

# Rethinking the relationship between pedagogy, technology and learning in health and physical education

Casey, Ashley; Goodyear, Victoria; armour, kathleen

DOI:

[10.1080/13573322.2016.1226792](https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2016.1226792)

License:

Other (please specify with Rights Statement)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Casey, A, Goodyear, V & armour, K 2016, 'Rethinking the relationship between pedagogy, technology and learning in health and physical education', *Sport Education and Society*, pp. 1-17.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2016.1226792>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

## Publisher Rights Statement:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Sport, Education and Society* on 19/09/2016, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/13573322.2016.1226792>

## General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

## Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

1    **Rethinking the relationship between pedagogy, technology and learning in health**  
2    **and physical education**

3    Ashley Casey<sup>1,2</sup>, Victoria A. Goodyear<sup>3</sup> and Kathleen M. Armour<sup>3</sup>

4    <sup>1</sup> Loughborough University, UK

5    <sup>2</sup> University of Limerick, Ire

6    <sup>3</sup> University of Birmingham

7

8

9    Corresponding Author:

10    Dr Ashley Casey,

11    School of Sport, Exercise and Health Sciences,

12    Loughborough University,

13    Loughborough,

14    LE11 3TU,

15    UK.

16    Email: A.J.B.Casey@lboro.ac.uk

17

**Abstract:** This paper seeks to address two key questions: 1) how could a pedagogically-driven approach to the use of DigiTech in HPE benefit young people's learning; and 2) what steps are required to develop new DigiTech pedagogies? The paper is a response to the largely pessimistic views presented in this journal by Gard, Lupton and Williamson about the role of technology in Health and physical Education (HPE). In this paper, we argue that while we need to be aware of the risks, we also need to explore the opportunities for digital technologies (DigiTech) to shape HPE in new and positive ways. Specifically, we argue that a focus on pedagogy is largely missing from earlier discussions. In mapping the evidence base on DigiTech against a three dimensional categorization of pedagogy – in the form of learners and learning, teachers and teaching, and knowledge and context (Armour, 2011) – we are able to demonstrate the value of a pedagogically-informed debate on this topic. The paper concludes by arguing for a 'profession-wide' debate to co-construct, trial and evaluate new ways in which we should – and should not – use DigiTech to optimise young people's learning in HPE.

**Key Words:** Digital Technology, Pedagogy, Emerging Technologies, Emerging Practices, Digital Learning

The use of technology in education should now be seen as a significant issue for everyone with a stake in education

(Selwyn, 2014, p. 1)

The deployment of digital technology (henceforth called DigiTech) to support learning has grown exponentially in recent years. This has led to increased critical scrutiny in a number of subject areas and from different disciplinary perspectives. In this context, it has been argued that developing a critically informed view of DigiTech in education is particularly important given the prevalence of impassioned, enthusiastic and, in the words of Neil Selwyn (2015, p. X), “bullshit” talk that has grown around it. The physical education (or, for the purposes of this paper, Health and Physical Education (HPE)) community has also engaged in these debates. The leading journal *Sport, Education and Society*, for example, recently devoted space for a discussion about the future of technology in HPE. In particular, Michael Gard, Deborah Lupton and Ben Williamson have raised new, if somewhat pessimistic, questions in this discursive space and these have provided one of the conceptual platforms for this paper. Drawing upon contemporary literature and our own recent work on this topic, the purpose of this paper is to rethink the links between pedagogy, technology and education. Specifically, while acknowledging the power and importance of the largely negative and alarmist views that have prevailed in our academic literature to date, we offer a different view that considers the value that a pedagogically-driven approach to the use of DigiTech in HPE could offer to support young people’s learning in a digital age.

This paper is organized into three sections to address two key questions: 1)

*how could a pedagogically-driven approach to the use of DigiTech in HPE benefit*

62 *young people's learning; and 2) what steps are required to develop new DigiTech*  
63 *pedagogies?* First, we provide a brief overview of Gard, Lupton and Williamson's  
64 arguments. Second, drawing on existing knowledge, we consider the relationship  
65 between DigiTech and pedagogy using a three dimensional categorisation of  
66 pedagogy. Third we make the case for the potential benefits of building new links  
67 between DigiTech and pedagogy in HPE and consider the 'what next?' question. In  
68 particular, we seek to mobilise the HPE profession, including both practitioners and  
69 researchers, to engage in a 'profession-wide' debate to co-construct, trial and evaluate  
70 new ways in which we should – and should not – use DigiTech to optimise young  
71 people's learning in HPE.

72

### 73 **1. Gard, Lupton and Williamson – an overview**

74 Gard (2014) introduced the concept of 'eHPE', which he defined as HPE's "ongoing  
75 investment in public health" and "digital technology" (p.828). Gard's argument about  
76 DigiTech is grounded in his longstanding critique of the presumed link between  
77 physical education and health, and the subsequent claims HPE scholars have made  
78 about the role DigiTech will play in helping HPE improve health (c.f. McKenzie and  
79 Lounsbery, 2013). Gard (2014) claims that DigiTech will intensify negative  
80 discourses of and related practices in "measurability, accountability, performativity  
81 and standardization" (p. 833). As a result, