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Body Knowledge, Power and Control

'The greatest enemy of scientific progress is orthodoxy' (John Brignell, 2000:209)

In this introductory paper we deliberately draw attention to the title of Michael Young's (1971) complex, edited volume, Knowledge and Control. New Directions for the Sociology of Education, a text that set out to frame the relation of the sociology of knowledge and education, some thirty years ago. Its disparate contents variously inspired, repelled and reflected a growing international community of sociological researchers in education critical of existing education policy, conservative ideology and 'conventional' forms of curriculum organisation, content and practice in schools. The 'new directions' espoused by Young and some of his contributors raised old questions about the political, social class and cultural origins of school knowledge and processes and their in-egalitarian outcomes in what appeared to be new and exciting, phenomenologically inspired, ways (see, Evans and Davies, 1986). However, they fell someway short of providing the conceptual, methodological and practical pedagogical means to attend such issues satisfactorily, failing to capitalise on the ideas of Basil Bernstein and Pierre Bourdieu, with which they lay, cheek by jowl in Knowledge and Control. Moreover, while raising challenging questions about the political, social and cultural origins of school knowledge, how it was organised, evaluated, transmitted, evaluated and interpreted, and how this influenced the categories used by teachers to select, label and position pupils as 'able', 'deviant' or otherwise, it had nothing directly to say at all either on how school knowledge generally is 'embodied', or how 'the body' is schooled (Shilling, 1993). By contrast this introduction along with other contributions to this symposium, engage directly with how 'knowledge of the body' is produced and transmitted through the various forms of Physical Education and health curricula (PEH) and sport now found in schools. Its implication in processes of selection, differentiation and the construction of social class and cultural hierarchies, identity and the embodied self, have, over the last thirty years, become the business of the slowly emerging but vibrant community of critical researchers now variously operating in areas of sociology, curriculum theory, Physical Education and sport pedagogy internationally (for examples see, Evans and Davies, 1986, 1993, Kirk and Tinning 1990, Rovegno and Kirk, 1995, Clarke and Humberstone, 1997, Fernandez Balboa, 1997, Hickey, et al, 1998, Macdonald, et.al, 2002, Laker, 2002) (2).

We contend that the critical sentiments of 'new directions', if reconfigured around the past thirty years of Bernsteinian insight on pedagogy, symbolic control and identity, can now
sharpen and guide our attention to ways of looking at how knowledge of 'the body' is implicated in the construction of identity and 'health' and the achievement of social hierarchies, order and control in society and schools. It may also advance our thinking on the policy and practical pedagogical measures to be taken towards the achievement of a curriculum that is both more 'inclusive' and expressive of social democratic ideals. Indeed, it is to show how Bernstein (2001: 364) began the task, inspired by Durkheim, of making 'explicit the social base of the pedagogic relation, its various contingent realisations, the agents and agencies of its enactments', both at the level of the knowledge base of society and the maintenance and change of its modalities of symbolic control, that this paper is dedicated. In effect, this is to examine the ideologies and knowledge claims that variously inform, influence and define the pedagogies of PEH; interrogate the actions and thinking of policy makers, teachers, pupils and others responsible for their enactment; and relate these processes to socio economic trends occurring outside schools. It is to ask how the pedagogies of PEH help regulate relations within and between social groups, 'impact' the pedagogic consciousness of pupils and, ultimately, are implicated in social and cultural re-production and the distribution of power and principles of control (Bernstein, 2000: 4).

Following Bernstein (2000), *Body Knowledge* is, then, in essence, concerned with understanding the social processes and practices of formal education and schooling, especially as found in the curriculum of PEH, 'whereby consciousness and desire are given specific forms, evaluated, distributed, challenged and changed' (xxvi). It is intended as another step towards understanding the impact that formal education has upon the intellectual, social and emotional development of young people, how practices within PEH and sport in schools, are 'embodied' and help in forming individuals' sense of identity and embodied self. It asks awkward and difficult and, hopefully, challenging questions about the new orthodoxies being established in schools, particularly those relating to the body and health that reflect wider cultural tendencies and themes. These are nurtured, rationalised and derive their authority from knowledge/s largely produced by the disciplines of the bio and health sciences and which now constitute largely taken for granted 'regimes of truth' among teachers and others in society and schools. On the surface these might seem to be unassailable, and more socially disinterested, objective and value free than sociology, but, as we shall see, they are not. They feed and frame policy and practice, influence and give structure and form to interactions and social relations and potentially impact upon the attitudes, emotions, selves and identities of teachers and pupils in schools and initial teacher education (ITE). Orthodoxy relating to the place and importance of sport in the PE curriculum, reflecting a wider endeavour to restore 'tradition' and certainty in social worlds characterised by rapid social and technological change, has been well documented critically elsewhere (Penney and Evans, 1999). The focus of this symposium, therefore, will be essentially but not exclusively on the new discursive 'truths' relating to the place, purpose and position of 'health' in the curriculum in general and PEH and sport in particular, that have found their way into schools. These, we suggest, express relatively new body perfection codes (stressing autonomy, self responsibility and control), which happily commingle with those of performance (stressing discipline and order) long established in education and the curriculum of PE (3).

