now these little rooms[85] were created by some of the most powerful movements we have seen in this country. I'm going to start with the Civil Rights movement because of course I think that that was the first one in the era we're in. Black folks started it, Black folks did it, so everything you've done politically rests on the efforts of my people – that's my arrogance! Yes, and it's the truth; it's my truth. You can take it or leave it, but that's the way I see it. So once we did what we did, then you've got women,…and you've got homosexuals, and you got all of these people who also got sick of somebody being on their neck. And maybe if they come together, they can do something about it. And I claim all of you as coming from something that made me who I am. You can't tell me that you ain't in the Civil Rights movement. You are in the Civil Rights movement that we created that just rolled up to your door. But it could not stay the same, because if it was gonna stay the same it wouldn't have done you no good. Some of you would not have caught yourself dead near no Black folks waking around talking about freeing themselves from racism and lynching. So by the time our movement got to you it had to sound like something you knew about. (p. 362)

This particular quote speaks to the fullness and the tensions within critical pedagogy. Reagon goes on to say, "Most of the time you feel threatened to the core and if you don't, you're not really doing no coalescing" (p. 356). I certainly don't need to hear

[85] Spaces where identity politics is at work, they are necessary but not as long term strategies.

those words twice, and each time I have read them, as with the passage above, I shudder and I am scared to death.

I began this work in an attempt to address the mind/body dualism in the literature and practice of critical pedagogy. As I read the literature and experienced its pedagogical outcomes, I lost my sense of what and who I was talking about. I discovered that critical pedagogy is as much about producing a certain kind of subject as it is invested in the notion that knowledge alone will liberate its participants. My desire to bring physical education to bear on critical pedagogy was, I think, an honest effort to connect specific, material bodies to the effects of pedagogical practices. I presumed that physical education was about the body and that its entrance into the conversation would somehow automatically make pedagogues aware of the ethical effects of their practices. It would shore up the practice side of the praxis equation.

Perhaps my interest in exploring the nature of how sport professionals come to understand their expertise represented on some level a need to queer my own thoughts about my conceptual foundations. I discussed my concern with sport science's technocratic leanings and the necessity to consider the socio-philosophical side of sport pedagogy. What I had not realized was that sport pedagogy was in many respects about the production of a specific kind of subject as well, one characterized by the "dis-minded" body. All of a sudden, my project of bringing physical to bear on critical pedagogy was not so simple after all.

Enter my conversations with Maureen and Reagon's (1983) article. Shifting the gaze in higher education is about the necessity of creating a space for coalition work. Physical education is another "barred room" and my seizing of pedagogical space in my sport practices is, with its important accomplishments intact, nonetheless problematic. That I lost my body in reading the literature on critical pedagogy is accompanied secondary to the fact that I lost my "presence of mind" in reflecting on sport pedagogy. The consequences of "being" Cartesian, though serious, are best addressed in "doing" coalition work, despite its dangers and messiness.

## *In Hindsight*

### *In conversation with my(selves)*

This thesis, as is the case with this concluding chapter, personifies a dual performance, a layering, a movement to and fro, reflection and reflexion. The part of the project that is easier to grapple with is the exploration of critical pedagogy as physical education. This project has required enormous reflection on my interests, my dispositions and my "taken-for-granteds" as a physical educator. This layer of the thesis addresses the importance of physical education to critical theory. The second layer of this project is about the queering of scholarly performance, about awareness and about epistemological *uncertainty*. It is about noticing who gets to participate, and, in more basic terms, what their participation means. It is about exploring pedagogy from a perspective concerned not only with its relationship to knowledge but also the very questioning of the possibility of "truth".

I began this thesis with a quotation from Popkewitz (see page one). Akin to Giroux, Popkewitz can be challenging to read, but, for me, he is always engaged and engaging. He seems to articulate that with which I resonate but have not quite found the words to express. Similar to Giroux, Popkewitz has also carved a niche for himself, his in the world of social epistemology.

### *Holding myself accountable*

For all the innuendo and play that I have suggested, teased out and made explicit regarding the politics of citational practices and the use of footnotes, I find myself guilty of having committed the same transgression, that of citing Popkewitz's work in isolation. Not that negotiating a terrain, a.k.a[86], greatness by association - and then staking a claim to a piece of that terrain, a.k.a. guilt by association, is the stuff of great legend, a.k.a. a possible empire of my own. It really is not all that easy, or is it? However, since it was in hindsight, I'll just let it pass - or at least for a moment while I get *my body* together, for its not as easy as one thinks to maintain our togetherness. For example, as I interrogated my practices as a sport professional, I recognized that my body is at once both a situated, albeit partial, knowledge and a site of resistance. I found pedagogy to be a messy,

*Uncertain* endeavor - by this I mean, that we "do it" in "unstable" spaces where we encounter resistance, passivity and, yes, other people's bodies trying to negotiate the same messy terrain.

I digress. Let me get back to the quotation at the beginning of my thesis. Have I shared with you how much I love quotations? This is the case probably because, narcissistically speaking, I hope to be quoted one day at the beginning of a "piece of work". I would be happier still, even if my words were deeply embedded…at the very minimum, in the *body* of someone else('s) work[87]. After all, self-referencing, though an important tactic in increasing your "hits" on the *Social Sciences Citation Index*, is a bit over the top! At a minimum, this performance has taught me to notice not just the games of publishing, but the importance of and value in coalition building. It is an aspect of Giroux's border pedagogy that I found initially promising, and an integral part of Anzaldúa, Ellsworth, Lather and Mohanty that I find invaluable. Referencing and engaging in respectful conversation, putting your practices and experiences on the line, hanging out there when you're not sure what the results will be - but that you are certain of the investment you want to make in and with others - that's the stuff of *embodied* pedagogy.

Leading quotations are important for many reasons. They set the stage, so to speak, often legitimately referencing a particular body of literature or series of conversations to which you would like to signal the reader's attention. For me, being able to visit, explore and register[88] a terrain of critical pedagogy outside of Giroux's that promotes a set of embodied practices - was important to the integrity of this work. Feminist ethics, queer theory and post-colonialism are places where I have traveled and found familiar, thoughtful and respectful, if messy, places.

Quotes set the mood, both for the author, and for the reader. They can be inspirational or directive for the author, since it is often the first thing she reads each time

---

[86] Also known as.

[87] I would be most happy if my words moved someone to action, invited someone into the conversation or incited them to do coalition work.

[88] The word register is loaded with useful nuances. As well as wanting to make an impression, I am interested in setting out formally for consideration, places on the

she revisits her "work in progress". On the other hand, in considering her reader, the author might want to challenge, play, incite or invite[89] a conversation or a reaction. Whatever their intention, (though in the Foucauldian sense intention is of no importance), quotations *embody* many expressed as well as hidden desires.

As I review each of these chapters, in what has been to date one of my most difficult performances, I remember what it was that struck me about Popkewitz's (1999) quotation in the first place. He states, "…social theories pay attention to the principles generated that qualify or disqualify individuals for participation and action" (p. 31). In Chapter One, my reaction and response to the challenge of my supervisor is telling in the level of resistance I presented. This section also foregrounded in many respects the spaces from which I seek refuge as an educator and student - places from which I venture out to do coalition work. This chapter also signalled the beginning of my realization that "something queer was happening to me".

Chapter Two is as much about mapping as it is about noticing; noticing what didn't get mapped and noticing why I hadn't seen it before. McWilliam (1999) suggests that pedagogy is not always progressing, while Popkewitz (1999) asserts the recency of curriculum, tied into discourses of modernity such as progress. In exploring the literature in higher education and the centrality of the Giroux and McLaren terrain, I had not initially realized that critical pedagogy was being claimed but the body was not present (i.e., an absent presence). That the brand of critical pedagogy proposed by Giroux and McLaren never quite "felt" right is the most direct expression of my visceral reaction. Body erasure, whether intentional or not, is highly problematic. That, as a physical educator, it should have been easy (and perhaps "second nature") for me to notice the erasure or lack of attention to *my* body signals an ease with which we can erase subjectivities, whether they are being claimed for the first or for the millionth time. After all, there is no strategy without the strategist, no pedagogy without the pedagogue.

Giroux and McLaren do hold an important place in the conversation. Reagon (1983) notes: "So all of these people who hit every issue did not get it right, but if they

---

margin. Interestingly enough, a register is also an adjustable plate or filter for controlling the "flow".

