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ABSTRACT

Once the exclusive domain of teacher education, physical education in Australian tertiary institutions has during the last twenty years evolved into a series of discipline-based fields concerned with human movement studies, leisure studies and sport science that have begun to feed new vocational opportunities in the sport, exercise and leisure industries. Concomitant with these changes in the social organization of knowledge in tertiary physical education has been a realignment of school physical education programmes, particularly in the senior school curriculum. Inevitably, the once sole focus of physical education in tertiary institutions on teacher education is now being forced to reinvent itself in light of these dynamic changes in the social organization of school and university knowledge. Following the work of Bernstein, Goodson and others, this article analyses current policy and practice in physical education teacher education and identifies several future scenarios. The first part of the article provides an historical overview of the emergence of new forms of tertiary knowledge in physical education from the mid-1970s until the present. The second part provides a similar overview of developments in school physical education with a focus on senior school and matriculation physical education during the same period. The third part analyses the current state of affairs in the social organization of knowledge for physical education teacher education. In the fourth part, a series of questions is raised concerning relationships between knowledge in physical education teacher education, school physical education and university forms of the field through the presentation of several future scenarios. The article concludes with several proposals for policy development concerned with physical education teacher education programmes.
Throughout this discussion we will use 'physical activity field' as an indicator for the tertiary field of knowledge that allows us to mark it off from other tertiary fields and to identify particular social constructions of the field rather than using any of these constructions in themselves and in so doing privilege that construction (e.g. 'physical education', 'human movement studies').

**KEY WORDS**

Australian education system; pedagogy; curriculum; physical education.

**INTRODUCTION**

It is clear that the disciplinary shift in physical education in higher education has undermined to some degree the training of teachers of physical education rather than enhanced their skills and status. (Newell, 1990: 234)

Excitement about programmatic and departmental changes was matched by confusion, turmoil, and concern. (Lawson, 1991: 280)

Once the central focus of physical activity programmes in Australian higher education institutions, physical education teacher education has been forced in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s to reinvent itself in response to ongoing educational, cultural and institutional change. In the mid-1990s teacher education remains a major vocational outlet for tertiary level students of physical activity. However, it no longer occupies the pre-eminent place in higher education institutions it once did, prior to the 1970s and with two-and-a-half decades of change. Changes to the curriculum of the physical activity field, to staffing structures and to the location of departments within higher education institutions have each played a part in reconfiguring policy and practice in physical education teacher education and its perceived status and role in Australian higher education.

Physical education teacher educators have also had to respond to other forces outside their institutions. Of major importance have been dramatic changes to physical culture during the post-Second World War period, particularly in relation to the commercialization of sport and recreation and the pervasive power of media sport. Within this broad context, changes to school physical education programmes have prompted the need for physical education teachers to develop new programmes, and new skills and knowledge to teach those programmes. Moreover, there have been broader developments in teacher education, particularly the recent influence of the competencies movement on initial teacher education to which physical education teacher educators will need inevitably to respond.

We will argue in this paper that many of the changes to the physical activity
field in higher education are constituted by a number of discourses that have been repositioned and reconfigured within the curriculum of higher education institutions. Our aim is both to describe and analyse these processes of repositioning and reconfiguration as a means of understanding how the initial education of teachers of physical education has changed over a twenty-five-year period and the implications of these changes for the future of physical education teacher education.

In order to theorize curriculum change in physical education teacher education, we characterize these processes, following Bernstein (1990), as the social construction of pedagogic discourse. This approach emphasizes two features of our analysis: first, we understand curriculum change to occur through structured human activity; and second, that processes of meaning making and communication are intrinsic to these activities. In the first half of the article we explain briefly our understanding of the social construction of pedagogic discourse as we wish to apply this notion within our analysis. We then locate current configurations of physical education teacher education within changes over the past twenty-five years to the physical activity field in higher education more broadly, and note a range of challenges that arise from these changes. In the second half, our focus shifts to consider changes to physical culture, school physical education, and initial teacher education policy. We conclude with a discussion of the interfaces between physical education teacher education and each of these cultural, secondary school and teacher education discourses, and the possible futures that may derive from further juxtapositioning and reconfigurations of these discourses.

UNDERSTANDING THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION AND CONSTITUTION OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHER EDUCATION

The turbulence of change and the uncertainties generated by the ongoing social construction of pedagogic discourse suggested by the two quotations at the beginning of this paper are far from unique to physical education teacher education. As Goodson (1988) and other curriculum historians have shown, the curricula of educational institutions are in constant and dynamic processes of contestation and reconstruction, and programmes, courses and subjects that fail to reinvent themselves in the face of new circumstances are liable to decline or to disappear. Indeed, it is clear from the curriculum history work of Kirk in relation to physical education in Britain (Kirk, 1992) and Australia (Kirk, 1994), and Lawson's (1991) writing in the USA, that physical educators are no strangers to contestation and change, and that struggles over the form and content of their field have been waged in often vociferous and acrimonious fashion.
One important contribution to understanding educational change made by Goodson has been his attempt to name the 'dominant' but abstract or faceless groups in society that the early 'new directions' sociology of education argued persuasively were responsible for constructing school knowledge. Goodson's (1988) identification of subject communities comprising coalitions of rival interest groups, and his emphasis on struggle and contestation as key processes in the production of school and university subjects and fields, provided an important step forward in terms of understanding how change works in the present. If the curriculum is made by flesh-and-blood people acting in coalitions motivated by particular beliefs and values, and if contestation between groups and individuals is a central feature of curriculum change, then the possibility appeared that strategies might be developed to make more incisive interventions in change processes.

Introduced in the late 1970s, these insights gave hope to educationists who recognized the limits of what Whitty (1985) in retrospect described as 'naive possibilitarianism' on the one hand and 'critical pessimism' on the other. However, Ball (1985) among others had been quick to note that Goodson's early concern with change as a process of interaction and contestation between identifiable groups and individuals, or what Ball described as the 'relations of change', tended to obscure the 'conditions of change' that provided individuals and groups with the opportunities and resources, often unequally accessed, with which to engage in struggles over the organization of knowledge.

