



*Citation for published version:*

Andrews, DL, Silk, ML, Francombe, J & Bush, AJ 2013, 'McKinesiology', *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, vol. 35, no. 5, pp. 335-356. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10714413.2013.842867>

*DOI:*

[10.1080/10714413.2013.842867](https://doi.org/10.1080/10714413.2013.842867)

*Publication date:*

2013

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* on 15/11/13, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/10714413.2013.842867>

## University of Bath

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

*McKinesiology*

## *McKinesiology*

### **Abstract**

Within this paper, we address how kinesiology—in a similar fashion to other disciplinary enterprises—has become enmeshed with the dictates of the market, privatization, efficiency, flexibility, and the accelerated rationalization of society, associated with the advent of late capitalism. Hence, we outline how these market considerations implicitly and explicitly privilege centrally controlled, efficiency oriented, rationally predictable, and empirically calculable ways of knowing, and of knowledge generation (Ritzer, 2004). We propose that these processes not only further wed kinesiology, the University, and implicated subjects (students as well as Professors) to the logics of the capital, but also place such concerns over human needs, civic and moral responsibilities, public values and critical contents (Giroux, 2010). These non-rational and incalculable pedagogical outcomes are crucial foundations for democracy, political freedom and equality (Brown, 2006), yet are apparently devalued in contemporary kinesiology as in other formations of (higher) education. Pace Ritzer (2006), we thus expose the *epistemological McDonaldization* evident with kinesiology, which we argue has resulted in a field stymied by what elsewhere has been described as its “inconvenient truth” (Andrews, 2008); namely, the intellectually and humanity limiting scientific doxa apparent and embodied within the constitution of kinesiological departments, curricular, journals, and, indeed, the kinesiology academy itself.

## *McKinesiology*

As a field of study, kinesiology is realized in different places and locations as a multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, and very rarely, transdisciplinary project. In the words of the American Kinesiology Association, it is an academic discipline that involves the study of physical activity and its impact on health, society, and quality of life.<sup>i</sup> With varying intensities and emphases, kinesiology draws from biology, psychology, sociology, philosophy and includes multiple sub-disciplinary areas (e.g., biomechanics, sport history, exercise physiology, sport pedagogy) (Gill, 2007). However, this is a far from integrated field. Indeed, with Andrews (2008), in its current iteration, kinesiology is a field fraught with hyperfragmentation and hyperspecialization in which there is instantiated an epistemological hierarchy that privileges positivist over postpositivist, quantitative over qualitative, and predictive over interpretive ways of knowing. While the trials and tribulations of kinesiology may appear distinctly parochial in relevance and reach, the issues framing the field's compromised evolution can be discerned within both higher education generally and in other interdisciplinary fields of inquiry which attempt to incorporate the disparate elements—and power differentials—present within the broader, market-driven University. In the balance of this paper, we argue that failure to fully acknowledge and support the contribution of social, cultural, philosophical, and historical focused research and understanding, precludes the actualization of kinesiology's expansive intellectual promise, impact and potentialities. For, a critical kinesiology is not just about the active body; it is, as Denzin (2012) argues, about the articulations between active bodies and spaces of violence, global terror, neoliberal regimes, identity, self, gender, queer bodies of color, bilingual belongings, and public education in globalizing times—it is about postcolonial intellectuals decolonizing the academy, freedom, social justice, border crossings, the voices of oppression, and, democracy (see e.g. Newman, 2010; Silk & Andrews, 2012; Silk,

2011).

Our central thesis is that that the *lean* and *mean* kinesiology presently operating within the (corporatized) academic jungle precludes the development of the field as a comprehensive and integrated approach to the study of human movement. Indeed, we argue that it is explicitly clear to see “whose knowledge counts” (Ingham & Donnelly, 1990) within the “prestige hierarchies” of the contemporary university, and whose does not (see also Miller & Ahluwalia, 2011). We argue that this not only is damaging to the field—it is bound to suffer from the structural inadequacies and partialities that will become inherent within the discipline—but ultimately destabilizes the possibilities for higher education as a site of intellectual advancement, social justice and critical and autonomous thinking. We argue then, the epistemological hierarchy associated with a McDonaldized kinesiology is something that we all need to forsake, in favor of more epistemologically balanced, empirically wholesome, and intellectually stimulating kinesiological fare: one which can do more than just reproduce the “contemporary landscape of political intelligibility and possibility” (Brown, 2006, p.693). We thus conclude by tentatively sketching what a reinvigorated—or resuscitated—kinesiology might (not ought) to look like; an interdisciplinary field ground within a *critical curriculum of the corporeal* that draws on a range of exciting and innovative methodologies that can provide the languages of, and possibilities for, a politically progressive, socially just and democratic citizenry.

### **The Bare Pedagogy of the McDonaldized University**

Ritzer’s (1998; 2004) McDonaldization—ground in Weber’s (1958) iron cage of capitalism—captures the increased organizational bureaucratization and productive rationalization of human existence within modernizing capitalist societies. This iron cage traps individuals in highly complex and rule-based organizational structures (they are

bureaucratized), in which evermore aspects of their existence become productivity and goal-oriented (they are rationalized). Ritzer's "iron cage" is, of course, the ubiquitous "Golden Arches", and as a material metaphor, McDonaldization speaks to the organizing and rationalizing of the institutionalized production and delivery of products and services, according to a set of profit-driven principles. These principles are based on: efficiency (the streamlining of production processes, and the simplification of products and services); calculability (the belief that things should be assessed by quantitative [objective] as opposed to qualitative [subjective] measures); control (increased influence of rules and regulations, and non-human technologies over workers/consumers); and, predictability (the creation of institutionally standardized products and services).

As Ritzer, and numerous others have identified, the "Golden Arches" of bureaucratic and commercially rationalized efficiencies has crept out of the fast-food franchise and into all aspects of life, including the public university. Fully entrenched within academe are a series of discourses, power relations and ways of knowing framed around the rationalization of rationality (Clegg, 2002) which are manifest in the all too familiar 'metrics' that dominate the discourses and lived experiences of our everyday lives within our McDonaldized institutions (see also Rogers, 2012)<sup>ii</sup>. Our institutions of higher education then are invariably increasingly predicated on efficiency (e.g. doing more with less, leaner and meaner, replacement of tenured positions), calculability (measurement of 'valued outcomes'), control (over the curriculum and regulations) and predictability (standardized 'products and services'.

Rather than underscored by democratic principles and practices that provide the conditions for future generations to confront the challenges of a global democracy (Giroux, 2010)—and as distinct from the beliefs of renown philosophers and educators such as John Dewey, Hannah Arendt, and Maxine Green (see Giroux, 2009)—a McDonaldized higher education is thus increasingly narrated in market terms: corporate culture subsumes

democratic culture, and, critical learning is replaced by an instrumental logic that celebrates the imperatives of the bottom line, downsizing, and outsourcing (Giroux, 2003; 2009; 2010). In this formulation, with Giroux (2010), and drawing on Agamben's (1998) 'bare pedagogy,' academics become obsessed with grant writing, fund raising, and capital improvements, and, higher education devalues "its role as a democratic public sphere committed to the broader values of an engaged and critical citizenry" (Giroux, 2003, p. 22).

In this regard, 'knowledge' production is to some extent 'privatized' (Olssen & Peters, 2005; Redden & Low, 2012; Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004) whereby "knowledge is not only structured to be economically productive but itself becomes wholly a commodity under market conditions" (Halsey et al., 1997, p. 23). As handmaiden to the 'logics of the market', higher education mimics the inequalities and hierarchies of power and ties public life and civic education to market-driven policies, social relations, values and modes of understanding (Giroux, 2010). Within this rationalized McUniversity, research is guided only by the "controlling yardstick of profit [that] undermines the role of the university as a public sphere dedicated to addressing the most serious social problems a society faces" (Giroux (1999, p. 20). Such instrumentalized knowledge is declared *a priori* superior and undermines forms of theorizing, pedagogy, and meaning that define higher and public education as a public good (Giroux, 2003). As such, dominant pedagogic practices within the corporate university become depoliticized and reduced to the status of training future students for the (corporatized, and increasingly militarized) workplace—with 'good value' courses being those deemed 'relevant' in market terms (Giroux, 2009)—and any knowledge that might challenge anti-democratic forms of power or that questions dominant social practices, values, power relations, and, morals, is dismissed by administrators, students and their parents, seen as ornamental and *irrelevant* to gaining a foothold in the job market (Giroux, 2003; 2010). Indeed, for Giroux (2010, p. 185), 'bare pedagogy' is one which deems compassion a weakness, scorns moral

responsibility given it places human needs over market considerations, and “strips education of its public values, critical contents and civic responsibilities as part of its broader goal of creating new subjects wedded to the logic of privatization, efficiency, flexibility, the accumulation of capital and the destruction of the social state.” As distinct as possible then from the historically stated mission of ‘higher’ education, and completely at odds with providing students with the skills and information necessary to think critically about the knowledge they gain, colleges and universities have become, or are increasingly perceived—and perceive themselves—as training grounds for corporate (and military<sup>iii</sup>) existence, a mere medium for sorting students and placing them into a pre-existing iniquitous social order (Giroux, 2003).

There are numerous damaging limitations—what Ritzer described as the irrationalities of rationality—at the heart of the McUniversity.<sup>iv</sup> Not least of these has been the treatment and positioning of students as consumers which has bought with it the specter of grade inflation, concerns over students (and newspaper) ‘ratings’ of the Department / University, the worrisome notion (ground in consumerist expectation) that effort and energy are all that is required to buy an ‘A’, the administrative obsession with student retention rates and initiatives designed to address the issue, and, the removal of all but the most remedial barriers to student’s securing the product which they consider themselves to have secured *a priori* at the point of *purchase*—their degree. This may seem an obvious point, but clearly there is a clash of culture between the sensibilities of the student consumer, and those of faculty laborers/servants (here to serve the needs of student consumers). The McUniversity’s irrationalities of rationality are further experienced and manifest in the educational fallout from the threatened demise of the tenure track professoriate, and its replacement by a corps of temporary-contracted McProfessors. Those who teach within Ritzer’s (future) McUniversity



are unlikely to be full-time, tenured faculty members; the tenure system having been removed due its perceived economic inefficiencies and its (democratic) role as a mechanism for circumventing the controlling influences of the university's central administration. The ranks of tenure track professors will be replaced by a legion of part-time academic workers (what Giroux, 2009, terms the outsourcing of academic labor); McJobbers (or indeed McProfessors) in the true sense of the phrase, whose wages are low; whose benefits are minimal; and, who are forced to spread their workload across numerous different classes, and/or institutions. Clear benefits exist for university administration who would welcome the savings from not having to pay the *inflated* wages, pension contributions, health insurance costs, and various other benefits, yet, the cost—both individual and collective—are profound. In terms of the former, it is unlikely that many will find the exploitative, “fast, take-away” (Payne & Wattlow, 2009, p. 17 in Hartman & Darab, 2012) working conditions—the effects of the intensification of work and time pressures that Hartman & Darab (2012) refer to as ‘speedy scholarship’—in any way rewarding, thus leading to a high turnover of instructors, and an understandable decline in the number of people wishing to pursue careers teaching in higher education. With regard to the latter, the rise of the McProfessoriate (part-time, non-tenured teaching labor) has broader implications for the development of democratic and socially just knowledge and understanding within society as a whole.

As we are all fully aware, the typical tenure/tenure track position brings with it job expectations with regard to teaching, research, and service (the precise weighting of these being dependent on the field of inquiry, the nature of the institution, and the belligerence of the individual faculty member). Nonetheless, it is an expectation of tenure/tenure track faculty to contribute to furthering the generation of knowledge within their research field, and to hopefully communicate these new insights and understandings within the classroom setting.

However, for the McProfessoriate, speedy scholarship (Hartman & Darab, 2012) suggests “little time, few inducements, and little in the way of facilities to engage in original scholarship and research” [Ritzer, 1998 #7801, p. 158]. Rather, and fully in line with a neoliberal, managerial, technocratic set of means for regulating and normalizing behavior and inducing conformity within the profession, faculty are “discovering that an increasing proportion of their time is being consumed by the necessity of reporting requirements, ostensibly to satisfy requests for accountability” (Lincoln, 2011, 369). In this regard, there exist covert and clandestine connections between the McUniversity, the deterioration of academic freedom, accountability and a regulatory administration with a “pervasive neoliberal distrust of faculties and their presumed freedoms and perceived lack of oversight and accountability” (Lincoln, 2011, p. 369). As Stephen Ball (2012) proposes, within the ‘reformation’ bought about by the roughest of neoliberal beasts, as educators we have had to make ourselves *more calculable than memorable*. Ball (2012, p. 18) argues that within a new paradigm of education built on competitive advantage, professionals themselves have to be re-invented as units whose productivity can be audited<sup>v</sup>, in making ourselves accountable and reporting on what we do rather than doing it; in short, this has bought about “a profound shift in our relationships to ourselves, our practice, and the possibilities of being an academic.” With Ball, this new academic performativity is built on the enterprising academic, who, drawing on Weber is a ‘specialist without spirit’ that makes it impossible for Universities to do what they do best—enabling people to think. The very performance then of ‘academia’ has become subjectified—the very structures of domination have been sedimented on the bodies of the McProfessoriate—with the realities of pedagogy practiced within the “constraining normativities of an increasingly corporatized academy” (Brenner, 2006, p. 3; cf. Sonu, 2012). Worst still, and as we experience in our very own Departments, there appears a sense of “ontological insecurity” in which academics increasingly disconnected from the McUniversity

wander aimlessly—in a sort of thirdspace distant from both academic freedom, thinking space and the dictates of accountability and performativity—with a “loss of a sense of meaning in what we do and of what is important in what we do” (Ball, 2012, p.20).

As the university community becomes evermore reliant on downsized part-time teaching labor (with ‘real’ academic work being about securing financial grants or linking with big business), the potential for the university as a site for intellectual advancement will be fatally undermined: the McUniversity then, becoming, somewhat ironically, a site of “disembodied (online) delivery [and] slimmed-down content” (Haryman & Darab, 2012, p. 56). Indeed, there is every possibility that the university will merely become the location for the delivery, and circulation, of extant and instrumental knowledge: in short, the University becomes devoid of “critical and autonomous thinking, a concern for social justice, and a robust sense of community and global citizenship” (Giroux & Giroux, 2012, p.4). Are we then, as Ball (2012) suggests, in a regime of performativity in which experience is nothing, but in which productivity is everything? Or, are we, as Sonu (2012) argues, so entrenched within the primacy of the market that even our efforts to introduce social justice into the classroom or curricula are influenced by a state of commodification, further do we find “performative stealth” (p. 240) in the hidden corners of our institutions, allowing for notions of freedom and resistance to flourish?

This scenario is compounded by the controlling impulses of the McUniversity, looking to standardize curricula and course content in order that it can be more easily replicated and delivered by the ever-changing retinue of McProfessors. In this sense, universities are likely to become less locally innovative, and more globally derivative, as they look to duplicate the curricula and course content offerings of their aspirational peers/ institutional competitors. When considering the structural (curriculum content and delivery) reformation of the commercially rationalized university, it is evident that they are “expanding in innumerable ways

in a mindless effort to survive even if that means surrendering everything that has made education distinctive” (Ritzer, 1998, p. 160). This scenario points to the fundamental *irrationality* that results from the *rational* efficiencies of the McUniversity. For, within the McDonaldized context, the university is being rendered a generic and anodyne entity. Thus elite institutions of higher learning are, in Ritzer’s terms, in danger of becoming seats of derivative educational “nothingness”; cultural institutions and forms that are “centrally conceived, controlled, and comparatively devoid of distinctive substantive [or meaningful] content” (Ritzer, 2004, p. 3). They are replicative expressions of what the market (primarily fee paying parents) expects a state “flagship” public university to look like and provide.

### **The *Science* of McKinesiology**

The McDonaldizing rational productivity ethos of liberal capitalist society has seemingly found its epistemic corroboration in the positivist objectivism that underpins the ***scientific method***, as conventionally understood. Both are constituents, and simultaneously constitutors, of a particular understanding of modernity, centered around linear evolutionary assumptions pertaining to the (assumed) inexorable progress of human civilization through the advancement of empirically grounded—often a euphemism for quantitatively driven and objectively reasoned—science. Hence, the scientific hegemony presently in place within the contemporary university speaks less about the veracity of the scientific method *per se*, as it does about the political economy of the McDonaldized university, and the broader political, economic, cultural, and technological context in which the process of McDonaldization exists and operates (e.g. Nandy, 1988; Rutherford, 2005). Science then, as a ‘reason of state’ (Nandy, 1988), is not an epistemological accident: it is quintessentially reductionist and related to the needs of a particular form of economic organization based on exploitation, profit

maximization and capital accumulation (Shiva, 1988). This is clearly a dangerous turn—not least given science can inflict violence in the name national security and development (Nandy, 1988)—one that all but removes the *ethical referent* from the meaning and purpose of higher education and in which educating students to resist injustice, anti-democratic pressures or to learn how to make authority and power accountable appears as a receding horizon (Giroux, 2003; Giroux & Giroux, 2012).

