1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Faculty Members Engaging in Transformative PETE: A Feminist Perspective

Shrehan Lynch

&

Matthew Curtner-Smith

Abstract

13

14   The purpose of this study was to describe sport pedagogy faculty members' (FMs) efforts at

15   engaging in transformative physical education teacher education (T-PETE). T-PETE stresses the

16   importance of FMs creating social change through their pedagogical approach and begins by

17   asking preservice teachers (PTs) to reflect on their perspectives and practices (Tinning, 2017;

18   Ukpokodu, 2009). Participants were three white, female, able-bodied, lesbian/gay sport

19   pedagogy FMs. The study was conducted in the United States. Feminist theory and feminist

20   pedagogy drove data collection and analysis. Data were collected by employing a series of

21   qualitative methods. An inductive and deductive analysis revealed that FMs had specific T-PETE

22   goals, content, and pedagogies. Furthermore, several factors served to facilitate and limit the

23   FMs' effectiveness when engaging in T-PETE. The findings suggest that program-wide PETE

24   reform is necessary in the United States for creating social change, and influencing PTs

25   perspectives and practices. In addition, they suggest that American PETE programs might benefit

26   from greater diversity among the FMs who staff them.

27   **Keywords:** Transformative pedagogy, Physical education teacher education, Social justice,

28   Critical consciousness, Feminist theory, Feminist pedagogy, Critical Ethnography

29   Faculty Members Engaging in Transformative PETE: A Feminist Perspective

30   A growing number of scholars have argued that current practices in teacher education,

31   schools, physical education teacher education (PETE), and physical education (PE) contribute to

32   the inequalities that exist in Western cultures (Fernández-Balboa, 1993; Kirk, 2009). This state

33   of affairs can be blamed in part on the influences of neoconservative and neoliberal ideologies on

34   educational policy in general (Fernández-Balboa, 2017; Ovens, 2017), and the globalization of

35   private markets in particular (Azzarito, Macdonald, Dagkas, & Fisette, 2017). In terms of PETE

36   and PE, critics argued that these influences have led to foci on the control, health, beautification,

37   and mastery of the body (Cliff, Wright, & Clarke, 2009; Kirk, 1998). In turn, they suggested that

38   these foci have led to performance and health pedagogies being prioritized in PETE (Cliff, 2012;

39   Kirk, 2009), and the performance of sport and the production of what the culture deems to be fit

40   and healthy-looking bodies prioritized in PE (McCuaig & Enright, 2017). From this perspective,

41   PE is viewed as an ableist, elitist, racist, sexist, classist, and healthist subject which privileges

42   some groups of students over others (i.e., generally able-bodied, high-skilled, White, male,

43   middle and upper-class students, with bodies that conform to societal norms of beauty and health

44   over disabled, low-skilled, non-White, female, lower class students, with bodies that do not

45   conform to societal ideals) (Fernández-Balboa, 1993; Rovegno, 2008).

46   A more equitable and relevant PE, some sport pedagogists have argued, should prioritize

47   a critical examination of sociocultural issues by students (Cliff, 2012; McCuaig & Enright, 2017;

48   Philpot, 2016; Ruiz & Fernández-Balboa, 2005; Walton-Fisette et al., 2018). Educators adopting

49   a sociocultural perspective use the medium of physical activity, sport, and health to guide

50   students to reflect on and gain an understanding of the groups in a culture that are dominant,

51   dominated, privileged, oppressed, powerful, and marginalized (Flory & Walton-Fisette, 2015;

52   Rovegno, 2008). The ultimate goals of this kind of PE are to influence students' beliefs, values,

53   and actions in order to play a role in the construction of a more equitable, socially just, and

54   democratic society, and to help students understand that knowledge is socially constructed by

55   raising their critical consciousness (Cliff, 2012; Cliff et al., 2009; Philpot, 2016).

56   Consequently, the production of PE teachers willing and able to deliver PE with a

57   sociocultural focus necessitates university faculty members (FMs) taking the same perspective

58   during PETE (Ruiz & Fernández-Balboa, 2005). Specifically, this involves FMs enabling

59   preservice teachers (PTs) to acquire a critical perspective themselves (e.g., being aware of how

60   PE, physical activity, sport, and health might contribute to the inequities in a culture) and arming

61   them with some methods they can use in schools (Fernández-Balboa, 1993; Ukpokodu, 2009).

62   Such *transformative pedagogy* (TP) (Tinning, 2017; Ukpokodu, 2009) employed by FMs

63   stresses the importance of educators creating social change through pedagogical approaches.

64   TP consists of multiple activist pedagogies that are underpinned by criticality for practice

65   and are part of a FM's educational philosophy (Tinning, 2017; Ukpokodu, 2009). Therefore,

66   transformative-PETE (T-PETE) includes asking PTs to reflect on sociocultural issues such as

67   privilege and dominance associated with the body, race, class, and gender. In recent research on

68   over 70 international PETE faculty, Walton-Fisette et al. (2018) found differences among PETE

69   faculty teaching sociocultural issues to PTs. Faculty based in Australia, New Zealand, and

70   England taught sociocultural issues through an intentional and explicit approach. In contrast,

71   faculty in the United States were less likely to plan or teach sociocultural issues directly. Instead,

72   they took advantage of teachable moments related to equality issues when their PTs were

73   engaged in early field experiences and teaching practice. Intentional and explicit pedagogical

74   approaches employed by FMs during teacher education have been summarized by Ovens (2017),

75   Ukpokodu (2007) and Walton-Fisette et al. (2018). They included storytelling, discussion and

76   debate of critical cases, place-based pedagogies, peer teaching, inquiry-based learning, role-play,

77   critically-focused clinical experiences, negotiation, project-based learning, reflective journaling,

78   and asking PTs to examine their biographies.