While Goodson (1988) has recognized and attempted to remedy the consequences of this overemphasis on the relations of change, the ways in which interactional and structural levels intersect remain problematic in relation to the social construction and constitution of curriculum. Basil Bernstein (1990) is one educational theorist who has attempted to deal with this problem through his critique of reproduction theories of education that argue there is a relative autonomy between components of education systems that provides space for resistance to oppressive practices and possibilities for counter-hegemonic struggle. In attempting to show how educational practices are linked to other social practices, Bernstein suggests that such theories tend to treat education as a mere 'relay' for class, race and gender oppression and that in the process they fail to describe the distinctive features of education itself and the ways in which these features mediate cultural reproduction. If, as McLuhan (1962) contends, 'the medium is the message', reproduction theories of education have in Bernstein's view failed in a fundamental sense to show how educational experiences give form and substance to the social construction of class, race and gender and, crucially, to forms of social disadvantage and injustice arising from class, race and gender oppression.

Bernstein's attempt to deal with this problem leads him to focus on the same problematic that appears in the work of Goodson, expressed there, as we have
noted, in terms of the intersection of relations of change and conditions of change and also within the work of social theorists as diverse in their interests as Habermas (1975), Foucault (1977), Giddens (1984) and Hall (1985). In each case, these theorists, while deploying often different language and concepts, have attempted to understand the relationships between abstract social processes and concrete social action. In Bernstein's work, these concerns have resulted in the development of a complex model of the social construction of pedagogic discourse in which the relationships between meaning making processes at a range of levels within educational systems and the actual communicative processes that take place within and between sites of production of meaning are capable of being analysed and described in substantive and specific detail.

The analysis of current policy and practice in Australian physical education teacher education set out in the rest of this article draws on a research programme that is informed, in large part, by Bernstein's work on the social construction of pedagogic discourse. Given the complexity and sophistication of Bernstein's account of the social construction of pedagogic discourse, there is space here only to identify the dimensions of Bernstein's theory to which this particular analysis relates, and to describe briefly some of the key concepts that we use to explain the current state of policy and practice in Australian physical education teacher education.

BERNSTEIN ON PEDAGOGIC DISCOURSE

Bernstein (1990) describes pedagogic discourse as a 'principle' or 'rule' that brings a range of discourses into conjunction with each other in educational settings. Pedagogic discourse is one of a set of 'recontextualizing rules' that in addition to the categories of 'distributing rules' (concerned with who has the power to create knowledge and who has access to it) and 'evaluation rules' (concerned with the transmission and acquisition of knowledge in relation to pedagogic practice) form 'the pedagogic device', 'the condition for the production, reproduction and transformation of culture' that, moreover, 'provides the intrinsic grammar of pedagogic discourse' (180). Bernstein states that the pedagogic device is 'a crucial arena of struggle for control' (182).

Pedagogic discourse is a pivotal concept in Bernstein's scheme since it provides a description of the process through which the many interfaces of social structures and social action take place, specifically in the forms that are transmitted and acquired within educational settings. Bernstein suggests that pedagogic discourse involves the construction of 'instructional discourse' out of the conjunction and reworking of a number of other discourses that form what he calls 'regulative discourse'. Instructional discourse takes specific and substantive forms depending on the settings in which it is instantiated, and is
concerned primarily with making sense of the transmission and acquisition of particular competencies. Regulative discourse, in contrast, is formed of an array of discursive practices that are not necessarily specific to the subject, course, programme or unit (in Bernstein's terms, pedagogic text and pedagogeme (194) that constitute instructional discourse, but contain within them imperatives for order, relation and identity within such specific pedagogic forms. Pedagogic discourse is a means of describing, in relation to any particular teaching-learning episode, how regulative discourse and instructional discourse relate to each other; Bernstein's favoured descriptor is that instructional discourse is 'embedded' in regulative discourse, suggesting an organic relationship that involves inextricable connection, constant change and mutual though not necessarily even adaptation.

The distributive, recontextualizing and evaluation rules operate within three fields or spheres of action, the distributive rules in a primary context of the production of discourse, the evaluation rules in a secondary context of the reproduction of discourse, and the recontextualizing rules in a third, recontextualizing context. In each of these contexts, specific agents and agencies operate according to these rules. Bernstein sees the primary context as the place in which the 'unthinkable' becomes reality and where new knowledge is created. Much of this work is done in universities and other research agencies and may be sponsored by governments or by corporations. The secondary context is centrally concerned with the reproduction of these new ideas now that they are 'thinkable', and this work takes place mainly in educational institutions of various kinds. The recontextualizing context is concerned primarily with the mediation of discursive resources between the primary and secondary contexts, and much of this work is done by specialized agencies such as state departments of education, universities, educational media and other non-education agencies that have a stake in educational processes.

Given the centrality of the instructional discourse and regulative discourse interface, and the work done in relation to this interface within the recontextualizing field to understanding the social construction and constitution of forms of educational knowledge, the focus of this article is the pedagogic discourse of physical education teacher education in Australia. More specifically, we aim to describe the nature of the interface between the instructional and regulative discourses of physical education teacher education by, first of all, describing the current forms of instructional discourse in physical education teacher education. We then examine the various forces that constitute regulative discourse, in particular the forms of public discourse on physical activity or what we will call 'physical culture', developments in senior high school physical education programmes, and developments in teacher education policy more broadly. We begin this analysis by focusing on the instructional discourses of the physical activity field in Australian higher education and pay particular attention to the recent history of the emergence of these
discourses in order to understand how physical education teacher education has been repositioned within the recontextualizing field.

EMERGING INSTRUCTIONAL DISCOURSES OF THE PHYSICAL ACTIVITY FIELD IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The specific instructional discourse of physical education teacher education needs to be located within the instructional discourse of the physical activity field in higher education. The current shape of this field can be illustrated by a three-dimensional framework of interdependent factors (see Figure 1). The framework takes the form of three intersecting continua. One continuum, the horizontal axis, is concerned with the relationship between discipline-based knowledge and professional and vocational knowledge. A second continuum, the vertical axis, is concerned with the relationship between biophysical knowledge and socio-cultural knowledge. A third continuum, a front to back axis, concerns the relationship between practical and theoretical knowledge.

The challenges currently facing physical education teacher education in Australia are in large part due to this reconfiguration of the instructional discourse of the physical activity field in higher education over the past twenty-five years in response to and as part of reorganizations of discourse in other related spheres of activity. System-wide changes that prompted the dramatic growth of higher education in the late 1960s facilitated a relatively rapid development of forms of instructional discourse that defined the physical activity field as discipline-based though with some vocational elements, predominantly theoretical and drawing on both biophysical and socio-cultural knowledge, though almost always with biophysical knowledge foregrounded.
Figure 2 A dominant form of the instructional discourse of the physical activity field in Australian higher education

This development contrasted with the form of instructional discourse that had been pre-eminent until this time, which was vocationally oriented towards teaching (not only, though predominantly, in schools), predominantly practical, and with a predominantly biophysical knowledge base.