[89] Maureen, the subtleties and intricacies of our conversations have not gone unnoticed.

took a stand, at least you know where their shit is" (p. 364). My journey from this point into the work of Ellsworth, Lather and Mohanty allowed me to focus on questions of where the physical, material body is located and theorized in critical pedagogy. Without claiming epistemological privilege, their work opens the discussion and need to question the very assumptions and presumptions underlying the literature and practice. I also cannot overstate the importance of their contributions to not "closing the door" on the critical pedagogy empire. Reagon (1983) captures my physical reaction to the writing of this chapter as well as the importance of "not being dismissive". She states:

> The reason we are stumbling is that we are at the point where in order to take the next step we've got to do it with some folk we don't care too much about. And we got to vomit over that for a while. We must just keep going. (p. 368)

The shift from Ellsworth's piece into Chapter Three marks a necessity to explore and expose my practices, albeit in spaces which, as the Head Tennis Professional, I had seized as counter-hegemonic. Taking on a sense of what Razack (1995) calls strategic essentialism, I explored my body as curriculum from three perspectives: as a site of *teaching and learning*, *healing and caring*, and *resistance*. It brought together Chapter One's dilemma concerning physical education's "extra-curricular" characterization (and reality) and demonstrated the centrality of beginning in and with my particular body as the site from which knowledge is produced. My graduate work served as a reflective tool where I use standpoint theory to situate myself in the "grounded" experience of my body and considered my body in ethical relation to others. This analysis is not so much a depiction of what good pedagogy (or critical pedagogy) ought to be as much as an exposition of the process of coming to a place so as to be able to speak. It is about the process, the struggle to develop and to embody critical pedagogy - it reflects the intentional and strategic ways I use my body.

Throughout this thesis, I have only touched the surface of resistance, both my own and those around me with whom I negotiate the messy terrain of pedagogy. Left still to explore are the tensions between pedagogical effectiveness and epistemological uncertainty and - simply stated - the negotiation of conflicting desires.

***The difficulty with staying in touch***

The first title section in Chapter One is *To In(corp)orate*. How very postmodern of me! Though its choice was no accident, it surfaces in this reflexive/reflective moment as a "hidden" surprise. It is laden, if you want it to be. It suggests an integration of our lives into the surrounding and unchecked "free market" rationale of capitalism. It also reveals notions of the techno-scientific colonization of the lifeworld. It indicates my desire to connect to the reader on more than just a verbal, impersonal level. It suggests a playfulness, for I certainly take myself too seriously at times.

To *In(corp)orate* gestures to the reader to step inside my narrative and to help me work through a few dilemmas. It marks for myself a starting point from which to begin to describe to other educators just how alike we are, how similar our projects are - how rich our community is. Yet, on some level, this term reveals how disparate our lives and those around us become when we try to force the proverbial round peg into the square w(hole). (You see, I just can't escape that postmodern thing!)

Before I proceed, I want to thank you, the "serious reader", for undertaking this journey with, for and against me. I hope you have enjoyed the performance so far, remembering that coming to the end is not often what we most treasure - for we are moved long before those moments. In closing here address to the audience at the West Coast Women's Music Festival (1981), Reagon appeals to the crowd gathered in front of her for the following:

> Everybody who is in this space at this time belongs here. And it's a good thing if you came. I don't care what you went through or what somebody did to you. Got for yourself. You give this weekend everything you can. Because no matter how much of a coalition space this is, it ain't nothing like the coalescing you've got to do tomorrow, and Tuesday and Wednesday, when you really get out there, back into the world: that is ours too. (p. 368)

Once again, and possibly for the last time in this project, I have "lost" my way. Let's briefly get back to the Popkewitz quote. The second part of what struck me was his notion of choice. He states, "Choice assumes erroneously that the available distinctions are equally available for all people in all social circumstances" (Popkewitz, 1999, p. 31). In this work, I have explored the richness, the possibilities and the tensions of critical pedagogy. To exercise choice within this field is to begin from a particular place, a

situated context. I have admitted to my surprise at having lost track of my body. I want to suggest that the significance of this oversight lies not in my failing to "notice", for I only have one set of possible choices, but in my failure to recognize that alternatives exist. My discovery of Mohanty and Ellsworth demonstrates this movement. Taking this one step further, Minnow (1990)[90] discusses one component of interpersonal power relations and our capacity to know the world as others do. She states:

> The more powerful we are, the less we may be able to see that the world coincides with our view precisely because we shaped it in accordance with our view…Saying that the world is how we see it is just one of our privileges. Another is that we are able to put and hear questions in ways that do not question ourselves. (p. 379)

The danger of disembodied approaches to critical pedagogy, like that of Giroux and McLaren, is in the very impossibility of affording others the opportunity for us to know them from their particular, situated context.