'Ability', Health and Achievement

From the early fifties the predominant concern of politicians and education policy makers in Britain and the USA was expressed in the rhetoric of whether educational systems met the individual needs of a changing and expanding industrial society. Education was conceived as an important commodity, consumer good, mark of status and a means of personal mobility, a high-return investment for both individuals and the nation. The 'problem' with it was seen to lie not so much with what it was, or what it did, which were considered to 'be good', but how it was distributed to pupils of different abilities and social classes (see,
Karabel and Halsey, 1977). Not only among the philosophers and psychologists who dominated its study but sociologists, too, the 'traditional' curriculum, emphasising high status intellectual 'academic' subjects rather than the aesthetic, practical and vocational, was largely regarded as unproblematic and worthwhile, the tasks of educational policy and practice being seen as maximising access to it. Schools were pictured as functioning to socialise children into the values and norms necessary for the effective performance of their roles in society, differentiating their academic achievements and allocating them as human resources to the adult occupational system. Persons seemed little more than amalgams of the expectations, values and attitudes handed down by a variety of socialising agencies. Deviance or failure to succeed either to gain academic credentials or, in PE, good performance in sport, fitness and health, tended to be explicated in terms of individual, familial, or sectional pathology. Similarly, in the UK, USA and Australia, the 'abnormal' academic underachievement of boys has, in recent years, been held variously to be the responsibility of 'progressive' pedagogy, weak labour markets or an excess of female teacher role models (see Lingard and Douglas, 1999; Mills, 2000, 2002, Apple, 2002, for critiques of this discourse). At any given point of view, certain fundamental features of educators' worlds are inevitably taken for granted, particularly what counts as educational knowledge and how it is made available, interpreted and differently received as 'ability' by individuals both within and across gender categories.

Just as neo-conservative 'right' agendas continue to make an impact on the curriculum in Australia and the USA (see Mills, 2002, Apple, 2002) driven rather blindly by unreconstructed meritocratic ideals, only recently in the UK have New Labour central governments begun to acknowledge that the conventional status and configuration of the secondary school curriculum may not, for many children, be desirable, let alone ideal. Its claims to have eroded educational inequality is backed by little evidence of change in terms of the educational opportunities available to different social categories of student in UK schools. Rising overall achievement in schools, as measured by GCSE examination success at age 16, has been accompanied by a consistent increase in relative inequalities of attainment in school, especially in relation to social class and ethnic origin (Gillborn and Youdell, 2001) and in terms of Higher Education entry. Although a performance code continues to dominate the curriculum generally, 'ability' 'has now come to be understood by policy makers, politicians and teachers as proxy for common sense notions of 'intelligence'' (Demain, 2001:2). As Gilborn and Youdell's research has pointed out, hereditarian assumptions and all the concomitant inequalities of opportunity that they produce and legitimate are now coded and enacted through the discourse of 'ability' that underlies the multiple and complex selections that separate out the 'able' and the 'less able' within schools. It provides the opportunity for teachers and senior managers to identify winners and losers at the earliest possible stages, allowing continual checks to ensure that those predicted to succeed 'fulfil' their potential. The significance of these developments for classroom processes, especially for the social production of achievement, underachievement, educational aspirations, 'ability' and identity and their intersections with gender, ethnicity and social class (see Francis, 2000 and Connolly and Neill, 2001), has yet to be fully explored.