The reconfiguration of the field was facilitated by further structural changes to higher education in Australia that began in 1987 with the replacement of the binary system of Colleges of Advanced Education (CAEs) and universities with a Unified National System of universities. Through amalgamation of institutions and the reorganization of departments of the former CAEs, the number of university departments of 'human movement studies', 'sports science' or 'kinesiology' in Australia has grown from three (at the University of Queensland, the University of Western Australia and the University of Wollongong) prior to 1987 to twenty-eight in 1996, with few departments retaining 'physical education' in their titles. Many of the 'new' departments emphasize the biophysical science subjects (e.g. exercise physiology, biomechanics, functional anatomy and motor learning) over socio-cultural subjects (such as sociology, history and philosophy), physical activities and professional preparation (Kirk, 1990; Macdonald and Tinning, 1995; Swan and Reynolds, 1992; Tinning, in press).

THE REPOSITIONING OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHER EDUCATION WITHIN THE PHYSICAL ACTIVITY FIELD: TWO CASE-STUDIES

It is within this broader form of instructional discourse of the physical activity field that the specific instructional discourse of current physical education teacher education can be located. Current programmes in physical education teacher education take a number of forms. Most specialist programmes prepare teachers for work in secondary schools, though a number incorporate some
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms of PETE programmes</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent (4 year)</td>
<td>B.Ed. or B.Sc.App. (HMS Ed.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel (2 x 3 year degrees in 4 years)</td>
<td>B.Sc./B.Ed. or B.Sc./B.Tch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-on (3 + 1) or (3 + 2)</td>
<td>B.Sc. + Dip.Tch. or B.Sc. + B.Ed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

preparation for teaching primary school students. There are currently no programmes that prepare specialists in physical education solely for primary school, an indication of where the emphasis in physical education teacher education is placed at present in Australia. The pathways to qualification as a physical education teacher vary, though there are trends towards a small number of emerging models.

The most common programme has been the four-year concurrent programme. Concurrent programmes involve students in professional studies early in their courses, though when professional studies begin can vary from first year to third year. Nomenclature also varies, with the most common award being the Bachelor of Education degree. An emerging variation on the concurrent degree model is the notion of a parallel or combined degree where students effectively enrol in and graduate with a Bachelor of Education or Teaching degree and a Bachelor of Science or Applied Science degree. A third option is the end-on one-year diploma of teaching qualification that follows a three-year programme culminating in a bachelor's degree with a major focus in sport science or human movement.

The organizational location of these programmes within institutions also varies. Typically, concurrent and parallel (B.Ed. or B.Tch.) degrees and postgraduate diplomas of teaching are awarded by faculties of education. This may remain the case even though there is an emerging trend toward the departments that teach the human movement studies components of parallel degree programmes to be located in a science or applied science faculty, where the funding formula is higher than in education. In a few cases, the teacher education qualification is awarded by a faculty other than education, though this as yet remains a rare situation.

The University of Queensland and Deakin University provide specific cases of these trends and contrasting examples of the ways in which changes to instructional discourse of the physical activity field have resulted in a convergence around the model described in figure 2 and a repositioning of physical education teacher education within this context. The University of Queensland has the oldest continuing physical activity department in the higher education field in Australia, while Deakin University has been formed through a series of amalgamations that began in the late 1970s. In each
institution, however, the earliest form of the instructional discourse of the physical activity field was vocationally oriented towards teaching, predominantly practical, and with a predominantly biophysical knowledge base, and even though each has a different history, there has been convergence towards the dominant form of instructional discourse in the physical activity field in the 1990s.

Between the early 1940s and the early 1970s, and typical of similar departments in the other five traditional universities (Adelaide, Sydney, Melbourne, WA, Tasmania), the Department of Physical Education of the University of Queensland was concerned solely with the preparation of specialist teachers of physical education. However, the Martin Report of 1964, a precursor to the development of a binary system of higher education, had recommended that subdegree courses should be discontinued in Australian universities. Since the qualification for physical education teaching was by this time a three-year diploma, the decision sent shock waves through the university departments.

The University of Queensland, in common with the other traditional university departments of physical education, was faced with the choice of discontinuing their diploma courses (and so extinction), or of upgrading these courses to degree level. Coincidental with these system-wide changes, a significant number of Australian physical educators were completing higher degree study in North America, and these individuals brought back to Australia a subdiscipline model of the physical activity field that had already become well established in North America (e.g. Henry, 1964).

Following the lead of the University of Western Australia, Queensland’s response to this situation was to develop two degree programmes, a three-year Bachelor of Human Movement Studies (BHMS) degree, ‘a discipline oriented degree for those wishing to study aspects of the art and science of human movement’ and a four-year Bachelor of Human Movement Studies (Education) (BHMS Ed.) degree that was built on the three-year programme ‘but incorporating professional preparation studies for teaching’ (Australian Council for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1973: 25). Both degrees were offered through the university’s Faculty of Education. Even though in their early form these degree programmes attempted to balance the ‘science and art’ of studies in human movement, the degree regulations summarized in a 1973 edition of the Australian Journal of Physical Education show that the core subjects of the curriculum drew disproportionately on the biophysical sciences, a matter of no small significance for later developments.

Within this ‘human movement studies’ form of instructional discourse, physical education teacher education was dislodged from its sole focus of the work of the department to be repositioned as simultaneously the vocational application of discipline-oriented study and as one of the subdisciplines of human movement studies in the form of ‘pedagogy’. The University of Queensland is one of the few higher education institutions in Australia
currently where the 'pedagogy' of human movement has the status of a sub-discipline of human movement studies in addition to its position as a professional application of studies of the subdisciplines. This dual status proved to be vital to the survival of physical education teacher education following further internal reorganizations in 1987 when, as an outcome of a review of the department, new science and applied science degrees were developed for offer through the Faculty of Science. This move gained the department access to a higher funding index but in the process shifted the field's position even further towards a biophysical and theoretical form of instructional discourse. Physical education teacher education remains as one of two vocational applications of human movement studies (the second in exercise management) offered through a Bachelor of Applied Science (HMS Ed.) degree within the Faculty of Science rather than the Faculty of Education, while retaining pedagogy as one of the subdiscipline bases of human movement. It is important to note that in 1975, when the BHMS and BHMS (Ed.) degrees had their first intake, most members of staff of the Department of Physical Education (renamed Human Movement Studies in 1978) had Ph.D. degrees but all had trained as physical education teachers. In 1996, a majority of staff have completed undergraduate and postgraduate qualifications in the physical activity field, but not all have physical education teacher education qualifications.

