

Olympism, Constructivism and Foucault's Technologies of Power: Governmentality at Work

Ian Culpan

New Zealand Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Canterbury

ian.culpan@canterbury.ac.nz

Abstract

This article draws on the works of Foucault to analyse how the philosophy of Olympism and the utilisation of constructivist pedagogies creates examples of governmentality and the technology of power (self) in action. The scholarly call for having Olympism education embedded in school physical education highlights how schools can perpetuate the production of docile bodies. The article emphasises how individuals, subscribing to mechanisms of power, which encourage individuals and collectives to lead particular forms of life, are dominated by self-regulation, self-control and self-discipline. The article concludes by arguing the convergence of Olympism and critical constructivism might mitigate against such dominant normalising attempts at governmentality and encourage learners to develop alternative visions in their quest for a flourishing life.

Keywords

Olympism, Foucault, Pedagogy, Constructivism.

Culpan, I. (2017). Olympism, Constructivism and Foucault's Technologies of Power: Governmentality at Work. *Diagoras: International Academic Journal on Olympic Studies*, 1, 75–94. Retrieved from <http://diagorasjournal.com/index.php/diagoras/article/view/7>



Purpose

The purpose of this article is to draw on the works of Foucault to analyse how the philosophy of Olympism combined with suggested constructivist pedagogies provides an example of governmentality and technology of power (self) at work. In particular, the article highlights the centrality of the body and how mechanisms of power, utilised through the teaching of Olympism, serves both institutional and personal interests in regulating, and controlling desired ways of living.

Introduction

The centrality of the body has become important in contemporary education, social relations, communications and the analysis of power (Woodward, 2009). Coupled with this importance is the recognition given to the body's association with human cognition. Indeed, Cheville (2005) argued that "the human body is an object of culture and subject of cognition" (p.86) and, as a consequence, becomes a target of interest in technologies of power associated with discipline and control. Foucault (1977) posited that the body is a malleable object on which society forces, such as discipline, are applied in order to gain control and subjugate it to social order. He argued such forces create docile bodies and are a result of the 'mechanics of power'. Accordingly, a docile body is one that is exposed, made use of, altered, and improved through exercising targeted power (Foucault, 1977). For Foucault, such techniques are not readily seen or identified as they are deeply embedded in institutional practices associated with governments, corporates, community organisations and capitalist ideology. These dominant systems of social control, he termed 'bio-power', and operate on bodies, regulating and controlling them through hegemonic self-disciplinary practices. For Foucault, this bio-power emerged in contemporary Western societies as a result of the decrease in military coercion and the emergence of more subtle mechanisms of power and control through social forces. These forces are generally sponsored by governmental and societal institutions e.g. schools, sporting organisations (bodies), corporations, media and networks of practices that permeate every level of daily life (Pylpa, 1998).

The domination of bio-power can be viewed as a productive force, not necessarily negative or repressive. It is reliant on the individual

acquiring knowledge and a desire to act (Foucault, 1977). The types of knowledge and behaviour, in recent times, have become self-regulating and controlling. As Pylpa (1998) argues, such knowledge and action is inseparable from power and has the effect of normalising behaviour by creating pressure to conform to norms that the power constructs. This pressure (power) is not necessarily coercive but, instead, constructed through desire. These constructions become normalised behaviours, dominant discourses and desired signposts of morality (Pylpa, 1998). Such normalising lead people to self-disciplinary and self-monitoring subjugation. The body is central in this bio-power 'play' and becomes a dominant focus of social control. In a health context, bio-power operates to create a pervasive desire to achieve the perfect body. The discourse emerging from this desire is that the healthy body is portrayed as slender, active, tanned, sexual, beautiful, and disciplined. In the sport context, bio-power operates to create the desire for perfect performance. The discourse emerging from this desire is that the sporting body is portrayed as strong, muscular, dominant, competitive, and attractive. It becomes a regulated project that can be shaped, trained, moulded and perfected. Both the healthy and sporting body are deemed to be conduits of virtuousness. The virtue is achieved through self-regulating, self-disciplining, and self-controlling bio-power processes. Such self-restricting moral discourses and desired behaviours are manifested in the surveillance mechanisms of: body weight measures, media (television, magazines and social texts), the image in the mirror, corporate advertising emphasising perfection, punishing training regimes, electronic timing, bio-feedback mechanisms, and monitored eating habits. As Pylpa, (1998) states, this type of "power produces the types of bodies that society requires" (p.27).