Sadly, with few notable exceptions (e.g., Burrows and Wright, 2001, Brittain, 2003 and Sparkes and Brown, forthcoming), we have little research internationally on the way in which 'ability' (either physical or intellectual) is socially constructed, 'defined', 'practised', 'organised' and 'performed' within either the conventional or 'new' curriculum of PEH in schools when driven by either performance or perfection codes. We can, therefore, only speculate as to whether similarly reductionist conceptions of 'ability' apply here too, driven and endorsed by a political climate that is pressing teachers towards the production and definition of 'achievement' in terms of measurable performances in sport, fitness or health. With fashionable search for the 'athletic gene' endorsing the belief that ability is given at birth and
differentially fixed in both quality and form in the identities of women and men, we can only be on our guard against such policy developments and tendencies. Interrogating how the practices of Physical Education, sport and health sciences and of Initial Teacher Education PE (ITEPE) may help endorse thinking of this kind, should be a priority concern. For example, what potential damage is done to a pupil's sense of confidence, competence and embodied self, when subjected to pedagogical and discursive practices which consider 'health' to be an individual responsibility, while regarding the 'ability' to achieve it, by engaging in appropriate health promoting physical activities, as both fixed and unevenly distributed amongst individuals and social groups? What future for inclusive Comprehensive school ideals when set against government policies and initiatives in the UK driving schools towards elite 'sports college status' and teachers towards 'talent identification' in contexts long governed by performance and perfection codes? Will 'ability' and 'talent' be reduced to a commodity simply to be 'spotted,' residing in the few, at the expense of the 'multiple intelligences' and potential endemic in all pupils, which all good pedagogues would strive to unfold. It compels us to think what some still believe unthinkable; that for a great many young people, particularly those from working class homes, girls and young women, 'non mainstream' cultural groups and people with disability, the content and conventional organisation of education and PEH may increasingly be neither worthwhile, nor empowering. As we have elsewhere stressed (Evans and Davies, 2002) to grasp this is still to challenge one of the most powerful of educational rhetorics, that 'education does you good'. Nowhere is this ideal more coveted or readily propagated, usually in the form of the more you have of 'it' (fitness, health, sport or physical activity), then the more it is doing you good, than within the Physical Education, health and sport communities. The part played by language in labelling, selecting, sifting, including and excluding in PEH, are matters to which we, and others, return.

Together we still need to consider that what passes for education, PEH and sport in the school curriculum is neither necessary nor immutable; they are social constructs laden with values, which may be less than universally desirable. In Bernstein's terms, they proceed from a number of knowledge bases in the natural and social sciences, the power of whose content is appropriated and selectively privileged by policy makers and reshaped in both the official and pedagogic recontextualising fields (such as curriculum agencies and Universities). Physical Education and sport have more than their fair share of quango like agencies (for example, in the UK, Sport England and the Youth Sport Trust) that define practice and allocate resources as if they were dispensing largesse. Their reproductive agents, teachers and coaches, tend to be strongly attached to performance, perfection and product, very often shaped by elite attachment or personal desire for all three.

As with educational processes more generally, PE and related health curricula have, regardless of the power and interests of those who shape and provide them, the potential to make both friends and enemies of those subjected to them, inspiring and alienating, conditioning and reconditioning class, cultural and power structures. This is nice for some (disproportionately, middle class, heterosexual, male, able bodied pupils) and nasty for others. It can have either a liberating or devastating effect on an individual's embodied self. We need, therefore, to explore the conventions of curricular hierarchies, deconstructing the ways in which common sense categories such as the 'good' and 'able' child, 'intelligence', 'physical ability', skill', 'health', 'fitness' and 'educability' are produced and performed though the practices of schools and initial teacher education (ITE). We also need to explore how the social ranking of subjects or activities (for example, in the UK, Sport England and the Youth Sport Trust) that define practice and allocate resources as if they were dispensing largesse. Their reproductive agents, teachers and coaches, tend to be strongly attached to performance, perfection and product, very often shaped by elite attachment or personal desire for all three.
of our curricular and pedagogical actions for the learning opportunities and identities of pupils. At the same time, we need also pursue the relationships between these phenomena and socio-cultural and economic interests, hierarchies and ideologies prevailing both in wider school settings and outside them in society, exploring issues of power, authority and control. This means adopting a relational view of educational processes so as to consider how the actions of teachers and taught both frame and construct the social world of classrooms and the opportunities therein, and how they themselves are framed and constrained by wider socio-cultural, political and ideological forces (Penney and Evans, 1999). This is to do no more than to seek to understand the relationships between their agency and structure, human action and social constraint. It is to ask of education, whose voice and values matter and where lies the locus of power, authority and control? Unsurprisingly these questions may seem nihilistic and damaging to conventional ways of understanding education, especially to those with vested interests in sustaining an inequitable status quo. All educational realities, categories or subjects, stand in need of explanation. The task is to explore through which persons, groups and processes, certain forms of knowledge and organisation, status and identity are sustained in schools.

