

OLYMPISM, PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE PEDAGOGIES

Ian CULPAN

New Zealand Centre for Olympic Studies, School of Health Sciences, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand.

ABSTRACT

The ubiquitous forces of the globalisation of sport and other social constructs, such as economic and political, create cultural necessities for physical education (PE) to connect and celebrate diversity, yet at the same time, commit to contextualised educative and social purposes. The commitment is the need for an inclusive relevancy, particularly in terms of race, religion, gender, social class and philosophical beliefs and principles. This article reinforces the suggestion, a philosophical position on sport and Olympism, is applicable to PE. It is posited that Olympism provides a way forward for the celebration of diversity focusing on PE's educative and social value. Journeys through scholarly pedagogical suggestions for Olympism education within PE are highlighted and the differentiation between the concept of Olympism and its conception are discussed. An argument is put that the concept of Olympism, to be relevant to PE, the conception of the concept must incorporate culturally relevant pedagogies. It explores and connects culturally relevant and responsive pedagogies with Olympism education within PE and concludes that bi-cultural principles contained within cultural responsive pedagogies for Olympism education, integrated into PE are applicable to multicultural settings as well.

Keywords: Olympism; Physical Education; Olympism Education; Culturally responsive pedagogies.

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

The ubiquitous forces of the globalisation of sport and other social constructs, such as economic and political, create cultural necessities for education in general and Physical Education (PE) and sport in particular to connect to, and celebrate diversity, yet at the same time commit to contextualised educative and social purposes. Advocates of the educative and social purposes of sport assert that it brings diverse peoples and communities together in peaceful co-existence and encourages competing participants to cooperate in their striving for, and their seeking of, human excellences (UNESCO, 2013). All this, in order to maximise personal and collective potentials (Parry, 2007). Conversely, sceptics question the whole construct of sport in that it is a creator of division, a root cause of conflict and the socio-political mechanism by which the fortunate and the 'moneyed' can perpetuate their dominance (Miller, 2009). As a consequence of binary positions, sport is manipulated by diverse political systems, particularly in an educative and economic sense, so as to achieve governmental objectives (Culpan & Meier, 2016).

While these seemingly irreconcilable differences exist and continue to transform sport, the whole social construct of sport, particularly the teaching of sport techniques, has become the dominant discourse and orientating factor of school PE programmes throughout much of the contemporary world (Kirk, 2010). In Kirk's analysis, this dominant discourse has a limited and finite future as its relevance to 21st century learning needs of young students is questionable. Inherent in the analysis of Kirk (2010) is the need for significant change to occur if PE, in schools, is to have a secure future. His, along with others like Tinning (2010), future focused suggestions are directed toward using sport and movement contexts as the mechanisms by which a much more sophisticated socio-critical humanist pedagogical position is employed to address understanding of 21st century 'physical culture'. Such understanding would focus on student personal meaning making and attendance to issues, such as inequity, social injustices and abuse of power within the whole movement culture. All this, Kirk (2010) argues is for the quest to become more 'fully human'.

The more 'fully human' idea, presented by Arnold (1979) and further developed by Parry (2007), suggests that learning through movement transcends the actual movement experience itself in that it can create an integrative awareness that recognises common life meanings and establishes an understanding of the interdependency between individuals and communities. To Parry (2007) this was PE and sports contribution to achieving a 'flourishing and virtuous life'. He argued that while movement might be the original learning attention, it is the ethical practices and principles that underline the movement context itself that can maximise learning. With this argument, "the idea of games and sports as laboratories for value experiments, in which participants are forced to react to opportunity and circumstance in the pursuit of some goal in a rule governed environment" (Parry, 2007:198), highlights the worthwhileness of PE and sport in the school curriculum. Its purpose becomes focused on the development of character traits that can lead to human virtuousness and notions of a 'flourishing life'.

Scholars, such as Parry (2007) and Martinkova (2012), posit that the philosophical concept of Olympism provides an excellent mechanism by which this can be achieved. While many scholars advocate for the merits of Olympism within a PE and sport context (Kidd, 1996; Naul, 2008; Martinkova, 2012), it is important to acknowledge that Olympism is a highly contested philosophy (Bale & Christensen, 2004; Lenskyj, 2012). Scholarly advocacy for Olympism, however, is sparse in regard to suggesting specific pedagogies by which Olympism, within a PE and sport education schooling context, can be implemented. Binder (2005), Naul (2008), Culpan and Wigmore (2010) and Culpan and McBain (2012) suggest specific pedagogical approaches but to date it seems no one is suggesting how Olympism might be presented through culturally responsive pedagogies that address the specifics of diverse cultural needs. The absence of this has given rise to the purpose of this article.