79   To date, the small number of studies completed suggests that T-PETE has been

80   ineffective in terms of influencing the perspectives and practices of PTs. The T-PETE studied

81   was either embedded within methods courses taught by sport pedagogy FMs (Curtner-Smith &

82   Sofo, 2004; Gerdin, Philpot & Smith, 2018; Flory & Walton-Fisette, 2015) or carried out within

83   one education course designated for the purpose and taught outside the core PETE program

84   (Walton-Fisette et al., 2018). Limited evidence suggests that neither of these two strategies has

85   been powerful enough to overcome the dominant performance and health-focused ideologies into

86   which PTs have been socialized during their own schooling, within their other PETE

87   coursework, and when in the PE profession (Cliff, 2012; Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Gerdin et

88   al., 2018). This lack of potency appears to be partly because the FMs teaching such courses do

89   not have the requisite preparation or content and pedagogical knowledge to teach critically (Ruiz

90   & Fernández-Balboa, 2005; Gerdin et al., 2018; Ukpokodu, 2007; Walton-Fisette et al., 2018),

91   work alone, are pitted against university regulations which privilege traditional teaching

92   methods, and expect change in PTs to occur too quickly (Fernández-Balboa, 1995; Fernández-

93   Balboa, 2017; Flory & Walton-Fisette, 2015; Ovens, 2017). The objective of this study was to

94   build on the limited amount of research previously completed on T-PETE. Its purpose was to

95   describe American sport pedagogy FMs' efforts at engaging in T-PETE. The specific research

96   questions we attempted to answer were (a) What content, organization, and methods did three

97   sport pedagogy FMs employ in order to influence PTs' perspectives and practices? and (b) What

98   factors served to facilitate or limit the three sport pedagogy FMs' effectiveness when engaging in

99   T-PETE?

Theoretical Perspective

101   The number of sport pedagogy scholars engaging in feminist research has increased

102   dramatically since Scraton and Flintoff's (1992) influential text. To our knowledge, however,

103   there have been no studies of T-PETE that have been grounded in the feminist perspectives

104   described by bell hooks (1994; 2015a, 2015b). In this study, we drew on hooks' work for two

105   reasons. First, we believed that the central constructs of her work would be useful in guiding data

106   collection and analysis, and help frame the findings of our research. Second, we hoped to draw

107   attention to hooks' work with the hope that other sport pedagogy scholars might also see it as

108   useful in their research.

109   Feminism is one of the most powerful social justice movements of the postmodern era

110   (hooks, 2015b) and serves the needs of all individuals through advocating an end to sexism,

111   sexist exploitation, and oppression of all kinds (hooks, 2015a). Since the feminist movement is

112   aimed at providing peace and well-being for all, it has transformative potential for a more equal

113   and equitable society for all persons. Thus, transformation contributes to the vision of a more

114   ethically conscious and socially responsible society. Central constructs to feminism include

115   political consciousness, sisterhood, and using work as a place for activism (hooks, 2015b).

116   Politically conscious individuals commit to being educated on political matters. Subsequently,

117   they form political solidarity with other feminist advocates. Specifically, advocates seek to

118   challenge White supremacy, domination, heterosexism, genderism, classism, and racism,

119   forming sisterhoods where allies come together in support of one another. To show a

120   commitment to the movement, feminists take their perspectives into their workplace and

121   advocate to end all types of oppression.

122   Feminist theory was also appropriate to use in this paper because the participants in this

123   study identified as women, and collectively they embodied and engaged in the feminist struggle

124   as educators within higher education (hooks, 1994). Therefore, key concepts were also drawn

125   from feminist pedagogy (hooks, 1994). Feminist pedagogy seeks to raise the critical

126   consciousness of PTs, whereby students gain a heightened sense of awareness related to

127   inequality in society. Raising critical consciousness is an essential component of feminism

128   because when individuals become aware of injustices, they can use sociocultural knowledge in

129   action to combat them. Furthermore, as hooks (1994) suggested, teaching is a political

130   performative act that is dialogical, reciprocal, communicative, critical, non-conforming, and

131   engaging. Thus, teaching opposes standard direct teaching methods, is largely conversation

132   based, includes injustice topics, and draws on students' knowledge.

133   **Method**

134   During this study, we took a critical ethnographic qualitative approach (Madison, 2012).

135   Feminist research is linked to feminist politics (Scraton & Flintoff, 1992), therefore, by taking

136   this approach, we had a political purpose to describe, analyze, and dialogically uncover power

137   and assumptions which evoked social consciousness and change (Thomas, 1993). Specifically,

138   following Madison (2012), we attempted to challenge the traditional norms of research through a

139   mutual and reciprocal participatory design that provided opportunities for ourselves and the

140   participants to engage in ongoing reflections, reciprocal dialogue, and negotiation with the goal

141   that all of us would be empowered. In this sense, we hope that the research would be

142   emancipatory and enable the participants and ourselves to further the social justice agenda

143   (Azzarito et al., 2017). Prior to commencing the study, we also recognized that since researchers

144   are agents within systems of power, some of our findings were likely to be to privileged and

145   others censored (Foucault & Deleuze, 1977). In an attempt to curtail the extent to which this

146   occurred, we made every effort to 'let the data speak to us and listen[ed] closely' (Thomas, 1993,

147   p. 63) to our participants' voices.

148   ***Participants and setting***

149   Participants were three White, female, able-bodied, lesbian/gay sport pedagogy FMs who

150   considered themselves socially liberal. They worked in different universities in the United States,

151   and their primary role was to educate PE teachers within 4-year undergraduate PETE programs.

152   The FMs were purposefully selected because of their scholarly focus on critical issues and due to

153   their engagement in T-PETE for a number of years, thus answering calls for research and the

154   long-term effects of delivering T-PETE (Ovens, 2017). During the academic year in which the

155   study took place, all three FMs taught courses in which they attempted to employ T-PETE. Prior

156   to the study commencing, each FM signed a consent form and selected a pseudonym for herself.

157   Harper was in her late 30s and had worked in a medium-sized public research-focused

158   university situated in the Midwest for 10 years. As well as teaching in the undergraduate PETE

159   program, she also served as her institution's director for teacher education. Harper attempted T-

160   PETE within a secondary methods course, her department's introduction to kinesiology course,

161   six content courses (fitness & health, target & fielding games and general secondary content) and

162   a seminar for late-stage PTs. Typically, the enrollment in Harper's classes ranged from 10 to 20

163   PTs.

164   The second FM, Eva, also worked in the Midwest at a large public research-focused

165   university. She was in her early 50s and had been employed at her institution for 20 years. Eva

166   taught within her department's graduate program as well as working with undergraduate PTs.

167   She attempted to conduct T-PETE primarily within an elementary methods course and courses

168   on content for upper elementary children, adventure-based learning, sociocultural issues in PE

169   and sport, and disability sport. The latter two courses included students from other kinesiological

170   majors as well as PTs. Her class sizes ranged from 20 to 50 students.

171   The third FM, Tara, was in her late 30s and had worked at a large public, research-

172   focused university situated in the Southeast for 8 years. Tara attempted to carry out T-PETE

173   within a secondary methods course, three content courses (middle school adventure education,

174   the tactical games approach, and high school sport education; weight training; and physical

175   activity/fitness), the culminating student teaching internship, and two seminars for late-stage

176   PTs. Her class sizes ranged from 14 to 29 PTs. Tara also taught in her department's online PE

177   master's program.

178   *Data collection*

179   The methods by which data were collected were discussed and agreed on by the first

180   author and the participants once they had indicated a willingness to take part in the study.

181   Subsequently, data were collected by employing six qualitative methods. In congruence with the

182   FMs' suggestion, a *formal interview* via Zoom with the first author was a key data collection

183   method. These interviews were conversational in nature. During the formal interviews, FMs

184   provided pertinent background and demographic data, described the pedagogies and methods by

185   which they attempted to conduct T-PETE, and noted specific facilitators and barriers to taking

186   this kind of approach to teacher education. Formal interviews were audio-recorded and

187   transcribed verbatim. They ranged in length from 114 to 127 minutes.

188   The FMs also took part in a face-to-face 97-minute *focus group interview*, during which

189   they were asked to collaborate to create an ideal T-PETE curriculum in terms of courses, content,

190   and pedagogies. The active participation in the focus group interview, we hoped, would be a

191   transformative experience for the FMs in that it would enable them to learn from each other and

192   produce something that was new to each of them. The focus group interview was also audio-

193   recorded and transcribed.

194   A third source of data was 29 free-written *email conversations* between the three FMs

195   and the first author in which the contents, successes, difficulties, and failures of FMs' recent T-

196   PETE classes were discussed. The emails were informal, often involved a number of exchanges,

197   and completed at the FMs' convenience. FMs also shared 236 relevant *written materials* they

198   used or had created as part of their efforts to conduct T-PETE. These materials were uploaded to

199   a shared Google Drive or emailed to the first author and subjected to content and thematic

200   analyses (Bowen, 2009).

201   Tara and Harper also uploaded entries to an *electronic journal* to the shared Google

202   Drive. These entries included their thoughts and reflections as they taught their T-PETE classes

203   regarding their methods and pedagogies and the barriers and facilitators they perceived as

204   negating or promoting any successes and failures. Reflections were critically-orientated, honest,

205   and focused on pedagogical improvement.

206   Eva supplied three *film snippets* of herself (233 minutes) via email, which illustrated

207   some of the key pedagogies she employed while attempting T-PETE. The first author made notes

208   on the contents of these film snippets which included descriptions and commentary as well as

209   direct quotes of Eva (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). In a follow-up conversation with the first author,

210   Eva expanded on what had been portrayed in the film snippets and so improved our

211   understanding of her T-PETE.

212   Finally, Harper suggested that one of her colleagues be contacted as part of the study.

213   Juju (a self-selected pseudonym), a White male, was a new faculty member at Harper's

214   institution. At the time the study took place, he was observing Harper with the goal of improving

215   his own understanding of T-PETE. Juju shared *field notes* he had taken, describing Harper's

216   pedagogies and interactions with PTs during her courses. He also answered follow-up questions

217   about these notes posed by the first author via email.

218   ***Data analysis***

219   Data were analyzed inductively and deductively by the first author within an overarching

220   framework based on the three analytic actions outlined by Miles and Huberman (1994). These

221   were (a) data reduction, (b) drawing conclusions about the data's meaning, and (c) data display.

222   Throughout this process, she employed the QSR NVivo 11 software. Initially, data from all

223   sources were coded as chunks that represented single actions, thoughts, ideas, beliefs, and topics.

224   These chunks were then coded a second time as pertaining to one of the two research questions.

225   Thus, two subsets of data were formed. Subsequently, during multiple readings of each sub-set,

226   the first author linked the findings to feminist theoretical perspectives, data chunks were grouped

227   to form categories, and categories were collapsed into larger themes. Finally, data snippets

228   representing each theme were selected for inclusion in the findings section of this manuscript.

229   Throughout the analysis, the second author took on the role of 'critical friend' (Costa & Kallick,

230   1993) by discussing and critiquing developing categories and themes with the first author.

231   Four strategies were employed to enhance the credibility and trustworthiness of the analysis

232   (Patton, 2015). First, an *audit trail* was created, which involved noting the specific time data were

233   collected and the method employed to collect those data. This involved noting the time-specific

234   data were collected and the method employed to collect those data. Second, by collecting data with

235   six different methods, we were able to *triangulate* our findings and cross-check them for accuracy.

236   Third, any *negative* and *discrepant cases* discovered resulted in categories and themes being

237   modified. Fourth, frequent *member checks* were made throughout the data collection process

238   during which FMs were asked to confirm whether or not previously gathered data were recorded

239   accurately. A final member check involved the FMs reading an earlier version of this manuscript

240   and providing feedback as to its accuracy.

241   **Findings and Discussion**

242   In the following sections, we begin by describing and illustrating the content, organization,

243   and methods the FMs employed in an attempt to influence their PTs' perspectives and practices

244   within three themes. These were (a) *T-PETE goals*, (b) *T-PETE content*, and (c) *T-PETE*

245   *pedagogies*. Next, we describe and illustrate the factors that served to facilitate or limit the FMs'

246   effectiveness when engaging in T-PETE within four themes. These were (a) *personal experience*,

247   (b) *the sisterhood*, (c) *women at work*, and (d) *political consciousness*.

248   ***FMs T-PETE***

249   *T-PETE goals*

250   The FMs teaching philosophy drove their T-PETE goal, and each FM identified a

251   sociocultural goal for PE that did not focus predominantly on biomedical and psychomotor

252   elements (Cliff, 2012; Cliff et al., 2009).

253   [Education] is to allow kids to understand themselves, to grow into individuals who are

254   emotionally grounded, socially competent, appreciate diversity, understand what it means

255   to work with others of all different backgrounds than theirs and to be able to take those

256   skills and apply them to their lives outside of schools. So I see the bigger picture . . . the

257   more important skills are the social and emotional skills. (Eva, Interview)

258

259   I think that [PE] kind of allows us to make students become better consumers of

260   knowledge and consumers of information so that they don't latch on to the latest fad diet

261   and only eat grapefruits for six days and hope to lose 20 pounds or whatever, and to

262   understand that *some* movement and *some* activity is better than none. (Tara, Interview)

263

264   I want them to be able to feel comfortable within their own bodies, comfortable within a

265   movement space, and hope for them, that they can gain confidence and have level of

266   comfort in that environment that maybe they'll be interested in being physically active

267   and for me, I don't care what physically active looks like and so I feel like PE is more

268   about exposing them to physical activities. (Harper, Interview)

269   The FMs' goals for PE drove their T-PETE content. Subsequently, this involved a critical

270   examination of sociocultural issues by PTs as suggested by Cliff (2012), McCuaig and Enright

271   (2017), Walton-Fisette et al., (2018), Philpot (2016), and Ruiz and Fernández-Balboa (2005).

272   *T- PETE content: Political solidarity, fighting for all forms of oppression*

273   Unlike findings with FMs by Ruiz and Fernández-Balboa (2005) and Walton-Fisette et

274   al. (2018) each FM in this study had a clear understanding of the definitions, purposes, and

275   practices congruent with T-PETE. Key content used by the FMs are shown in Table 1. The table

276   reveals that the FMs covered a variety of content including race, ethnicity, social class, religion,

277   and inclusive practices. One of the only differences in the FMs' delivery of the content included

278   the fact that Eva taught a specific sociocultural course for PTs. She was able to intentionally and

279   explicitly base all of the content for the class on various forms of oppression. However, while

280   still intentional and explicit in their planning, Harper and Tara were required to draw on

281   teachable moments (Walton-Fisette et al., 2018) to examine sociocultural issues during

282   coursework primarily aimed at other objectives. For example, Harper's syllabi outlined, 'A

283   sociocultural perspective will be infused throughout all instructional and pedagogical discussions

284   and experiences' (Harper, Document). Tara also provided a resource to her PTs stating: 'Good

285   teachers prevent inequalities, prevent student domination, [and] prevent the use of social

286   stereotypes' (Tara, Document).

287   Each FM identified that they needed to dedicate a large portion of class time to educating

288   PTs on the content of sociocultural issues. In line with feminist theory, they were cautious not to

289   dismiss any form of oppression and used content related to the intersectionality of race, gender,

290   and social class (hooks, 2015b). Eva acknowledged,

291   We need to address those social-cultural issues to help tackle or promote social justice,

292   but at the same time realizing, for me, for example, I am a lesbian, but that's not the only

293   part, so there needs to be the intersection of these social-cultural issues so it's not just

294   realizing that it is a single issue. (Eva, Interview)

295   Becoming aware of social issues that affect the teaching and learning process, both directly or

296   indirectly, provided PTs the opportunity to raise their critical consciousness, and potentially for

297   transformative action (Fernández-Balboa, 1995).

298   *T-PETE pedagogies: The performative act*

299   Each of the FMs shared similar approaches toward the pedagogical act. The key methods,

300   assessment, and organizational structures used by the FMs are shown in Table 1. The table

301   reveals that the FMs covered a variety of methods that were deemed common approaches to T-

302   PETE such as storytelling, discussion and debate of critical cases, place-based pedagogies, peer

303   teaching, inquiry-based learning, role-play, critically-focused clinical experiences, negotiation,

304   project-based learning, reflective journaling, and autobiographies (Ovens, 2017; Ukpokodu,

305   2007; Walton-Fisette et al., 2018). Additionally, the FMs in this study employed digital media,

306   freewriting, arts-based activities, gallery walks, guest lectures, and immersion experiences as T-

307   PETE methods (see Table 1). Each of the FMs adopted similar T-PETE approaches with the

308   exception of core assessment methods. Table 1 reveals the FMs' assessments. Harper and Tara,

309   who did not have their own sociocultural class, were forced to include slightly more traditional

310   methods that were required for passing teacher education in the United States, such as the

311   Educative Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA), unit plans, and teaching portfolios.

312   Despite being held to teacher education requirements by law, the FMs infused non-traditional

313   assessments within their classes such as sociocultural journals, reflection papers, and resource

314   packets (see Table 1). As Eva said, 'I never do exams. I just don't like it' (Eva, Interview). Each

315   FM stressed the participatory aspect of assessment, and due dates were adjustable and flexible

316   rather than rigid and fixed (hooks, 1994). Class negotiation is a key element of T-PETE, as Tara

317   illuminated, 'My due dates are always flexible' (Tara, Interview).

318   Lastly, Table 1 reveals the FMs' organizational structure of the class, which was largely

319   discussion-focused and student-centered. The T-PETE methods were often dependent on the day,

320   content, lesson, and mood of the teacher and were enhanced by the organizational structure of

321   classes (often circle based), which allowed for a student-centered experience with a focus on

322   dialogue. Juju noticed this in Harper's lessons: '[Harper] definitely focuses on bringing the

323   students into the subject matter directly, most often through discussion and/or group work' (Juju,

324   Field Notes). Tara also commented on how she encourages dialogue:

325   I would have to say that classes are more discussion based . . . I don't allow my students

326   to sit in rows. I hate rows. I think they are very sterile and so we call it the circle of trust

327   and I just have them form a circle with the desks, so we can all sit and see each other and

328   talk. (Tara, Interview)

329   In line with feminist pedagogy, the classroom was a participatory space for all to contribute to,

330   where the FMs did not have to be dictators (hooks, 1994). At times, PTs peer taught one another:

331   'My students continue to identify social justice issues and are open to the conversations on how

332   to respond and for some, to educate others. That inspires and excites me' (Harper, Email).

333   Importantly, dialogue provided students an opportunity to raise their critical consciousness and

334   supported the classroom atmosphere toward a community orientation (hooks, 1994).

335   In Eva's teaching video, the first author noted, 'Eva is walking around the room with a

336   baby on her hip. After five minutes, she gives the baby to another student and continues to walk

337   around the room listening to group discussions' (Eva, Film Snippet 2, Field Notes). When

338   speaking with Eva about the baby and whose it was, she commented that the

339   [baby] belongs to one of my students. Due to the late afternoon/early evening timeframe

340   for the class, there were a number of different times that [baby] came to class as her

341   daycare closed before class was finished! The class was great with her, and a few of us

342   would take it in turns to walk around with [baby] if she was a little fussy so her mum

343   could focus on classwork! (Eva, Email)

344   Such a spirit of love, compassion, and understanding of other women's education is essential to

345   feminist leaders (hooks, 2015b). Consistent with hooks (1994), the FMs provided a classroom

346   climate that was open and encouraged intellectual rigor for all students, despite situational

347   circumstances. Consequently, the FMs' pedagogies focused on creating a community through

348   democratic settings and all students felt a responsibility to contribute; both are essential elements

349   of TP (Ukpokodu, 2009).

Factors that facilitated and limited the FMs' effectiveness

350

351   *Personal experience facilitated critical consciousness*

352   The main facilitator for conducting T-PETE for each FM was using their personal

353   experience, which allowed them the opportunity to be vulnerable with their PTs in an attempt to

354   raise their critical consciousness. Although TP does not necessarily lead to transformation

355   (Ovens, 2017), the feminist educators in this study worked for critical consciousness (hooks,

356   2015a). Raising critical consciousness is an essential component of T-PETE because when an

357   individual becomes critically aware of injustices, they can work toward addressing them (Cliff,

358   2012; Cliff et al., 2009; Philpot, 2016).

359   [I aim to] to bring them [students] to a level of awareness and understanding . . . with the

360   hope that some will develop a critical consciousness and even become advocates of their

361   own, but I hope that when they become teachers, at the very least, they do not perpetuate

362   social inequalities. (Harper, E-journal)

363   FMs were conscious of the pain, discomfort, and conflicting beliefs/values that the PTs

364   could be experiencing, a common finding of conscious raising (hooks, 1994). Similarly to hooks

365   (1994) and Flory and Walton-Fisette (2015), the FMs shared their 'own stories,' 'personal

366   experiences,' and confessions to support students in uncovering their 'biographies,' 'beliefs,'

367   'values,' and 'perspectives' and related them to the 'students' lives/contexts.' Specifically,

368   Harper wrote a personal identity paper to show her students when they were completing their

369   own:

370   Whenever I talk to people back home, they cannot believe a poor kid who had a difficult

371   upbringing has attained such an educational status as I have. I was one of the very few

372   who made it. I'm still the only person from my mom's side of the family to graduate from

373   college. And now, I consider myself to be monetarily privileged: Even though I had

374   extensive student loans, I am a college professor and live comfortably, unlike many

375   people in this world. I feel grateful for my economic privilege every single day. (Harper,

376   Document)

377   Eva expressed vulnerability by emphasizing her passion and being emotional with her students:

378   I'm completely honest with my students. They know who I am. They know my identity. I

379   bring it up as examples in class . . . first off when we were talking about disability and

380   then when we were talking about LGBTQI issues . . . But, when we were talking about

381   those issues at the end of class because there was some flippant comments that were

382   coming out . . . I took about 20 minutes and got really emotional actually when we were

383   talking about disability saying you know I understand that most of you have never

384   experienced this and its hard sometimes if you haven't experienced a disability to really

385   understand how you are oppressed on a daily basis, and so I think putting myself into

386   these sessions helped them to realize how passionate I felt about these issues and why I

387   wanted them to understand these issues because my whole thing was, I want you to

388   explore your identity and understand how these have impacted you. But more

389   importantly, I want you to take this and understand this impacts your teaching because

390   your self-identity impacts how you teach and so here you are flippantly talking about

391   disability, and yet you will be teaching kids with disabilities day in, day out, whether it's

392   a hidden disability or whatever it might be, and I did the same when we were talking

393   about LGBT. I always *come out* in that class. I always try and save it for that class. (Eva,

394   Interview)

395 Also, after sharing a significant personal scenario with her PTs and confessing her own identity,

396 Tara reflected on the importance of being vulnerable with PTs and stressed that creating the right

397 organizational environment allowed this to occur:

398   I am crying to my students about dating a woman and being a lesbian and my parents not

399   totally knowing yet and all this scary stuff, and it was so unexpected, and I think that's

400   when I realized when you are willing to be vulnerable and human with your students. I

401   think you are able to get a lot more across to them. I know some professors do not like to

402   share their personal lives with students whatsoever because they do not think it's

403   professional and it crosses a line or whatever, but I think just being real and intentionally

404   vulnerable with your students can be very positive and just the whole ivory tower, let's

405   not knock it down, I'm an educator, you're an educator, let's learn together. (Tara,

406   Interview)

407 *The Sisterhood*

408   A secondary facilitator included forming a sisterhood with each other, which came to

409 light through the FMs' shared research interests, influential past mentors, and friendship. Most

410 T-PETE FMs work alone within their respective institutions in their efforts for conscious raising

411 (Fernández-Balboa, 2017; Flory & Walton-Fisette, 2015; Ovens, 2017) and that was the case in

412 this study. By forming allies, the FMs came together in support of one another. They directed

413 their research line to common goals: 'Having just written a [journal] paper on [topic], Harper and

414 I wrote the introduction together' (Eva, Interview). The sisterhood meant that the FMs were

415 provided with support from colleagues outside of their institutions: 'My colleagues and I—when

416   I say my colleagues and I mean the research group that I work with [i.e., Eva and Tara]' (Harper,

417   Interview). Harper went on to illustrate how difficult it was finding like-minded individuals:

418   'Really finding very few scholars in the field to really connect with has been helpful but

419   challenging' (Harper, Interview).

420   The focus group provided an opportunity for the FMs to consider future needs in T-

421   PETE, and they reflected on the instrumental value of their doctoral mentors:

422   Harper: We really need to think about the next steps for the research that we are doing,

423   and obviously you [the first author] are doing stuff that is similar but also different from

424   what we are doing but . . .

425   Tara: We all had mentors, and they didn't pave the way, but they sort of swept some dirt

426   off to help us blaze our trail.

427   Eva: Or pushed your thinking.

428   Tara: Yeah. So, you [Eva] had [name of professor], you [Harper] had [name of

429   professor], I had [name of professor]. I think of each of us would potentially get here, but

430   maybe, we needed a little extra nudge perhaps?

431   Harper: Yes, and my nudge was being in that minority mindset right? You had to fight

432   and work, and that is why we came all together, and I knew ultimately I couldn't do it

433   [form in solidarity] by myself and I wanted other people that were strong that could do

434   this, but we need to continue this, and we can't just stop the buck. (Focus Group)

435   The FMs strengthened and affirmed one another by coming together to form a bond and creating

436   a sisterhood (hooks, 2015b). Harper illustrated, 'Honestly, you hold on to really good people.

437   You are my left-hand person [Eva]' (Focus Group). Tara explained her thoughts in an email

438   conversation after the focus group:

439   I was inspired to talk with two other colleagues that are like-minded and share some of

440   our struggles and successes together . . . it will inspire me to reach out to Eva & Harper

441   again in the future when I am struggling or having a tough time. (Tara, Email)

442   *Women at work*

443   Four key limitations that hindered the FMs' ability to conduct T-PETE came to light

444   during the study. These were sexism, homophobia, solitary work conditions, and the social

445   justice illiteracy of colleagues. Sexism is still the norm in higher education (Cole & Hassel,

446   2017) and White middle-class women face stressful and unsatisfying work conditions (hooks,

447   2015b) while juggling family and personal commitments. After Harper's 2-hour interview, she

448   remarked,

449   I just got 22 emails in the time that we have been talking, and so I will quickly go through

450   them in the next few minutes and get home quickly as possible as my daughter's school is

451   closed this week and my wife has been looking after her all day, so it's my turn! (Harper,

452   Interview)

453   Juju identified how PTs inherit sexist thinking in Harper's institution:

454   [Harper] has confided in me that she believes she's known as 'the bitch' of the program.

455   She believes the students have this perception for one main reason—because she is a

456   woman. After talking with her about it, my eyes were opened when she said that if she

457   had the same energy, passion, intensity, and challenged her students the same way, but

458   was a man, the perception would be different. I have to agree with her. Being a male

459   educator is an inherent advantage because of some of the perceptions and stereotypes

460   people hold . . . There is a truth to what she perceives, and it really seems to stem from

461   the fact that she is female. (Juju, Field Notes)

462   Similar to Cole and Hassel (2017) and Flory and Walton-Fisette (2015), the FMs in this

463   study spoke at length as to how they worked in isolation and challenged homophobia and sexist

464   thinking as part of the feminist movement (hooks, 2015a, b).

465   I also asked if anyone in the group was dating—not because any of my business, but

466   because that type of information might be important to know for grouping students. I also

467   had on my mind that two students from my very first cohort got married just after the first

468   of the year, which I found just adorable! . . . Well, after asking this of the group, one of

469   the male students pointed across the circle to two other male students and said "those two

470   are!" and started laughing. I was frozen. This was a completely homophobic remark, and

471   this group of students has no idea that I have a female partner, so I had to think quickly

472   about how to address this . . . I also couldn't just let his homophobic comment go

473   unaddressed, because that is a really terrible message to send. Looking back, I'm actually

474   sort of proud of myself for thinking on my feet like I did! [Tara provided an example of

475   homophobic language in school she had observed.] What I did say was that as educators,

476   we need to be very careful about the words that we use, because what we say or don't say

477   carries so much importance. (Tara, E-journal)

478   Additionally, Eva noted that her colleagues perpetuated sociocultural issues because of their

479   focus on motor competence:

480   Eva: Now getting them on board with social justice is another matter. They think they are

481   all on board with social justice, but their viewpoint or their lens is very different from like

482   [sociocritical perspectives]. We have got a huge continuum, just talking about gender,

483   "Well I talk about gender, so I am doing socially critically stuff [voicing a colleague]."

484   Erm, well no, not really.

485   First author: But really, they are really perpetuating gender inequality?

486   Eva: Yep . . . we come from all different backgrounds and all different philosophical

487   positions. . . . I mean my focus is on the social-emotional, not getting them to be able to

488   name off the ten critical elements of the forehand lob in badminton or whatever it might

489   be. (Eva Interview)

490   Eva was also adamant that some of her colleagues were cognizant of social justice issues,

491 but believed that they focused on motor competence during their classes. Thus, she was of the

492 opinion that her colleagues avoided covering and discussing sociocultural issues with their

493 students and so perpetuated hidden inequalities that plagued society. Harper also emphasized her

494 solitary work and research at her institution

495   First author: Do you think your colleagues do perpetuate it because they are focused on

496   [specific curriculum models]?

497   Harper: Oh yeah, yep, I mean a lot of them don't see their own privilege, a lot don't teach

498   about those issues. Even our adapted PE specialist who's [ethnicity stated] is also a

499   traditionalist so his research may focus on some social issues but it's not what he

500   practices at all . . . I am with two behaviorists, right? I mean I can't get away from

501   [author/date] book. I'm like, let's move with the times people! . . . It's hard; it's hard.

502   (Harper, Interview)

503 In the focus group, Eva and Tara highlighted the frustration of social justice illiterate colleagues

504 toward sociocultural issues and their fat biases:

505   Tara: One of our colleagues tells me about our obese students at least twice a week and

506   how we should be fitness testing them and maybe how he needs to have a conversation

507   with him *man to man* with this one student. It is like, "Do you not think he looks in the

508   mirror every day and knows that he is overweight and do you want a lawsuit and do you

509   want us to lose our program?" You can't say that. It doesn't mean that he is not gonna be

510   able. I am like, "Would you pass these tests?" Just stop. He is like, "Back in the 70s in

511   [college] we used to." And I am like, "It is 2018, that was 40 years ago, almost 50. I don't

512   need to hear about that."