The story of physical education teacher education within Deakin University presents a contrasting example to developments at the University of Queensland. Deakin University was founded in 1977 as a result of the merger and reconstitution of two existing higher education institutions in Geelong, one a specialist Teachers' College, the other an Institute of Technology. The academic staff who were initially appointed to the new university were, by and large, those who had been previously employed in the two antecedent institutions. 'Physical Education' was part of the curriculum in the Teachers' College, provided mainly for generalist primary school teachers, and it was automatically included in the curriculum of the new School of Education of Deakin University.

One of the initial decisions about the construction of the curriculum of the university was that there should be a distinction between discipline studies and professional/vocational studies. Members of staff of the school subject departments of the Teachers' College, such as 'Mathematics', 'Physical Education' and 'Science', had taught both discipline and professional studies. As a consequence of the university's decision, a number of staff in maths, science and several other fields relocated from the School of Education to the School of Science or the School of Arts and took their discipline-focused subjects with them. But relocation to the 'parent discipline' was not an option available to Physical Education, since the 'parent discipline' was at that time Education.

Prior to the formation of Deakin University, the instructional discourse of
the physical activity field in the Teachers' College was vocationally oriented, practical and predominantly biophysical. While topics such as human anatomy, biomechanics, exercise physiology, motor learning and sport sociology were taught, there had been no need to identify them as separate from 'physical education', and they constituted subjects with the titles 'Physical Education 1', 'Physical Education 2' and 'Physical Education 3' within teacher education courses. However, when the new university formalized the distinction between discipline and professional studies, these discipline-oriented elements of 'physical education' began to be identified in the curriculum by their more specialized titles rather than as components of 'physical education'.

As a consequence of this naming of the theoretical and non-vocational elements of the older instructional discourse, between 1977 and 1992 staff who taught these subjects found themselves increasingly marginalized in the School of Education, whose core business was teaching and research in education and schooling. It was the case that the subject matter of the human movement studies form of instructional discourse was seen by some staff of the School of Education to be of little value to prospective generalist primary school teachers. In addition, the cost of providing laboratories and equipment for an increasingly scientific and specialized conception of human movement studies was felt to be inappropriate in a School of Education that was not funded to teach science subjects.

This process of marginalization would undoubtedly have played itself out to an inevitable conclusion but for the inauguration of the Unified National System which by 1992 had wrought dramatic changes in Deakin University. There was considerable pressure on smaller regional universities like Deakin to amalgamate with other institutions to achieve a critical mass for funding purposes. Although it had some years previously amalgamated with a small rural college in Warnambool, some 200 km to the west, Deakin was still too small and in 1992 senior administrators elected to amalgamate with a large CAE in nearby Melbourne that had itself been recently reconstructed through amalgamations between three other colleges.

The new Deakin University included a large Department of Physical Education that prepared specialist secondary school teachers through a four-year concurrent B.Ed. degree and provided generalist primary school teachers with a major in physical education. Like the old Deakin, staff in this department had also been teaching discipline-based subjects together with professional studies within an Education Faculty. Following amalgamation, an academic reorganization resulted in the creation of a School of Human Movement located within a Faculty of Health and Behavioural Sciences and modelled on the instructional discourse of the physical activity field similar to that of the University of Queensland and the University of Western Australia. While this development was welcomed by some staff who saw their work and future as
discipline based, others who had no higher degree qualification in human movement studies and who wished to continue to contribute to professional studies protested, claiming that ‘physical education’ should be located in Education. A compromise of sorts was reached. The new school was called Human Movement, Physical Education and Recreation, and all but four staff (including two of the authors) whose work lay entirely in education and professional studies rather than in both discipline and professional studies were relocated in the new school.

By 1994 it had become apparent that the Faculty of Health and Behavioural Sciences had its own agenda for the School of Human Movement, Physical Education and Recreation and that an increasing focus on the role of physical activity in health promotion was to shape future appointments and the research of the school. The appointment towards the end of 1994 of an epidemiologist with expertise in health promotion and exercise as the Head of School and Foundation Chair in Human Movement Science confirmed this trend. Within a few months of this appointment the School of Human Movement, Physical Education and Recreation became the School of Human Movement, as had been envisioned by some senior administrators during the academic reorganization.

Meanwhile, mirroring developments that had taken place some twenty years earlier at the Universities of Queensland and Western Australia, and elsewhere since that time, a three-year Bachelor of Applied Science (Human Movement) degree was put in place. Moreover, this degree taken in conjunction with a Bachelor of Teaching degree formed the basis of initial teacher preparation for school physical education. However, this positioning of physical education teacher education within a separate degree programme administered by another academic unit of the new Deakin University posed problems for the School of Human Movement. This discipline-based, theoretical and biophysical form of the physical activity field contained little of the practical, socio-cultural and vocational knowledge students needed to teach school physical education. In this case, physical education teacher education has been removed from the physical activity field entirely and repositioned as professional studies within a different academic unit.

THE SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONAL DISCOURSE OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHER EDUCATION

These two case-studies illustrate how discourses within the physical activity field in higher education have been repositioned in relation to each other over a twenty-five-year period since the beginning of the 1970s. It is clear that physical education teacher education is no longer the central focus of the field but is now in most cases a professional/vocational application of the
discipline-based, biophysical, theoretical knowledge of human movement studies that is produced and controlled separately from the work of professional preparation. Moreover, in those institutions where there is no pedagogical subdiscipline base of human movement studies commensurate with other subdisciplines, there is the clear implication that physical education teacher education is a discourse of method rather than substance. It is in this context dependent upon human movement studies for its subject matter.