Whose body matters anyway?

We have long held the view that the Durkheimian inspired views of Bernstein (Bernstein, 1990, 1996, 2000, Davies, 1994), focusing upon educational discourse and pedagogy, appropriately combined with other social theories, give best purchase on these questions and a way of approaching them in adequate depth. For example, we might ask, ‘are new hierarchies of the body being nurtured in our secondary comprehensive schools, relating to size, shape and weight?’ (Evans, Evans and Rich, 2003). If so, are such hierarchies potentially as virulent and unhelpful to inclusive, egalitarian, comprehensive ideals as many aspects of those of gender, race and class, which they may feed on and endorse? Paraphrasing Bernstein, we must consider what body shape or form is being recognised as being of value in schools. Is there a dominant image of value such that some students are unable to recognise themselves as having a ‘body’, or more broadly, ‘a self’ of any value? What body images are excluded by the dominant images of the school? Whose body is seen and heeded? (see Oliver and Lalik, forthcoming). In Bernstein’s terms,

‘A school metaphorically holds up a mirror in which an image is reflected. There may be several images, positive and negative. A school’s ideology may be seen as a construction in a mirror through which images are reflected. The question is: who recognises themselves as of value? What other images are excluded by the dominant image of value so that some students are unable to recognise themselves? In the same way, we can ask about the acoustic of the school. Whose voice is heard? Who is speaking? Who is hailed by this voice? For whom is it familiar?

In this sense there are visual and temporal features to the images the school reflects and those images are projections of a hierarchy of values, of class values’. (Bernstein, 2000, p xxi)

These are important issues, reminding us that a distribution of knowledge (for example, of and about the body) carries unequal value, power and potential. This matters because the distribution of resources tends to follow the distribution of images such that for those at the top with the ‘right’ image or ability to perform there may be more time, space, opportunity, attention and reward, both emotional and material. As Bernstein goes on to point out, an unequal distribution of images, knowledge, possibilities and resources will also effect the rights of participation, inclusion and individual enhancement of groups of students. In his view, schools disguise and mask power relations external to the school and produce
hierarchies of knowledge, possibility and value. They create 'horizontal solidarities' (allegiances between socio-cultural groups) 'whose object is to contain and ameliorate vertical (hierarchical) cleavages between social groups' (op. cit: xxiii). To achieve this the school must ‘disconnect its own internal hierarchy of success and failure from in effectiveness of teaching within the school and the external hierarchy of power relations between social groups outside the school' and in such a way that 'failure is attributed to inborn facilities (cognitive, affective and, we add, physical) or to the cultural deficits relayed by the family which come to have the force of inborn facilities’ (xxiv). Sociological researchers in Australia, New Zealand, the USA and Europe, sometimes driven by residual and unreformed interests in the 'new sociology of education' or mainstream sociology's discovery of the body as an important topic for research, have gone some way towards illustrating how these social processes feature in and are embodied in curriculum and pedagogy (Macdonald, et al, 2002) (4). This symposium seeks to further that goal and contends that the central concerns of the sociology of education with selection, differentiation, identity, equity, the nature of socio-cultural reproduction, order and control, remain as valid now as they were thirty years ago.

Sociology, the Body and Health in a Risk Society: From Performance to Perfection Codes.

