View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk
brought to you by CORE
provided by Leeds Beckett Repository

Transformation or accommodation? The entry of women students into Carnegie

Anne Flintoff

Introduction

For those who know something of the history of Physical Education (PE) in England, it might seem strange to include a chapter entitled the 'entry of women students into Carnegie' in a book revisiting the history and development of *women's* PE. But as the latter chapters of Sheila Fletcher's history of women's PE explore, it was only in the 1970s that the transition to coeducational training[1] of PE teachers began. Prior to that, men and women PE teachers were trained in separate institutions, with very different approaches and philosophies. Carnegie College of Physical Education[2], the focus of this chapter, was the first men's teacher training college opened in 1933, some thirty years after women had established and developed a network of teacher training colleges for women. Given the separate and distinct single-sex histories, the transition to coeducation of the men's and women's training colleges represents a significant moment in the history of PE in England - and in Fletcher's eyes at least - contributed to the decline of women's influence on the profession and the erosion of what she called the 'female tradition'. In the final pages of *Women First*, she speculates that there are at least two ways of approaching this decline: either it reflected the 'strong career drive of the men' moving *into* the separate sphere of women's PE, or the women *coming out* of their sphere and by them so doing, losing their power as other influences, including men, began to be significant. This chapter explores something of both of these perspectives, through a focus on the process of transition to

[1] My preferred term is 'education' rather than 'training'. The government returned to using the term 'training' in the 1990s, reflecting, some would argue, the shift in teacher education towards practical based competencies and skills at the expense of critical reflection.

[2] Since opening of Carnegie College of Physical Education in 1933, the name 'Carnegie' has appeared in different guises ever since: as the School of Physical Education, as the college first formally amalgamated with the City of Leeds Training College in 1968 to today when the name 'Carnegie' has been retained as the name for one of four faculties of the university. The university itself was renamed from Leeds Metropolitan University to Leeds Beckett University in September 2014, and one of the three schools within the Carnegie Faculty is the Carnegie School of Sport. The original Carnegie College building on the Headingley Campus is also still called 'Carnegie Hall'.

coeducation of Carnegie which began to accept women onto its courses from the early 1970s. What was the impact of the entry of women students into the historically all-male environment of Carnegie? How did the shift to coeducation[3] impact on the nature and philosophy of the PE it espoused? What role does gender play in contemporary practices at Carnegie in the education of new PE teachers?

In addressing these questions, I need to declare a particular interest, both personally and professionally, in this transition. As a student on one of the first cohorts of women accepted onto the four year, Bachelor of Education (Honours) teacher education course at Carnegie in 1976, I experienced the transition to coeducational PE as a student first hand, and then some years later, as one of the first women members of the teaching staff. Amongst other things, it was those experiences that led me to continue with academic study. However, it was only during my masters' studies at Leeds University in 1984 that I gained access to feminist theories of education which helped me to begin to make sense of my gendered experiences of PE. There had been no academic focus on gender as a professional issue during my undergraduate studies beyond odd sessions on 'women and sport' - a situation not untypical in many PE teacher training colleges at that time (see (Hall, 1996), despite the rapid increase of feminism in academia and elsewhere. A doctorate at the Open University followed, exploring gender relations in the professional socialisation of PE students (Flintoff, 1993; Flintoff, 1993b; Flintoff, 1993c), the focus emerging directly from my everyday experiences of teaching at Carnegie. And I am now a professor in the Carnegie Faculty, where my teaching and research is underpinned by a strong commitment to feminist theory and practice, and to challenging gender (and other) inequities in education and PE. So, to some extent, writing this chapter is also writing about my personal and professional journey. My experiences of Carnegie, as a student and member of staff, have been influential in shaping my perspectives of PE, and underpin the perspective I take here.

[3] We might ask whether the move to mixed sex cohorts should be called a move to coeducation, a point I will explore later in the chapter (see Evans, et al, 1987).

In this chapter I argue that whilst now the norm in England (as elsewhere in the western world), the process of transition from single sex to coeducational PE teacher education (PETE) was a hugely contested one. Drawing on interviews with former members of staff[4]; my own experiences as a student in the late 1970s, and broader research literature about gender and PE, I highlight some of the key issues and struggles. In his chapter, David Kirk describes the processes of 'masculinisation, sportification and academicisation' underpinning the struggles for the PE curriculum at Carnegie between the years 1934-1980. In this chapter I explore further the implications of the processes of masculinisation with a specific focus on the struggles over *gendered* notions of what counts as 'useful' knowledge in PETE, and what coeducation might mean for the *pedagogical* experiences of men and women, students and lecturers[5]. This contestation was particularly evident at Carnegie in the early years of the transition to coeducation, in the latter half of the 1970s and early 1980s, and some examples of this are illustrated here. The chapter goes on to argue that whilst gender relations remain a significant and powerful dynamic within PETE, conversations about gender and other equity issues as professional matters remain marginal, and marginalised within preservice teachers' preparation and practice. The chapter concludes with some comments about contemporary challenges for gender equity in PE, particularly in light of the most recent changes introduced into teacher education in England (Furlong, 2013). In doing so, it returns to appraise some of the arguments made in *Women First* about the shifts towards coeducation and the impact on the position and perspectives of women. Inevitably my discussion presents a 'snapshot' of what are complex and ongoing processes, and highlights particular voices and perspectives. It is also important to acknowledge here, the ways in which academic understandings of gender (including my own) have shifted over the last time, and how silences and omissions contribute to bolstering particular perspectives at the expense of others.