These changes to the instructional discourse of the physical activity field have been fiercely contested within individual institutions such as Deakin University (Tinning, in press) and the University of Queensland (e.g. McKay et al., 1990) and debated vigorously within the literature serving various agents within the primary and recontextualizing fields of physical activity in higher education (e.g. Newell, 1990). These debates have tended to be focused primarily at the level of instructional discourse and identified as problems of specialization, fragmentation, professional preparation and balance within the physical activity field (McKay et al., 1990; Lawson, 1991; Macdonald and Tinning, 1995; Newell, 1990; Tinning, 1993; Whitson and Macintosh, 1990).

However, with the exception of the work of Evans and his colleagues (e.g. Evans, 1988) and Lawson (1996), few analyses have attempted to identify forces outside the physical activity field in higher education that have contributed to these reconstructions of the instructional discourse of the field. In the second part of this article, we examine three sets of discursive practices that we believe constitute the regulative discourse in which the specific instructional discourse of physical education teacher education is embedded. Physical education teacher education takes its shape and substance primarily from the juxtapositioning of these discursive practices by agents such as teacher educators within the recontextualizing field. Our interest is to describe these discursive practices briefly and in their own terms, and then to discuss the ways in which they are brought into relation with each other as regulative discourse, containing imperatives for order, relation and identity, so as to construct and constitute the pedagogic discourse of physical education teacher education.

It is through this discussion that we aim to identify the future challenges that may face physical education teacher education. We should note that the work in the second half of this article is necessarily more speculative than our discussion of the instructional discourses of the physical activity field in higher education, since the juxtapositioning of the discursive practices we will describe is currently ongoing and their regulative effects on the practices of physical education teacher education may not as yet be able to be discerned clearly. It is precisely for this reason that an examination of the components of regulative discourse and their interface with instructional discourse provide markers for potential future developments.
We use the term physical culture here in a manner akin to its use in nineteenth-century Europe to refer to a range of discursive practices concerned with the maintenance, representation and regulation of the body, in contemporary Australia centred on three highly codified, institutionalized forms of physical activity – sport, physical recreation and exercise. During the past two decades, sport, recreation and exercise have entered a phase of dramatic and rapid change. As McKay (1991) has pointed out, each of these aspects of physical culture has been subject to high levels of commercialization and have become commodities in their own right. Recent turmoil over television rights surrounding various aspects of professional sport in Australia is an example of the kinds of forces that are altering the ways in which sport is coming to be understood. The so-called fitness industry has made considerable inroads into people’s conceptions of exercise and has convinced many of the need to buy expertise, access to facilities and use of special equipment in order to maintain their health. Physical recreation, from whitewater rafting to bungee jumping and skiing, has in similar fashion become highly organized, regulated and commercialized.

The reach of physical culture into people’s everyday lives has increased as a result of these developments. The growing visibility of professional sport on free to air and pay television has prompted operators in other commercial spheres to use sport, physical activities and bodies as metaphors for a range of social values, particularly in advertising a wide range of products from soft drinks and beer to cosmetics, foodstuffs and, of course, sports goods. We now have an extensive literature available to us that shows how social values such as being healthy and wealthy, being successful, or being feminine and masculine are ‘articulated’ (Hall, 1985) with images of slender, toned, tanned and youthful female bodies and powerful, tough and capable male bodies (Kirk and Tinning, 1994; Theberge, 1991; Fitzclarence, 1990). The desire of political and other leaders to be associated with winning sports teams is not new, but that such association now seems to be considered a requirement for staying in office suggests physical culture is becoming increasingly pervasive in its influence on the portrayal and construction of social values.

So dramatic has been the reconstruction of these three major institutions of physical culture in the past decade or so that popular conceptions of sport, physical recreation and exercise that emerged during the 1940s and 1950s have begun to change. The new forms of sport, physical recreation and exercise that so astonish their parents’ generation are commonplace for young people growing into adulthood as we approach a new century. There are, then, new
imperatives for order, relation and identity within this changing form of physical culture, in terms of the social construction and constitution of the body through new forms of sport, exercise and recreation. If the regulative discourse of physical culture is being dramatically reconstructed, what might be the implications for the reconstruction of the instructional discourse of physical education teacher education?

**School physical education**

Within Bernstein’s theory of pedagogic discourse, school physical education ostensibly is located in the secondary or reproductive field. However, we suggest that changes to this set of discursive practices act on the instructional discourse of physical education teacher education when they direct the kinds of work that teachers are required to do in schools. In this specific sense, school physical education forms another component of the regulative discourse of physical education teacher education. In this section, we examine the regulative imperatives within recent curriculum development in school physical education during the compulsory years of schooling and also in the post-compulsory senior years of schooling.

We suggest that developments in physical education in the post-compulsory years are of particular importance since they form an obvious interface with the physical activity field in higher education where the school subject counts towards tertiary entrance. Indeed, it is a matter of considerable interest, given our earlier discussion of shifts in the physical activity field towards a discipline-based, biophysical and theoretical configuration, that developments in senior high school physical education programmes in several Australian states have reproduced this form of the field and have then begun to act back on physical education teacher education. Here, by way of example, we focus on developments in the Australian state of Queensland as an illustration of this point.

1. **Post compulsory developments: the case of health and physical education in Queensland**

A shift from traditional external examinations to school-based assessment during the early 1970s in Queensland offered physical educators the opportunity to establish a subject in the senior school, which they called Health and Physical Education, that would count towards a student’s tertiary entrance score. The first Syllabus, published in 1975, consisted of ‘practical’ physical activities in the form of major and minor sports and games, and required in addition that 35 per cent of curriculum time be devoted to Foundations of Health and Physical Education and Health Science. These ‘theoretical'
elements of the course, as they came to be understood by teachers, consisted of the biological and socio-cultural subdisciplines of human movement studies.

Although the 1975 Syllabus attempted to construct a relationship between these elements of Health and Physical Education, in which the practical and theoretical work together contributed to an understanding of the overarching concept of health, it quickly became clear that the Syllabus provided insufficient advice to teachers on how to realize this aspiration. By 1987, a review of the Syllabus formalized what had become common practice in schools, which was a separation of theoretical and practical knowledge within the subject. In its global aims, the Syllabus suggested that the appropriate emphasis for Health and Physical Education in the senior school was to ‘prepare students for decision-making through a study of the disciplines (exercise sciences and socio-historical studies) from which the subject is drawn’ (Board of Senior Secondary School Studies (BSSSS), 1987: 2). It then went on to make a distinction between theory lessons which ‘should provide a cognitive challenge and develop academic skills’ and ‘practical experience to pursue excellence in performance (and) a broadening of experience so as to emphasize individual and life long activities’ (BSSSS, 1987: 2). While it was pointed out that ‘it may be possible to relate aspects of different elements to a unifying theme’, the structure of the Syllabus maintained a distinction between theoretical and practical knowledge.