Given that the McUniversity is, if nothing else, a pragmatic environment, it has responded to the corporate and “governmental manipulation of science” by reinforcing the primacy of “high-quality science” (Lather, 2006, p. 35, 34): in short, the meaning and purpose of higher education has become besieged by a phalanx of narrow economic and political interests (Giroux, 2010, p. 188) and in which the corporate brand is more important than any mission to educate free moral agents (Giroux, 2012; see also Barnett and Griffin, 1997; Evans, 2004/5; Readings, 1996). The actions of public and private funding bodies have made it apparent that the nearer one approaches the “gold standard” of randomized experimental design, the more one is likely to receive funding for doing “objective and good science”, and the larger that funding is likely to be (Lather, 2006, p. 32). A pervasive grant culture within the McUniversity has thus skewed the epistemological hierarchy, such that research areas are valued for their funding potential and records, more than their intellectual impact and relevance: in short, primacy is afforded to rationally conceived, empirically grounded and objective research, while critical, interpretive, and reflexive forms of intellectualizing are devalued (Denzin & Giardina, 2006).

As argued above, as Kuhn (1970) famously suggested, particular regimes of power are underpinned by specific regimes of truth, and *vice versa*, a complex amalgam of corporate, bureaucratic, and military interests, have become responsible for advancing not only science

*per se*, but a particularly narrow and, some have argued, regressive understanding of, and role for, science within society (see e.g. Freshwater & Rolfe, 2004; House, 2005). Such pressures have compromised the perceived rationality and value-free Enlightenment practices upon which the scientific method is founded, privileging particular types of, and foci for, scientific endeavor. This is a ‘scientific knowledge’ that is political through and through; a knowledge ground within our contemporary social and political conditions that authorize particular regimes of truth (Murray et. al., 2007). It is, as Dallas Rogers (2012) suggests, about the politics of (and technocratic right to) placing boundaries about what can be counted as ‘truth’. In this climate, it is of little surprise that we come face to face with the aggressive push of evidence based “scientific” progress, policies and programs. This “dangerously naïve commonsense view on truth” (Murray et al., 2008, p.273) fails to recognize the political workings of power which silently operate behind the mask of objectivity, inscribe rigid norms and standards that ensure political dominance, and, set the agenda with regard to what questions about ‘truth’ can be asked and by whom: it is, quite simply, a mechanism of power that has co-opted and corporatized all aspects of learning (both the construction and understanding of learning) and re-interprets then as competition, privatization and profiteering (Canella, 2011). Based in the doctrines of logical positivism, and following Murray et al. (2008, p.273), “this view betrays an almost unshakeable faith in the human capacity for unbiased or objective observation and analysis.” In this formulation, science becomes supplanted by ideology shaped by the neo-conservative cultural logics of neo-liberalism, even as it basks in the dubious glow of its spurious value-free objectivity (Lincoln & Canella, 2004; also Giroux, 2005; Harvey, 2003; Lakoff, 2006; Stevenson, 2010).

The ‘pornography’ (Giroux & Giroux, 2012) of the McUniversity has clearly materialized in kinesiology (see especially Andrews, 2008; Bairner, 2012; Gill, 2007). We use the term McKinesiology here as a provocative pejorative, as it seeks to capture the partisan

version of kinesiology that we are in danger of creating (if indeed, we have not already done so). Kinesiology has been McDonaldized: it is cheaply produced in a standardized and highly predictable form; it is outwardly seductive and appealing, popular and (ful-)filling, but closer inspection reveals a bland and insubstantial structure; it offers anything but a balanced and healthy composite of the various food groups; it serves its immediate purpose, but offers nothing in terms of long-term benefits to the individual, it is far from the multi-ontologic (multiple ways of being physically) and multi-epistemic (there being numerous different forms of knowledge of physical activity) field that it believes itself to be. McKinesiology is infused with one of the most significant *irrationalities* of higher education *rationality*: namely, an epistemological empirical calculability that for the most part has embraced the doctrines and standards of logical positivism<sup>vi</sup> and its correlative, constrictive curricular efficiency. Any ontological or epistemological position that may run counter to such a position and might enable students to develop critical and analytical skills that might hold power accountable ('speak the truth to power' in Edward Said's parlance), or develop a sense of prophetic justice (Giroux, 2010), is usually viewed with suspicion at best and outright hostility at worst. Those marginalized, stand-alone and 'avant-garde scholars' who exist on the periphery of the field, are deemed to counter the 'legitimate' or normative forms of kinesiology against which their work is judged. In short, McKinesiology is dominated by self-destructive reductionist science that (subconsciously) acts as an insidious component of social and economic conditions that privilege 'state' science (Murray et. al, 2007)—science that is embedded within, and looks to expand, neoliberal, militarized, economic modes of governance and efficiency.

We are informed and inspired at this juncture by Alan Ingham and Peter Donnelly's (1990) short, but highly suggestive commentary "Whose Knowledge Counts? The Production of Knowledge and Issues of Application in the Sociology of Sport." As Ingham and Donnelly opined (1990, p. 59), humanistic knowledge has definitely suffered at the hands of

“technocratic” scientific knowledge currently privileged within McKinesiology’s epistemological prestige hierarchy. While department’s may pay “lip service to the liberal education curriculum”, within the “contested terrain” of kinesiology, the “humanistic intellectual” is habitually forced to view the (scientific) “technical intelligentsia” as an overbearing and resource-hogging adversary, as opposed to a kinesiological ally. The “technological intelligentsia” however oftentimes consider “humanistic intellectualizing” to be a superfluous, and thereby expendable, kinesiological trifle. McKinesiology’s self-evident epistemological hierarchy—what we can term the epistemological violence (Shiva, 1988; see also Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005) that privileges specific “scientific” ways of knowing—has structurally and intellectually constrained the kinesiological project, in terms of realizing its aims of developing a truly integrative and interdisciplinary approach to the study of physical activity and thereby of society. This has resulted in the triumph of a depthless, bland, and wholly unsatisfying politicized McKinesiological sciences, stripped of much that made kinesiology a potentially distinctive and significant integrative intellectual project. As a consequence, today’s McKinesiology departments tend either to be exclusively bio-science focused, or unapologetically bio-science centric (the social sciences and humanities being grudgingly tolerated, but habitually under-funded and under-supported).

In order to interrupt the naturalized and normalized bio-scientism of the McKinesiology enterprise, it is important to make visible some key elements and effects of the rationally-driven process of scientization. Given that McKinesiology is both an effect and agent, a product and producer, of McDonaldization, our focus is on the generative interplay between the epistemic empirical calculability and constrictive curricular efficiency that is at the heart—the supposed ‘nutritional’ staple—of the McKinesiology enterprise<sup>vii</sup>. Since the body was viewed primarily as a biological organism (i.e. it was an effect of nature), the scientific method routinely used to investigate elements of the natural world became viewed as the



unquestioned means of empirically engaging and understanding the body. Indeed, there persists an “equation of corporeality with biology and the correlated assumption that natural science has a more direct access to the ‘truth’ of the body are still commonplace today” (Fraser & Greco, 2005, p. 7). Such a philosophy finds a comfortable and confirmative home in kinesiology where “scientific discourse and common sense” combine to “naturalize the ‘truth’ about the body”, and thereby obscure its social and historic constitution (Hargreaves, 1987, p. 139).