---

[4] Interviews were carried out with a number of former staff of the College from the 1960s to the 1980s to support a larger project prompted by Carnegie's 75th anniversary in 2009.

[5] As my doctoral study showed, it is one thing to analyse 'curriculum' as text, it is another to examine gender relations as they impact everyday classroom/pedagogical interactions, and how the curriculum is enacted (Maguire, 2014; Braun, 2011) Because of space, the chapter focuses mostly on the practical physical activity aspects of the curriculum; others have critiqued the nature of the theoretical PETE curriculum and its role in constructing a sports performance philosophy and pedagogy (e.g.(Dewar, 1987;Macdonald, 1993)

I draw here on feminist and critical perspectives that understand gender as *relational, and socially constructed* through everyday practices, such as PE, in schools and universities. Connell (1995)'s concept of the 'gender order' is useful here. In her view, the gender order describes the ways in which gender relations are ordered and reordered within institutions, and within and across specific contexts with them. Research conducted by Brown and Rich (2002) for example, has shown that although there are multiple constructions of masculinities and femininities within PETE, men and women students are positioned, and position themselves in relation to dominant ideological forms of hegemonic masculinity. Teacher education institutions, including Carnegie, are thus involved in reproducing specific 'gender regimes', where particular ways of being 'male' or 'female' are supported and celebrated. However, as Alan Skelton shows, reflecting back on his own masculine and professional identity construction during his time at Carnegie in the early 1990s (see Skelton, 1993), how individuals negotiate this process of identity construction within such gender 'regimes' is never simple or straightforward. Doing 'gender identity work' is always complex, and varies for individuals across different institutions and contexts, and over time, and importantly, always experienced through the intersection of other identity markers, such as class, ethnicity, sexuality or ability (Flintoff, et al 2008)[6].

The female tradition in PE

It is appropriate here to briefly consider the history of women's PE, if only to highlight once more its separate and distinct 'female tradition' and culture (Fletcher, 1984; Scraton, 1992). Women's PE teacher education initially emphasised the importance of physical activity for women's health and wellbeing, and incorporated a child-centred approach, drawing on a wide range of physical activities, including dance, gymnastics and some games. As David Kirk (1992) has shown in his historical research on men's PE, the male tradition was quite different, growing out of different roots and influenced by militarism

[6] Arguably, race and ethnicity have been a missing lens in PE research; it is only recently that (white) scholars have begun to acknowledge its significance in the historical and contemporary practice, and how gender relations are always also racialised (Fitzpatrick, 2013;Douglas, 2011 ;Flintoff, 2014)

and competitive team games. Girls' PE was underpinned by powerful images and ideas about women, their roles and capabilities. Callisthenics, and the later introduction of Ling gymnastics, were seen as gentle, appropriate exercise for girls' health and wellbeing. Some games were introduced, such as netball, tennis, hockey, and lacrosse, which remained within the boundaries of 'acceptable' femininity, and avoided the stigma of overt masculinity associated with male games (Scraton, 1992). Their introduction was on the premise that girls needed different activities to those of boys or ones that were adapted or foreshortened versions of 'male' games. Netball is a good example of this; Sheila Fletcher describes how students at Dartford college adapted this game from basketball, with the limitations on where each player can move to, and strict 'no contact' rules and the more 'upright position of the body' seen as more befitting of 'young ladies'. Girls and women therefore had limited access to team sports that stressed endurance, physical contact or strength.

The women's PE colleges were influential in developing a comprehensive and balanced PE, underpinned by the notion that teaching was an educational philosophy that centred on the development of self-control; service to others; discipline and respect for authority. These became the 'standards' of girls' PE and formed the basis of both medical and educational inspections at the time. So whilst the development of separate training for women PE teachers challenged some gendered expectations of women's physical capabilities by giving them access to sport and physical activities previously denied to them, as can be seen from this brief overview, this separate tradition was also underpinned by powerful, gendered ideologies of femininity and physicality that influenced and shaped a separate girls' PE curriculum (Flintoff, 2006).

If women had substantially defined what was understood as PE in the early part of the twentieth century, from the 1960s onwards, Fletcher argued that this position was consistently eroded. A number of factors were involved, not least, the impact of the rapidly changing demographic trends that led to significantly less teachers being required, resulting in the closure of many specialist PE colleges or their merger with institutions of higher

education (Gosden, 1990). Alongside rationalisation, the other key change to teacher education was the push towards a graduate profession and the development of the B.Ed degree. Both Sheila Fletcher and David Kirk's chapter in this book explore what these developments meant for PE, as men and women struggled to agree and articulate what 'counted' as 'degree-worthiness' in order to satisfy the Council for National Academic Awards - the then validating body for non-university degrees. It appears that the men had been more interested in this challenge from the start; they had begun this process through their work in universities, and, in Fletcher's eyes, had recognised the opportunities for career advancement opening up by this increased academicisation of the subject. Even in the moves to academicisation, Fletcher recounts the differences in focus between men and women: the men's interest and engagement was, she argued, more in *measurement of performance*, whereas the women's focus on the *meaning and evaluation* of performance in a broader sense. Given the strength of the separate and distinct traditions of male and female PE, it is not surprising that the transition to coeducational PETE, including the development of academic degrees in PE, was described by Fletcher as about essential 'questions of identity' and values. However, to present the struggle as 'men versus women' would be too simplistic. As Kirk (2002) reminds us, it is important to note that neither men's, or women's PE were 'totalising discourses' and we should not assume a total homogeneity amongst the values and dispositions of male and female professionals within their separate spheres[7].