The appropriation of aspects of the instructional discourse of the physical activity field in higher education by school physical educators may have convinced gatekeepers that physical education was worthy of entry into the senior school curriculum, but this development presented a number of challenges to physical education teacher education that it was apparently able only partially to fulfil. While beginning teachers were entering the workforce from the late 1970s with sufficient subject matter knowledge of the subdisciplines of human movement studies to teach the ‘theoretical’ elements of Health and Physical Education, it is clear that their teacher education programmes provided them with little assistance in relating ‘theoretical’ and ‘practical’ elements. Since it was the ‘theoretical’ elements that provided the justification for Health and Physical Education’s senior school status, there was an obvious danger that in order to survive in the competitive academic curriculum, ‘practical’ physical activities might need to be sacrificed, thereby moving even closer to the subdiscipline, biophysical and theoretical form of the physical activity field in higher education (Kirk, 1988).

Mindful of this danger, a 1990 review of Health and Physical Education recognized that any future syllabus ‘should be integrated and developmental . . . rather than developing academic skills . . . (and) practical experience’ that generated a ‘unitized approach which often fails to maintain a developmental link across learning experiences’ (BSSSS, 1990). These concerns, together with
a groundswell of support for an increased role for health education in senior schooling, led to the development of separate Health Education and Physical Education Syllabuses, which are currently being piloted. Drawing on the work of Arnold (1979), the Pilot Physical Education Syllabus utilizes the concepts of learning in and about movement to require teachers to integrate through the appropriate construction of student learning experiences what were in the 1987 syllabus perceived to be separate ‘theoretical’ and ‘practical’ elements. This development has turned the aspiration of the 1975 Syllabus into a mandated requirement to which physical education teacher education will be forced to respond.

2. Developments for the compulsory years of schooling: the ‘national’ statement and profile in health and physical education

Between 1989 and 1993 in a policy climate described as corporate federalist (see Brooker and Macdonald, 1995) in which Australian state, territory and federal governments entered into national, co-operative arrangements, a major educational initiative was undertaken. Its focus was the production of curriculum documents for eight key learning areas, one being the area of Health and Physical Education. Statement documents provide a framework of the essential and distinctive elements for the area together with a sequence for developing knowledge and skills. Profiles, linked to the Statements, show the typical progression towards achieving learning outcomes for the area. While the development process of the Health and Physical Education documents was surrounded by controversy (Glover, 1993), the documents were released on schedule in 1994. By this time the commitment to corporate federalism had waned due to several changes of state governments, and the national documents came to be considered as curriculum guides to be accessed selectively by states and territories rather than shaping a prescriptive ‘national curriculum’.

The Statement and Profile in Health and Physical Education draw together the topics of safety, sexuality, growth and development, sport, exercise and physical recreation, drug education, food and nutrition, ethics, relationships, identity, consumer health, health promotion and traffic safety. The Statement suggests that the key principles framing the content and pedagogy of these topics are diversity, social justice and supportive environments. The topics and principles for the area are organized in the following Profile strands: Human Development; Human Movement; Physical Activity and the Community; People and Food; Health of Individuals and Populations; Safety; and Human Relations. There is no clear relationship between the areas’ topics, the Profile’s strands and the ‘subjects’ that exist in schools. Topics within Health and Physical Education are currently taught in a range of established school subjects and, in some cases, they overlap between subjects, while in other cases
they are not taught at all. For example, in secondary schools it may be that physical educators will be required to join with home economics teachers, health educators, traffic safety educators, pastoral leaders and outdoor educators in order to co-ordinate and teach the Health and Physical Education key learning area.

**Teacher education policy**

In the same federalist policy climate that spawned the ‘national curriculum’ initiatives, there was also a focus on co-ordinating and regulating educational and performance standards across the Australian workforce using competency models. Argument for the teaching profession to develop a set of competencies was couched in terms of the micro-economic reform of the ‘education industry’ with improved efficiency, explicitness, productivity, commitment and confidence both within and beyond the profession as outcomes (Ruby, McLaren and others, 1992). While some teacher educators argued that the profession needed to seize control of its own competency agenda (e.g. Kennedy, 1993), critics of ‘factory floor preoccupations’ (Knight and McWilliam, 1992: 93) argued that the move to define teachers’ work through competencies would not only deskill teachers but reinforce teachers’ practices as complicit in the economic problem and reproductive of schooling rather than transformative (Ginsburg, 1988; Porter, Rizvi, Knight and Lingard, 1992).

Nevertheless, while this debate continued, the federal government established the National Project for the Quality of Teaching and Learning (NPQTL), which became responsible for managing the production of competencies for the teaching profession (Preston and Kennedy, 1995). The NPQTL (1992: 4-6) stated that ‘a model for recognizing and articulating what competent teaching actually is' should provide modes of recognition and achievement of competence for application in curriculum development in initial and continuing teacher education, registration, employment and promotion criteria. Moreover, it should enhance deployment of competence through labour market efficiency and equity, to ensure employment of competent teachers, enhance teacher mobility, and identify and remedy areas of inadequate performance. Finally, it should provide the basis for communication about the quality of teaching and learning within the education community and special interest groups.

The NPQTL's brief drew on the National Training Board's (NTB, 1991: 7) National Competency Standards Policy and Guidelines, which defined a competency as ‘the specification of the knowledge and skill and application of that knowledge and skill within an occupation or industry level to the standard of performance required in employment'. After using a multi-method process to explore approaches to formulating competencies, the NPQTL
(1995) published a *National Competency Framework for Beginning Teaching* supported by illustrating case-studies. In this framework competence focuses not only on performance and standards but also teacher attributes. The five areas of competence are:

- using and developing professional knowledge and values;
- communicating, interacting and working with students and others;
- planning and managing the teaching and learning process;
- monitoring and assessing student progress and learning outcomes;
- reflecting, evaluating and planning or continuous improvement.

The fledgling Australian Teaching Council has now endorsed the *Competency Framework for Beginning Teaching* in its draft induction kit for beginning teachers.

Alongside these competencies, and taking a more socially critical perspective, the Australian Curriculum Studies Association (ACSA, 1996) has published its *Draft Policy on Teacher Education*. It opens with the statement ‘education is a key social activity’ (1996:11) and more specifically suggests that the curriculum for teacher education should address: broad social analyses; cultural re/production of knowledge; multiculturalism; educational provision for indigenous Australians; educational theory and research; reinterpreting disciplinary knowledge from an educational perspective; and school practice.

While the physical education profession in Australia has not sought to develop its own policies such as has occurred in the United States (National Association for Sport and Physical Education, 1995), the Australian Senate Inquiry into Sport and Physical Education did recommend that the federal government establish minimal attainment levels in physical education for all generalist teachers and that regular in-service education be provided to enable teachers to achieve minimal attainment levels.

**DISCUSSION: THE CONSTRUCTION OF PEDAGOGIC DISCOURSE AND THE FUTURE OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHER EDUCATION**

It will be recalled that, according to Bernstein, pedagogic discourse is a device for describing how sets of non-specific discursive practices, in this paper identified as physical culture, school physical education and teacher education policy, are brought into relation with one other in a specific educational context (higher education institutions) to form a regulative discourse, and are then reconfigured in this context to produce a specific instructional discourse, in this case physical education teacher education. What we have described so far is a dominant form of the instructional discourse of the physical activity field in higher education, the specific instructional discourse of physical
education teacher education, and the discursive practices that we claim together regulate the practices of physical education teacher education in higher education institutions. Our task in the final section of this paper is to explain how this regulation might occur by pointing to the imperatives for the future practices of physical education teacher education contained within this discourse.

It has been argued elsewhere (e.g. Kirk, 1994) that the currently dominant form of school physical education centred on multi-activity sport-based programmes is regulated in part by the discursive practices of physical culture that emerged in the 1940s and 1950s. We suggest that current forms of physical education teacher education are regulated by similar cultural imperatives. Absent from this version of regulative discourse is the recent development of sport as entertainment and big business, and the commercialization of exercise and physical recreation. Consequently, the forms of corporeal regulation embedded in these emerging forms of commodified physical culture are likewise absent from this post-war regulative discourse. As we have demonstrated in other work, the outcome for students (Kirk and Tinning, 1994) and beginning teachers (Macdonald and Kirk, 1996) can often be alienating, disorienting and traumatic. At the very least, students and their teachers can experience considerable difficulty making sense of school physical education experience as this is mediated by a new form of regulative discourse informed by commercialized and commodified physical culture.

Moreover, physical education teacher education regulated in part by a post-war form of physical culture is likely to be working within functionalist assumptions about gender, race and social class, if these are acknowledged at all, that may be culturally obsolete and certainly dangerously misleading. Similarly, the social construction of the body through sport, exercise and recreational activities is unlikely to register, far less become a subject of critical attention, within this form of instructional discourse. In short, we suggest that current forms of physical education teaching ‘make sense’ only in relation to cultural forms that have now begun to be superseded.

The challenge for physical education teacher educators is to appropriate aspects of physical culture that resonate with the experiences of young people and to use these as a medium for a pedagogy that assists young teachers and their students to be critical consumers of commodified physical culture. Actively acknowledging cultural developments and making use of these pedagogically, as both a source of subject matter and a medium of learning, is not the same thing, we would suggest, as merely reproducing culture. The consequences of failing to do this may be dire, and there are already signs that the professional monopoly physical educators have enjoyed in this field since the 1940s is now being challenged (Tinning, 1992).

Just as these shifts in physical culture contain imperatives for teacher education, so too do they demand a response from school physical education. The
extent to which an adequate response is being made through recent curricu-

lum developments remains to be seen at this stage. The structure and popular-

ty among students of the 1987 Health and Physical Education Syllabus
cemented the relationship between the physical activity field in higher edu-
cation and schools in a number of ways. Perhaps first and foremost, the popu-

larity of the Syllabus created a demand for increased numbers of graduates
from physical education teacher education programmes, particularly gradu-
ates from human movement studies degree programmes who were considered
to have a more ‘solid’ grounding in the ‘theoretical’ aspects of Health and
Physical Education. Second, in practice the Syllabus focuses heavily on the

teaching of isolated subdisciplinary knowledge, effectively reproducing these
human movement studies programmes. Indeed, the ‘theoretical’ component
of the Syllabus was spoken of by teachers as a ‘slightly watered down version’
of university programmes. At the same time, it should be recognized that this
subject matter provided physical education teachers and their subject with a
degree of intellectual credibility and challenge (Macdonald, 1995).

The Pilot Physical Education Syllabus takes a perspective that in several
ways challenges knowledge and practices in human movement studies. First,
the Syllabus requires that subdisciplinary knowledge not be divorced from
the performance of physical activity. This suggests that physical education
teacher education students will need their subdisciplinary knowledge pre-

sented with a focus on application in a range of physical activity media.
Furthermore, the Syllabus’s encouragement of cross-disciplinary perspectives
in the study of physical activity requires teachers to integrate the subdisci-
plines themselves, thereby challenging the ongoing fragmentation of the uni-

versity field of knowledge noted by writers such as Lawson (1991). Second,
the pedagogy of the Syllabus is oriented to teaching as facilitation rather than
as transmission, suggesting that student teachers will need to focus on indi-

vidual task-based and co-operative learning strategies in their courses rather
than the more conventional modelling of reproductive teaching methods
(Mosston and Ashworth, 1986).

Third, the renewed emphasis on ‘practical’ physical activity in the Syllabus
demands of graduates a depth of knowledge in a number of physical activities
at a time when the practical knowledge component in many human move-
ment studies programmes has been reduced. Additionally, the learning pri-

ority is one of strategic understanding of physical activities whereas, in line
with performance priorities that derive from some of the discursive practices
of post-war physical culture, physical education teacher education pro-
grammes have tended to background strategic understanding in favour of
‘objective’ and competitive outcomes (Macdonald and Tinning, 1995). Finally,
the separation of Health Education and Physical Education has posed
strategic questions for departments of human movement studies. Should they
be educating teachers of Health Education? If not, who should? And to what
extent does Health Education inform the process of becoming physically educated?

Just as the Health and Physical Education Statement and Profile are not directly aligned with established school subjects (particularly at the secondary level), the same is true of the relationship with the organization of disciplinary knowledge in Australian universities. In universities different departments such as human movement studies, science, education, the health sciences, nursing, and the social sciences could contribute to the subject matter and processes for understanding the learning area of Health and Physical Education. Consequently, the Statement and Profile have implications for physical education teacher education on at least two levels, the structure of departments and degree programmes, and undergraduate coursework.