Disciplined bodies are a requirement of capitalist's modes of production, whereby the learning of self-regulation and self-monitoring encourages a desire to be economic units of perfect efficiency and consumption. Foucault's (1977) bio-power analysis offers an insight into alternative understanding of how contemporary power mechanisms are being exercised. The insights and understanding go beyond normalised perceptions of power relations, oppression and coercion and highlight the malleability of the body in order to subjugate it to docility (Kirk, 2010). This docility has created the 'cult of the body' (Tinning, 2010) and is expressed through sport at personal, institutional, corporate and governmental levels. As Woodward (2009) reports:

Governments (*and large institutions, corporates and organisations*) have long targeted the body as a means of creating 'good citizens' as expressed in the 'healthy mind, healthy body' dictum... Bodies are also the target of interventions, for example, through the multiple bodies of governmentality, because of the assumption that 'we are our bodies' and that citizen selves can be transformed and recreated through body practices (authors emphasis P.4).

The term governmentality (Foucault, 1991), refers to how governments, corporates, and other socio-political organisations produce the citizen, including athletes, that are best suited to serve particular interests, policies and ways of being. It is characterised by technologies of power that serve to assist how the people are to be governed, how they are to lead their lives and how moral 'truths' develop. In the sporting context, the technologies of power regulate the athlete by practices that determine training regimes, monitor performance, stipulate diet, and specify ways of behaving (Kirk, 2010). Given that governmentality is a relatively recent addition to the literature, much of the theorising about it has emerged from a late 20thC neo-liberal political environment. Tinning (2010) however, points out that sport and physical education, and other health related professions have been attempting to regulate the lives of people since, at least, the late 19th century. Arguably, de Coubertin's vision for the modern Olympic movement, including his philosophy of Olympism, was an explicit example of a form of governmentality operating at this time. It is to this understanding of governmentality, technologies of power and their relation to the philosophy of Olympism that I now wish to turn.

Governmentality, Technologies of Power and Olympism

Olympism was developed by de Coubertin as a philosophical concept aimed specifically at establishing a set of rules and procedures to govern sport, how sport should be conducted and how sport could influence one to live one's life (Chatziefstatahiou & Henry, 2009). It provided an integrated set of life principles, values and behaviours which exercises power at the micro (personal), meso (sporting context level e.g. Olympic Games), and macro (wider society) levels of being (Chatziefstatahiou, 2012). By drawing on the International Olympic Committee's (IOC) definition of Olympism, as adapted from the *Olympic Charter* (IOC, 2015), and

Understanding Olympism (New Zealand Olympic Committee, 2000) it can be loosely defined as a philosophy of life that blends sport, culture and education. Olympism seeks a way of life that is based on balanced development of body, will and mind, the joy of effort, the educational value of role modelling, social responsibility, and observing universal ethics of tolerance, generosity, friendship, unity, non-discrimination and respect for others.

Learning the about, and implementing, Olympism based programmes have, for many years, been fraught with controversy. The problem being Olympism's association with the IOC, the Olympic Games, corporate capitalism of the West and the Eastern bloc interpretation of this economic ideology (Culpan, 2015). In short, Olympism is highly contested terrain. What augments the contest is the "pseudo-religious rhetoric [...] elevated to the level of holy writ" (Lenskyj, 2012, p.66), the myths encircling Olympic idealism and the lack of academic agreement and critique of the Olympic project itself (Culpan, 2015). Lenskyj (2012) and, previously Walmsley (2004), have argued that Olympism is a conceptual, philosophical, and socially constructed vestige, legitimizing the dominant discourses of the modern age with negligible educative or social worth. Lenskyj (2012), for instance, challenges the canon by highlighting the absence of critical analysis and in-depth thinking associated with learning the knowledge of Olympism. Instead, she disputes the normalized rhetoric focuses on the promotion of the Olympic Movement, the spectacular nature of the Games and the athlete's physical performance. The educational focus on Olympic philosophy (Olympism), which was de Coubertin's lifelong pursuit, for all intents and purposes, is lost. Scholars (Culpan & Wigmore, 2010; Kidd, 1996; Lenskyj, 2012) argue that instead of Olympism being at the core of knowledge development and learning in order to foster ethical and socio-moral development, it has been vanquished to the margins. The discourse of the propagation of the Olympic Movement dominates and becomes normalized (Culpan, 2015). The irony is that the binary positions of Olympism, i.e. the 'capturing' of the Olympic project by the corporatization of sport and alternatively, and more particularly, the under-lying philosophy of Olympism both lend themselves to be analyzed using technologies of power identified by Foucault (1977). Essentially, advocating for Olympism in its purist form, as per de Coubertin's vision, or alternatively sponsoring the ideological inscription that Lenskyj claims it has become, are Foucault's external and internal social technologies of power at

work. One technology is aimed at controlling and dominating the conduct and behaviours of individuals externally (coercive power), and the other is aimed at internal control (self-regulating power) where individuals take responsibility for self-disciplining and transforming themselves into ways of being influenced by a dominant Olympic ideology. The influence of each type of 'power' denotes particular approaches and as Chatziefstathiou and Henry (2009) suggests:

it is the technologies of power/domination and self which together, when internalised, constitute the notion of governmentality, referring to socio-political contexts where power is de-centred and where members of a society play an active role in their own self-government (p.2).

Pivotal to governmentality, and the de-centring of power in the Olympic context, is the centrality of the sporting body. The sporting body becomes the fundamental subjectivity in constituting what sport is, and what learning is necessary, and how, through Olympism, de Coubertin envisaged life should be lived. De Coubertin's vision of regulating one's lifestyle, through Olympism, for their own and collective best interests, arguably contains a mix of authoritarianism, evangelicalism, condescension, righteousness and knowing-ness. Whilst the vision is laudable, the sense that the newly created 'Olympic experts' could tell the populace how to live their lives is a shining example of Foucault's concept of governmentality in operation. From a Foucauldian perspective, de Coubertin's outlook was a deliberate endeavour by institutional forces (IOC) to shape, influence, monitor, and direct the conduct of others. It included a set of principles and strategies upon which athletes and all nations, belonging to the Olympic Movement, were to subscribe. The subscription being increasingly monitored and controlled by the technologies of the self. In effect, de Coubertin's Olympism is a praiseworthy template of the deployment of an institutionalised (governmental) strategy seeking to influence, shape and monitor the conduct of individuals and collectives.

Drawing on the definition of Olympism, outlined earlier, a brief deconstruction illustrates the powerful statements of how athletes and the general populace are to be governed and regulated. Firstly, the notion of 'balanced development of body, will and mind' reinforces the centrality of the body in contemporary times and the importance of cognition in this significance. For de Coubertin, the muscles needed to be the most thoroughly educated, meticulous,

and constant servants in the formation of the mind (Muller, 2000). In his Olympic Letter III: *Olympism Education* (Muller, 2000) he makes plain his objection to the extreme compartmentalisation of human existence and the popular thought that knowledge of the mind was catalogued separately to become an isolated component of education. Instead he argued for a '*scale of perfect equilibrium*' and stressed that it was too simplistic just to consider the mind/body dualism. In addition, de Coubertin added the importance of character (Muller, 2000). He argued by combining character with the body and mind, a new form of education could be forged. It could 're-burnish' a community and provide a link between different social classes resulting in peace and well-being. While arguing for this harmonious development, de Coubertin also highlighted the 'joy of effort' and stressed the strength of contentment that emerges from intense competitive physical effort. He also acknowledged the import the joy that altruism (generosity, tolerance, friendship, unity, non-discrimination and respect) could provide. De Coubertin claimed that combining the two sources of joy, a perpetual dawn and an un-paralleled collective happiness would result.

From this brief deconstruction, links can be made between de Coubertin's and the IOC's philosophy of Olympism, sport and the multiple realities of contemporary corporate capitalism. Arguably, the *culture of Olympism* can be viewed as a governing disciplinary technology of power and domination. From a Foucauldian perspective the development of a healthy and active citizenry, through the construct of sport, the economic prosperity of nation states is made possible. Furthermore, using Olympism with its inherent connections to cognition and moral behaviour, as contemporary governing technologies of power, there is enormous potential to generate self-regulating, self-actualising, and self-maximising individuals who can reinforce and perpetuate powerful political networks of progress. Clearly, it is in the nation state's interest to create such economic productivity and the maintenance of social order. It is also in the interests of the IOC and other sporting institutes that nation states create this social order through sport, both at the grassroots and elite performance level. By exploiting technologies of self-power, political and social agendas are achieved. The 'mechanics of power', as indicated earlier, are embedded in sophisticated institutional and corporate practices that play on protocols of sporting behaviour. For example the strict regime of drug testing for high performance athletes; the