Choice or compulsion? The move to coeducational PE teacher education

Why then, did Carnegie and the other single sex PE colleges in England succumb to coeducation? Despite the passing of the Sex Discrimination Act in 1975, single sex teacher training in PE continued to be lawful in England until 1985 because of an exception in the Act (Section 28b). However, the European Law of Equal Treatment in 1976 paved the way

[7] Patricia Vertinskyj's chapter, Dancing in New Directions, for example, explores some of the struggles over the practices of dance within the school curriculum.

for a repeal of this exception, though as Margaret Talbot (Talbot, 1990, p.198)[8] notes, it was not until some years later, in 1984, that the Department of Education and Science wrote to all teacher training institutions informing them that admissions 'irrespective of sex' must be the case for that year's entry and beyond. For Carnegie, the admission of women students had come somewhat earlier, although as was the case in many schools too (see Evans, et al 1987), this seems to have resulted less from an *educational* rationale, but rather because of pragmatics and resource considerations. The rationalisation in teacher education in the 1970s entailed the merger of many specialist colleges with other tertiary institutions in order for them to survive. Carnegie merged with City of Leeds Training College in 1968 resulting in PE students being trained alongside students from other disciplines, and, inevitably, in coeducational cohorts. Alongside these organisational and structural changes, the beginnings of a feminist critique of education and schooling was also emerging (Weiner, 1994), questioning the sex differentiated school curriculum and its limiting impact on the career opportunities of girls (e.g.(Deem, 1980). Whilst PE entered these debates somewhat later, nevertheless this historically gendered subject area became an increasingly important one for feminist analysis at school and PETE levels (Scraton, 2013).

There are few archival documents that specifically record the presence of women students on the Carnegie courses, but we do know that the Advanced Diploma in PE was advertised as available to men and women from as early as 1955. Although there had been women students engaging in PE as part of their Primary and the Middle School teacher education studies, the secondary PE course was the last to move to coeducation. It wasn't until the early 1970s that the first women were accepted onto the three or four year Bachelor of Education secondary courses. Recollections from former male members of staff about the admission of women students are interesting. Mervyn Beck, a tutor at Carnegie from 1970 into the 1990s, suggested that the entry of women onto this specialist course involved a 'quantum shift' on the part of staff, but was, in his mind, a wholly positive one:

---

[8] Who became the Head of the Carnegie Department of PE, Leeds Polytechnic in 1987

> In my opinion, we gained a lot because with an all-male and highly macho ethos, it was very, ‘this is the way we do it’. It had an unquestioning aspect to it, and [the women] brought a new perspective. Prior to the arrival of the women students and staff it was ‘this was the course, we know what we are doing, we deliver it and you receive it’…After the women arrived and the mixture of staff, you got a much keener sense of what do the actual students think, what do they want from the course and it was really the beginning of accountability. Why are you doing what you are doing? [Mervyn Beck, Interview, February 2008]

Similarly, Peter Morris, a Carnegie staff member of thirty years from 1968 -1998, suggested much was gained by the entry of women:

> I think a lot was gained [from the entry of women]. I think we had gone a long way down the road of a male-dominated, insular, approach and we needed to break out of that…In the attitudes of the staff, and in the attitudes of former students, and everything else. We could only...I think we were only able to survive by having women students [Peter Morris, Interview, February 2008].

As the Head of Carnegie School of Physical Education from 1987-1997, Clive Bond had the unenviable task of leading staff through some of the key years of this transition - not easy given the limited opportunities and resources available to change the staffing base, or the existing buildings and infrastructure:

> Now the staff, the resources, the whole place – no ladies’ toilets in the place, for example - and your staff as a fixed commodity. It is difficult to change so that you could properly do a rather more balanced approach to the course and you will know that there were very few women among the staff and very difficult for them to fight their corner in essentially a traditional male institution and whatever you did, some of the women felt threatened by that. If you did get the opportunity to begin to get a bit of balance …you can imagine within the institution there would also be a fight

> for this – we want another physiologist and so on – so it was always a fight … [Clive Bond, Interview February 2008]

One of the results was that in the early 1980s, many of the women staff were recruited initially on one year, temporary appointments, filling the spaces left by permanent male staff members who had been granted 'advanced study' sabbaticals. Such arrangements would have had significant implications on the extent to which these women would be able to influence curriculum and other developments - a situation that arguably remains today.[9]

Tranforming the curriculum?

The move to coeducation offered the opportunity for a rethinking of the PE curriculum, and of breaking down notions of 'boys' PE or 'girls' PE; however, it seemed that the entry of women into Carnegie had no such impact. Rather, women were largely *accommodated* within the existing curriculum and, in the early days at least, apart from a few additions specifically for the women - for example, the introduction of netball - very little changed. As Peter Morris, explained:

> I wouldn't say there was any change at all. We were 'light' in our [staff] experience of the practical work of teaching women on the subjects that weren't sort of multi-gender. O.K. we could teach hockey, we could teach everything and the fact that there were women there. They didn't make any difference at all [Peter Morris, Interview, Feb 2007]

Similarly, Clive Bond suggested that there was very little change, other than addressing the so called 'women's activities', which were simply added on:

[9] Women's position and influence in higher education and the subject area today remains similarly marginalised; recent figures by the Equalities Challenge Unit, for example, show that women are still more likely to be employed part-time than men (women make up 54.7% of part-time academic staff in UK universities), and within the specific area of sport (including PE), just 15% of professors are women (Equality Challenge Unit, 2014).

> Yes …certainly it was a difficult problem to face because you have got a set of staff who are appointed essentially for men's physical education programmes and somehow they have to be able to accommodate teaching women as well…what would be seen as the women's activities would have to be strengthened … [Interviewer: presumably the delivery of major games presented a challenge?]. Yes but now they [women] would do them all anyway and people who were fairly progressive in their thinking would say, well, do the lot.

Clive Bond alludes here to one of the key issues in debates about coeducational PE. Very often these are framed in terms of the appropriateness of particular activities for girls/women (mostly the so-called 'men's' invasion games), but as Talbot (1993) has noted, rarely was there any debate how boys/men have <u>also</u> often been prevented from taking part in activities such as dance. This reflects the differential status and value accorded to 'men's' activities compared to those of 'women'. One of my own student experiences from 1977 illustrates the ways in which these strong gendered ideologies underpinning the historical development of women's PE, were also present in the practices in the early days of women students entering Carnegie:

> Like most new entrants to PETE I had been an active participant in numerous sports before coming to Carnegie. One of these was cricket, and although not allowed to play at school (where it had been seen as a 'boys' game'), I had nevertheless played for several years in the local women's evening league team, and progressed to playing for the junior county side. Needless to say, I was shocked to learn I wasn't 'allowed' to learn to teach cricket at Carnegie and that the woman were allocated to tennis instead. The explanation presented to me by a male staff member was that a cricket ball was 'too hard for women', and that a blow to a woman's breasts from a cricket ball could cause breast cancer! It was only after some argument that I was able to persuade him to take advice from a well known, international player at the time, Rachel Heyhoe-Flint. In response to his question about the kinds of protection

> that women wore for cricket, she is purported to have replied 'well not coconut shells if that's what you mean!' The following week I joined men in their cricket session held in the indoor nets at Headingley stadium, but was only allowed a turn at batting after first proving my ability wearing a fencing jacket, complete with steel breast inserts!

We can perhaps smile at this scenario now, but it provides a good example of the strength of the gendered ideologies that underpinned the practices of PETE, and girls' PE, in the 1970s and 80s, and some of the challenges facing the Carnegie staff as a result of the entry of women students into the previously all-male cohorts. Some years later, as a member of the staff and Head of Games, one of my first tasks involved changing the timetabling arrangements to begin to challenge such limiting practices[10], and founding the first women's cricket team in Leeds. After accessing cricket in the PETE curriculum – often for the first time - many students went on to play for the City of Leeds Women's cricket team, with some selected to represent their county and the national team, including Helen Plimmer who captained England to their 1993 World Cup victory in Australia. The appointment of other women onto the Carnegie staff, such as Wendy Owen, herself an international soccer player and coach, further supported the erosion of notions of 'women's' and 'men's' games. Below, I return to consider contemporary practice and question whether these are still evident in today's curriculum.

Although there was much contestation and struggle over women's rights to access particular games activities, there were never the same kinds of concerns over the ways in which ideologies of masculinity might have restricted the physical activity opportunities of male PE students. Peter Morris explains this in relation to dance, historically a central activity within women's PE:

[10] I should note that these changes were not without resistance; for example, one male member of staff who taught rugby was adamant that he would not teach mixed rugby for 'safety' reasons, resulting in a major discussion of the role of practical activity within PE and sport degrees.

> If there was any problem, the problem was in getting the men to do what was understood to be the women's subjects, and the men doing dance was a real problem…It took a very good dance tutor to engage them and keep them coming - that wasn't easy [Peter Morris, interview, February 2007].

Bev Pickering, originally appointed to the Middle School PE course who went on to teach dance on the secondary PETE course for many years, presented a more positive picture, but admitted that her task of engaging men students was made easier by the partnership that existed with a local school's dance group in Harehills. This group went onto become the initially all-male, Pheonix professional dance group:

> I think one of the things that helped me enormously was having the Phoenix dancers. They weren't Phoenix then, they were the Harehills' young people but they were fantastic. They would use our Dance Studio and to reciprocate, they would give a performance which showed the students strength, ability, agility, sensitivity. It was a wonderful eye-opener for those who were going into teaching. It showed them what Dance was, you know, they could see what these young dancers could do physically. It made them realise that you could be strong and virile within Dance as well as on the games field and that was very, very helpful [Bev Pickering, interview, February 2008]

How did these experiences resonate with those in PETE courses and institutions elsewhere? Was Carnegie typical? What about institutions that had been former women's PE colleges? These personal experiences of the early years on the Carnegie staff motivated me to begin my doctoral studies, where I was able to analyze the gender regimes of two other PETE institutions, Heydonfield and Brickill[11] (the focus of *Women First*) which I selected specifically because of their different histories. My research found similar struggles happening in these institutions, albeit played out somewhat differently, and ongoing curriculum and organizational changes very much reflecting their different histories.

[11] Haydonfield and Brickhill were the psdonymns for Bedford and Exeter respectively.

Despite moving to coeducation like Carnegie some years before my research took place[12] , in both institutions men and women students were learning to teach traditionally ‘girls’ and ‘boys’ PE, with single sex classes for some major games. In *both* institutions there was evidence that the curriculum was orientated to meet the interests of men, rather than women. For example, at Heydonfield, men were allowed to ‘opt out’ of aesthetic activities such as dance, but despite having little experience of the game before coming to university, there was no such opportunity for the women to opt out of cricket. Given that grades for practical performance contributed to the students’ final degree classification at this institution, such gendered practices were not insignificant. There was also evidence to suggest that at Brickhill, curriculum change was instigated in line with men’s interests for example, through replacing a generic module on striking/fielding games including cricket, rounders and softball to one with a sole focus on cricket (see Flintoff, 1993b). The rationale for these curriculum differences was linked firmly to a conservative view of the role of PETE - to prepare students to teach in schools ‘as they are’, rather than as they might be – and the men needed to learn cricket. Women’s teaching of rounders was not considered important enough to maintain. Interviews with lecturers (of both sexes) revealed deep-seated attitudes and expectations about the physical capabilities of men and women, mirroring the earlier work of Scraton conducted with PE teachers in school (Scraton, 1992).