The purpose of this article is to briefly reinforce the suggestion that the philosophy of Olympism is applicable to the PE context. It will highlight some pedagogical suggestions for Olympism education with a PE context and argue that Olympism, to be successfully utilised in PE and made germane to learners, must incorporate culturally relevant and responsive pedagogies. Here the article will explore and make connections with culturally relevant

pedagogies and Olympism education within a PE context. It will draw on culturally responsive pedagogies applicable for bi-cultural schooling in Aotearoa New Zealand as a specific example.

OLYMPISM AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

The founder of the modern Olympic Movement, Pierre de Coubertin, coined the phrase 'Olympism' and denoted it as a concept applicable to how one could live their life (Muller, 2000). Drawing from the International Olympic Committee's Charter (2015), Olympism can be broadly conceptualised as a way of life that blends sport with culture and education. It promotes a way of life through balanced development of body, will and mind; the joy found in effort; the educational value of being a good role model; and observing the universal ethics of tolerance, friendship, unity, non-discrimination, generosity and respect for others (IOC, 2015). Scholars (Parry, 2006; Naul, 2008; Martinkova, 2012) argue that Olympism is manifest and accomplished through explicit applications of PE and sport practices and Parry (2006:190) in particular, argues "Olympism is a formative and developmental influence contributing to desirable characteristics of individual personality and social life". He also suggests that "the philosophy of Olympism has been the most coherent systemization of the ethical and political values underlying the practice of sport so far to have emerged" (Parry, 2007:214).

Bennett and Culpan (2014:10) go further and suggest "Olympism is also the most coherent educative explanation of sport to have emerged over the last 100 years". In addition to this advocacy, Arnold (1996) proposed that Olympism is a justifiable, necessary and potentially powerful component of education and is best located within PE and sport education in schools. If systematised coherently "then the true values inherent in formal and informal, deliberate or spontaneous, structured or unstructured movement experiences can materialise, be processed, acted upon, and as a consequence its participants can become *forces for social betterment*" (Culpan, 2011:39). In advocating for Olympism within a PE and sport education context, Culpan and Wigmore (2010) make clear the distinction between commonplace Olympic education (more concerned with the propagation of the Olympic Movement and the Olympic Games (Lenskyj, 2012) and their advocacy for Olympism education within PE.

Drawing on the work of Culpan and Moon (2009:1), Olympism education is defined as "a culturally relevant experiential process of learning an integrated set of life principles through the practice of sport". This is pedagogically characterised by having less emphasis on the technical aspects (functional facts and figures) of the Games; strongly focusing on Olympism and fostering critique and debate within this focus; encouraging meaning making from actively engaged practice; and developing a criticality with a view to transforming unjust and inequitable practices within sport and other movement contexts. In essence, Olympism education sets out to foster active critical consumerism of movement in order to contribute to creating a more virtuous and flourishing life for self and others. While this sort of arrangement might be a 'naïve and fond hope' (Parry, 2007), this approach is entirely consistent with the recent New Zealand PE curriculum (Culpan & Bruce, 2007).

Mentioned above was the contested nature of Olympism. One such critique of Olympism has been that it lacks a coherent pedagogy. Certainly the placement of Olympism within a PE context does necessitate the adoption of pedagogies commensurate with its purpose. Here the literature is somewhat sparse apart from suggested works by Naul (2008), Culpan and Wigmore

(2010), Binder (2012), Culpan and McBain (2012) and Teetzel (2012). For a fuller analysis see the work of Naul (2008), Culpan and Wigmore (2010) and Culpan and McBain (2012). However, these works do not necessarily focus on culturally responsive pedagogies that acknowledge the diverse nature of ethnic groups, communities and indigenous populations. Clearly, if Olympism is relevant to all, as suggested by de Coubertin (Muller, 2000), then there is a need to comment on the claims of the universality of Olympism and be suggestive in regard to appropriate pedagogies that cater for diverse populations. It is to these two particular aspects, Olympism and universality, and culturally responsive pedagogy for Olympism, to which I now wish to turn.

OLYMPISM AND UNIVERSALITY

Whilst Olympism had its roots in ancient Greek practice and its more contemporary understandings and manifestations emanating from Western Europe, Olympism, as a concept, emphasises the role sport has in a socio-political global culture. More specifically, it is claimed that Olympism encourages the individuals and groups to learn through sport's ethical, moral and social practices, international understandings and the pursuit of peaceful coexistence between nations (Muller, 2000). The claim that Olympism is a universal concept can be somewhat problematic given that social practices (and sport is such) are influenced by time, space, order, language, politics and cultural contexts.

Given this, it would seem difficult to claim that Olympism has universalising tendencies, because any ideology or philosophy claiming to have universal relevance and application must be inclusive of, and relevant to all nations, genders, races, social classes, political ideologies and religious affiliations (Parry, 2006). The corollary to this is that Da Costa (2006) and Parry (2006) suggest that Olympism generates different meanings and interpretations depending on the context in which it is promoted. Essentially Olympism can only be deemed a universal when all countries can settle on, obligate to and perpetrate a common set of values – and here lies the challenge. Both Da Costa (2006) and Parry (2006) provide a helpful and useful way forward to this problem. Parry (2006) argued that the universalising of Olympism is at a high level of conceptual generality and this generality gives rise to expressions of import, substance, significance, value, meaning, cultural understandings and contextual interpretations that are subject to interrogation, examination and debate. Principally, Parry (2006) highlights the dissimilarity between *concepts* and *conceptions*. Drawing on the work of Tamir (1995), he reasons that Olympism affords a 'thin layer' of humanist values that are revealed through the practice of sport. Distinctive and rare cultural expressions in place, space, time, and history deliver the *conceptions* of Olympism that intensify the rich tapestry of cultural diversity.

This richness is considered the 'thick values' and are contestable between cultures. As a result, Parry (2006) maintained that there is a requirement for nations to commit to the high level generalities voiced in Olympism and then subsequently realise contextual representation of them in a custom that is exclusive to their culture. DaCosta, (2006:162) denoted this as the "axis of logic of Olympism". The explications, interpretations and conceptions of Da Costa's and Parry's standpoints on the universalising of Olympism are culturally certified and disclosed through contingent display. Parry (2006) further reasoned that the cultural qualifications and

demonstrations makeup the fertility, richness and profitability of the Olympism philosophy – fertility, richness and profitability being in the collection of diverse engagements that differentiate contemporary times and locations. Scholarly support for this analysis is given by Teetzel (2012) who suggests that each interpretation in time and context institutes the conception of the concept.

Drawing on Da Costa's (2006) and Parry's (2006) argument about conceptions of the concept, the work of the New Zealand Centre for Olympic Studies concurs with this helpful analysis and provides an example of what is needed in New Zealand for a bi-cultural view of Olympism to unfold. This bi-cultural view addresses the universalising claim that Olympism transcends cultural boundaries. The work from New Zealand (Culpan *et al.*, 2008) has identified expressions of difference between New Zealand's indigenous people, Māori, and the dominant European culture (Pākehā). This difference required attention if New Zealand was to journey toward a bi-cultural view of Olympism applicable to PE contexts and accessible to all people.

The literature according to Coakley (2003) reports widely held perceptions of what counts as sport are likely to alienate and marginalise indigenous forms of physical activity and sport as European dominant forms of sport have been privileged and normalised in many cultures. Essentially, the work in New Zealand has attempted to avoid this alienation by making moves towards embracing a Māori conception of Olympism and sport practice. For New Zealand, Māori, physical activities and games were expressions of deeply held beliefs and values and served multiple purposes and dimensions. According to Hokowhitu (2004), the physical dimension of being active was the least important aspect of dynamic engagement. Games and activities were connected to the regeneration of genealogy (*whakapapa*), cultural practices (*tikanga*), spirituality (*wairua*) and a life force (*mauri*).

The concept/conception analysis is reflected in the Māori metaphor of knowledge and a world view. Reedy (cited in Culpan *et al.*, 2008) for instance, acknowledged that Māori interpret knowledge within two divisions: the philosophical/comprehension and the practical/technical. The philosophical and celestial comprehension refers to the anatomical upper jaw (*Te kauae runga*) and the practical corresponds to the anatomical lower jaw (*Te kauae raro*). For Māori the upper and lower jaw must work together as the knowledge and practice are complimentary – they are not separate. It is a reciprocal relationship. Reedy drew the relationship between these two anatomical features: Olympism was the purity of sport, the philosophy, the educative and social value, leading to the pursuit of a flourishing life (the upper jaw) and the physical doing of sport was the simple physical exertion required of participation (the lower jaw). In essence, both are inseparable as they are dependent on each other – one does not dominate the other but instead they work in harmony. For Māori, this metaphor applies to indigenous and dominant colonising views of sport – they must work together in harmony if the rich tapestry of contextual interpretations of Olympism are to be realised.

Emerging from this journey to establish a bi-cultural understanding (conception) of Olympism (concept) was the Māori world view of the interconnectedness between the physical (*taha tinana*), social (*taha whānau*), spiritual (*taha wairua*), mental and emotional (*taha hinengaro*) and the land (whenua) to form a conception of wellbeing called Hauora. This interconnectedness is, on the surface, similar to Olympism's motion of balanced development of

body, will and mind. However, there are some noteworthy distinctions in the Māori conception of this concept.

For Māori, balanced development for *Hauora* (well-being) is deeply rooted in the spirit (*wairua*) and the *mauri* (life force). It is the inter-connectedness of these beliefs that the Māori world of understanding well-being is connecting the past to the present, the spiritual with the temporal and the land with the people. “For Māori, the importance of *whenua* (the land) extends to all cultural practices, including physical activity and sport” (Culpan *et al.*, 2008:128). *Whenua* (the land), for Māori is a source of spiritual (*wairua*) sustenance; it provides a life force (*mauri*). As a consequence, the land (*whenua*) must be acknowledged, cared for, nourished, and not necessarily looked upon as a commodity to be traded in the market place. The land and the environment (*whenua*), spirituality (*wairua*), life force (*mauri*) and customs (*tikanga*) are important additional Māori considerations to Olympism’s import of balanced development of body, will and mind. It is an essential part of individual and collective well-being (*Hauora*).

What also has emerged from the Māori conception of sport and Olympism is the strong interconnected links well-being (*Hauora*) has with social arrangements – it presents a holism that is perhaps lacking in New Zealand’s European (*Pākehā*) cultural understandings of sport. Associated with this, Māori conception of Olympism is the importance of ‘self-determination’ (*tino rangatiratanga*) which seems to be absent from a European (*Pākehā*) conception of Olympism. To Māori, the importance of self-determination (*tino rangatiratanga*) is for the ability and acceptance for Māori to determine their own identity and destiny by being enabled to successfully live as Māori while wholeheartedly participating as citizens of the nation and the world; benefiting from high standards of living, education and health. Dominant discourses in the Western world assume that this sort of self-determination is an absolute and implies separateness. To Māori, and many other indigenous cultures, self-determination is not separateness but rather relational and acknowledges inter-dependence between people, the environment (including the land) and the promotion of world views that are “legitimate, authoritative and valid in relation to other cultures” (Bishop *et al.*, 2007:10). Achieving self-determination (*tino rangatiratanga*) for Māori necessitates learners accessing the ‘world of Māori’ (*Te aro Māori*), which includes language, culture, customs and education. For Māori, education (Salter, 2000:45):

- is seen as *ngā taonga tuku iho* (tribal treasures passed down from the ancestors);
- is concerned with understanding *te ira tangata* (life principle) in holistic and cosmological ways;
- aims to unfold the *pūmanawa* (unique talents and abilities) of each individual;
- demonstrates commitment to the collective, as well as to the individual.

As Salter (2000), argues, Māori conceptions of education are quite dissimilar to that of European (*Pākehā*) with respect “to what counts as knowledge, and what its purposes and outcomes are supposed to be, and how it might be disseminated” (Salter, 2000:45). As a consequence, education in particular, including PE, sport and Olympism, needs to adopt culturally responsive pedagogies to bridge the dissimilarities and give due diligence to cultural interpretations in order to facilitate the maximisation of Olympism learning for all.

CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE PEDAGOGIES

Culturally responsive pedagogies can briefly be described as an approach to teaching and learning that draws on, and considers: what counts as cultural knowledge, students prior experiences, cultural contexts and techniques in which ethnically diverse students make pedagogical encounters meaningful and relevant (Gay, 2013). It is a student-centred pedagogical approach in which learners' diverse cultural experiences and strengths are cultivated, cherished and utilised to maximise learning opportunities, develop a sense of wellbeing and to understand and value their cultural heritage. It is an educationally emergent term that refers "to a more dynamic or synergistic relationship between home/community culture and school culture" (Ladson-Billings, 1995a:467). Earl *et al.* (2008:12) established that cultural responsive pedagogies:

Mean interacting with (*student's*) families to truly understand their reality; it means understanding the socio-political history and how it impacts on classroom life; it means challenging personal beliefs and actions; and it means changing practices to engage all students in the learning and make classrooms a positive learning place for all students.

Such pedagogies require students to experience academic success, develop and sustain interactions with their cultural heritages and learn criticality by being skilled in identifying, challenging and transforming social injustices, practices of exploitation and inappropriate use of power.

In implementing culturally responsive pedagogies, Bishop *et al.* (2007) stress that it is important that teachers adopt the philosophical position of rejecting deficit theorising as a means of explaining indigenous students' lack of education achievement. Deficit theorising in an education context means that some students are more susceptible to lack of achievement due to their cultural and community background. This type of cultural deficit thinking tends to ignore the root causes by locating the problem with individuals and their learning rather than addressing problems associated with poor teaching, poor school practices and institutional structures that favour dominant middle-class groups. This model of deficit theorising and thinking tends to absolve schools and teachers from their obligations to educate all students according to need and, as a consequence, victim blaming emerges that focuses on 'pointing the finger' at students, families and communities.