513   Eva: I have had colleagues around a student who was overweight, probably obese. Great

514   playing, really good playing sports, really good teacher, had urban experience and when

515   it came to our interviews one of them goes, "is she [student] really a good role model for

516   PE teachers?"

517   Tara: "Just stop, bitch please," is what I have to say about that [said in jest, referring to

518   colleague].

519   Eva: [response to colleague] "Yes, let's stop this conversation right now, first of all she's

520   a great teacher, she has got a wealth of experience, and you are gonna stop her going into

521   this profession because of her weight? What message is that sending to students?" I am

522   like oh my god, 'I am either gonna hit you or leave the room [said in jest].' But the

523   mindset was there. (Focus Group)

524   Those in higher education are expected to publish but not teach in unique and passionate ways

525   (hooks, 1994). Consequently, conservative colleagues often feel threatened by liberal, left-

526   leaning, non-traditional educators (hooks, 1994), but ultimately, being a solitary FM limits T-

527   PETE and can infuriate FMs with sociocultural philosophies. A faculty-wide agenda is necessary

528   to raise the critical consciousness of PTs (Ovens, 2017), as Eva suggested,

529   I think the ideal PETE program would have a faculty who were all on the same page

530   coming from the same philosophical position, buying into the same belief system. You

531   can teach in different ways but having a consensus of people who feel the same way is

532   important because that way it's a consistent message to students. (Eva, Interview)

533   *Politically conscious*

534   Three main limitations hindered the FMs' ability to conduct T-PETE. These were the

535   political situation of the United States, the FMs' political consciousness, and their PTs' political

536   views. All three FMs believed that the political climate in the United States served to counter and

537   constrain their efforts to conduct T-PETE. Specifically, they were concerned about the 'lurch to

538   the right' the country had taken following the election of Donald Trump as President:

539   It's just frightening to be honest, what is happening and how unsafe people are feeling

540   who are being discriminated against or oppressed and how emboldened to those who

541   have kept their views to themselves feel that they can come out and make these racist,

542   misogynist comments or action without any recourse. (Eva, Interview)

543

544   I have my definite views on politics, exceedingly so, it's depressing, I am angry, I mean

545   we have a tyrant that is in office who is sexist, misogynistic, every phobic in the entire

546   universe who is overturning so much of what President Obama did . . . when it comes to

547   education it's deplorable. (Harper, Interview)

548

549   I think we are on the cusp, I don't wanna say dark times, but I have a feeling that it is

550   gonna get worse before it gets better…. just this veil of yuckiness because we have this

551   awful president and there is all of this injustice and…. he's just a bigot, and people don't

552   see the difference. (Tara, Interview)

553   Each FM highlighted their political consciousness through a sustained commitment to

554   fighting all forms of oppression (hooks, 2015a, b). In addition, they recognized that education

555   could not be politically neutral (hooks, 1994). As a consequence, their political consciousness

556   influenced their T-PETE content, pedagogies, and organizational structures.

557   In contrast, the FMs noted that many of their PTs were in favor of the right-wing agenda

558   being advocated by the President and his supporters and explained that this was a further

559   constraint on their effectiveness in terms of delivering T-PETE: 'It's terrifying sometimes to

560   think about the preconceived notions and biases that some of our students have!' (Tara, E-

561   journal). Eva agreed, 'That's how they've grown up and the values that they have had and what

562   has been accepted in their group' (Eva, Interview). Harper illustrated the importance of teaching

563   her students about social inequalities, because otherwise 'that is how we end up getting someone

564   like Trump in office because they don't know how to be able to see the [social] issues' (Harper,

565   Interview). Eva suggested educators must 'challenge [PTs] in a constructive way' (Eva,

566   Interview). Ultimately, however, all three FMs conceded that many of their students resisted the

567   content and ideas they were teaching because of their biographies and life histories.

568   **Conclusions and Implications**

569   The FMs in this study embodied and engaged in the feminist struggle as educators in higher

570   education (hooks, 1994). The experiences they shared during this study highlighted the fact that

571   academic institutions, and FMs within them, must be cognizant of the inequitable structures they

572   have inherited (Cole & Hassel, 2017). Moreover, they emphasize the need for all FMs to challenge

573   sexist and heteronormative thinking and that this crucial work not be left solely to feminist leaders.

574   Further, our participants' struggles indicate how important it is for those in higher education to

575   investigate how sex, race, gender, class, and ability intersect and have a negative impact within the

576   academy, with the goal of creating and establishing inclusive structures and practices. Only then,

577   will students in higher education be socialized into viewing different identities as equitable, and,

578   unlike some of the PTs referred to by the paticipants in this study, not devalue a women's

579   pedagogy.

580   As it is part of the higher education structure, this study also has implications for PETE

581   programs in the United States. Considering PETE should seek to address social justice issues and

582   inequality (Ruiz & Fernández-Balboa, 2005), we agree with Ovens (2012): TP can only work

583   when it is entrenched in every aspect of PTs' lives. Not only must all faculty be on board, but it

584   must be consistent across content, methods, and organizational structures in programs.

585   Furthermore, based on our study, we would tentatively suggest that many American PETE

586   programs would need reform so they are aligned with a social justice agenda. Ukpokodu (2007)

587   made several recommendations for teacher education courses with which we agree. These included

588   changing the core perspectives of the program, reorienting FMs' knowledge to the sociopolitical

589   context of schools, creating and offering sequential courses on teaching for social justice in the

590   program of study for PTs, and focusing efforts on diversifying faculty and student populations to

591   create a balance that reflects student populations in public schools.