These examples illustrate how struggles over practical knowledge content in PETE were central in the transition to coeducation, both at Carnegie and elsewhere. These had important implications for the future of PE teaching in schools and remain ongoing challenges for the profession. If teachers are to have the skills and capabilities to challenge sex differentiated PE practice in schools, then PETE students need to be enabled to feel confident working within a range of physical activities, as well as recognise their role in challenging gender relations in their own classrooms. Concerns over the sex differentiated curriculum in schools, first expressed in the early 1980s (e.g. Leaman, 1984), have not gone away. In many schools in England PE continues to be delivered in single sex groups, particularly at Key Stage 3 (for children, 11-14 years of age) and job advertisements often

[12] The fieldwork for the research was conducted in the early 1990s

seek someone to teach ‘boys’ or girls’ games, (Stidder, 2002, 2005). Other research shows that men and women PE teachers feel more confident to teach particular (gender-stereotypical) activities rather than others (Waddington, et al, 1998) and their assessment of pupils’ abilities continue to be gendered (e.g. Hay, 2010; Velija, 2009). Most recently, the review of the English examination PE at General Secondary Certificate of Education level (GCSE) (16 years of age), and Advanced level (18 years of age), reveal the continuing existence of gendered practice, and that the debates within PETE institutions described above, are far from out-moded ones. For example, in the equality impact assessment[13] of the new curricula there is a sustained discussion about the removal of rounders, a game specifically popular to girls. However, the document notes:

> There remains a number of other activities on the proposed activity list that are traditionally seen as appealing to girls, including netball, contemporary dance and swimming, however the *DfE would not want to encourage gender stereotyping in perceptions of sport preferences* (Department for Education, (DfE) 2015, p.29) [my emphasis]

It concludes that

> ‘Appropriate teacher support and encouragement should mean that no activity lacks accessibility or appeal to female students. DfE wishes to encourage attitudes towards physical activities that are not gender dependent’ (p. 30).

Interestingly, the report also concludes it is ‘confident’ that there are sufficient options to cater for the ‘tastes of all ethnic minorities’ (p.31). Whilst there have clearly been some shifts in PE practice in relation to gender for some (middle class, white) girls (see Scraton, 2013), nevertheless, there is *also* strong evidence to suggest that such ‘wishing’ away of gendered attitudes will not be enough to ensure accessibility for *most* girls as the next section explores.

---

[13] The Equalities Act introduced in 2010 required all public bodies to conduct an equality impact assessment to ensure that any change, including hereto school curricula, does not have adverse effects on any of groups covered by the ‘protected characteristics’ under this law (e.g. gender, race, sexuality).

Coeducational pedagogy?

Although important, debates about curricular *access,* offer a limited understanding of the nature of gender relations within PE. Developments in feminist research in the 1980s and 1990s also showed the significance of teachers' attitudes and their pedagogy. Scraton's (1992, 1993) research, for example, was important for showing the significance of gender and sexuality for understanding girls' experiences of mixed PE classes:

> By placing girls in a situation where ideologies of masculinity (especially those concerning physicality and heterosexuality) are reinforced and reproduced, they are in danger of losing out not only in terms of teacher attention, use of space, and inclusion in activities, but also being the focus of sexual abuse and harassment – both verbal and physical. Both girls and boys can learn in this context that the relations between the sexes are power relations with boys taking up the dominant role and girls expected to retain a subordinate position (Scraton, 1993, p.149).

Since Sheila Scraton's ground breaking research on gender and PE in the 1990s, more contemporary feminist research has shown the continuing significance of gender relations operating within PE classrooms - although there is now recognition of the often nuanced ways in which this takes place, including through the hidden curriculum. Equally, this research highlights the intersection of other identity categories with gender in the experiences of young people, teachers and student teachers, challenging the binaries underpinning notions of 'girls' PE' and 'boys' PE' (e.g. Benn, 2002; Flintoff, 2015; Fitzpatrick, 2013a; 2013b;Larsson, 2009; Ronholt, 2002).

Whilst my own research in the 1990s showed how gender relations were reproduced through the lecturers' expectations, attitudes and their pedagogy (Flintoff, 1993c), it also showed that some lecturers were active in challenging and resisting these through their pedagogy, and I have reflected on my own struggles to do this in my own classrooms

(Flintoff, 1993a; Dowling, 2014). The recognition that teachers can challenge gender relations through their pedagogy is an important one, and raises significant implications for PETE practice. Elsewhere, colleagues and I have recently argued that initial teacher education (ITE) policy and practice in relation to *race* equality in England is characterized by marginalization, individualisation and non-compliance (Flintoff, 2014). Race equality has always been a marginalized discourse within the professional education of teachers. Despite more recent, strengthened legislation[14] requiring institutions to *promote* racial equality, the national picture is one of non-compliance (Wilkins, 2013) with good practice relying on the work of committed individuals. How different or similar was (and is) the professional education of teachers in relation to gender equality? The development of national criteria for ITE in 1984 by the then newly established Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (CATE), established gender equality (as well as race) as a compulsory *professional issue* for all teacher education courses to address (DES, 1989).How this impacted upon the work of Carnegie specifically is unknown, but a survey carried out by the Equal Opportunities Commission in 1989 found the overall national picture to be one of 'benign apathy' - with pockets of good practice linked directly to the work of committed individuals (Equal Opportunities Commission, 1989). In PE, findings from Dewar's (1987) and my own research (Flintoff, 1993b) mirrored this broader picture.