The understanding of the body as an exclusively biological organism is, of course, little more than a compelling mythology. As Ingham noted, the “body is, at the same time, both physical and cultural ... the genetically endowed is socially constituted or socially constructed, as well as socially constituting and constructing” (Ingham, 1997, p. 176). Clearly, the ways of knowing/truths associated with the active body/human movement are not the exclusive domain of the positivistic adherence to the quantitative data-driven generation of models and predictions. As much a social, cultural, philosophical, and historical entity—as it is a genetic, physiological, and psychological vessel—there are important, interpretive engagements (materialized in interpretive, ethnographic, autoethnographic, narrative, textual and discursive, socio-historic methodologies) that aim to generate otherwise inaccessible interpretations and understandings of the active body/human movement. Such social and cultural dimensions of corporeality simply cannot be imagined, let alone understood, using a logical positivist predilection for identifying and testing the existence of objective rationalities. Nonetheless, within some circles—not least of which being within the corridors of McKinesiology—the myth of the natural body persists, and is effectively reinforced through the institutional (overt and covert) promotion of the *natural* bio-scientific dimensions of kinesiology.

This is of course a dangerous pathway for kinesiology to follow—*any* single perspective is laden with assumptions, blindness, and limitations, produces a naïve

overspecialization, and is often imbued with elitist dimensions of dominant cultural knowledge techniques (Kincheloe, 2001). To avoid one-sided reductionism, there is a need to counter the limitations of a dominant and naturalized bio-scientific Kinesiology, the discursive strictures of this disciplinary approach, the historicity of its certified modes of knowledge production, and the inseparability of the knower and known<sup>viii</sup>. Kinesiology's survival as a vibrant discipline is based on opening elastic conversations about the ways in which knowledge can be developed, as individuals contributing to a more democratic whole, as teams, or as a field contributing to wider societal debates. At the very least, as individuals and as a field, we need to be open to competing discourses and viewpoints; we must ensure that an epistemological and paradigmatic pluralism that promises expanded understandings of kinesiology are not lost in a chase for ever-declining research dollars from funding institutions (and by extension, university administrators that press for externally funded research) that narrowly define what constitutes an acceptable scholarly contribution.

Although not wishing to overstate the point, we do feel it is important not to dismiss these examples of “privileging science” as trivial and inconsequential acts. In Bourdieu's terms, this is a classic example of symbolic violence (Wacquant, 1987) whereby normalized, and thereby unconscious, modes of communication become complicit in the tacit domination of one group over another: of the scientific subject over the humanistic subject. The effect of this practice on individuals is difficult to assess. However, at the very least, the institutional privileging of empirical, rational, and objective ways of knowing which, when combined with the commonsense perception of the human body as primarily and fundamentally a natural bio-physical entity, provides kinesiology's bio-science “intelligentsia” with the ammunition for a more than healthy sense of their own self-importance and centrality. It is perhaps easier to assess the impact of McKinesiological science's symbolic violence within institutional and programmatic settings when considering the related issues of curricular efficiency. The

militarily inspired climate of educational/scientific accountability that prompted the climate of sub-disciplinization in the early 1960s, has been replaced by a complex amalgam of corporate, bureaucratic, political, and military interests, responsible for advancing not only science per se, but a particularly narrow and regressive understanding of, and role for, science within society. Further, and far from reveling in the anticipated fruits of a post-scarcity society (Chernomas, 1984; Giddens, 1995), today's rationalized capitalist formation has become associated with evermore intensifying periods of economic stringency resulting, amongst other things, in significant reductions in levels of state funding to public universities. This has had profound effects on the structure and experience of university life, since it is expected to become both *leaner and meaner* in its operation, focus, and intent (Harrison, 1997). The neophyte, and therefore self-consciously vulnerable, discipline of kinesiology has been efficiently co-opted into the self-legitimizing hegemony of scientific funding. While unfortunate, it is wholly understandable why those commanding the precarious kinesiology amalgam should privilege the epistemic order (science) that is most readily rewarded (through major grant funding), and thereby valued, by managerialist administrators intent on hiring academics with a 'good' record (read, who have a track record in obtaining external funding). However, in doing so, economic considerations now come to augment the already normalized scientism held by large swathes of the kinesiology community. This has—and will doubtless continue to, unless it is checked—had some deleterious effects on kinesiology as a whole, and particularly those researching and teaching within the humanities based nodes of kinesiological inquiry (the sociologists, cultural studies, historians, and philosophers amongst us). As aforementioned, the result of the narrow-minded McKinesiology is both a *leaner and meaner* intellectual project.

*Lean ...*

McKinesiology is *leaner* because those sub-disciplinary/research areas that have scrapped for their very existence in the face of the scientific onslaught are now faced with rational efficiencies driving staffing and curricular decisions. In terms of having a truly diverse, vibrant and productive research culture, most kinesiology departments are lacking, and could be characterized as being lean; there is every indication that they are becoming leaner, and likely to become even more so. Research areas that are not in a position to potentially secure major funding are increasingly viewed as being “simply not viable” within the current climate. However, and crucially, philosophically, historically, and sociologically-focused researchers within kinesiology departments are oftentimes not judged by the “major funding” benchmarks/standards of their area of inquiry (for instance, a \$5,000 research award for a historian being a significant sum), but by the granting scales of entirely different academic universes. Indeed, many administrators openly fantasize about the “medical school model” of faculty funding, whereby individual researchers are expected to generate an ever-higher percentage of their base salaries from externally sourced funding; an academic-Darwinism in which survival of the most fundable evolves as a distinct possibility in the not-too-distant future.

However, not all McKinesiology administrators are sufficiently narrow-minded not to recognize the importance of the humanities domains to the interdisciplinary project of kinesiology. Their treatment of such areas, however well intentioned, nevertheless belies an implicitly demeaning and ultimately deleterious form of academic patronage. This often comes in the form of recognition that those in philosophy/history/sociology cannot be expected to generate significant grant funding. The flip side is far more flippant: contribution to the department must be made in other ways, namely teaching. Yet, such a position only serves to feed the epistemological violence of McKinesiology in two interrelated ways. First, it characterizes the bio-scientific grantsman as possessing an inherent disdain or disregard for

teaching (which may or may not be the case). Second, it positions humanities scholars as a reverse category: as individuals who need—for their very institutional existence—to recognize their role as teachers first, and researchers second, if at all. Such an approach legitimates the treatment of the humanities as an area that needs to be taught (although not necessarily ‘valued’ by our ‘customers’), but not invested in as a productive and valued research group. As a result, most philosophers, historians, and sociologists within departments of kinesiology are likely to be, if not ploughing a solitary scholarly furrow, certainly lacking membership of the type of critical mass of likeminded intellectuals that could generate a truly vibrant and productive research culture. Thus, at both the individual and institutional level, there exists a *de facto* marginalization of the kinesiological humanities. This has, of course, been a lived reality for many people for quite a considerable period of time and it shows every indication of getting worse.

Within the ever-rationalizing McUniversity, the designation of the kinesiological humanities as important teaching domains, leaves tenure track faculty lines in these areas vulnerable to being replaced by low-wage, minimal benefit, part-time McProfessors: the resultant free lines being commandeered by more financially generative, and thereby valued, sectors of kinesiology. The impact of such *speedy* strategies on kinesiology, both its constituent elements and the sum of its parts, cannot be overstated. Within the sociology of sport, for example, a generation of sociology of sport McProfessors—with little time or opportunity to develop new forms of knowledge and understanding through original and innovative research—will be compelled to deliver extant knowledge within classroom settings. Thus, the sociology of sport could conceivably become an intellectual field set in aspic, whose insights and understandings become dated and centralized. With McUniversity administrators aware of the institutionalized stagnation of sociology of sport, in all likelihood they would look to standardized course content, in order that the *in situ* McProfessor can deliver it, more

efficiently. This could lead to the emergence of a sociology of sport nothingness: a centrally conceived and largely generic form of knowledge largely devoid of distinctive local content and relevance (Ritzer, 2004); as circulated within commercial textbooks, and ancillary web materials, and, taught by temporary instructors increasingly unlikely to be trained, and certainly not actively researching, within this field of inquiry. One fears here that such nothingness may fleetingly appear as a popular ‘special’ on the McUniversity menu—a *McPhoenix*<sup>ix</sup> perhaps—removed once consumer demand has been satiated.

*... and mean*

Perhaps most worryingly, Ritzer noted “the general irrationality of rationality is dehumanization” [Ritzer, 1998 #7801, p. 42]. A meaner McKinesiology has been dehumanize; as the kinesiological humanities have become diminished, so has the understanding of the lived human experience of sport and physical activity. Instead, the individual active (or indeed inactive) human being is engaged as a genetic, physiological, psycho-physiological, or psychological entity, from whom statistically derived empirical data is drawn and analyzed. While doubtless worthy in its own right, this type of research clearly fails to account for, and thus understand, the lived or experiential realm of physical activity. Once again, the active body becomes viewed as primarily a bio-physical entity, as opposed to a socio-cultural expression, when in reality it is both. This leads many bio-scientists to dehumanize their research subjects by treating them as statistical objects, rather than complex, living, breathing, socially interacting individuals. It may be a little harsh to accuse these researchers of meanness, however, at the very least, McKinesiology is culpable in (re)producing a clearly dismembered/dissected and fundamentally fragmented understanding of the individual subject.