international code of ethics for sport people (*IOC Code of Ethics*, 2016) and the numerous government policy documents across the globe outlining ethical conduct in sport e.g. Fair play policies, race and gender equality. These are all examples of Foucault's 'mechanics of power' operating in the creation of docile bodies essential in contributing to the optimisation of individual and collective productivity for the political economy. These practices of governmentality, through organised systems (e.g. the Olympic project), contribute to societal norms of the body, knowledge and morality.

In identifying Olympism and the actions of the IOC as sophisticated strategies of governmentality, Tinning (2010) reminds us that governmental technologies are essential pedagogical devices that are engaged to lead and govern. Here Foucault's bio-power assists in the understanding of pedagogies associated with sport, Olympism and physical education. Bio-power has come to mean that the social controls operating on the body to discipline it, have been dominated, in recent times, by self-regulation, self-control, and self-monitoring. Bio-power focuses on conceptualising the human body as a project that can be manipulated shaped, moulded and worked similar to a machine that is productive, efficient and economic in its functioning. Drawing further on Foucault's work, the pedagogies of sport and Olympism are used as governmental technologies to serve the best interests of 'controlling' organisations' e.g. IOC and the state. Recently, scholars have called for the development of an Olympic pedagogy in order to make the plethora of Olympic Education programmes around the world more relevant to learners (Binder, 2005, Culpan 2008; Culpan & Wigmore, 2010; Naul, 2008). The call is based on the assumption that 'Olympic' learning might best be focused on a mass scale through utilising the power of the state and its compulsory schooling systems. In this call, physical education has been identified as the subject ideally positioned to accommodate this appeal (Arnold, 1996; Culpan & Stevens, 2017; Culpan & Wigmore, 2010; Naul, 2008; Parry, 2007). The intent is for Olympism to become an institutionalised and legitimate part of the school physical education curriculum. Such an initiative is a concrete example of Foucault's governmentality at work.

While it is easy to understand why schools are targeted for such a governmental strategy, it is important to acknowledge recent curricula and pedagogical shifts in contemporary schooling.

Developmental shifts in schooling has seen moves away from strongly prescribed curriculum content dominated by exhortation type pedagogies (coercive power) to programmes of study that are more outcomes based encouraging individual meaning making (self-regulating bio-power). With these sorts of changes in learning arrangements, certain knowledges and behaviours are described (as opposed to prescribe) and pedagogical shifts emerge that align with Foucault's power technologies of the 'self'. Tinning (2010) has noted the shifts in curricula orientation and pedagogy has highlighted the emergence of an approach that utilises bio-pedagogies. Bio-pedagogies foster knowledge construction on how to: move, eat, morally behave, and look. They are pedagogies promoting ways of living and ways of regulating the 'lived body'. This shift is characterised by a technology of power that is in line with Foucault's position of self-disciplining, self-regulating and self-controlling mechanisms of power that are consistent with the recent dominant neo-liberal political agenda.

Arguably, these bio-pedagogies are aimed at assisting young people, in this case sports people, to develop lifestyles that are self-enhancing, through self-regulation. In Parry's (2007) words the aim is to achieve a 'flourishing life'.

It is to the call of an Olympic pedagogy and in particular a call in my previous works to an Olympism pedagogy that now needs further attention.

Olympism Pedagogy – an orientating Framework

In earlier works (see Culpan & McBain, 2012; Culpan & Wigmore, 2010) an argument was presented for Olympism education as opposed to Olympic education. Contained within the argument was a call for an Olympism pedagogy. Firstly, it is important to clarify the point of difference Olympism education has from dominant discourses on Olympic education, Olympism education and opposed to Olympic education is characterised by:

- Moving the focus away from the technical aspects (functional facts and figures) of the Games;
- Presenting a focus on the philosophy and *culturally relevant* practices of Olympism;
- Achieving a pedagogical coherence which promotes *a criticality to Olympism*;

- Cultivates meaning making, the practice of critical consumerism and social transformation through active engagement in relevant experiential physical education and sport practices;
- Aligns itself to the country's physical education and sport education curriculum and
- Attempts to nurture a *critically* active citizen who can contribute to building a more peaceful and better world (adapted from Culpan & Wignore, 2010).