***In Conversation with WOMEN***

The days leading up to the completion of my performance have been taxing, physically, mentally and emotionally. I am very aware of my body as I compose these final words. The reflexivity in which I have attempted to engage has produced several layers of this text. One of them has been my relationship with my supervisor, as well as other feminist academics at OISE/UT. If I can boldly assume that I might have been the "object" of their emancipatory projects, then I am deeply grateful to their physical as well as intellectual commitment. Shogan (1993) notes, when speaking about her experience in feminist ethics, that it has shown her "…how deeply the material can affect us when it is seriously referred to in our own lives" (p. 444). Reflexivity is most "certainly" a difficult and messy endeavor. It is undoubtedly a process, technique and orientation in which I will continue to (re)invest.

This performance has been about my (re)asserting *my body* throughout my work, about my (re)claiming my experiences as valid and about (re)calling moments and conversations that are personally transforming. Lather (1991) notes: "Pedagogy is fruitful ground to help us address questions of how our very efforts to liberate perpetuate the

[90] As quoted in Ford and Pepper Smith (p. 455).

relations of dominance at the micro level of local resistances" (p. 48). I resonate with this comment because, for me, it holds in constellation the tension between the epistemological uncertainty of pedagogy and the ethical connection necessary in one's pedagogical practices. It is also a cautionary note: Do not be so quick to replace one being in the know(n) with another, in an attempt to seize the authority of knowledge (Ford, 1995). Though I have spoken about productive tensions throughout this thesis, I want to move away, at some point in the future, from the inherent dualities (such as the tension between a teacher's claim to power and a student's right to exert control over their own bodies). taying grounded, taking the body seriously as curriculum has been my way of keeping "in mind" and "in body" the dangers of rationalist assumptions often inherent in critical pedagogy. Taking seriously my body as curriculum has been, from the outset, always local, always situated.

Remember.

As teachers, we are all educators in, of and through the physical.

## References


Anzaldúa, G. (1998). To(o) queer the writer - Loca, escritora y chicana. In C. Trujillo (Ed.), *Living Chicana Theory* (pp. 263-276). Berkeley, CA: Third Woman Press.

Apple, M. (1979). *Ideology and Curriculum*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Apple, M. (1982). *Education and Power*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Audi, R. (Ed.). (1999). *The Cambridge dictionary of philosophy* (Second ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Balyi, I. (2001, Summer). Sport system building and long-term athlete development in canada. The situation and the solutions. *Coaches Report, 8,* 25-29.

Bensimmon, E. M. (1995). Total quality management in the academy: A rebellious reading. *Harvard Educational Review, 65*(4), 593-611.

Bérubé, A. (2001). How gay stays white and what kind of white it stays. In B. Brander Rasmussen (Ed.), *The making and unmaking of whiteness* (pp. 234-265). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Bordo, S. (1993). *Unbearable weight: Feminism, western culture, and the body*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bordo, S. (1998). My father the feminist. In T. Digby (Ed.), *Men Doing Feminism* (pp. 19-31). New York: Routledge.

Brah, A. (1996). *Cartographies of diaspora: Contesting identities*. London & New York: Routledge.

Britzman, D. (1995). Is there a queer pedagogy? Or, stop reading straight. *Educational Theory, 45*(2), 151-165.

Bryson, M., & de Castell, S. (1993). Queer pedagogy: Praxis makes im/perfect. *Canadian Journal of Education, 18*(3), 285-305.

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex"*. New York: Routledge.

Canadian Association of University Teachers. (2001-2002). *Directory of university board - Corporate linkages*. Ottawa: Canadian Association of University Teachers.

Coaching Association of Canada. (1996). *NCCP model coach survey analysis*. Ottawa, Ontario: Coaching Association of Canada.

Coaching Association of Canada. (1998). *A vision for coaching* [Internet]. Coaching Association of Canada. Retrieved November, 2001, from the World Wide Web: http://www.coach.ca/cbet/miss_e.htm

Codes, L. (1991). *What Can She Know: Feminist Theory and the Construction of Knowledge*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Collins, P. H. (1990). *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Routledge.

*The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary* (Ed.).^(Eds.). (1979). London, England: Book Club Associates.

Cunningham, F. (2002). *Theories of democracy. A critical introduction*. New York: Routledge.

Darder, A., Baltodano, M., & Torres, R. D. (Eds.). (2003). *The critical pedagogy reader*. New York: RoutlegeFalmer.

