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Physical education lacks a set of superordinate research questions to guide our crossdiscipline, and it also lacks an overarching mission and set of goals to guide our profession. It is contended here that clarifying the possibilities and limitations that exist in our society for provision of services by experts in exercise and sports could help us to clarify the mission and goals of our profession, and this in turn could facilitate the development of a set of vital, superordinate scholarly questions around which our crossdiscipline could coalesce. This enterprise requires scholarly investigation of sports and exercise in relation to the social contexts in which they are most frequently embedded—health, leisure, and education. Sociocultural inquiry is ideally suited to examine such phenomena, and therefore it is contended that sociocultural scholars are of crucial importance to the future of our field.

As I reflect on the efforts of physical educators during the last 25 years to define the nature of our field, it is clear that we have not found our way to the cohesive crossdiscipline envisioned by Franklin Henry (1964, 1978), nor have we become a full-fledged profession. Lawson and his colleagues have written extensively about the need to integrate the crossdisciplinary and professional aspects of our field, advocating such an approach to curriculum planning at both undergraduate and graduate levels (Ingham & Lawson, 1986; Lawson, 1976, 1979, 1980, 1984; Lawson & Ingham, 1985; Lawson & Morford, 1979). In spite of widespread knowledge of both Henry’s crossdiscipline model and the Lawson group’s later addition of a professional focus to it, the dual goal of profession and discipline has remained elusive for us.

We have created some fairly clever rhetoric that in many cases has convinced campus officials, and perhaps even ourselves, that our field has value in the academy. The argument usually entails describing ourselves as a cohesive crossdiscipline focused on the study of exercise and sports (or perhaps, more broadly, human movement). In academic settings wherein a practical identification is palatable, the rhetoric would probably also include an outline of the profes-

About the Author: Janet C. Harris is with the Department of Physical Education, University of North Carolina, Greensboro, NC 27412.

This paper was presented at the NASPE Symposium titled “Science, Inquiry and Progress: The Future of Physical Education” at the AAHPERD National Convention in Las Vegas, April 1987.
sional nature of our crossdiscipline. Beneath the verbal veneer, however, we are still at best a collection of scholars with considerable potential to break apart and take up residence in the department that houses the "parent discipline" of our own specialization (e.g., physiology, sociology, psychology, education).

We lack a well-developed discipline, a collectively embraced body of knowledge and a set of methodologies for seeking new knowledge that coalesce around important, vital questions and goals (Nixon, 1967). Furthermore, we have not acquired the characteristics of a well developed profession. These include a body of knowledge and skills that society considers to be useful, rigorous control of the quality of people seeking entry to our field, and a means of assurance that our body of knowledge and skills will be used in socially responsible ways (Parsons, 1968).

How might we move our field toward a more desirable state of affairs, and what role does sociocultural inquiry in physical education have in all of this? It is my belief that clarifying the possibilities and limitations that exist in our society for experts to provide services in exercise and sports could help us clarify the mission and goals of our profession. This in turn could facilitate the development of a set of vital, superordinate scholarly questions around which our crossdiscipline could coalesce. These overarching professional goals and scholarly questions would, of course, be partially shaped by proactive initiatives of physical education professionals and scholars. They would not be unilaterally shaped by society. Nevertheless, if one takes the increasingly common theoretical position that all of social life is constructed through interactive negotiation processes, even such assertive actions by physical educators would be partially shaped by the larger society.

Sociocultural inquiry (used here as an umbrella term to refer to work in numerous social science and humanities disciplines) is ideally suited for examining the limitations and possibilities in our society for provision of services by experts in exercise and sports. Therefore, it is my position that sociocultural scholars are of crucial importance to the future of our field. What follows is an elaboration of these ideas.

**Importance of Profession as a Central Focus**

For a number of years I have supported rather wholeheartedly the efforts of scholars in our field to realize the crossdisciplinary model suggested by Henry (1964, 1978). I now believe that the best possibility for developing a cohesive sense of the knowledge that falls, or ought to fall, within our developing crossdiscipline lies in attending more to the interrelationships between the services we provide (or would like to provide) to our society and the social contexts in which those services are provided. In other words, greater attention must be given to societal possibilities and limitations for physical educators. It should be underscored that I am not suggesting that the production of new knowledge by researchers across the breadth of our field has little to do with the shaping of our crossdiscipline. To make such a suggestion would be sheer folly. However, it is my contention that a sense of overall cohesiveness, purpose, and direction for the crossdiscipline is currently still missing, that it is crucial for the future of physical education to develop this sense of direction, and that a very important
avenue for facilitating this lies in giving increased scholarly attention to the development of our profession.