By embracing these main differential characteristic of Olympism education an attempt is made to place the learner and Olympism at the central core of the learning process. It pushes Olympic education's 'ideological inscription' and promotion of the Olympic Movement to the margins and attempts to provide relevancy and meaning to the development of attitudes, values and ethics to sport practices. However, in doing this, comment is needed on what type of pedagogy enhances and maximises this learning process. Despite the recent changes in pedagogical shifts to bio-pedagogical orientations (see above) "pedagogical developments associated with Olympism or even Olympic education are under-developed" (Culpan, 2015. p. 27). Notwithstanding this under-development, Binder (2005) suggests that Olympic learning (Olympism) needs to address pedagogical matters related to educational theory, teaching methodologies and student learning. Barker, Barker-Ruchhiti, Rynne, and Lee (2012) in their investigation provide insight into student learning. They investigated to what extent did aspects of Olympism become relevant and meaningful to learners? Results from their study suggested that for learning to be authentic it needed to be culturally contextualised and situated. By taking into account these two variables Barker et al. (2012) argued that personal meanings and cultural features specific to the learner facilitated the learning of ethical behaviours that influenced the conduct of learners. They concluded that contextualised and lofty principled exhortations (coercive power) had little effect on the acquisition of personal meaning-making, desired knowledge and ethical behaviours associated with sport. Personal meaning-making, particularly as it relates to knowledge and ethical behaviours, arguably, is a form of bio-power being played out in the body. The self-regulation, self-monitoring and control is an Olympic bio-power of self, and brings into focus this author's contention that Olympism education needs to have a general pedagogical orientated framework. However,

in suggesting such, Tinning's (2010) reminder that there is no 'Holy Grail' of *Olympic/Olympism* pedagogies (author's emphasis) is noteworthy as pedagogy and pedagogical encounters are dynamic constructs that are constantly changing shape and form depending on the contextual arrangement. Acknowledging Tinning's reminder, Culpan and McBain (2012) suggest a general pedagogical orientating framework for Olympism needs to be anchored to contemporary pedagogical developments that can neither be prescriptive or absolute (see earlier). They suggest that any such framework will need to be flexible, nimble, adaptable, accessible and relevant to Olympic learning and to the targeted learner. For Culpan and McBain (2012) a constructivist framework for Olympic learning presents strong potentialities for sharpening and contextualising the relevancy of Olympism meaning-making for the learner. They highlight that a constructivist framework has three main areas of relevance: the psychological, the social and the critical. While it is not the purpose of this article to provide a full analysis of constructivism, brief comment on what is meant by a pedagogy of constructivism is necessary (for a fuller account see Culpan & McBain, 2012).

Psychological constructivism

Psychological constructivism encourages the learner, acting like a *lone ranger*, to interpret and make sense and meaning from learning materials at an individual level (Pritchard & Woollard, 2010; Richardson, 2003). The pedagogical encounter is an intensely personal undertaking where the learner constructs schema and maps in order for new information to be analysed and processed. The process culminates when new knowledge, understandings and new ways of thinking and behaving are created (constructed) (Richardson, 2003). In Olympism education, psychological constructivism encourages learners to explore opportunities and new ways of understanding the Olympic project. For instance, investigating and examining personal engagement in sport, the moral and ethical tensions of sport and active lifestyles, cheating, violence, gender stereotyping, and the scientised dehumanisation and objectification of sport and the athlete. Essentially, psychological constructivism facilitates individualised and personal construction of knowledge and meaning that can lead to individualised ways of knowing, behaving and being.

Social constructivism

Social constructivism involves similar processes to psychological constructivism except the learner is operating within a social

group. Here social interactions play the key role in constructing new knowledge, and behaviours. It is through social interactions, engagements, interrogations and social position taking, that new ways of knowing are generated (Cobb, 1996; Fosnot, 1996). By interacting with their social, cultural and physical environment the social cohort, with which pedagogical encounters occur, process and make meaning out of the experiences. For social constructivism new information is processed and constructed in a similar way to the psychological. However, the richness and complexity of the process is dependent on interpretations, opinions and perspectives of others (Pritchard, & Woollard, 2010). Here, learning communities are established and are encouraged to share their understandings of the multifarious constructs of sport and Olympic matters, including norms, practices, expectations in a contextualised manner. The key thing for meaning-making in social constructivism is that it is culturally contextualised and socially engaged (Richardson, 2003).

Critical constructivism

This is the third and essential area of the framework. It involves individuals and groups examining, challenging and questioning inequalities, injustices, abuses of power and unethical practices in social phenomenon (Kincheloe, 2005). It involves a critical analysis (see Gillespie & McBain, 2011 for full details on the critical analysis process) by individuals and or groups, followed by the encouragement to take social action to rectify any inappropriate practices. This sort of criticality is aimed at fostering change. In the context of Olympism and the Olympic project, critical constructivism addresses the scholarly censure of the lack of criticality and the dominant culture of viewing Olympic matters as unproblematic goods (Lenskyj, 2012). It is reasoned that new approaches to knowledge construction and the critique of it can provide pathways and potentialities for new visions and intellectual understandings to occur (Kincheloe, 2005). According to Richardson (2003) one form of constructivism has no particular advantage over the other. Instead, she argues the integration of psychological, social and critical constructivism provides the best of all worlds from a pedagogical sense. This strategies, she argues, has the potential to maximise learning. Never-the-less, the maximisation of learning arguably begs the question – what is the learning? What or who controls it? and what is the purpose? It is to these sentiments that I now wish to address.

Olympism learning and purpose?

Originally De Coubertin's role and purpose for Olympism was for it to be a median and an intrusion to address and resolve the problematics of the modern age largely brought about by mass industrialisation (Muller, 2000). Such problems as the retreat of religion, declining ethical standards and a less physically active populace, were for de Coubertin, the moral decay of contemporary society (Brown, 2012). De Coubertin viewed Olympism as the mechanism by which chivalry, nobility, moral decency and the development of physicality could be achieved. His development of Olympism was a retort to deep-seated socio-political predicaments manifested in human exploitation, poverty, disease, and anguish, created by the new industrial order (Kidd, 1996, Muller, 2000). De Coubertin's vision was for Olympism, and indeed the Games, to provide a legitimate and institutionalised solution to the educative and social crisis that he perceived bedeviling French society.

In more contemporary times, de Coubertin's socio-educative legitimacy for Olympism has become highly contested terrain (see earlier). However, scholars such as Parry (2007), despite suggesting it can be seen as a 'naïve and fond hope', argues "the philosophy of Olympism has been the most coherent systematization of the ethical and political values underlying the practice of sport so far to have emerged" (p. 214). He also asserts that it provides individuals and groups with "a mechanism upon which they can express commitments, ideals and hopes for the future of the world" (p.214). Parry is not alone in suggesting that Olympism has strong and worthwhile educative value (Arnold, 1996; Binder, 2005; Culpan, 2008; Martinkova, 2012; Naul, 2008; Teetzel, 2012). It is through stimulation of the imagination and the encouragement of creativity, learners of Olympism can come to see themselves and their world in a different ways and these alternative visions can be characterised by possibilities and a push for social change (Culpan, 2015). This educative conceptualisation of Olympism is in Parry's (2007) terms fostering learners to seek a '*flourishing life*'. In Culpan and Wigmore's (2010) view it is an attempt to raise people's consciousness to interrogate and disrobe the contradictions and taken for granted assumptions that are manifest in dominant ways of thinking about the world. It is an "attempt to provide a framework by which people can examine their own realities, knowledge and values so that they might make meaning out of their lived experiences" (Culpan & Wigmore, p.71).