Dei, G. J. S. (1999). Race and equity in the academy. In K. Armatage (Ed.), *Equity and how to get it* (pp. 79-90). Toronto: Ianna Publications.

Dewar, A. M. (1996). Critical and feminist pedagogies in physical education. In P. Schempp (Ed.), *Scientific development of sport pedagogy*. New York: Waxmann.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education*. New York: Macmillan.

Digby, T. (Ed.). (1998). *Men doing feminism*. New York: Routledge.

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review, 59*(3), 297-324.

Ford, M. (1995). *Being in the know(n): Educational implications of situated knowledges.* Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Toronto, Toronto.

Ford, M., & Pepper-Smith, K. (1998). Dividing the difference: Intelligibility as an element of moral education under oppression. *Journal of Moral Education, 27*(4), 445-464.

Foucault, M. (1972). *Archaeology of knowledge & the discourse on language* (A. M. S. Smith, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1973). *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences*. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1980). Two lectures. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977* (pp. 78-108). London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Foucault, M. (1983). On the genealogy of ethics: An overview of work in progress. In H. L. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (pp. 229-254). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1986). Nietzsche, genealogy, history. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 76-100). London: Penguin.

Freire, P. (1973). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.

Gieryn, T. F. (1983). Boundary-work and the demarcation of science from non-science: Strains and interests in professional ideologies of scientists. *American Sociological Review, 48*, 781-795.

Gilbert, W., & Trudel, P. (1999). *Framing the construction of coaching knowledge in experiential learning theory* [Internet]. Sociology of Sport Online. Retrieved October 1, 2001, from the World Wide Web: http://physed.otago.ac.nz/sosol

Giroux, H. A. (1983). *Theory and resistance in education*. South Hadly, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey.

Giroux, H. A. (1988). Border pedagogy in the age of postmodernism. *Journal of Education, 170*(3), 162-181.

Giroux, H. A. (1990). *Curriculum discourse as postmodernist critical practice*. Victoria: Deakon University Press.

Giroux, H. A. (1992). *Border crossings. Cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York: Routledge.

Giroux, H. A. (1994). *Disturbing pleasures: Learning popular culture*. New York: Routledge.

Giroux, H. A., & McLaren, P. (Eds.). (1994). *Between Borders: Pedagogy and the Politics of Cultural Studies*. New York: Routledge.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Gore, J. M. (1990). What can we do for you! What can "we" do for "you"? *Educational Foundations, 4*(2), 5-26.

Gould, D., Giannini, J., Krane, V., & Hodge, K. (1990). Educational needs of elite U.S. national team, Pan American, and Olympic coaches. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 9*, 332-344.

Gramsci, A. (1994). *Letters from prison* (R. Rosenthal, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Habermas, J. (1982). The entwinement of myth and enlightenment: Re-reading *Dialectic of enlightenment*. *New German Critique, 26,* 23.

Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action. Volume one: Reason and the rationalization of society* (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.

Haraway, D. J. (1992). *Simians, cyborgs, and women. The reinvention of nature*. New York: Routledge.

Harding, S. (1986). *The Science Question in Feminism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Harding, S. (1998). Can men be subjects of feminist thought? In T. Digby (Ed.), *Men doing feminism* (pp. 171-195). New York: Routledge.

Harstock, N. (1987). Rethinking moderism: Minority vs. majority theories. *Cultural Critique, 7*, 187-206.

Hill, J. D., & Wilson, T. M. (2003). Identity politics and the politics of identities. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power, 10,* 1-8.

hooks, b. (1989). *Talking back: Thinking feminist, thinking black*. Boston: South End Press.

hooks, b. (1990). *Yearning: Race, gender, and cultural politics*. Boston: South End Press.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress. Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.

Hopkins, P. D. (1998). How feminism made a man out of me: The proper subject of feminism and the problem of men. In T. Digby (Ed.), *Men doing feminism* (pp. 33-56). New York: Routledge.

Hunter, I. (1996). Assembling the school. In A. Barry & T. Osborne & N. Rose (Eds.), *Foucault and political reason: Liberalism, neo-liberalism and the rationalities of government* (pp. 143-166). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kahane, D. J. (1998). Male feminism as oxymoron. In T. Digby (Ed.), *Men doing feminism* (pp. 213-235). New York: Routledge.