592   Finally, reforms are suggested based on the fact that, to our knowledge, there is not a

593   comprehensive T-PETE program in the United States. Therefore, we suggest that sport pedagogists

594   need to study American PETE programs that claim to be transformative or that are working toward

595   more equitable goals. This would allow us to understand how a social justice agenda and T-PETE

596   are enacted at present. In addition, researchers need to study the influence of these programs on

597   PTs' perspectives and practices. Furthermore, we have told the White, female, lesbian/gay, able-

598   bodied story. Future research would be beneficial if it focused on other identifying transformative

599   pedagogues to see how they enacted T-PETE. It would also be helpful to study individual FMs

600   who become T-PETE advocates. This would allow us to 'learn what it actually takes to

601   'transform'' (Tinning, 2017, p. 290). Taking a critical ethnographic approach, in which feminist

602   pedagogy and perspectives are featured, could be one lens through which such research is viewed.

603   References

604   Azzarito, L., Macdonald, D., Dagkas, S., & Fisette, J. (2017). Revitalizing the physical education

605   social-justice agenda in the global era: Where do we go from here? *Quest, 69*(2), 205-

606   219.

607   Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research*

608   *Journal*, *9*(2), 27-40.

609   Cliff, K. P. (2012). A sociocultural perspective as a curriculum change in health and physical

610   education. *Sport, Education and Society, 17*(3), 293-311.

611   Cliff, K. P., Wright, J., & Clarke, D. (2009). What does a 'sociocultural perspective'mean in

612   health and physical education? In M. Dinan-Thompson (Ed.), *Health and physical*

613   *education:Issues for curriculum in Australia and New Zealand* (pp. 165-182).

614   Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

615   Cole, K., & Hassel, H. (2017). *Surviving sexism in academia: Strategies for feminist leadership*.

616   New York: Routledge.

617   Costa, A. L., & Kallick, B. (1993). Through the lens of a critical friend. *Educational Leadership*,

618   *51*, 49-49.

619   Curtner-Smith, M. D., & Sofo, S. (2004). Influence of a critically oriented methods course and

620   early field experience on preservice teachers' conceptions of teaching. *Sport, Education*

621   *and Society, 9*(1), 115-142.

622   Fernández -Balboa, J.M. (1993). Sociocultural characteristics of the hidden curriculum in

623   physical education. *Quest, 45*(2), 230-254.

624   Fernández -Balboa, J.M. (1995). Reclaiming physical education in higher education through

625   critical pedagogy. *Quest, 47*(1), 91-114.

626   Fernández-Balboa, J. M. (2017). A contrasting analysis of the neo-liberal and socio-critical

627   structural strategies in health and physical education: reflections on the emancipatory

628   agenda within and beyond the limits of HPE. *Sport, Education and Society*, *22*(5), 658-

629   668.

630   Flory, S. B., & Walton-Fisette, J. L. (2015). Teaching sociocultural issues to pre-service physical

631   education teachers: A self-study. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical*

632   *Education, 6*(3), 245-257.

633   Foucault, M., & Deleuze, G. (1977). Intellectuals and power. In D. F. Bouchard (Ed.), *Language,*

634   *counter-memory, practice: Selected essays and interviews* (pp. 205-217). Ithaca: Cornell

635   University Press.

636   Gerdin, G., Philpot, R., & Smith, W. (2018). It is only an intervention, but it can sow very fertile

637   seeds: graduate physical education teachers' interpretations of critical pedagogy. *Sport,*

638   *Education and Society*, *23*(3) 203-215.

639   hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress*. New York: Routledge.

640   hooks, b. (2015a). *Feminism is for everybody: Passionate politics* (2nd ed.). New York:

641   Routledge.

642   hooks, b. (2015b). *Feminist theory: From margin to center* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.

643   Kirk, D. (1998). *Schooling bodies: School practice and public discourse 1880-1950*. London:

644   Leicester University Press.

645   Kirk, D. (2009). *Physical education futures*. New York: Routledge.

646   Madison, D. S. (2012). *Critical ethnography: Method, performance, and ethics* (2nd ed.).

647   Thousand Oaks: Sage.

648   McCuaig, L., & Enright, E. (2017). Effective physical education teacher education: A principled

649   position In C. Ennis (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of physical education pedagogies*

650   (pp. 428-446). New York: Taylor & Francis.

651   Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and*

652   *implementation* (4th ed.). San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

653   Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook* (2nd ed.).

654   Thousand Oaks: Sage.

655   Ovens, A. (2017). Transformative aspirations and realities in physical education and teacher

656   education (PETE). In C. Ennis (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of physical education*

657   *pedagogies* (pp. 295-306). New York: Taylor & Francis.

658   Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks:

659   Sage.

660   Philpot, R. (2016). Physical education initial teacher educators' expressions of critical pedagogy

661   (ies) Coherency, complexity or confusion? *European Physical Education Review, 22*(2),

662   260-275.

663   Rovegno, I. (2008). Learning and instruction in social, cultural environments: Promising

664   research agendas. *Quest, 60*(1), 84-104.

665   Ruiz, B. M., & Fernández-Balboa, J.M. (2005). Physical education teacher educators' personal

666   perspectives regarding their practice of critical pedagogy. *Journal of Teaching in*

667   *Physical Education, 24*(3), 243-264.

668   Scraton, S., & Flintoff, A. (1992). Feminist research and physical education. In A. Sparkes

669   (Ed.), *Research in physical education and sport: Exploring alternative visions* (pp. 167-

670   187). London: Falmer Press.

671   Thomas, J. (1993). *Doing critical ethnography*. Newbury Park: Sage.

672   Tinning, R. (2017). Transformative pedagogies and physical education In C. Ennis (Ed.), *The*

673   *Routledge handbook of physical education pedagogies* (pp. 295-306). New York: Taylor

674   & Francis.

675   Ukpokodu, O. (2007). Preparing socially conscious teachers: A social justice-oriented teacher

676   education. *Multicultural Education, 15*(1), 8.

677   Ukpokodu, O. (2009). The practice of transformative pedagogy. *Journal on Excellence in*

678   *College Teaching, 20*(2), 43-67.

679   Walton-Fisette, J. L., Philpot, R., Phillips, S., Flory, S. B., Hill, J., Sutherland, S., & Flemons, M.

680   (2018). Implicit and explicit pedagogical practices related to sociocultural issues and

681   social justice in physical education teacher education programs. *Physical Education and*

682   *Sport Pedagogy*, 1-13.