Where McKinesiology could rightly be accused of meanness—and once again, we would offer the fact that this is an unintentional consequence of conventional bio-scientific

methods—it is in the manner that much genetically, physiologically, psycho-physiologically, or psychologically-based research performed within kinesiology departments, tacitly corroborates the perniciously damning neoliberal individualistic ideology that dominates the (American) political landscape. In this way, the science of McKinesiology is, as Ingham and Donnelly (1990) identified, a fundamentally politicized science. This results in a failure to recognize the corroborative relationship that much individualizing research has with the individualistic ideology of the neoliberal moment. A central component of neoliberalism is the cult of individualism, and the concomitant recasting of social problems (poverty, crime, drug use, inadequate health-insurance, obesity) as purely individual problems (see e.g. Rose, 1999). Such concerns are clearly evident in McKinesiology context; the scientific examination of phenomenon such as obesity, hypertension, and physical inactivity, from a purely individualistic epistemology fails to recognize, and account for, their social and cultural dimensions. Such an approach individualizes these social issues, by casting individuals as the “social problems”. This is perhaps the unintended meanness of McKinesiological research, because it constructs and vilifies individuals as irresponsible miscreants, for being responsible for their self-inflicted wounds/problems. It correspondingly identifies them as the source of their own salvation; if only they would become more responsible for their own lives/bodies/health. Evidently, your friendly exercise physiologist is probably wholly unaware of the relationship between her/his research findings, and the self—righteous individualistic moralizing of neoliberalism. However, that is the relationship that is forged, especially when McKinesiology departments fail to invest within research areas that would generate understandings of the inalienable socio-cultural dimensions of “social problems”.

### **Towards a Curriculum of the Corporeal**

There are, however, some brighter spots on the horizon. McKinesiological curricular emaciation is most pronounced in programs in the United States. While there are a number of examples of highly productive and impactful socio-cultural sport research groups in Canada, the UK, Japan, Korea, Australia and New Zealand<sup>x</sup>, to name but a few, a seeping neoliberal influence lurks not too far beyond the horizon. Indeed, it may be more accurate to suggest that the locus of knowledge production in the social sciences of sport is—at least in the US—no longer found in Kinesiology Departments<sup>xi</sup>. Against a climate of specialization and (sub-)disciplinary hierarchies, there exist a small number of scholars, who with varying degrees of acknowledgement or incorporation of the social sciences and humanities in kinesiology, have questioned and pushed at the disciplinary strictures and blindness of the field (e.g. Gill, 2007; Heywood, 2011; Vertinsky, 2009)<sup>xii</sup>. There are also those, especially Duncan (2007) and Grant and Kluge (2007, p. 399), who turn towards the corporeality of the discipline, calling for a democratization of kinesiology—an enriched *body* of knowledge—that incorporates “other body(s) of knowledge” beyond the quantifiable and who emphasize the import of interpretive methodologies to explicate the constitution of self and the ways in which people make sense of the world.

At this juncture, it is perhaps best to turn back to the hauntingly instructive work of Alan Ingham (1985). While many of us are still toiling away trying to come to some sort of understanding between sport/physicality and what is now a firmly established neoliberal order, nearly 30 years ago Ingham empirically identified and cogently dissected this unfolding crisis, perhaps better than it has been done before or since. Indeed, long before such luminaries as Lawrence Grossberg and Henry Giroux began to articulate what an emergent neoliberalism meant for the cultural politics of the present, Ingham foretold the bio-scientific and politically regressive McKinesiological turn and its acquiescence to power. As a field we are still yet to fully embrace, let alone readily address, Ingham’s prophetic observations. These specters haunt



the corridors of McKinesiology, speaking clearly to a blinkered field dominated by a single overarching metanarrative that marginalizes and obfuscates alternative approaches (Kincheloe, 2001).

Ingham (1997), however, not only foretold the current/impending crisis within kinesiology, he also provided a compelling solution to it. He sought to counter the fragmentation of kinesiological knowledge through the advancement of cross- and inter-disciplinary studies of practices in physical culture. Unfortunately, the rest of us, perhaps ourselves most pointedly, have not had the courage of such convictions; rather, we find ourselves responsible and indeed culpable as we develop—or perhaps better put, manage the survival of—our own corners and programs within the context of our Departments. These kinesiological humanities do tend to inter-disciplinarity (in that it synthesizes and integrates elements of sociological, historical, anthropological, and philosophical analysis). Yet, the often-unambitious nature of this inter-disciplinarity means that these carefully manicured corners do not challenge the epistemological violence of McKinesiology. Rather, their form and existence effectively confirms the boundaries between the technological intelligentsia (the Cognitive Motor Neuroscience and Exercise Physiology research groups/clusters/ silos) and humanistic intellectuals.

Following the specters of Ingham, we would stress that neither bio-science nor humanities, positivism nor post-positivism, quantitative nor qualitative approaches, should be privileged one over the other. We are not calling for any one ideology on the political spectrum to take over the University, however, following Giroux (2010) we are suggesting the need for our disciplines (and our institutions) to take a stand about the meaning and purpose of higher education; ensuring that kinesiology does not become another site in which teaching is not “confused with training, militarism or propaganda” (Giroux, 2010, p. 190). With Garbutt and Offord (2012), we are pointing to the compelling and urgent need for scholarship/pedagogy

that is activated by ethical imperatives and concerns; a form of pedagogy that can consider relations of freedom, authority, democratic knowledge and responsibility (Stevenson, 2010) and which can do justice to the diverse narratives, issues, histories, experiences and contexts we are likely to encounter as part of the pedagogical process (Giroux, 2010b). This is a kinesiology program ground in an “ethos of experimentation” (Cote, Day & de Peuter, 2007, p.317), which, in name and intent, requires a complimentary synthesis of epistemologies if it is to realize its diverse and multi-faceted empirical project: a project which can contribute towards reason, understanding, dialogue, and critical engagement for both faculty and students (Giroux, 2010a) and is informed by democratic imperatives of equality, liberty and justice. A critical self-reflexive kinesiology that can free itself from the shackles of academic Darwinism and challenge hegemonic orthodoxies positions itself to embrace an expansion of knowledge and the democratic sphere. It offers ways of seeing and interpreting through engagement with alternative ontological, epistemological, ideological, political, and methodological approaches to the study of the active human body—in all its multiple and iterative forms. In direct contrast to the cult of speed that dominates the McUniversity—drawing on the Slow Food Manifesto that proposes we are enslaved by speed, a fast-life of fast food that is stripped of its nutritional values and cultural connections—Hatrman & Darab (2012) suggest we embrace a slow pedagogy that can strike at the heart of neoliberal educational rationalities. Slowing down, they argue, is a form of critical praxis that challenges the orthodoxies of speedy pedagogy and thereby provides the space and time for engaging with ideas, deep reflection, experiential learning, reflexivity, critical insight, creativity and innovation.

Pace Bairner (2012) who calls for a strengthening of the sociology of sport rather than the ambitions of proponents of Physical Cultural Studies, we believe to understand sport and physical activity as key sites in which social forces, discourses, institutions, and processes congregate, congeal, and are contested in a manner which contributes to the shaping of human

relations, subjectivities, and experiences in particular, contextually contingent ways—that is to understand the (in)active and (un)healthy body as fully bound with relations of power—requires a language and curriculum of possibility. As Denzin (2012, p. 296) suggests, a “critical sports cultural studies” needs a new language of possibility; a morally centered and critically informed dialogue focused on human rights, history and politics. He continues, “an embodied sports studies project that matters must locate the body with a radically contextual politics. It must focus on the active, agentic flesh-and-blood human body” (p. 298), it must reestablish a relationship to the body that imagines embodiment as a site of pedagogic possibility—one that questions normalized cultural narrations of embodied existence (Titchkosky, 2012). This is, if you like, the point of departure for an interdisciplinary and productive project of the active body—denoting whichever moniker that best resounds with the entrenchment and trajectory of the field—that enacts an interventionist, reflexive, dialogic and slow pedagogic agenda that centralises the performance of the physical, destabilises taken for granted forms of knowledge / ‘data’ and unlocks the potentialities of the field: an agenda that is both engaging and invigorating for researchers and students alike. It is a curriculum that, building on the work of Brophy & Hladki (2012) and Titchkosky (2012), can help in reshaping understandings of abnormalcy/normalcy, wellness, representations of the body, inclusion/exclusion and presence / absence of the body. This is thus a curriculum beyond ‘bare pedagogy’ as an instrument of neoliberal legitimization, it is one, following Giroux (2010a) that provides students with pedagogical practices that create a formative culture and safe space for development of humanistic bodily knowledges, technical knowledge, scientific skill and a mode of literacy that enables them to engage and transform (when necessary) the promise of a global democracy.