To overcome deficit theorising, teachers and schools need to fully understand how, and be committed to, fostering and creating mechanisms by which high standards of achievement can be attained. Evidence suggests that high quality teaching is one of the most important influences on achieving high quality learning outcomes from culturally diverse learners and also highlights that effective teaching and learning are dependent on strong, positive and fruitful relations between teachers and learners (Ministry of Education, 2009). In focussing on such remedies, the literature alludes to several key competencies or attributes that are important components of culturally response pedagogies. These are (Education Council of New Zealand, 2011), with the New Zealand Māori name in brackets:

1. An ability to participate with learners and communities in meaningful communications in order to establish co-constructed learning goals to benefit achievement (*Wānanga*);
2. Actively participating in respectful and meaningful professional interactions and establish co-constructed learning goals to benefit achievement (*Wānanga*);

3. Fostering relations with learners, their parents and communities to form learning partnerships and cultural connections (*Whānaungatanga*);
4. Consistently exhibiting and demonstrating knowledge of, professional qualities and virtues as integrity, sincerity, tolerance, non-discrimination and respect, towards cultural beliefs, customs and language in order for learners to feel culturally located (*Manaakitanga*);
5. Providing contexts for learning that celebrates and affirms the identity of ethnic learners through emphasising the importance of family connections, cultural beliefs, language, and customs in order for learners to develop placed-based socio-cultural awareness and knowledge (*Tangata Whenuatanga*).
6. Ensuring students take responsibility and accountability for their own learning in and beyond the school setting (*Ako*).

In New Zealand these cultural competencies are called *Tātaiako* (Education Council of New Zealand, 2011). They have been formulated and formalised as essential components of culturally responsive pedagogy in a genuine attempt to form productive and meaningful relations between Māori students, their families, their communities and schools. They are specifically developed to provide personalised learning with Māori learners to foster education success and achievement so that their schooling experiences are integral to learning, their culture and their worldview (Education Council of New Zealand, 2011).

In identifying such essential components, Ladson-Billings (1995b) points out that what is suggested for cultural responsiveness is fundamentally more than good teaching. She argues that the suggested components should have a centrality in the education (schooling) process and not necessarily be identified as a 'silver bullet' for culturally diverse group achievement, but rather a general humanising approach to education. The centrality of this pedagogical approach, according to Ladson-Billings (1995b:160), is premised on three criteria: (1) learners must experience academic success and achievement; (2) learners must develop or maintain cultural competence; and (3) learners must develop a critical consciousness through which they are empowered to challenge assumptions and dominant forms of practice.

The third criteria (Ladson-Billings, 1995b) is of considerable interest as the first two seem to be encapsulated and emphasised in New Zealand's identification of cultural competencies entitled *Tātaiako* (Education Council of New Zealand, 2011). However, the notion of 'criticality' is largely absent in *Tātaiako* and is worthy of further comment here. The term 'criticality' in this article refers to pedagogical practices that emanate from critical theory where dominant ways of knowing, doing and thinking are challenged. They are challenged by questioning dominant assumptions around power relations and social injustices by examining socio-cultural-political relations from a pedagogical framework that endeavours to expose the relationship between power and knowledge and ways of being.

It is about identifying inequalities and empowering individuals and groups to be empowered to take social action in order to achieve more equitable and just behaviours to enhance the qualities of experience (Apple, 2003; McLaren, 2003). The justification, for the importance of criticality in the provision of being culturally responsive in education, is that students must develop, beyond individual achievement and success, to engage the world in a socially conscious

manner. This allows them to critique socio-cultural norms and practices that have created, maintained and reinforced the original inequality. This is, it is argued, where ‘critical citizenship’ is fostered. It is fostered for socio-cultural betterment and aligns with Olympism’s contribution to achieving a ‘flourishing life’.

OLYMPISM, CRITICALITY AND CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE PEDAGOGIES

The clear link between the philosophy of Olympism and the purposes of culturally responsive pedagogies is that both endeavour to assist individuals and collectives to lead more ‘flourishing lives’. Olympism, through its founder, de Coubertin, is thought to have universalising tendencies and through the work of Da Costa (2006) and Parry (2006) the differentiating between the concept of Olympism (the thin veneer of the concept) and its conception (contextual cultural expressions of the concept) that the universalising and contextualisation of Olympism can be brought to a reality. By utilising this concept/conception idea a rich tapestry of cultural diversity and acceptance can be encouraged and obtained.

Similarly the required components for culturally responsive pedagogies are specifically formulated to capture the richness of diverse cultural identities and customs in order to locate and contextualise learning so as to enrich and maximise indigenous people’s cultural competencies, understanding and academic achievement. By its definition of blending sport, culture and education, and utilising the concept/conception arrangement, the concept of Olympism immediately opens itself for diverse cultural interpretations. In New Zealand for instance, the philosophical point of Olympism focusing on the balanced development of mind body and character can be seen to be very relevant to its indigenous people. Indeed, more so, with the deeper and arguably more sophisticated understanding of the spiritual nature of well-being (*Hauora*), the importance of the land (*whenua*) and how physical activity, games and sport to the Māori were more connected to the regeneration of genealogy (*whakapapa*), cultural practices (*tikanga*), spirituality (*wairua*) and a life force (*mauri*) than simply a physical exertive undertaking. Analogously, Olympism’s focus on ‘the joy in effort’ corresponds to the identification in culturally responsive pedagogies to the emphasis on achievement and accountability.

In New Zealand these have been identified as pedagogical responsive practices that encourage Māori, with their teachers, to establish co-constructed learning goals to benefit achievement (*Wānanga*) and being responsible and accountable for their own learning in and beyond the school setting (*Ako*). Furthermore, Olympism’s focus on the importance of role modelling as an educational tool is deeply imbedded in relations with family and community (*whanungatanga*), where ‘elders’ play a critically important role in the education of the young. In particular, these people act as role models in the passing down of *ngā taonga tuko iho* (tribal treasures). The importance of role modelling to Māori is also evident in the concept of *Tangata Whenuatanga*, where cultural identities are learnt and reinforced through family and immediate connections within their communities. Clearly, the link between learning Olympism’s ‘universal values’ are self-evident with tolerance (*manaakitanga*), friendships and connections (*Whānaukatanga*), non-discrimination and respect for others (*Wānanga*). However, the self-evidence needs also to acknowledge the enriched cultural interpretations and customary

practices (*tikanga*) as to how Māori make sense and understanding of the Olympism concept. This enrichment is prominent in the cultural competencies identified by *Tātaiako* (Education Council of New Zealand, 2011).

The above links align with the work of Ladson-Billings (1995b) where she identified the first two requirements for culturally responsive pedagogies – those of academic success and achievement and the development of cultural competence. However, it is to the third requirement that I now wish to turn to, namely that of developing a critical consciousness with diverse learners in a PE/Olympism context. Here, arguably, the Education Council of New Zealand *Tātaiako*'s framework may need strengthening and certainly the philosophy of Olympism (the concept) has come under heavy scholarly attack for its lack of criticality (Bale & Christensen, 2004; Lenskyj, 2012; Kohe, 2014). Lenskyj (2012) for instance questions why scholars of Olympism are not more critical of the Olympic project. She suggests that 'Olympism' academics conveniently ignore criticality when it comes to matters focused on the Olympic project'. Kohe (2014) notes that fostering critique within Olympic education resources is rather spasmodic and not sustained. However, he does acknowledge that in more recent times there have been calls by Culpan and Wigmore (2010), Barker *et al.* (2012) and Teetzel (2012) to have greater critical rigour in Olympic education.

New Zealand, for example, has emergent examples of embedding criticality in both Olympism and PE. Their national PE curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1999 & 2007) has a strong socio-critical intent (Burrows, 2004; Gillespie & McBain, 2011). Olympism education in New Zealand also has this socio-critical determination (Culpan & McBain, 2012). In this resolve, there is an emphasis on values exploration through participation in a range of movement contexts, which are aligned to the attitudes and values of the curriculum. Coupled with the social justice focus, there is a fostering of a criticality that aligns itself with a 'critical' Olympism and 'critical' constructivist pedagogy (Culpan & McBain, 2012).

To bring the curriculum's socio-critical intent to a reality and bridging the theory-practice chasm, the work of Gillespie and McBain (2011) is useful. These two scholars have developed a framework which provides physical educators with a demonstrable instrument to utilise when introducing students to critical perspectives connecting to issues of social injustice, inequalities and abuses of power, which are often manifested within PE, sport and Olympic matters and practices. The framework principally attends to the development of criticality, with pedagogical encounters that challenge students to contemplate the taking of social action in order to address identified injustices, inequalities and abuses of power (Gillespie & McBain, 2011). The carefully developed sequential steps within the framework begins with the introduction of an encounter or predicament or unjust incidence within the movement culture. Students are encouraged through sequentially constructed questions, to identify and challenge dominant discourses, taken for granted assumptions, incidences of discrimination and unjust practices. The process concludes with students creating an action plan that aims to specifically change the identified practice.

While this is in its infancy, Gillespie and McBain (2011) do report on teachers and students commenting favourably on the usefulness of developing a 'critical capability'. What Gillespie

and McBain (2011) have attempted to do is develop a level of critical competence that is commensurate with the intent of the national PE curriculum. In addition to this, it is argued here that what is most applicable about this is its usefulness in addressing not only a 'critical Olympism' as well, but is also useful in concentrating on the call of Ladson-Billings (1995b) for a critical conscious component to be employed in the development of culturally responsive pedagogies. Whilst the framework of Gillespie and McBain (2011) has been developed for PE, it is sufficiently generic to be utilised in other subject disciplines. In the context of this article and at this juncture, we have the possibility of criticality, Olympism, PE and culturally responsive pedagogies converging. Bringing these attentions together in a simultaneous educative endeavour may provide a pathway in which both PE and Olympism can better connect to, and celebrate, diversity while at the same time committing to contextualised educative and socio-cultural purposes.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This article has briefly reinforced the suggestion that the philosophy of Olympism is applicable to the PE context. It has highlighted some pedagogical suggestions for Olympism education within a PE context and argued that the teaching of Olympism, to be successfully utilised in PE and made germane to learners, must incorporate culturally relevant and responsive pedagogies. Relating to this argument, the article explored what culturally relevant and responsive pedagogies meant for Olympism education within a PE context by drawing on culturally responsive pedagogies applicable for bi-cultural schooling in Aotearoa New Zealand.