So this is the learning associated with Olympism. Yet connecting what is learned from Olympism with the call for constructivist pedagogies brings into sharp focus Foucault's notion of governmentality. Let me explain. The acceptance of Olympism promoting a flourishing and virtuous life through sport is an agenda that both the state and the IOC find attractive. It is in the best interests of the both to develop the social capital of virtuousness and ethical ways of behaving amongst the populace. It demonstrates institutional social responsibility. Furthermore, it is in the interest of the state that their citizenry develop healthy active lifestyles through sport in order to reduce the high capital costs of health care. Similarly, by enshrining Olympism into the institutionalisation of sport, via the IOC's 'Olympic project' and other international and national agencies, the hegemonic interests of these organisations are taken care of. It is taken care of by the mechanisms of power that institutionalises sport throughout the world. As Foucault argues, such technologies of power are deeply embedded in institutional practices associated with international organisations, governments and capitalist ideology. However the mechanics of power are not necessarily exercised by the state, the IOC or others through technologies of coercion. There is little need for coercion and exhortation to promote the acceptance of the benefits of a flourishing life with the general populace. This acceptance is achieved largely through Foucault's technologies of the self. For young people and youth, schooling plays a major role in the technologies of self. So too do the media and other capitalist modes of production and consumption. Still, the subtle irony is complex. Contemporary schooling in the West strongly promotes a pedagogical framework that focuses on personal and collective meaning-making and the personal and collective construction of knowledges. It also encourages individual and collective self-regulating accountabilities. This, they call the pedagogical constructivist framework (see earlier).

The convergence of Olympism and constructivist pedagogies, arguably is an unspoiled example of Foucault's governmentality and the bio-power of self, as a regulatory technology, at work. This sophisticated arrangement becomes more complex when acknowledging and lending support to the call for Olympism education as a legitimate part of the school physical education curriculum (Arnold, 1996; Culpan, 2015; Culpan & Wigmore, 2010). Here the IOC and the state are using, via mass schooling and the physical education curriculum, mechanisms of power

associated with bio-pedagogies (Tinnings, 2010). They are, by way of Foucault's governmentality, perpetuating physical education's role of regulating bodies through education. The domination and perpetuation of this power/knowledge nexus, played out with the body, however, does not necessarily deflect the attention from the making of docile bodies nor the need for analysing how best to produce ethical and moral citizens. What is indispensable in this 'non deflection' is the employment of pedagogies that are commensurate with challenging, questioning and confronting the general acceptance of normalising and dominant forms of knowing and behaving. Here, the critical constructivist component of the framework becomes essential. For Foucault, this meant the educative processes associated with the learning of Olympism, need to problematize and interrogate ways of knowing and behaving to construct new forms of subjectivities (Markula & Pringle, 2006). This, I argue, can liberate the individual and the collective from dominant normalising realisations of sport and things 'Olympic'. It can provide the learner(s) with skills and knowledges that enable them to consider marginalised dispositions and different ways of viewing the power and potential of Olympism and sport. It allows for unfettered thinking, and behaviour. All this of course, in the quest to counteract the production of docile bodies and instead construct new alternative visions and subjectivities in the journey to seeking a flourishing life.

Concluding Comments

The purpose of this article was to draw on the works of Foucault to analyse how the philosophy of Olympism combined with suggested constructivist pedagogies provides an example of governmentality and technology of power (self) at work. The article has highlighted the centrality of the body and how mechanisms of power, utilised through the convergence of Olympism and constructivist pedagogies, serves both institutional and personal interests in attempting to regulate and control desired ways of living.

The push by some scholars to have physical education in schools as the subject by which Olympism can be curriculum mandated potentially perpetuates physical education's history of 'body control' and the coercive mechanisms of power. However, despite the argument of governmentality being exercised this article concludes by suggesting that critical constructivism might mitigate against the production of docile bodies. Instead, the

criticality of constructivism, within an Olympism context, might just soothe the way for individuals and collectives to be liberated from dominate ways of knowing. It might unfetter their thinking in order to facilitate the development of a flourishing life. If this can be the case, then criticality, within Olympism, may enhance its role as a form of an affirmative governmentality and Foucault's technologies of power are correspondingly considered beneficial in the self-regulating and self-disciplining person.