This is an interdisciplinary field and one that equally embraces a fluid methodological toolbox (placing the gold-standard of scientism on an equal footing with a suite of interpretive

methodologies that can make the physical ‘visible; and ‘palpable’ [Denzin, 2012]); most importantly it is a field underpinned by a need for our research to intervene and create an impact. It is a project that centers the tacit, sensuous body (including our own), its fleshy sinews, its movement and its (in)activity in our research, teaching, knowledge and methodological trajectories. It is one that resounds with the messiness of reflexivity and empirical vulnerability as we place, or articulate, the body purposefully within our scholarly practices and forward inquiries that look to redefine the boundaries of knowledge production (Giardina and Newman, 2011). In this sense, following Giardina and Newman (2011) through the study of body cultures and body politics (as opposed to one obsessed with, well the fastest, highest, strongest), it becomes a project that embraces a wider cultural politics and contextualizes the physical within power relations of the present, past and future. In this regard, the project explicates the noticeable impact of corporeal movement, contact, proprioceptive politics that problematize the mythologies of scientific research paradigms and bring to the fore more creative and innovative approaches that seemingly elicit or allow for a *fuller exposition of the cultures of the body* that are being experienced (Giardina & Newman, 2011; see also Bairner, 2012). Centralising the body, in the sense that it is allowed to move, gesture, exercise, dance, at as many points as possible inevitably means an entanglement of the embodied, emplaced (Pink 2011), cognitive and epistemological.

To destabilise the centre and thus challenge (or at least slow down) such a regressive orthodoxy, we need pedagogies, curricula and projects that counter positivistic scientific, read McEducation, doxa: we propose instead a more democratic, anti-reductionist approach that centres on an active, pedagogical, ethical and moral axiology—a slow kinesiology if you like. In centralising the body (that matters and moves) in a radical democratic social transformation our project should be motivated by a commitment to a progressive and democratic social science of sport and physical culture; one underscored by an unequivocal commitment to

progressive social change (Miller, 2001). In short, this is the production of physical knowledge that places the field in a position to intervene into the broader social world, and *make a difference*. Think of the possibilities and understandings such interdisciplinary and methodological and theoretical fluidity and equality would allow: kinesiology can and should be contributing to a range of conversations about: gender-based violence and sexual health for disadvantaged women in the global south, healthcare provision among ‘excluded’ or ‘marginalized’ populations, the neoliberal governance of the body, the pathologized or abject body, immigration, racisms, personal identity, citizenship, freedom, patriotism, justice, democracy, perpetual war, violence, terror, global social relations, political struggle, sporting bodies, class relations, bodies in (urban) spaces, (trans)gender bodily politics, and so on.<sup>xiii</sup>

In sum, a corporeal curriculum is one in which our research and teaching encounters provide a space and opportunity to de- and re-construct taken for granted bodily forms of knowledge; understanding sport and physical activity as diverse experiential forms through which physically active human bodies are organized, regulated, trained and consumed, and thus, the significance of sport as an effective vehicle for critically examining issues in the context of the wider social, economic, and political environments. It is predicated on a simultaneous shifting between research pedagogies, teaching pedagogies and the physical that make salient the discursive currents of age, gender, society, education, race, class, ethnicity, religion, (dis)ability that converge and permeate upon physical cultural spaces/‘sites.’ In so doing we thrust body pedagogies (Rich, 2010, 2011) and body texts (Fusco, 2006) into the core of our studies and into the life-worlds of those our research interacts and impacts—including, but not restricted to, our colleagues, peers, participants, the public and our students. Although only briefly delineated, what we hope to have shown is a requisite to (re)locate the body and situate it as an integral part of the contextual, theoretically rigorous and democratic study of sport and physical activity. Dedicated to the advancement of knowledge and implicitly

ground in an incentive to intervene, exchange and transfer knowledge in dynamic, illuminating and meaningful ways, it is about harnessing and being accountable to a moral, democratic and ethical agenda and bringing it to bear on the research process (Giroux, 2001): it is about the body, it is about the moving body and mobilising the body within research and teaching practice and curriculum design.

## **Coda**

For sure, our musings are in their infancy, and our sketch of a curriculum of the corporeal for researchers and students alike is nothing more than embryonic<sup>xiv</sup>. Yet, ours needs to be project that can counter the individualizing tendencies of bio-scientific approaches, and formulate an integrated, and we would argue more germane and nuanced understanding of social problems, in the interplay between individual actors/bodies and social contexts/environments in which they are located. Such an approach would provide spaces—within our classrooms, within our texts, our research, our academic journals, and our conferences—for discussion of personal injuries and private terrors that we can translate into public considerations and struggles (Giroux, 2001a/b). It would push at the boundaries of what counts, or better put, what and who matters in kinesiology, opening the discipline to an understanding of itself in relation to its wider political, economic, and ideological context. It requires the production of students and scholarship concerned with exposing patterns of inequality and intervening in local communities, scholarship that places kinesiology within the material contexts of everyday life and that forms part of critical conversations about cultural politics, multiracial, economic, and political democracy. This is a project that requires that we, as educators, point to a future world which is more socially just, offers discourses of critique and possibility in conjunction with the values of reason, freedom and equality: a world of moving bodies that is part of a democratic project that promotes the public good, nurtures

students to be critically engaged citizens, and expands research opportunities to address important social issues (Giroux, 2009; 2010a).

A slow kinesiology centered on democratic values, identities and practices—a revanchist kinesiology if you like—following Miller & Ahluwalia (2011), requires recognizing that the social sciences and the humanities are vital, for they provide the space for us to be absolutely clear about the critical importance, distinctiveness and impact that education can have upon our societies. In this formulation, and in direct contrast to the dictates of McDonaldized institutions of higher education, a slow kinesiology becomes a space for students to “embrace pedagogical encounters as spaces of dialogue and unmitigated questioning, to imagine different futures, to become border crossers establishing a range of new connections and global relations, and to embrace a language of critique and possibility that responds to the urgent need to reclaim democratic values, identities and practices” (Giroux, 2009, p. 691). There are a number of examples, where, against the odds, innovative educators have forged the space for the possibilities of producing students as informed and responsible citizens of the world (see e.g. Sparks, 2005; Sherman Gordon & Albrecht-Crane, 2005). To follow such innovation, we need to be innovative, passionate, oppositional and perhaps intellectually cunning to ensure ours is an approach that allows students the opportunities to develop critical skills and awareness of the contingencies of existing social relations such that they can locate themselves in the cultural-political formation and devise effective interventions (O’Shea, 1998). Indeed, to educate young people in “the spirit of a critical democracy by providing them with the knowledge, passion, civic capacity, public value, and social responsibility necessary to address the problems facing the nation and the globe also means challenging the existence of rigid disciplinary boundaries, the cult of expertise or highly specialized scholarship unrelated to public life, and anti-democratic ideologies that scoff at the exercise of academic freedom” (Giroux, 2010a, p. 187).