In developing this argument, examples of how the concept of Olympism can be contextualised (conception) could be presented. Drawing on the work of Ladson-Billings (1995b), three important criteria were identified as foundational to establishing cultural responsiveness. These were: (1) learners must experience academic success and achievement; (2) learners must develop or maintain cultural competence; and (3) learners must develop a critical consciousness through which they are empowered to challenge assumptions and dominant forms of practice (Ladson-Billing, 1995b:160).

While clear links between these cultural responsive criteria were made with Olympism, it was the third criteria that was identified as needing strengthening in the New Zealand cultural competencies of *Tātaiako* (Ministry of Education, 2011). Suggestions were presented as to how the critical process could be incorporated into Olympism teaching by making use of the critical analysis framework of Gillespie and McBain (2011). These suggestions are entirely consistent with the New Zealand PE curriculum and highlight how criticality, Olympism, PE and culturally responsive pedagogies converge. This convergence, all in the quest for social betterment and the obtaining of a flourishing life for all, is an emerging journey in New Zealand and arguably could be applied, with adjustments, to other cultural contexts. This application could be a way forward for capturing the educative and social worthiness and potential of both Olympism and PE in future developments.

REFERENCES

- APPLE, M. (2003). Creating difference: Neo-liberalism, neo-conservatism and the politics of educational reform. In J. Freeman-Moir & A. Scott (Eds.), *Yesterday's dreams* (pp.180-213). Christchurch, NZ: Canterbury University Press.
- ARNOLD, P. (1979). *Meaning in movement, sport and physical education*. London, UK: Heinemann.
- ARNOLD, P. (1996). Olympism, sport and education. *Quest*, 48(1): 93-101.
- BALE, J. & CHRISTENSEN, M. (2004). *Post-Olympism? Questioning sport in the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: Berg Publishers.
- BARKER, D.; BARKER-RUCHHTI, N.; RYNNE, S. & LEE, J. (2012). Olympism as education: Analysing the learning experiences of elite athletes. *Educational Review*, 64(3): 369-384.
- BENNETT, B. & CULPAN, I. (2014). The coach as educator: Content and pedagogical frameworks. *Journal of Physical Education and Health: Social perspective*, 3(5): 5-18.
- BINDER, D. (2005). *Teaching Olympism in schools: Olympic education as a focus on values education*. Barcelona, Spain: Centre d'Estudis (UAB).
- BINDER, D. (2012). Olympic values education: Evolution of a pedagogy. *Educational Review*, 64(3): 276-302.
- BISHOP, R.; BERRYMAN, M.; CAVANAGH, T. & TEDDY, L. (2007). *Te Kotahitanga Phase 3 Whānauangata: Establishing a culturally responsive pedagogy of relations in mainstream secondary school classrooms*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- BURROWS, L. (2004). Understanding and investigating cultural perspectives in physical education. In J. Wright; MacDonald, D. & L. Burrows (Eds.), *Critical inquiry and problem solving in physical education* (pp.105-119). London, UK: Routledge.
- COAKLEY, J. (2003). *Sports in society: Issues and controversies* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- CULPAN, I. (2011). Olympism education within physical education: Contributing to legitimacy. In S. Brown (Ed.), *Issues and controversies in physical education* (pp.35-45). Mairangi Bay, Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson.
- CULPAN, I. & MEIER, C. (2016). Sport and the political economy: Considerations for enhancing the human condition. *Athens Journal of Sports*, 3(2): 143-154.
- CULPAN, I. & BRUCE, J. (2007). New Zealand physical education and critical pedagogy: Refocusing the curriculum. *International Journal of Sport and Health Science*, 5(November): 1-11.
- CULPAN, I.; BRUCE, J. & GALVAN, H. (2008). Toward a bicultural view of Olympism within New Zealand physical education: An emerging journey. In H. Ren, L. DaCosta, A. Miragaya, & N. Jing, (Eds.), *Olympic studies reader: A multidisciplinary and multicultural research guide. Vol 1: Olympic studies. Selected works* (pp. 129-146). Beijing, China: Beijing Sport University Press.
- CULPAN, I. & MCBAIN, S. (2012). Constructivist pedagogies for Olympism education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education*, 3(2): 95-108.
- CULPAN, I. & MOON, C. (2009). Unpublished work. New Zealand Olympic Studies Centre, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand.
- CULPAN, I. & WIGMORE, S. (2010). The delivery of Olympism education within a physical education context drawing on critical pedagogy. *International Journal of Sport and Health Science*, 8(October): 67-76.
- DA COSTA, L. (2006). A never ending story: The philosophical controversy over Olympism. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 33(2): 157-173.

- EARL, L.; TIMPERLEY, H. & STEWART, G. (2008). "Learning from QTR&D Programme: Findings of the External Evaluation". Wellington: Ministry of Education. Hyperlink: [<http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/schooling/49172>]. Retrieved on 16 December 2016.
- EDUCATION COUNCIL OF NEW ZEALAND. (2011). *Cultural competencies for teachers of Māori learners: Tātaiako*. Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Education.
- GAY, G. (2013). Teaching to and through cultural diversity. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 43(1): 48-70.
- GILLESPIE, L. & MCBAIN, S. (2011). A critical analysis process: Bridging the theory to practice gap in senior secondary school physical education. *Teachers and Curriculum*, 12(1): 65-72.
- HOKOWHITU, B. (2004). Challenges to state education: Tikanga Māori physical education curricula, historical deconstruction, inclusivism and decolonisation. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 10(1): 71-84.
- IOC (International Olympic Committee) (2015). "Olympic Charter". Lausanne. Hyperlink: [http://www./document/olympic-charter_en.pdf]. Retrieved on 3 December 2016.
- KIDD, B. (1996). Taking the rhetoric seriously: Proposals for Olympic education. *Quest*, 48(1): 82-92.
- KIRK, D. (2010). *Physical education futures*. London, UK: Routledge.
- KOHE, G. (2014). Stimulating a sociological imagination in Olympic learning legacies: A Critique of a London 2012 initiative. In D. Chatziefstathiou & N. Müller (Eds.), *Olympism, Olympic education and learning legacies* (pp. 87-99). Newcastle on Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- LENSKYJ, H. (2012). Olympic education and Olympism: Still colonizing children's minds. *Educational Review*, 64(3): 265-274.
- LADSON-BILLINGS, G. (1995a). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 35(3): 465-491.
- LADSON-BILLINGS, G. (1995b). Buts that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into Practice*, 34(3): 159-165.
- MCLAREN, P. (2003). Critical pedagogy: A look at the major concepts. In A. Darder, M. Baltodano & R.D. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (pp. 69-97). New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.
- MARTINKOVA, I. (2012). Teaching values in movement activities: Inherent and added values. *ACTA Universitatis Carolinae Kinanthropologica*, 48(2): 111-119.
- MILLER, T. (2009). Michel Foucault and the critique of sport. In B. Carrington & I. MacDonald (Eds.), *Marxism, cultural studies and sport* (pp. 181-194). New York, NY: Routledge.
- MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (1999). *Health and physical education in the New Zealand curriculum*. Wellington, NZ: Learning Media.
- MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (2007). *The New Zealand curriculum*. Wellington, NZ: Learning Media.
- MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (2009). *Ka Hikitia-Managing for success: The Māori educational strategy 2008-2012*. Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Education.
- MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (2011). *Tātaiako: Cultural competencies for teachers of Maori learners*. Wellington, NZ: New Zealand Teachers Council.
- MÜLLER, N. (2000). *Olympism: Selected writings*. Lausanne, Switzerland: International Olympic Committee.
- NAUL, R. (2008). *Olympic education*: Oxford, UK: Meyer & Meyer Sport Ltd.
- PARRY, J. (2006). Sport and Olympism: Universals and multiculturalism. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 33(2): 188-204.
- PARRY, J. (2007). The religio-athletae, Olympism and peace. In J. Parry, S. Robinson, N. Watson & M. Nesti (Eds.), *Sport and spirituality: An introduction* (pp. 201-214). London, UK: Routledge.

- SALTER, G. (2000). Culturally responsive pedagogy and the renaissance of a Māori dimension in physical education: Te reo kori as a cultural taonga. *Journal of Physical Education New Zealand (Special millennium issue: A tribute to teachers)*, 33(2): 42-63.
- TAMIR, Y. (1995). Two concepts of multiculturalism. *Journal of the Philosophy of Education*. 29(2): 181-190.
- TEETZEL, S. (2012). Optimizing Olympic education: A comprehensive approach to understanding and teaching the philosophy of Olympism. *Educational Review*, 64(3): 317-332.
- TINNING, R. (2010). *Pedagogy and human movement: Theory, practice, research*. London, UK: Routledge.
- UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation) (2013). *Berlin declaration. 5th International Conference of Ministers and Senior Government Officials Responsible for physical education and Sport (MINEPS V)*. Berlin: 28-30 May, 2013. Berlin, Germany: UNESCO.

Corresponding author: Ian Culpan; E-mail: Ian.culpan@canterbury.ac.nz