Arguably, since the early nineties, there has been now even less space in PETE courses for including a consideration of equality issues, with the shifts in emphasis towards practical based 'competences and skills', and away from reflection and theoretical concerns (Mahony and Hexhall, 1997; Younger, 2007; Murray, 2007). In England, routes into teaching have become increasingly diverse, with the Coalition government supporting moves to increase the numbers of teachers trained through school-based routes, such as Teach Direct since 2010 (Department for Education, 2010). Whilst on one hand, such diversity could be seen as problematic for ensuring all future teachers' engagement with issues of equity, on the other, it is clear from the commentary above, that university-based

[14] In 2000, the Race Equality (Amendment) Act required all public bodies in the UK to promote racial equality.

routes have fared little better. Worryingly, the recent Carter Review of Initial Teacher Training (DfE, 2015) set up to 'identify core elements of high quality ITT across phases, subject disciplines and the different routes, whilst recognizing *inconsistency* within the provision, makes *no* mention of the need for future teachers to engage in issues of equity, apart from addressing children with special educational needs and disabilities. Some ten years ago, Wright (2002) concluded that the now considerable body of knowledge about gender and PE appears to have had minimal impact on the teacher education curriculum, and consequently on the practice of PE in schools. However, although having little visibility in teacher education curricula or practice, gender and sexuality remain significant in PE teachers' work (Brown and Rich, 2002; (Dowling, 2008). Student teachers entering the profession already have established gendered identities, and in developing their pedagogical skills, they draw on these already established gendered roles and practices in their teaching. When few alternative strategies are made available to them through PETE, Brown and Rich (2002) argue that it is difficult for students to do anything other than be complicit with the gender order, in a climate where gendered practices are perceived and accepted as the norm, and, I would add, where post-feminist and neoliberal discourses refuting the need for feminist analyses, are strong counterpoints (Scraton, 2013).

How might things improve, given the rather pessimistic picture painted above? In taking Carnegie's move to coeducation as its focus, my chapter provides little sense of the shifting extensive terrain of feminist theory and practice outside of education, and its significance for contemporary PE practice. Scraton (2013) provides a useful overview, and points in particular to two challenges: the importance of maintaining a focus on equality *and* difference, and bridging what is an increasing gap between theory and practice. Addressing the first point, Sheila Scraton and I have suggested Walby's theoretical framework is useful in contemporary discussions about feminist praxis (Flintoff and Scraton, 2005). Walby (2000) suggests that we need to engage in a politics of *transformation*, rather than simply a politics of equality or a politics of difference. Arguably, to date, the majority of feminist praxis in PE falls into what she has called a politics of equality, or politics of recognition. Accounting for difference by adopting a politics of equality entails teachers

working with the assumption that the current practice of PE is acceptable for girls, and all we have to do is to make the provision a bit more 'girl-friendly' by making minor changes and adaptations. Carnegie's early days of accepting women into teacher education could be described in this way; so-called 'women's activities were simply added onto the existing men's curriculum. Accounting for difference by taking a politics of recognition approach, Walby's second political strategy, is also problematic. Here there is a move to develop respect for different groups, (for example, girls) with the assumption being that they have different needs and interests that are not shared with other children (for example boys). The problem with such an approach, Walby argues, is that by simply embracing difference, existing inequalities may be endorsed. For example, the introduction of curriculum activities to meet 'girls' interests', such as aerobics, or keep fit, does little to challenge the higher status of so called 'boys' activities'. It's clear from Evans and Penney's (1999) extensive research on the national curriculum in England that it is a narrow, masculinized, sports-performance form of PE, largely controlled by men, that dominates - even if some schools provide alternative activities for girls. Walby (2000) calls for a politics of transformation – an approach embraces difference without losing the explicit link to inequality. Transformative politics would ask what kind of PE do we want for all young people, boys as well as girls? The challenge for PETE, at Carnegie and elsewhere, is how can we help presevice teachers understand the need to develop gender *relevant* (Gorely, et al 2003), rather than gendered, PE. There are some good examples of work that is trying to do just that, through explicitly working to bridge theory/practice gaps, bring together the personal and the professional, and link the work of universities and schools more closely (e.g. Garrett, 2004; 2006; Oliver, 2010; 2012; Nike/Youth Sport Trust, 2000). Whilst promising, like the race equality initiatives aluded to above, they rely on the commitment and struggles of individuals and programmes, rather than representative of wider political and policy agendas.

Conclusion

The struggles involved in moving to coeducation at Carnegie in the 1970s and 1980s reflect those experienced elsewhere in PETE across the country. As gender was a key organising principle in the historical development of PETE, it is perhaps not surprising to note many of the difficulties revolved (and indeed, continue to revolve) around what counts as valued knowledge, particularly in the area of practical physical activity. Whilst reiterating the significance of the differing histories of individual PETE institutions, and the dangers of reifying notions of 'women's PE' and 'men's PE', it seems that Sheila Fletcher was right in predicting the decline of women's influence on the profession and the erosion of what she has called the 'female tradition'. It is clear that the philosophy and practice of contemporary PE in England is characterised by sport, and a performance pedagogy, both aspects central to historical conceptions of men's PE (Kirk, 2002). However, as mentioned above, one of the limitations of this chapter is its lack of analysis of the theoretical aspects of Carnegie PETE curriculum at Carnegie. Like others, I argue that access to feminist knowledge, and equity issues more broadly through PETE, is critical if we are to *educate professionals* rather than produce sports performers or coaches (Dowling, 2011). Given the significant changes to teacher education in England, there is a pressing need for research that explores the nature of the contemporary PETE curriculum, including in relation to gender and equity issues, and how this may vary across training routes. Whilst Carnegie is no better or no worse than other institutions involved in PETE in developing critical reflective practitioners able to deliver a gender relevant PE, for those of us committed and centrally involved in teaching and research about gender equity, this makes for a somewhat uncomfortable position. But it is also one that pushes us to continue to struggle and work towards a better future.

References

Benn, T. (2002) 'Muslim Women in Teacher Training: Issues of Gender, 'Race' and Religion'. In: Penney, D. (Ed.): **Gender and Physical Education: Contemporary Issues and Future Directions**. London, Routledge, pp.57-79

Braun, A., et al. (2011) 'Taking Context Seriously: Towards Explaining Policy Enactments in the Secondary School'. **Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education**, 32(4), pp.585-596.

Brown, D. and Rich, E. (2002) 'Gender Positioning as Pedagogical Practice in Physical Education'. In: Penney, D. (Ed.): **Gender and Physical Education: Contemporary Issues and Future Directions**. London, Falmer, pp.80-100

Connell, R. W. (1995) **Masculinities**. London, Polity Press.

Deem, R. ed. (1980) **Schooling for Women's Work**. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Department for Education (2010). **The Importance of Teaching: The Schools White Paper 2010**. London, Crown Copyright.

Department for Education (2015). **Gcse and a Level Subject Content: Equality Analysis**. London, Crown Copyright.

Department for Education [Internet] (2015). **Carter Review of Initial Teacher Training (Itt)**. London, Crown Copyright Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/carter-review-of-initial-teacher-training [Accessed 5th Jan 2015].

Dewar, A. (1987) 'The Social Construction of Gender in Physical Education'. **Women Studies International Journal**, 10(4), pp.453-465.

Douglas, D. and Halas, J. (2011) 'The Wages of Whiteness: Confronting the Nature of the Ivory Tower Racism and the Implications for Physical Education'. **Sport Education and Society. Available online at: http://dx.org.doi: 10.1080/13573322.2011.602395**, pp.1-22.

Dowling, F. (2008) 'Getting in Touch with Our Feelings: The Emotional Geographies of Gender Relations in Pete'. **Sport, Education and Society**, 13(3), pp.247-266.

Dowling, F. (2011) ''Are Pe Teacher Identities Fit for Postmodern Schools or Are They Clinging to Modernist Notions of Professionalism?' A Case Study of Norwegian Pe Teacher Students' Emerging Professional Identities'. **Sport Education and Society**, 16(2), pp.201-222.

Dowling, F., Fitzgerald, H. and Flintoff, A. (2014) 'Narratives from the Road to Social Justice in Pete: Teacher Educator Perspectives'. **Sport, Education and Society**, DOI:10.1080/13573322.2013.871249.

Equal Opportunities Commission (1989) **Formal Investigation Report: Initial Teacher Education in England and Wales**. Manchester, Equal Opportunities Commission.

Equality Challenge Unit (2014). **Equality in Higher Education: Statistical Report 2014 [Internet]. Available from Www.Ecu.Ac.Uk (Accessed January 2015)**.

Evans, J. and Et Al (1987) 'Some Thoughts on the Political and Pedagogical Implications of Mixed Sex Groupings in Physical Education'. **British Educational Research Journal**, 13(1), pp.59-71.

Fitzpatrick, K. (2013) **Critical Pedagogy, Physical Education and Urban Schooling** New York, Peter Lang.

Fitzpatrick, K. and Russell (2013) 'On Being Critical in Health and Physical Education'. **Physical Education and sport pedagogy**, DOI: 10.1080/17408989.2013.837436.

Flintoff, A. (1993a) 'Gender, Physical Education and Teacher Education'. In: Evans, J. (Ed.): **Equality, Education and Physical Education**. London, Falmer, pp.184-204

Flintoff, A. (1993b) 'One of the Boys? Gender Identities in Physical Education Initial Teacher Education'. In: Siraj-Blatchford, I. (Ed.): **'Race', Gender and the Education of Teachers.** Buckingham, Open University Press, pp.74-93

Flintoff, A. (2015) 'Playing the 'Race' Card? Black and Minority Ethnic Students' Experiences of Physical Education Teacher Education'. **Sport Education and Society**, 20(2), pp.190-211.

Flintoff, A., Dowling, F. and Fitzgerald, H. (2014) 'Working through Whiteness, Race and (Anti) Racism in Physical Education Teacher Education'. **Physical Education and sport pedagogy**,(10.1080/17408989.2014.962017).

Flintoff, A., Fitzgerald, H. and Scraton, S. (2008) 'The Challenges of Intersectionality: Researching Difference in Physical Education'. **International Studies in Sociology of Education**, 18(2), pp.73-85.

Flintoff, A. and Scraton, S. (2005). Gender and Physical Education: The Contribution of Feminist Research. Paper presented at the **British Education Research Association Annual Conference,**, University of Glamorgan, Sept 14-17th 2005.