## References:

- Agamben, G. (1998). *Homer Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Translated by D. Heller- Roazen. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Andrews, D. (2008). Kinesiology's Inconvenient truth and the Physical Cultural Studies Imperative. *Quest*, 60, 45-62.
- Bairner, A. (2012). For a Sociology of Sport. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 29(1), 102-117.
- Ball, S. J. (2012). Performativity, Commodification and Commitment: An I-Spy Guide to the Neoliberal University. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 60(1), 17-28.
- Barnett, R. and Griffin, A. (eds.). (1997). *The End of Knowledge in Higher Education*. London: Cassell.
- Brenner, D. (2006). Performative Pedagogy: Resignifying Teaching in the Corporatized University. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 28(1), 3-24.
- Brophy, S. & Hladki, J. (2012). Introduction: Pedagogy, Image Practices, and Contested Corporealities. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy and Cultural Studies*, 34, 75-81.
- Cannella, G. S. (2011). Political Possibility, Hypercapitalism, and the "Conservative Reeducation Machine". *Cultural Studies <=> Critical Methodologies*, 11(4), 364-368.
- Chernomas, R. (1984). Keynes on Post-scarcity Society. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 4(December), 1007-1026.
- Clegg, S.R. (2002). "Lives in the Balance": A cMment on Hinings and Greenwood's "Disconnects and Consequences in Organization Theory?" *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47: 428-441.
- Cote, M., Day, R. & de Peuter, G. (2007). Utopian Pedagogy: Creating Radical Alternatives in the Neoliberal Age. *Review of Education, Pedagogy & Cultural Studies*, 29(4), 317-336.
- Denzin, N. (2012). Afterword. In Silk, M. & Andrews, D. (eds). *Sport & Neoliberalism: Politics, Consumption & Culture*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple.
- Denzin, N. & Giardina, M. (eds) (2006). *Qualitative Inquiry and the Conservative Challenge*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press
- Duncan, M. C. (2007). Bodies in Motion: The Sociology of Physical Activity. *Quest*, 59(1), 55-66.
- Evans, M. (2004/5). *Killing Thinking: The Death of the Universities*. London: Continuum.
- Fraser, M., & Greco, M. (2005). Introduction. In M. Fraser & M. Greco (Eds.), *The Body: A Reader* (pp. 1-42). London: Routledge.
- Freshwater, D. & Rolfe, G. (2004). *Deconstructing Evidence Based Practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Fusco, C., 2006. Inscribing healthification: governance, risk, surveillance and the subjects and spaces of fitness and health. *Health & Place*, 12 (1), pp. 65-78.



- Garbutt, R. & Offord, B. (2012). A Scholarly Affair: Activating Cultural Studies. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 34(1-2), 3-7.
- Giardina, M. D., & Newman, J. I. (2011). The Physical and the Possible. *Cultural Studies <=> Critical Methodologies*, 11(4), 392-402
- Giardina, M. D., & Newman, J. I. (2011). Physical Cultural Studies and Embodied Research Acts. *Cultural Studies <-> Critical Methodologies*, 11(6), 523-534
- Giddens, A. (1995). Affluence, Poverty and the Idea of a Post-scarcity Society. *United Nations Research Institute for Social Development Discussion Paper, 63*(Discussion Paper 63). Retrieved from [http://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BCCF9/\(httpPublications\)/D04C41AAF1FA94FF80256B67005B67B8?OpenDocument](http://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BCCF9/(httpPublications)/D04C41AAF1FA94FF80256B67005B67B8?OpenDocument)
- Gill, D.L. (2007). Integration: The Key to Sustaining Kinesiology in Higher Education. *Quest*, 59(3), 270-286.
- Giroux, H. (2010a). Bare Pedagogy and the Scourge of Neoliberalism: Rethinking Higher Education as a Democratic Public Sphere. *The Educational Forum*, 74(3), 184-196.
- Giroux, H. (2010b). Dumbing Down Teachers: Rethinking the Crisis of Public Education and the Demise of the Social State. *Review of Education, Pedagogy & Cultural Studies*, 32(4), 339-381.
- Giroux, H. A. (2009). Democracy's Nemesis: The Rise of the Corporate University. *Cultural Studies <=> Critical Methodologies*, 9(5), 669-695.
- Giroux, H. (2005). *The Terror of Neoliberalism: Authoritarianism and the Eclipse of Democracy*. Boulder and London: Paradigm Publishers.
- Giroux, H. (2004). War Talk, the Death of the Social, and the Disappearing Children: Remembering the Other War. *Cultural Studies <-> Critical Methodologies*, 4, 2, 206-211.
- Giroux, H. (2003) *The Abandoned Generation: Democracy Beyond the Culture of Fear*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Giroux, H. (2001a). Cultural Studies as Performative Politics. *Cultural Studies <-> Critical Methodologies*, 1, 1, 5-23.
- Giroux, H. (2001b). "Something's Missing:" Cultural Studies, Neoliberalism and the Politics of Hope. *Strategies: Journal of Theory, Culture and the Politics*. 14, 2, 227-252.
- Giroux, H.A. (1999). *Corporate Culture and the Attack on Higher Education and Public Schooling*. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, Fastback 442.
- Giroux, H. & Searls-Giroux, S. (2012). Universities Gone Wild: Big Money, Big Sports, and Scandalous Abuse at Penn State. *Cultural Studies <-> Critical Methodologies*,
- Grant, B. C., & Kluge, M. A. (2007). Exploring "Other Body(s)" of Knowledge: Getting to the Heart of the Story About Aging and Physical Activity. *Quest*, 59(4), 398-414.

- Halsey, A.H., Lauder, H., Brown, P. and Wells, A.S. (eds.). (1997). *Education, Culture, Economy, Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hargreaves, J. (1987). The Body, Sport and Power Relations. In J. Horne, D. Jary & A. Tomlinson (Eds.), *Sport, Leisure and Social Relations* (pp. 139-159). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Harrison, B. (1997). *Lean and Mean*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Hartman, Y. & Darab, S. (2012). A Call for Slow Scholarship: A Case Study on the Intensification of Academic Life and its Implications for Pedagogy. *Review of Education, Pedagogy & Cultural Studies*, 34(1-2), 49-60.
- Harvey, D. (2003). *The New Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heywood, L. L. (2011). Affective Infrastructures: Toward a Cultural Neuropsychology of Sport. *Front Evol Neurosci*, 3, 4.
- House, E.R. (2005). Qualitative Evaluation and Changing Social Policy. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition) (pp. 1069-1082). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ingham, A. G. (1997). Toward a Department of Physical Cultural Studies and an End to Tribal Warfare. In J. Fernandez-Balboa (Ed.), *Critical Postmodernism in Human Movement, Physical Education, and Sport* (pp. 157-182). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Ingham, A. G., & Donnelly, P. (1990). Whose Knowledge Counts? The Production of Knowledge and Issues of Application in the Sociology of Sport. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 7(1), 58-65.
- Kincheloe, J. (2001). Describing the Bricolage: Conceptualizing a New Rigor in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(6), 679-692.
- Kincheloe, J. & McLaren, P. (2005). *Rethinking Critical Theory and Qualitative Research*. In Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (eds). (2005). *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kuhn, T. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. (2006). *Whose Freedom? The Battle over America's Most Important Idea*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Lather, P. (2006). This is Your Father's Paradigm: Government Intrusion and the Case of Qualitative Research in Education. In Denzin, N. & Giardina, M. (Eds). (2006). *Qualitative Research and the Conservative Challenge*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Lincoln, Y. (2011). "A Well Regulated Faculty ...": The Coerciveness of Accountability and Other measures that Abridge Faculties' Right to Teach and Research. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 11(4), 369-372.
- Lincoln, Y. & Canella, G. (2004). Dangerous Discourses, Methodological Fundamentalism, and Governmental Regimes of Truth. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10, 1, 5-14.
- Miller, T. (2001). What it is and what it isn't: Introducing....Cultural Studies. In T. Miller (Ed.),