Kimmel, M. S. (1998). Who's afraid of men doing feminism? In T. Digby (Ed.), *Men doing feminism* (pp. 57-68). New York: Routledge.

Kumashiro, K. K. (2001). Queer students of color and antiracist, antiheterosexist education: Paradoxes of identity and activism. In K. K. Kumashiro (Ed.), *Troubling intersections of race and sexuality: Queer students of color and anti-oppressive education* (pp. 1-25). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Laclau, E. (1988). Politics and the limits of modernity. In A. Ross (Ed.), *Universal abandon?: The politics of postmodernism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern*. New York: Routledge.

Lombardo, B. J. (1987). *The humanistic coach: From theory to practice*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

Lorde, A. (1982). *Zami. A new spelling of my name. A biomythography*. California: The Crossing Press/Freedom.

Luhmann, S. (1998). Queering/querying pedagogy? Or, pedagogy is a pretty queer thing. In W. Pinar (Ed.), *Queer theory in education* (pp. 141-155). Mawwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lyotard, J.-F. (1979). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge* (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans.). Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

MacIntosh, D., & Whitson, D. (1990). *The game players: Transforming Canada's sport system*. Kingston, ON: Queens Press.

Maclean's. (2002). *Universities 2002* [Internet]. Maclean's. Retrieved April 29, 2003, from the World Wide Web: http://www.macleans.ca

Magnusson, J. L. (1998). Canadian higher education and citizenship in the context of state restructuring and globalization. *Encounters, 1*(1), 107-123.

Magnusson, J.-L. (1999). Five easy games of referencing. *International Journal of Applied Semiotics*(Special).

Mannicom, A. (1992). Feminist pedagogy: tranformations, standpoints, and politics. *Canadian Journal of Education, 17*(3), 365-389.

May, L. (1998). A progressive male standpoint. In T. Digby (Ed.), *Men doing feminism* (pp. 337-353). New York: Routledge.

Mayo, P. (1993). When does it work? Freire's pedagogy in context. *Studies in the Education of Adults, 25*(1), 11-30.

McClintock, A. (1994). The angel of progress: Pitfalls of the term 'post-colonialism'. In P. Williams & L. Chrisman (Eds.), *Colonial discourse and post-colonial theory. A reader* (pp. 291-304). New York: Columbia University Press.

McCoy, L. (1999). *Accounting discourse and textual practices of ruling: A study of institutional transformation and restructuring in higher education.* York University, Toronto.

McGowan, J. (1991). *Postmodernism and its critics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

McLaren, P. (1988). Schooling and the postmodern body: Critical pedagogy and the politics of enfleshment. *Journal of Education, 170*(3), 53-99.

McLaren, P. (1996). Liberatory politics and higher education: A Freirean perspective. In H. A. Giroux (Ed.), *Counternarratives: Cultural studies and critical pedagogies in post modern space* (pp. 117-148). New York: Routledge.

McNally, D. (2001). *Bodies of meaning. Studies on language, labor, and liberation*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

McWilliam, E. (1999). *Pedagogical Pleasures*. New York: Peter Lang.

McWilliams, E. (1999). *Pedagogical pleasures*. New York: Peter Lang.

McWilliams, E. (2000). Stuck in the missionary position? Pedagogy and desire in new times. In C. O'Farrel & D. Meadmore & E. McWilliams & C. Symes (Eds.), *Taught bodies*. New York: Peter Lang.

Meadmore, D., Hatcher, C., & McWilliams, E. (2000). Getting tense about genealogy. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 13*(15), 463-476.

Merriam-Webster Incorporated. (2003). *Merriam-Webster online* [internet]. Merriam-Webster. Retrieved April 25, 2003, from the World Wide Web: http://www.m-w.com.home.htm

Mohanty, C. T. (1994). On race and voice: Challenges for liberal education in the 1990's. In H. A. Giroux & P. Mclaren (Eds.), *Between borders: Pedagogy and the politics of cultural studies* (pp. 145-166). New York: Routledge.

Mohanty, C. T. (1997). Dangerous territories, territorial power and education. In L. Roman & L. Eyre (Eds.), *Dangerous territories: Struggles for difference and equality in education* (pp. 1-19). New York: Routledge.

Morgan, W. (1996). Personal training: Discourses of (self) fashioning. In E. McWilliam & P. G. Taylor (Eds.), *Pedagogy, technology, and the body*. New York: Peter Lang.