The past twenty-five years have been a period of considerable socio-economic and cultural change, accompanied by 'monumental efforts to undertake significant educational reform' (Hargreaves, 1999: 340) in schools and in ITE. In England and Wales we have witnessed the arrival of a National Curriculum for PE and similar initiatives have occurred in Australia, New Zealand and elsewhere, many fore-grounding 'sport' or 'health' agendas amongst their goals. Fundamental changes in the form and organisation of economic activity have occurred throughout the Western world. These changes in the economic base have had a profound impact on the socio-cultural infrastructure of society, dramatically altering relationships between men and women and making problematic conventional conceptions of masculinity and femininity, of what it is and means to be male and female in the work-place, home, and at leisure. Conventional beliefs and value systems (including the once powerful grand narratives of socialism, feminism, religion and morality) have, if not broken down, been stirred or shaken. Concomitantly, a resurgence of interest in notions of self help, 'community' and religious, ethnic and national identity has occurred, perhaps reflecting a search for social and psychological certainty or security and as ways of countering these globalising trends (Castells, 1997). Some of these changes have been reflected in significant educational reforms in many countries, including the re-rigging of more strongly state-controlled markets represented by movement towards more locally or self-managed schools. Such neo-liberal policies embody expectations that educational systems should operate more on the lines of the market, treating parents and pupils as 'consumers' of education. The curriculum is now considered more a package of quality controlled consumer goods than a set of rights to educationally worthwhile experiences, its requirements 'being defined less in terms of content to be covered and time to be allocated to that content, than in terms of standards, targets or outcomes that must be achieved' (Hargreaves, 1999: 340). On one view, this reflects the Macdonaldisation of society to which Ritzer (2000) refers; moving inexorably toward a totally regulated bureaucracy in which schools, like Universities, become increasingly like drive-in drive-out fast food establishments offering a diet that, putatively, both defines and satisfies everyone's basic needs. In the UK for example, the National Curriculum has ensured that, in principle, a child can attend any one of the state sector's school outlets knowing that the curriculum on offer is (rhetorically at least) the same as in every other. They can 'enjoy' the educational means available and consume it. Unsurprisingly, in these conditions teachers (and pupils) find it easier to describe the fine detail of what curriculum content they should be teaching (and learning) than to give appropriate philosophical or sociological reasons why they are doing so. The many and
varied responsibilities laid upon teachers presage a homogenised and standardised, predictable, curriculum made up of skills and competencies. It has been accompanied by an inexorable erosion of their ability and authority to define and control the nature of valued knowledge in respect of children's and community needs.

On another view, these policy and curriculum changes towards centralisation can seem at odds with wider social trends which seem to require that we have, and accept, greater responsibility for our lives. Coincident with de-regulation of the economy, political uncertainty and instability, the threat of global terrorism and the globalisation of knowledge, information and entertainment, have engendered greater social, moral and scientific uncertainty. With it, according to some analysts, new levels of risk impact deeply on our daily lives. In Giddens' (1999:2) view such risk, especially 'manufactured risk' ('human environments of uncertainty' created by the advances of science and technology) is now not just one of the most important issues in the social sciences today; it is central to what our lives are about so that '(w)hat it means to have self identity, how you relate to the diversity of information about diet, food, on the one hand and the global economy on the other, the Asian crisis, ecological problems - in their own way are all risk environments'. Indeed, he argues of the welfare state in the UK as we would of the school curriculum, especially in PEH (see Tinning and Glasby, 2002), that it is a system designed to protect against risk and contingency of illness, of disablement, or unemployment. In this view, the world is now full of surprises and unintended consequences, for example, of contracting AIDS, HIV or BSE ('mad cows disease'). It is a world of 'deregulated uncertainty' where advances in science and technology, accompany an erosion of 'tradition' in the western world (Turner, 2002: 4). And as 'tradition shapes our lives less and less' its demise signals a new dynamic where, according to Giddens (1995: 5-6), 'autonomy and freedom replace the hidden power of tradition with more open discussion and dialogue'. 'We' (a rather undifferentiated claim, we strongly suggest) now seem to be faced with countless choices (over relationships, diet, procreation, looks, sexuality, etc,) where previously there were few, or none. Ironically, this has made life more uncertain and stressful, less comfortable (psychologically) as the multiple options available in many aspects of life always seem to be accompanied by a bewildering array of contested knowledge claims, contradictory opinion and uncertain advice. And '(w)herever you have choice you have risk because you're confronting an open future' and 'in the new risk situations, calculations of probability are not possible because there is no historical experience with which to make calculations' (ibid: 6). There are few, if any, precedents, and no certainties, to help us decide what to do. 'Thus, in the 'new moral climate of risk, we tend to get an oscillation between accusation of scare-mongering on the one hand and accusations of cover-ups on the other' (ibid). BSE and, as we and others will contend 'obesity disease' are good examples of this, though evidence of doubt in such matters is not always apparent amongst teachers or policy makers in the curriculum of PEH in schools (see Gard, forthcoming).