Lawson and his colleagues have published the most well-developed suggestions for defining our field with a central professional focus (Ingham & Lawson, 1986; Lawson, 1976, 1979, 1980, 1984; Lawson & Ingham, 1985; Lawson & Morford, 1979). Unlike Broekhoff (1977, 1979, 1982), who has encouraged us to center on the preparation of physical education teachers, the Lawson group views the profession of physical education much more broadly. They include a host of careers in their model such as exercise rehabilitation, teaching, coaching, research, athletic medicine, sport journalism, sport management, and exercise and sport equipment design. Also unlike Broekhoff, who suggests that the discipline of physical education should consist mainly of applied, integrated knowledge related in very direct ways to the teaching of motor performance skills, the Lawson group considers it important to include within our body of knowledge more abstract, Henry-style crossdisciplinary knowledge as well as information about the means by which this knowledge can most effectively be utilized by practitioners to serve society.

Another major contribution of the Lawson group is their recognition of the importance of the social settings or contexts in which sports and exercise take place. This is most centrally addressed in Lawson's (1984) essay on problem-setting for physical education, but earlier comments also reflect a concern with context (Lawson, 1976, 1979), and the theme continues in later essays on the curriculum at Miami University (Ingham & Lawson, 1986; Lawson & Ingham, 1985). Lawson describes problem-setting as a process that grows out of relationships between a profession and the social settings in which professional activities take place.

These relationships include specific interactions between professionals and their clients, and more general interactions between a profession and society at large. Such interactions spark discourse among members of a profession about the major societal problems and concerns that can and should be addressed. Problem-setting is viewed as a continuous activity that slowly results in modifying and clarifying a profession's mission and goals. Lawson calls for an examination of the problem-setting process in our field, providing the following rationale for the importance of this task:

Professionals cannot escape the necessity of exploring how problems have been set, why, and by whom. The task is not just to examine current missions or goals. It is necessary to review why other alternatives have been eliminated because problem-setting is a form of social editing. Only when this is accomplished can professionals answer an important question. Are the problems we have set important, appropriate, complete, correct, and correctly stated? (1984, p. 51)

Identification of the vital, important, and broad problems and concerns in society that should play a part in shaping the emerging profession of physical education has yet to occur. We seem to sense that our central foci are sports and exercise, but if I asked 10 people what the major goals of physical education are,
I would probably get 10 different and rather narrow answers. This lack of a collective sense of direction hampers the development of our profession, and also the coalescence of our crossdiscipline. Many of us have had great success with the design and pursuit of our own programs of research. We have failed, however, to look beyond the next logical step in our own work to wonder about defining overarching, guiding questions and problems that are needed to give our developing crossdiscipline a sense of direction. And because this has not been accomplished, it has been impossible to ask how our own programs of inquiry are situated in relation to any central questions and problems of our field.

It is my contention that this broader look requires knowledge of the relationships between (a) sports and exercise (the phenomena of central importance to us) and (b) the social contexts in which these activities take place. It involves examining not only sports and exercise that fall within the spheres of influence of physical educators, but also sports and exercise that go on in society beyond our influence. Such work should give us broader understanding of the limitations and possibilities in our society for providing expert services centered on sports and exercise, which in turn should lead us to develop and clarify our ideas about the mission and goals of our profession, which in turn should lead to a more unified discipline coalesced around vital, superordinate, guiding scholarly questions.

The importance of examining sociocultural phenomena in relation to a larger context has been growing in the social sciences and humanities over the last 15 years. Influenced by work in literary criticism, linguistics, and symbolic anthropology, social scientists and scholars in the humanities are increasingly employing analyses emphasizing contextualization in an effort to understand the meanings that sociocultural phenomena have for the people involved. The emphasis is on relationships between a larger context and the phenomena of central interest. In our case, to reiterate, the sociocultural phenomena of central concern are exercise and sports, and these can be examined in relation to broader social contexts, particularly those in which health, leisure, and/or education are important.