Namaste, V. (2000). *Invisible lives: The erasure of transsexual and transgendered people*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Newson, J., & Buchbinder, H. (1988). *The university means business: Universities, corporations and academic work*. Toronto: Garamond Press.

Newson, J., & Polster, C. (1998). Don't count your blessings: The social accomplishments of performance indicators. In J. Currie & J. Newson (Eds.),

*Universities and globalization: Critical perspectives*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Payne, M. (Ed.). (1999). *A dictionary of cultural and critical theory*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Phillips, D. (2002a). *Just Who Are the Skin Police?*Unpublished manuscript, Toronto.

Phillips, D. (2002b). *Missing conversations. Unremarked and remarkable. Queering the space*.Unpublished manuscript, Toronto.

Phillips, D. (2003). Economics as ideological fantasy: Dispensability of man by way of changing the nature of ideas. *International Journal of Applied Semiotics*(in press).

Pinar, W. F. (Ed.). (1998). *Queer theory in education*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Polster, C. (1999, September). The university has no business in the intellectual property business. *CAUT Bulletin ACPPU,* pp. 36.

Popkewitz, T. (1997). The production of reason and power: Curriculum, history and intellectual traditions. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 29*(2), 131-164.

Popkewitz, T. (1999). A social epistemology of educational research. In T. Popkewitz & L. Fendler (Eds.), *Critical theories in education: Changing terrains of knowledge and politics* (pp. 17-42). New York: Routledge.

Pronger, B. (1998). On your knees: Carnal knowledge, masculine dissolution, doing feminism. In T. Digby (Ed.), *Men doing feminism* (pp. 69-79). New York: Routledge.

Purkey, W. W., & Stanley, P. H. (1991). *Invitational teaching, learning and living*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Razack, S. (1995). To essentialize or not to essentialize: Is this the question?, *Looking white people in the eye* (pp. 158-170). Toronto: U of T Press.

Readings, B. (1996). *The university in ruins*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Reagon, B. J. (1983). Coalition politics: Turning the century. In B. Smith (Ed.), *Home girls: A Black feminist anthology* (pp. 356-368). New York: Kitchen Table - Women of Color Press.

Rodmell, F. E. (1988). *Ethics in nursing: The development of an educational model for practice.* Unpublished dissertation, University of Surrey, Guildford.

Schempp, P. (Ed.). (1996). *Scientific development of sport pedagogy*. New York: Waxmann.

Scholl, L. (2001). Narratives of hybridity and the challenge to multicultural education. In K. K. Kumashiro (Ed.), *Troubling intersections of race and sexuality: Queer students of color and anti-oppressive education* (pp. 141-161). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Sedgewick, E. K. (1990). *Axiomatic. Epistemology of the closet*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Shilling, C. (1993). *The body and social theory*. London: Sage Publications.

Shiva, V. (1993). *Monocultures of the mind. Perspectives on biodiversity and biotechnology*. London: Zed Books.

Shogan, D. (1993). 'Doing' feminist ethics in a feminist ethics seminar. In D. Shogan (Ed.), *A reader in feminist ethics* (pp. 438-446). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc.

Simon, R. I. (1992). *Teaching against the grain: Texts for a pedagogy of possibility*. Toronto: OISE Press.

Smith, D. (1987). *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Sterba, J. P. (1998). Is feminism good for men and are men good for feminism? In T. Digby (Ed.), *Men doing feminism* (pp. 291-304). New York: Routledge.

Sykes, H. (2001). Understanding and overstanding: feminist-postructural life histories of physical education teachers. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 14*(1), 13-31.

Tamboukou, M. (1999). Writing genealogies: An exploration of Foucault's strategies for doing research. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 20*(2), 201-217.

Tamboukou, M., & Ball, S. J. (2001). *Genealogy and ethnography: Fruitful encounters or dangerous liaisons?* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Seattle.

Teeple, G. (2000). *Globalization and the decline of social reform: Into the twenty-first century*. Aurora, Ontario: Garamond Press.

Tierney, W. G. (1995). *Building Communities of Difference*. Toronto: OISE Press.

Wartenberg, T. E. (1998). Teaching women philosophy (as a feminist man). In T. Digby (Ed.), *Men doing feminism* (pp. 131-145). New York: Routledge.

Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. New York: Basil Blackwell.

Zuckerman, J. (2001). *Queering the life of a progressive urban elementary school: Genealogical ghost stories*.Unpublished manuscript, Teacher's College, Columbia University, New York.