A society living on the 'other side of nature and tradition' (Giddens, 1999) is, then, one that calls for a greater level of decision making in everyday life. And the idea that human beings should be more autonomous and responsible for their own health and safety, individually and collectively, has paralleled the rise of 'manufactured risk'. At one level such a trend is clearly reflected in the massive expansion in western economies of 'health industries' (variously purveying cure all drugs and vitamins, health and exercise advice, or surgical body modification techniques). At another, in the heightened emphasis given to health issues in PE and the wider school curriculum in recent years in the USA, UK, Australia (see Penney and Chandler, 2000, Tinning and Glasby, 2000) and elsewhere, that increasingly privilege alongside performance, body perfection codes celebrating responsibility, autonomy and self-control. Reflected in the UK, for example, in curriculum such as Health Related Fitness or Health Related Education, the latter trading on elements of child
centredness to achieve its aims and ideals. There is a dark side to this development, as we will later see.

We share Turner's view that both these seemingly contradictory views of an increasingly regulated and de-regulated social world are plausible and register trends that find expression in complementary, rather than contradictory, ways in the school curriculum, especially in PEH. On the one hand, the political desire to provide a centrally regulated 'Macdonalised curriculum' in PE (in the UK, in the form of a National Curriculum) and to nurture and privilege more 'traditional' sport may be seen as an attempt to impose order on a deregulated, uncertain world. On the other, the 'new' emphases given to PE and health curricula nurturing self-responsibility, autonomy and self-control may be read as expressions of body perfection code answers to uncertainty. Both may coexist in the curriculum of PEH; performance code sport centred curriculum expressing 'tradition', discipline and social order providing the conservative cultural parameters within which perfection code autonomy, independence and self-control are permitted to form. Neither curriculum may help teachers or pupils explore more difficult socio-cultural changes relating, for example, to how social class and 'race' inequities, 'ability' and sexuality are to be re-conceptualised and dealt with and how young men and women are to think about themselves, their bodies, each other and their health. Yet, all of the changes documented above have impacted upon teachers' and pupils' work making it more complex, more demanding and, as Hargreaves (1999) has pointed out, in some senses more professional, in others more technical, managerial and isolating. The various contributors to this symposium will begin to make clear just how these global trends have penetrated into core teaching and learning practices, becoming embedded and literally embodied through the practices of PEH. They also demonstrate that the 'new' discourses of contemporary social theory, themselves reflecting wider socio-economic change, lead us to approach old questions in new and innovative ways.

Structure of the Symposium.