There are almost limitless levels of contextual analysis, ranging from very broad to quite narrow. Examples from research on sports and play include inquiry into the meaning of the Olympic Games within the context of the International Olympic Committee ideology and the realities of international life (MacAlloon, 1984), consideration of the meaning of Balinese cockfights within the context of the relatively inflexible Balinese social structure (Geertz, 1972), and examination of the meaning of children’s free play at an urban day care center within the context of their formal lessons there (Schwartzman, 1978, pp. 232-245).

The nature of professions in general and their interrelationships with the broader context of our society has been undergoing reexamination in the last 15 years. Geison (1983) provides an overview of these changes. In the late 1960s, he contends, there was considerable agreement among scholars that professions generally provided beneficial services, that professionalization was almost inevitable in societies that are dependent on highly technical knowledge and skills, and that professionals were harmonious and united by virtue of similarities in their professional preparation (pp. 4-5). All of this was thrown into question beginning in the 1970s:
Examples of demonstrable corruption or ineptitude on the part of some certified professionals have become more widely publicized. There has been a growing outcry against the alleged "tyranny of the experts."... closer attention to the actual behavior and structure of professional groups has revealed the extent to which superficial similarities and harmonies can conceal important differences and conflicts underneath. What once looked like relatively passive, static, and homogeneous "communities of the competent" are increasingly perceived as segmented, hierarchical populations in flux and struggle. (Geison, 1983, pp. 4-5)

He goes on to point out that both of these theoretical models are probably somewhat in error. Professionals are not completely serene, benign servants of society, nor are they completely inept, power-hungry insighters:

Whether... [the theorists] conceive of professionalization as the emergence of benign, apolitical, "non-economic," and homogeneous "communities of the competent," or whether they see it as a conspiratorial, stratifying, and exploitative process in tune with the needs of capitalism, the existing models are simply unable to account for the richly diverse forms and distribution of professional groups. (p. 6)

Geison (1983, pp. 7-8) continues with the observation that scholars of professions and professionalization must pay close attention to the rhetoric of professional ideologies and the relationships of these to a broader context encompassing the ways in which social elites conceive of their world.

In an essay on the professionalization of public lecturing in mid-19th-century America, Scott (1983) also utilizes an interactive model:

It is more useful to approach "profession" as a changing social and cultural construct, encompassing different meanings of the idea of profession and different institutional arrangements at different times. ... Professionalization can be usefully construed, moreover, not only as something people do to gain power and status but as a process that implicates the broader society. Profession, in this sense, is not only an identity that might be claimed or sought but also a cultural designation that is conferred. Whatever the legitimacy of a professional claim or the motives behind it, both the claim itself and the public acceptance of it—bestowal of professional identity and standing—stem from the configuration of meanings that at any given time are associated with the idea of a profession. In this sense, professionalization can be construed not simply as an institutional but a cultural process as well: an activity, body of knowledge, or occupation can be seen as becoming a profession not only when it assumes a discernible institutional shape but also when it is granted public recognition and acceptance as a profession. (p. 14)

Geison (1983), Scott (1983), and Lawson (1984) would agree on the importance of studying a profession within some larger sociocultural context in order to broaden scholarly understanding of the meaning of the profession to the people involved. A concomitant of such study is the opportunity to clarify the profes-
tion’s mission and goals, and this in turn is crucial in the development of a set of superordinate, scholarly questions that guide the discipline underlying the profession.

It should be noted here that formal study of professions in relation to larger social contexts is not unusual. Confirmation of this can be obtained by glancing through the course offerings of most professional schools at major universities throughout the nation (cf. Harvard Medical School, 1986; The Johns Hopkins, 1985; Stanford University Bulletin, 1986; University of California, 1985).

Enhancement and Display
Through Exercise and Sports

People who use knowledge from physical education in their careers are most centrally concerned with facilitating or bringing about enhancement and display of human beings through exercise and sports. Direct enhancement of performance in these motor activities is often sought. On the other hand, people may seek to bring about other kinds of improvements entirely, such as enhancement of health, beauty, morality, character, fun, neurological functioning, competitiveness, teamwork, social status, group cohesiveness, and so forth. I am not concerned here with whether or not the efficacy of exercise and sports for bringing about all of these changes has been documented. I wish only to provide examples of the kinds of improvements that have been sought at one time or another through participation in these two sets of movement activities.

Display of human beings through exercise and sports may occur before a large audience, or in relative privacy with only an opponent or a few friends present. Although the variety of ideas that can be expressed through performance of exercise and sports is probably limited, these activities seem to be vehicles for communication of quite a wide range of concepts. Direct display of excellence in motor performance certainly takes place, and in many cases performances are interpreted straightforwardly in these terms. However, when sports and exercise are thought to lead to enhancement of other qualities as well, displaying excellence in motor performance may carry connotations of excellence in these other areas too. A winning athlete may be lauded for fine character, good health, hard work, or any other quality thought to be associated with or developed through participation in the activity.

Finally, display through exercise and sports may involve exhibition of ideas or qualities not necessarily thought to be developed through participation in the motor activities themselves, but which are nevertheless called to mind through watching or performing them. Negative evaluation of the rigidness of Balinese social structure is connoted by displaying the social structure in juxtaposition with the bloody business of cockfighting (Geertz, 1972). Rodeo in North America displays an interesting tension in the West that has to do with becoming wilder and less civilized during the process of taming the wild (Lawrence, 1982). In spite of the traditional International Olympic Committee ideology favoring the minimization of international conflict, the Olympic Games have been one of the best arenas in the world for overt display of tensions between nations (MacAlloon, 1984). These are but a few examples of the growing list of documented display functions of large-scale spectator sports performances.
Once again, it is important to remember that enhancement and display of human beings through exercise and sports do not take place in a vacuum. They occur in social settings, and most frequently these contexts involve health, leisure, and/or education. Some of the best examples of sociocultural studies in which sports and exercise are contextually analyzed come from sport history. Three examples will be briefly noted.

The title of Stephen Hardy’s monograph, *How Boston Played: Sport, Recreation, and Community, 1865–1915*, succinctly describes the thrust of his research. The book deals with sports in Boston during this period, but places them in the broader context of concerns among the people of Boston for leisure activities. They engaged in considerable debate about establishing parks and playgrounds as well as exercise and sports programs in schools. There was also growing interest in social clubs centered on sports, in communal physical pursuits centered on the easy availability of the bicycle, and in hero worship of prominent athletes. Hardy sets his examination of these things in the still broader contexts of (a) the growing diversity of ethnic groups, social classes, and neighborhoods in Boston at the time; and (b) the ways in which civic questions about opportunity for leisure activities influenced and were influenced by more general quests for community, escape, and urban reform in the growing city. In a later paper dealing more broadly with the playground movement in the late 19th century, Hardy and Ingham (1984) remind us of the importance of the negotiations and struggles that occurred between various local, social factions that all had a hand in shaping this important leisure phenomenon.

Roberta Park’s (1985, 1986, 1987a, 1987b) recent research on exercise and sports in the United States in the 19th century emphasizes the thinking of the period concerning human biology, health, and morality. Victorian views included notions that the brain and mind could be enhanced by bodily exercise; that the mind was the wellspring of willed, intentional action; and that strength of willed, intentional action underlay strong character and high morality. With this view, it was easy to connect participation in exercise and athletics with development of mind, will, character, and morality. By the end of the 19th century, Park (1987a) claims, one of the things the athletic male body had come to symbolize was unification of individual human beings and society:

*The athlete’s body... united all that modern biology had separated into systems, tissues, cells, and the like. His achievements—over himself and over an opponent—were demonstrable proof that man was not unduly fragile and that the social order would not necessarily come apart.* (pp. 29-30)

Finally, James Mangan examines the growth of British team sports in the 19th century in his monograph, *Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public School*. The contexts he utilizes include major issues and concerns in the larger British society during the period, as well as the public schools themselves. He concludes that the major education-related influences on the development of athleticism in the British public schools were (a) headmasters’ needs to find a means of disciplining their unruly students, (b) the Victorian ideology linking athletic participation with character development and high morality, and (c) a copycat mentality at some institutions where there was neither a strong discipline
problem nor a strong attachment to the Victorian ideology of morality and character development.

This tradition was strengthened and perpetuated by (a) wealthy alumni who donated money to build extensive and lavish playing fields as monuments to athleticism and to their own wealth, (b) a strain of anti-intellectualism in which athletically inclined masters and students were often more highly revered than their intellectually inclined peers, and (c) numerous symbolic acts, objects, and rhetoric that came to be traditional in conjunction with the athletic contests. Important factors in the society at large that influenced the development of athleticism in the public schools included (a) parental belief in the Victorian ideology of morality and character development, and (b) admiration of the British public schools by well-known people from abroad.