- A Companion to Cultural Studies* (pp. 1-20). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Miller, T., & Ahluwalia, P. (2011). Why the Humanities and Social Sciences are Vital. *Social Identities*, 17(5), 603-604.
- Murray, S.J., Holmes, D., and Rail, G. (2008). On the Constitution and Status of 'Evidence' in the Health Sciences. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 13(4), 272-280.
- Murray, S.J., Holmes, D., Perron, A., and Rail, G. (2007). No Exit? Intellectual Integrity Under the Regime of 'Evidence' and 'Best-Practices'. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 13, 512-516.
- Nandy, A. (1988). Science as a Reason of State. In Nandy, A. (Ed). *Science, Hegemony & Violence: A Requiem for Modernity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Newman, J. (2010). Full Throttle Jesus: Toward a Critical Pedagogy of Stockcar racing in Theocratic America. *Review of Education, Pedagogy & Cultural Studies*, 32, 3, 263-294.
- Olssen, M. and Peters, M.A. (2005). Neoliberalism, Higher Education and the Knowledge Economy: From the Free Market to Knowledge Capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(3), 313-345.
- O'Shea, A. (1998). A Special Relationship? Cultural Studies, Academia and Pedagogy. *Cultural Studies*, 12(4), 513 - 527.
- Pink, S. (2011). From Embodiment to Emplacement: Re-thinking Competing Bodies, Senses and Spatialities. *Sport, Education and Society*, 16(3), 343-355. doi: 10.1080/13573322.2011.565965
- Readings, B. (1996). *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Redden, G. & Low, R. (2012). My School, Education, and Cultures of Rating and Ranking. *Review of Education, Pedagogy & Cultural Studies*, 34 (1-2), 35-48.
- Rich, E., 2010. Body Pedagogies, Education and Health. *Sport, Education and Society*, 15 (2), 147-150.
- Rich, E., 2011. Exploring the Relationship Between Pedagogy and Physical Cultural Studies: The Case of New Health Imperatives in Schools. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 28, 64-84.
- Ritzer, G. (2004). *The McDonaldization of Society* (Revised New Century Edition ed.). London: Sage.
- Ritzer, G. (1998). *The McDonaldization Thesis: Explorations and Extensions*. London: Sage.
- Rogers, D. (2012). Research. Practice and the Space Between: Care of the Self Within Neoliberalized Institutions. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 12(3), 242-254.
- Rose, N. (1999). Government and Control. *British Journal of Criminology*, 40(2), 321-339.
- Rutherford, J. (2005). Cultural Studies in the Corporate University. *Cultural Studies*, 19(3), 297-317.

- Sherman Gordon, P. & Albrecht-Crane, C. (2005). Critical Pedagogy in Conservative Contexts. *Cultural Studies*, 19(4), 407-414,
- Shiva, V. (1988). Reductionist Science as Epistemological Violence. In Nandy, A. (Ed). *Science, Hegemony & Violence: A Requiem for Modernity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Silk, M. (2011). *The Cultural Politics of Post 9/11 American Sport: Power, Pedagogy and the Popular*. New York: Routledge.
- Slaughter, S. and Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, State, and Higher Education*. London: John Hopkins University Press.
- Stevenson, N. (2010). Critical Pedagogy, Democracy and Capitalism: Education Without Enemies or Borders. *Review of Education, Pedagogy & Cultural Studies*, 32(1), 66-92.
- Sonu, D. (2012). Illusions of Compliance: Performing the Public and Hidden Transcripts of Social Justice Education in Neoliberal Times. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 42(2), 240-259.
- Sparks, T. (2005). AIDS IN AFRICA, CULTURAL STUDIES IN GEORGIA -- A Teacher's Case Study. *Cultural Studies*, 19(4), 481 - 490.
- Titchkosky, T. (2012). The Ends of the Body as Pedagogic Possibility. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*. 34(3-4), 82-93.
- Vertinsky, P. (2009). Mind the Gap (or Mending It): Qualitative Research and Interdisciplinarity in Kinesiology. *Quest*, 61(1), 39-51.
- Wacquant, L. J. D. (1987). Symbolic Violence and the Making of the French Agriculturalist: An enquiry into Pierre Bourdieu's Sociology. *ANZJS*, 23(1), 65-88.
- Weber, M. (1958). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

## Notes

<sup>i</sup> While Kinesiology has been instantiated as the name for this discipline in the US, there are various other monikers applied to the loose conglomeration of disciplines that make up the field. In the UK it is more common to use the term Sports Studies or somewhat more tellingly, Sport & Exercise Sciences, while in Australia, Human Movement Studies is the preferred terminology.

<sup>ii</sup> Perhaps there is no more pertinent and grounded apparition of this haunting prophecy than the BA (Hons) in Business Management offered at De Montfort University in Leicester sponsored by Kentucky Fried Chicken. As Professor David Wilson, deputy vice-chancellor and dean of business and law at De Montfort University, suggested "At De Montfort University, we pride ourselves on our ability to *adapt our skills and services to match the needs of business*. This is an important new contract for De Montfort University and we are delighted to have this opportunity of working with such a major player in the global restaurant market" (in Smithers, 2012, our emphasis).

<sup>iii</sup> While the processes of militarization—especially in Kinesiology—have a longer history, Giroux (2008) offers a compelling account of the intensification of these processes post 9/11 such that within a wider *biopolitics of militarization* the university has become a militarized knowledge factory. He argues that there has been an increasing reliance on the Pentagon and corporate interests, and that resultantly the academy has opened its doors to serving private and governmental interests, further compromising higher education's role as a democratic public sphere.

---

<sup>iv</sup> While Ritzer is at pains—certainly more than we—to stress that the rational efficiencies associated with McDonaldisation do result in some very real benefits and advantages, they are, by the same token, equally fraught with damaging limitations.

<sup>v</sup> Indeed, in the United Kingdom, the Research Excellence Framework (REF) points to a new shift from accountability over finances to control over substance and the content of what is researched: the last vestiges of independence from the state being cast aside (Olssen, 2011, in Ball, 2012).

<sup>vi</sup> We do not suggest discarding such advances, yet we do oppose parochialism and domination and the ways in which the conventions of this particular approach become accepted as *the* natural way of producing knowledge and viewing a particular aspect of the world. As such, our intent is to raise questions, provide an opportunity for thoughtful reflexivity, and aid the power of those in the academy to apply research so that it impacts, and is meaningful to, the various communities that Kinesiology has the potential to touch. These are debates that are likely to continue, that we imagine will be challenged, and opposed, for what may seem to be appropriate to some may well be ludicrous to others—such debates, are, in our opinion a vital sign of a self-reflexive, healthy, field of study.

<sup>vii</sup> As galling as it may be, we cannot wholly condemn our *bio-science* colleagues for their blithe assurity regarding the centrality of the scientifically observable, natural body, as the core of kinesiology. This is because they have, as a result of both their graduate training and professorial indoctrination, been socialized into believing in, and unconsciously communicating, their own perceived centrality, and by association that of their version of Kinesiological scholarship. This scientific bias within Kinesiology rests on what Westkott termed, the “first positivist assumption” that “the methods appropriate for studying the natural world are equally appropriate for the study of human experience” (Lather, 2006, p. 33).

<sup>viii</sup> Building on Kincheloe (2001), to avoid such one-sided reductionism, there is a need for a variety of ways of seeing and interpreting in the pursuit of knowledge; the more one applies, the more dimensions and consequences of the field can be illuminated—the bricolage. Kincheloe, does however point to the dangers of embracing an ‘interdisciplinary bricolage’ e.g. superficiality of methodological breadth in which scholars, failure to devote sufficient time to understanding the disciplinary fields and knowledge bases from which particular modes of research emanate. Inhabiting the world of the bricoleur is far from an easy option, requires knowledge—if not deep comprehension—of multiple worlds, methodological approaches, theoretical perspectives, and disciplinary assumptions.

<sup>ix</sup> Derived from the self-proclaimed ‘champions’ of online and distance degree certification

<sup>x</sup> How refreshing, for example, is the ‘menu’ is at the University of Alberta’s Department of Physical Education & Recreation “where the art and science of human movement come alive”

<sup>xi</sup> For example, intellectuals located within mainstream sociology / cultural studies are increasingly engaging the empirical domains of sport and physical activity: these include notables such as Michael Messner, Douglas Hartmann, Reuben Mays, Toby Miller, Scott Brooks, and, most recently Norm Denzin and Henry Giroux.

<sup>xii</sup> Perhaps then the McKinesiology we have portrayed in this paper is a figment of the conspiracy-theory paranoia of humanistic intellectualism? Maybe Kinesiology is actually countering the trends evident within the rationalizing, and increasingly anodyne and ineffectual, McUniversity. The fledgling American Kinesiology Association has even come up with a draft of a common core of knowledge for undergraduate programs, which includes the following: Physical activity in health, wellness and quality of life; Scientific foundations of physical activity; Cultural, historical and philosophical context of physical activity; and, the practice of physical activity. Despite such developments, our cynicism and paranoia remains: we are deeply troubled by the influence of those encroaching ‘Golden Arches’.

<sup>xiii</sup> This list is, of course, necessarily abbreviated.

<sup>xiv</sup> This is a project however that we are incessantly working on, both within our writing (see Silk & Francombe, forthcoming for a more detailed discussion of the corporeal curriculum) and within our own institutions where we continue to press for a more democratic, moral, civic and socially just conception of the field / curricula content which ensuring students are prepared as productive change agents, rather than ‘trained’ for, the ‘workplace.’