Drawing on the recent research of some of the leading figures in the fields of sociology, sociology of education and physical culture, Body Knowledge will, therefore, endeavour to provide both an innovative and critical way of looking at the relationships between education, physical culture, identity and health. Although we examine the relations between 'the body' and formal education broadly, we have a strong orientation towards issues of health and identity, interrogating in particular how processes of schooling, historically and contemporaneously, have been and continue to be implicated discursively and pedagogically in the social construction and control of 'the body', identity, well-being and health. In so doing it foregrounds and critiques powerful themes within contemporary culture, notably the assumed positive relationship between organised physical activity and schooling and health. It also offers a way of conceptualising the practices of education, schooling and physical culture drawing on research that radically challenges not only the practices of professional concerned with PEH and sport but also the discursive practices of science and Initial Teacher Education that guides and informs them. Our ambitions are thus both critical and constructive, in that we point both to the potency of knowledge and pedagogy as catalysts for agency and change, as well as their potential to restrict and control. Jan Wright continues our introduction to these issues, outlining key methodological features of post structuralism while highlighting their possibilities for the analysis of the relations between education, physical culture and identity. Jan gives clear steer to the merits of discourse analysis as a way of conceptualising and deconstructing the relations both within and between PEH, the body, identity and health, as socially constructed domains. We get a strong sense that post structural methodology can be used as a tool both for the relational analysis of socio-cultural settings and social and educational change.
We then centre on the ways in which ideologies, policies and discursive practices outside schools and ITEPE influence thinking and actions within them. Together we explore conceptions of childhood, health and identity, illustrating how definitions, agendas and categories employed and often taken for granted by teachers and teacher educators are constructed historically and contemporaneously, in changing socio-cultural circumstance and in relation to the policies and practices of science and other economic and political interests outside schools. Michael Gard offers a powerful critique of the so called 'obesity epidemic', a discursive resource legitimising a number of academic disciplines, including PE, industry and public health agendas. Gard's analysis suggests that Physical Education's alignment with 'the war against obesity' may not only be bad for the development of the subject but also, ironically, for the well being and health of many children and young people in schools. A curriculum grounded in the interests of business and the health industry, rather than the physical cultures of students and educational aims, is not what young people need. Lisette Burrows and Jan Wright further illustrate how taken for granted cultural categories, in this case, 'childhood', re constructed in relation to corporeal discourses that define the healthy child. They foreground the influences of the media and other agencies outside schools that define teachers, parents and pupils as culpable in the production of health and illness, documenting how these powerful social forces regulate and constrain the nature of policy and practice in schools. Dawn Penney and Jo Harris further highlight the impact that health discourse has had on education policies and practices in recent years. They document the 'discursive boundaries' inherent in official policy texts, illustrating their impact on the curriculum and teaching of PE and health in schools in the UK and elsewhere. Their analysis, like that of the others, goes beyond critique to speculate on the role of pedagogy in challenging current boundaries of knowledge and extending understandings among teachers and pupils about their bodies, health and Physical Education. Drawing on critical race theory and anti racist scholarship Kimberley Oliver and Rosary Lalik describe and critique an intervention designed to help 8th grade girls examine 'the Beauty Walk', an annual event in a school in southeast part of the United States. We learn that the 'white body' is the school enforced ideal for beauty and that, while the girls were able to name and critique this type of institutionalised racism, in many ways they supported its continuation. They raise fundamental questions not only about the nature of racism in schools but also of the limits of research to act as a vehicle for changing deep seated taken for granted attitudes and school practices. Deana Leahy and Lyn Harrison draw on a case study of a Year 10 health and physical education programme in a metropolitan secondary school in Australia to illustrate how discourses of risk, health and citizenship, reproduced through the curriculum and classroom practices, can operate as mechanism of social regulation and control. They highlight the merits of viewing the classroom as a 'site of governance', where the way in which students and their bodies are positioned within discourses of education, health, citizenship and risk has significant consequences for their developing sense of identity and self. Together then, these authors provide not only a challenging critique of contemporary practices in schools but also, as Richard Tinning concludes, a rich agenda for curriculum innovation and research. Given the potential impact of PEH and sport curricula on young people's development, health and well being, we can only hope that this small contribution to continuing debates within education, Physical Education and health will leave policy makers and practitioners with a better understanding of what it will take to secure, amongst all children and young people, a positive sense of embodied self.

Notes

1. This paper introduces symposium EVA02292 at AARE 2002. The full version of the paper along with those of all other contributors to the symposium plus additional unpublished papers by authors not at the conference (including, Chris Shilling, Andrew Sparkes, David Kirk and Gill Clark), will be published in book form, Evans, J, Davies, B, Wright, J. (2003) 'Body Knowledge and Control', London, Routledge.
2. We can not name or do justice to all those internationally who, from very different perspectives over the last thirty years have contributed to critical research and curriculum development in PE and sport in schools. The array of work produced, for example, by Bain, Birrell, Crum, Griffin, Hall, Hellison, Jewett, Lawson, Messner, O'Sullivan, Schempp, Siedentop, to name but few, will be familiar to many reading this book, and there are many other perspectives emanating from Europe, USA, Australia and elsewhere, too numerous to mention here, but featuring in journals such as *Sport, Education and Society* dedicated to social science research in PHE and sport, who are continuing to define the field. Not all could, or would want to be, classified as 'critical sociologists', however, together, their work has nurtured the reflective development of research and innovation in PE and sport in schools and ITEPE in many countries.

3. We use the term code following Bernstein (2000, p202) to refer to 'regulative principles which select and integrate relevant meanings (classifications), forms of their realisation (framings) and their evoking contexts. The values (strong/weak) and functions (classifications/framings) carry the code potential. How this potential is actualised is a function of the struggle to construct and distribute code modalities which regulate pedagogic relations, communication and context management. Conflict is endemic within and between the arenas in the struggle to dominate modalities and in the relation between local pedagogic modalities and official modalities'. The making of the National Curriculum PE in the UK provides a good example of such conflict (Penney and Evans 1999). The social class origins and consequences of such coding will be explored elsewhere.

4. The work of Morais, Neves and their associates provides the best, extended example of the application and development of these ideas to the classroom. It is mainly focussed on lower secondary science teaching in Portugal and is overviewed in their 2001 article.
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