Hardy (1982) focuses on a leisure context, Park (1985, 1986, 1987a, 1987b) concentrates on a context of ideas about human biology and health, and Mangan (1981) stresses an educational context. At the same time it must be noted that none of these investigators gives sole attention to only one of these three. It is clear, for example, that the urban reform discussed by Hardy is closely connected with health reforms in the late 19th century, and Hardy also devotes an entire chapter to sports and exercise programs in the schools. Likewise, Park devotes more than passing attention to sports in educational contexts. Nor can Mangan's discussion of Victorian ideology tying athletic participation to character development avoid occasional references to leisure and health.

It is important to begin with the phenomena of central interest, exercise and sports, and then during the research process make decisions about the most salient contexts in which they are situated. Furthermore, in appropriate circumstances work should extend beyond health, leisure, and education to other societal domains that have influence in shaping these contexts and/or in shaping exercise and sports more directly. In some investigations, for example, it may be appropriate to focus on entrepreneurial contexts. It is my contention, however, that business activities that influence or are influenced by exercise and sports are most often themselves embedded within educational, leisure, and health contexts. For example, entrepreneurial fitness enterprises often advertise their services' contributions to all three of these domains.

When societal contexts surrounding sports and exercise are elaborated, it becomes feasible to ask questions about the limitations and possibilities in these social milieus for provision of sports and exercise services by specially prepared professionals. Of the three scholars discussed here, Park (1985) has focused most directly on this concern. She examines incipient professionalization in physical education in the 19th century against a social backdrop of (a) widespread moves to professionalize many areas of endeavor during the period, and (b) the ideological climate mentioned previously.

Contributions of Sociocultural Studies in Physical Education to the Crossdiscipline and Profession

By focusing on the professional activities of physical educators (including the contexts in which these take place), it is my contention that we will help to define more clearly both the profession and the crossdiscipline. We will learn
more about the possibilities and limitations for physical educators to provide exercise and sport services in society, and this will help us ask vital, important questions that can serve as overarching guides for the development of the crossdiscipline. It has already been pointed out that sociocultural studies in physical education are central to this whole endeavor.

Fleshing out the entire range of research questions that need to be addressed, if we are to examine the professional possibilities and limitations of our field, is beyond the scope of this discussion. However, a few examples should help to clarify the contributions that could be made by such inquiry. These are stated below in the present tense and thus obviously refer to contemporary social life, but it should be clear from the preceding discussion that historical studies are also crucial to the enterprise, and thus readers should rephrase each question for themselves in the past tense as well:

1. **What are the prevalent conceptions of sports and exercise in our society, or in some part of our society?**

   What sports and exercises are valued most highly? What others exist more peripherally, and who engages in them? How is this current arrangement maintained and/or altered, and how did it come to be, historically? Are there a number of different prevalent conceptions of sports and exercise, and whose conceptions are most influential in shaping or constructing these activities? To what extent, and in what ways, are physical educators and people in related professions influential in shaping or constructing these activities? What broader societal factors, especially with regard to health, leisure, and education, influence the shaping of our conceptualizations?

2. **What are the underlying rationales for participation in sports and exercise in our society, or in some part of our society?**

   What is the most prevalent rationale? What are additional rationales, and who holds them? How is this current arrangement maintained and/or altered, and how did it come to be, historically? Are there a number of different prevalent rationales, and whose ideas are most influential in constructing and shaping whatever rationales prevail? To what extent and in what ways are physical educators and people in related professions influential in shaping these rationales? What broader societal factors, especially with regard to health, leisure, and education, influence the shaping of our rationales?

3. **To what extent, and in what ways, are people with educational backgrounds in physical education providing services related to sports and exercise to members of our society?**

   (a) To what extent and in what ways do members of our society, or parts of our society, recognize physical educators as the best experts in sports and exercise and utilize their services? To what extent and in what ways do members of our society, or parts of our society, engage in sports and exercise primarily outside the sphere of influence of physical educators? How are these current arrangements maintained and/or altered, and how did they come to be, historically? What individuals and groups of people are most influential in the shaping of societal conceptions of physical educators, and physical educators’ conceptions of themselves? What influence do broader societal factors, especially as related to health, leisure, and education, have in shaping the conceptions of physical educators?
(b) How far-reaching *should* the sphere of influence of physical educators be? Considering especially health, leisure, and educational contexts, should some exercise and sports activities remain outside the sphere of influence of physical educators? How should the influence vary from one setting to another, or from one group of people to another?