A key question in regard to both issues is whether the Health and Physical Education learning area should be approached as a subject in itself, rather than a map of the knowledge in this broadly defined area. If the learning area were to be treated as a subject, teachers would then need to have expertise across the Profile strands. While such an approach is akin to expectations for primary generalized teachers, the breadth of the area raises questions as to how much time would be required within an undergraduate programme. For secondary specialists the question is perhaps even more complex as university departments and degrees are structured around specialization reinforced by budgetary, pedagogical and epistemological differences and promotional processes. Furthermore, we know that students are often attracted to an area of specialization, for example to human movement studies, because of its focus on physical activity and sport (e.g. Lawson, 1989; Macdonald, 1995; Stroot, Faucette and Schwager, 1993). Consequently, it may be that the study of a more general field would be less appealing. However, at the very least, if current specializations within Health and Physical Education remain, it may be necessary for physical education teacher educators to form strategic alliances across university departments if there is to be a co-operative and coordinated approach to the learning area in schools.

Even if the school systems continue to require subject specialists to address specific Profile strands there are, nevertheless, implications for the content and pedagogy of specialist programmes. To appreciate fully the Health and Physical Education Statement and Profile, students are required to understand the key principles of the learning area, which are social justice, supportive environments and understanding diversity. To grasp these and their relationship to the diverse subject matter of the learning area requires a fairly sophisticated understanding of some sociological concepts and the social model of health. We suggest that not only would current human movement studies programmes have neither the staff expertise nor programme space to address these, far less embed them throughout the various biophysical and socio-cultural subdisciplines, but that the principles may be in tension with
the individualistic, masculinist and performance orientations characteristic of the pedagogy of the instructional discourse of human movement studies (e.g. Dewar, 1990; Whitson and Macintosh, 1990; Macdonald and Tinning, 1995).

Trends towards a competencies approach in teacher education policy development also contain regulative imperatives for physical education teacher education, though at this stage these may be less evident and clear-cut than the imperatives of physical culture and school physical education. To date, the various teacher education policies and recommendations are not binding at a national level. It has been suggested by Preston and Kennedy (1995: 41–54) that at this stage, they may serve as:

- a checklist for course content and student assessment;
- criteria for graduation and a framework for the goals of the course;
- an approach to assessment procedures;
- a guide to course structure and coherence;
- a guide to the role and nature of the practicum;
- a framework for collaboration;
- a guide to pedagogy;
- a framework for student self-management of learning.

However, should they become binding, their priorities will make it increasingly difficult for physical education teacher education positioned within the dominant discourse of the physical activity field in higher education to meet adequately the requirements of the teaching profession. With the competency frameworks oriented towards an appreciation of social issues (e.g. cultural diversity and social justice), there is some question as to whether human movement studies forms the most appropriate knowledge base for physical education teaching. If these competencies become part of an industrial agreement between employers and unions, there will also be pressure on the degree structures in physical education teacher education to reshape the curriculum to include more social and educational theory, with repercussions for departmental staffing, budgets and what other subject matter gets left out. The competency policies also emphasize the pedagogical reshaping of disciplinary knowledge in order to break what some teacher educators perceive to be the inappropriate reproduction of forms of university knowledge in the secondary context of schools. Other requirements such as initial teacher education experience in enquiry-based learning, teamwork and cross-professional collaboration could also challenge physical education teacher education programmes.

**CONCLUSION**

We suggest, in conclusion, that by focusing on the social construction of pedagogic discourse we have been able to identify some of the key discursive
practices that substantiate and regulate the production of physical education teacher education in Australia. Of central importance to understanding current forms of physical education teacher education and the challenges that will direct future developments is the capacity of this approach to highlight the interfaces and intersections of the discursive practices that construct and constitute this field. We hope to have shown that changes to physical culture, recent curriculum developments in school physical education and recent policy initiatives in teacher education contain regulative imperatives for the curriculum of physical education teacher education, though how individual institutions respond to these challenges will, of course, depend to a large extent on the additional factor of local circumstances.

The capacity to study these interfaces and intersections in a relatively systematic fashion is crucial to any attempt to make strategic interventions in shaping the future direction of physical education teacher education at local levels, and to make some contribution to potential future developments in the field more generally. In this respect, the recontextualizing field and the agents and agencies who operate within it emerge as major players in the construction of pedagogic discourse, since it is in this field that the discursive practices that form regulative discourse are brought into alignment in institutions and the instructional discourses of teacher education programmes are created. We propose that further studies of the curriculum of teacher education courses in the physical activity field might fruitfully be focused in this recontextualizing field.

Changes within the physical activity field in higher education have also played a major part in repositioning, over a twenty-five-year period, the instructional discourse of physical education teacher education. This repositioning has resulted in a precarious situation where physical education teacher education is in many institutions a professional or vocational application of human movement studies and a discourse of method rather than of substance. It seems to us that one means of defusing some of the dangers inherent in this situation is for teacher educators to work towards the establishment of ‘pedagogy’ as a subdiscipline of human movement studies that can then inform the professional applications of physical education teaching, sports coaching, physical recreation and exercise instruction; in other words, it needs to become both a discourse of method and of substance. The emerging trend towards a parallel degree structure (e.g. B.Sc./ B.Tch.) in some institutions may be the most difficult context in which to achieve this goal, however, since it moves physical education teacher education into another academic unit of the university and positions it as ‘method’. Given this danger, the best curriculum form for achievement of this outcome may be the concurrent degree structure (four- year B.Ed. or B.Sc.App. (HMS Ed.) where physical education teacher education organizationally is part of human movement studies.

Such a strategy may prove to be difficult to realize, however, given the
imperatives of regulative discourse we have outlined in this paper. It is important to note the 'lag' that our analysis shows appears to exist between current forms of physical education teacher education and some of the more recent developments in the discursive practices we have described. This 'lag' does provide us with some insights into potential future directions. However, it also suggests to us that physical education teacher education is in urgent need of reform in meeting at least some of the imperatives of regulative discourse in order to be culturally, educationally and professionally relevant. The challenge facing physical education teacher education is to find the best means of balancing the demands of the broader instructional discourse of the physical activity field and the imperatives for order, relation and identity contained in regulative discourse.
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