References

- Arnold, P. (1996). Olympism, sport and education. *Quest*, 48(1), 93-101.
- Barker, D., Barker-Ruchhiti, N., Rynne, S., & Lee, J., (2012). Olympism as education: Analysing the learning experiences of elite athletes. *Educational Review*, 64(3), 369-384.
- Binder, D. (2005). *Teaching Olympism in schools: Olympic education as a focus on values education*. Barcelona: Centre d'Estudis (UAB).
- Brown, S. (2012) De Couberti's Olympism and the laugh of Michel Foucault: Crisis discourses and the Olympic games. *Quest*, 64:150–163.
- Chatziefstathiou, D. (2012). Active citizens and public policy: The example of London 2912 Olympic Games. *International Journal of Sport Management, Recreation and Tourism*, 9, 23-33.
- Chatziefstathiou, D., & Henry, I. (2009). Technologies of power, governmentality and Olympic discourses: A Foucauldian analysis for understanding the discursive constructions of the Olympic ideology. *Esporte e Sociedade*, 4(12), 1-28.
- Cheville, J. (2005). Confronting the problem of embodiment. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 18(1), 85-107.
- Cobb, P. (1996). Where's the mind? A coordination of sociocultural and cognitive perspectives. In C. T. Fosnot (Ed.), *Constructivism: theory, perspectives and practice* (pp. 103-119). New York, London: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Culpan I. (2015) *Olympism education and pedagogy: A critical repositioning*. Johannesburg, South Africa: International Conference on Historical and Contemporary Issues in Olympic Studies, 30 Nov-2 Dec 2015. In *Historical & Contemporary Issues in Olympic Studies*: 18-35.
- Culpan, I. (2008). New Zealand and critical pedagogy: The call for an Olympic pedagogy. *Conference proceedings of the International Forum on the Beijing Games*, 237-248.
- 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). *Olympism education*. Unpublished work. New Zealand Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, NZ.
- Culpan, I., & Stevens, S. (2017). Olympism, physical education and attitudes and values: What do graduating teachers in Aotearoa, New Zealand know and understand? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport & Physical Education*. 8(3), 259-272.

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, 67-76. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5432/ijshs.20090028>.

Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality, trans. Rosi Braidotti and revised by Colin Gordon, in Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon & Peter Miller (Eds.). *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, pp. 87–104. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Michel Foucault power and knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. Colin Gordon (Ed.). New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Translated by A Sheridan, New York: Random House.

Fosnot, C. T. (1996). *Constructivism: theory and perspectives and practice*. New York, London: Teachers College, Columbia University.

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, 65-72

International Olympic Committee, (2016). *IOC Code of Ethics: International Olympic Committee*. IOC Ethics Commission, Lausanne, Switzerland: Retrieved from: www.olympic.org/ethics-commission

International Olympic Committee, (2015). *Olympic charter*. Lausanne: International Olympic Committee. Retrieved from: [http://www/document/olympic-charter_en.pdf](http://www.document/olympic-charter_en.pdf).

Kidd, B. (1996). Taking the rhetoric seriously: Proposals for Olympic education. *Quest*, 48, 82.

Kincheloe, J. (2005). *Critical constructivism primer*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Kirk, D. (2010). *Physical education futures*. London: Routledge.

Lenskyj, H. (2012). Olympic education and Olympism: Still colonizing children's minds. *Educational Review*, 64(3), 265-274.

Markula, P., & Pringle, R. (2006). *Foucault, sport and exercise: Power, knowledge and transforming the self*. London: Routledge.

Martinkova, I. (2012). Teaching values in movement activities: Inherent and added values. *ACTA Universitatis Carolinae Kinanthropologica*, 48(2), 111-119.

Muller, N. (2000). *Olympism: Selected writings*. Lausanne: International Olympic Committee.

- Naul, R. (2008). *Olympic education*. Oxford: Meyer & Meyer Sport Ltd.
- New Zealand Olympic Committee, (2000). *Understanding Olympism*. Wellington: New Zealand Olympic Committee.
- 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: Routledge.
- Pritchard, A., & Woollard, J. (2010). *Psychology for the classroom: constructivism and social learning*. New York: Routledge.
- Pylpa, J. (1998). Power and Bodily practice: Applying the work of Foucault to an Anthropology of the body. *Arizona Anthropologist*, 13, 21-36.
- Richardson, V. (2003). Constructivist pedagogy. *Teachers College Record*, 105(9), 1623-1640.
- 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: Routledge.
- Wamsley, K. (2004). Laying Olympism to rest. In J. Bale & M. Christensen (Eds.), *Post-Olympism: Questioning sport in the twenty-first century*, (pp. 231-240). New York: Berg Publishers.
- Woodward, K. (2009). *Embodied sporting bodies: Regulating and regulatory bodies*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Author

Ian Culpan is a full Professor of Physical Education and Director of the New Zealand Centre for Olympic Studies at the University of Canterbury New Zealand. He has a strong international profile, published widely with research interests in Olympism, Physical Education/Teacher Education and pedagogy.