Flintoff, A. and Scraton, S. (2006) 'Girls and Pe'. In: Kirk, D., Macdonald, D. and O' Sullivan, M. (Eds.): **The Handbook of Physical Education**. London, Sage, pp.767-783

Furlong, A. (2013) 'Globalisation, Neoliberalism, and the Reform of Teacher Education in England'. **The Educational Forum**, 77, pp.28-50.

Garrett, R. (2004) 'Negotiating a Physical Identity: Girls, Bodies and Physical Education'. **Sport, Education and Society**, 9(2), pp.223-237.

Garrett, R. (2006) 'Critical Storytelling as a Teaching Strategy in Physical Education Teacher Education'. **European Journal of Physical Education**, 12(3), pp.339-360.

Gorely, T., Holroyd, R. and Kirk, D. (2003) 'Muscularlity, the Habitus and the Social Construction of Gender: Towards a Gender Relevant Physical Education'. **British Journal of Sociology of Education**, 24(4), pp.429-448.

Gosden, P. (1990) 'The James Report and Recent History'. In: Brown, J. B. (Ed.): **British Universities and Teacher Education: A Century of Change**. Lewes, Falmer Press,
Hall, M. A. (1996) **Feminism and Sporting Bodies**. Leeds Human Kinetics.

Hay, P. and Macdonald, D. (2010) 'The Gendering of Abilities in Senior Pe'. **Physical Education and sport pedagogy**, 15(3), pp.271-287.

Kirk, D. (2002) 'Physical Education: A Gendered History'. In: Penney, D. (Ed.): **Gender and Physical Education: Contemporary Issues and Future Directions**. London, Routledge, pp.24-37

Larsson, H., Birgitta, F. and Redelius, K. (2009) 'Queering Physical Education. Between Benevolence Towards Girls and a Tribute to Masculinity'. **Physical Education and sport pedagogy**, 14(1), pp.1-17.

Leaman, O. (1984) **Sit on the Sidelines and Watch the Boys Play: Sex Differentiation in Physical Education**. London, Longman for Schools Council.

Macdonald, D. (1993) 'Knowledge, Gender and Power in Physical Education Teacher Education'. **Australian Journal of Education**, 37(3), pp.259-278.

Maguire, M., Braun, A. and Ball, S. (2014) ''Where You Stand Depends on Where You Sit': The Social Construction of Policy Enactments in the (English) Secondary School'.

Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education, DOI:1080/01596306.2014.977022.

Murray, J. and Maguire, M. (2007) 'Changes and Continuities in Teacher Education:International Perspectives on a Gendered Field'. **Gender and Education**, 19(3), pp.283-296.

Nike/Youth Sport Trust (2000) **Girls into Sport: Towards Girl-Friendly Physical Education**. Loughborough, Institute of Youth Sport.

Oliver, K. (2010) 'The Body, Physical Activity and Inequity: Learning to Listen *with* Girls *through* Action'. In: O'sullivan, M. and Macphail, A. (Eds.): **Young People's Voices in Physical Education and Youth Sport**. London, Routledge, pp.31-48

Oliver, K. and Oesterreich, H. A. (2012). "We Lived the Process Rather Than Learned About It at the Univeristy": Student-Centred Inquiry *as* Curriculum as a Model for Field Based Physical Education Teacher Education. Paper presented at the **paper presented at the British Educational Research Association annual conference, Manchester**.

Ronholt, H. (2002) ''It's Only the Sissies...': Analysis of Teaching and Learning Processes in Physical Education: A Contribution to the Hidden Curriculum'. **Sport, Education and Society**, 7(1), pp.25-36.

Scraton, S. (2013) 'Feminism and Pe: Does Gender Still Matter?'. In: Pfister, G. and Kristin Sisjord, M. (Eds.): **Gender and Sport: Changes and Challenges**. Berlin, Waxman, pp.199-216

Skelton, A. (1993) 'On Becoming a Male Physical Education Teacher: The Informal Culture of Students and the Construction of Hegemonic Masculinity'. **Gender and Education**, 5(3), p.289.

Stidder, G. (2002) 'The Recruitment of Secondary School Physical Education Teachers in England: A Gendered Perspective'. **European Physical Education Review**, 8(3), pp.249-269.

Stidder, G. (2005) 'Trainee Teachers' Perceptions of Job Advertisements in England with Reagrd to Gender and Physical Education'. **European Physical Education Review**, 11(3), pp.309-333.

Talbot, M. (1990) 'Sex Discrimination in Britain: Implications for the Delivery of Physical Education, Recreation and Sport'. In: Scraton, S. (Ed.): **Gender and Physical Education**. Geelong, Deakin University

Velija, P. and Kumar, G. (2009) 'Gcse Physical Education and the Embodiment of Gender'. **Sport, Education and Society**, 14(4), pp.383-399.

Walby, S. (2000) 'Beyond the Politics of Location: The Power of Argument in a Global Era'. **Feminist Theory**, 1(2), pp.189-206.

Weiner, G. (1994) **Feminisms in Education: An Introduction**. Buckingham, Open University Press.

Wilkins, C. (2013 (iFirst)) 'Inspecting the Inspectors: Race Equality and Quality in Initial Teacher Education'. **Race, Ethnicity & Education**, 10.1080/13613324.2013.832939, pp.2-27.

Younger, M. (2007) 'The Gender Agenda in Secondary Itet in England: Forgottened, Misconceived or What?'. **Gender and Education**, 19(3), pp.387-414.