It seems that questions such as those posed above are best answered by relatively holistic examinations of social life in particular geographic or sociocultural regions during particular periods of time. Obviously, scholars in physical education with backgrounds in areas other than sociocultural studies can provide some of the answers. Reflections of everyone in our field about our own day-to-day involvements with people in health, education, and leisure contexts can help us develop a broader understanding of the professional limitations and possibilities that exist for us. However, most are so busy with their own specialized work that they have little time or inclination to give serious, systematic attention to such concerns. This is not meant as an indictment of my colleagues, but rather as a rationale for the importance of sociocultural specialists in the development of our profession and crossdiscipline.

Because physical educators who graduate from colleges and universities in North America tend to enter careers here, I favor focusing our sociocultural studies on North America. Depending upon scholarly inclinations, central attention might be given to a particular city, geographic region, subculture, socioeconomic class, ethnic group, gender, historical time period, ideology, power relationship, or some combination of these. In each case, the central focus would be on sports and/or exercise in relation to the salient sociocultural contexts in which these are embedded—most likely health, leisure, and/or education. A study of the exercise activities that go on in a single city, for example, would probably involve consideration of all three of these.

In addition, useful material is available from work on exercise and sports in other societies. Although the cultural particulars might be of less concern to North American physical educators, the theoretical insights gained by knowledge of this work would be important and useful in our own studies of North America. Given appropriate levels of breadth and depth, this model focusing on sports and exercise in North American contexts, and also using appropriate theoretical insights from other work, could be employed to describe sociocultural research in physical education as well as the sociocultural curriculum in physical education.

Beyond the crossdiscipline of physical education, it would be important to be knowledgeable about health, leisure, and education in North America. This information would be necessary to enable a sophisticated examination of the relationships between exercise/sports and these three contexts. At the very broadest level, familiarity with concepts and theories in the social sciences and humanities would be indispensable to lending sophistication to the sociocultural enterprise in physical education. It is essential in the social sciences and humanities to gain both broad and deep familiarity with research and theory in these fields. This differs somewhat from scholarship in the natural and behavioral sciences, wherein depth of knowledge in a relatively narrow area is often the ideal.

Sociocultural research is heavily interactive between new data and a broad array of existing scholarly literature. Often one cannot settle on the best conceptual focus for a study until some of the data have been gathered. It is only through extensive and intensive knowledge of the scholarly literature that one is able to
situates the findings in an insightful and conceptually sophisticated manner. There is no one best overall theoretical perspective; in fact, scholars who make long-term commitments to one perspective may fail to focus on certain phenomena that are particularly salient in a social setting, because the theoretical orientation is not sensitive to these phenomena.

Sociocultural studies in physical education can make major contributions to two of three areas of our body of knowledge. The three can be outlined as follows: (a) exercise and sports skills; (b) knowledge that facilitates the enhancement and/or display of human beings through exercise and sports, such as motor learning/control, biomechanics, exercise physiology, motor development, sports and exercise psychology, sociocultural perspectives on sports and exercise, pedagogical techniques specific to sports and exercise, organizational management techniques specific to sports and exercise, and communication processes specific to sports and exercise; and (c) knowledge that facilitates problem-setting for the profession and the establishment of superordinate, guiding questions for the cross-discipline, including knowledge at the cutting edge of the entire research enterprise in our field, and knowledge of relationships between sports and exercise and the social contexts in which they are embedded. Little attention has been devoted here to sociocultural contributions in the second area, but it is clear that understanding relationships between sports/exercise and their social contexts would be useful in facilitating human enhancement and display through these activities.

The main thrust of this discussion has of course been on the third area. Without considerable understanding of the relationships between exercise and sports and the broader social contexts in which these occur, it is difficult to see how our field can chart an overall course for the future. If progress refers to some goal-oriented "movement toward perfection" (Guralnik, 1976, p. 1135), then we are unlikely to make much progress toward a more coalesced cross-discipline or profession unless we have some idea of the nature of the perfection toward which we wish to move. I have argued here that sociocultural studies in physical education provide an important avenue for clarification of this.
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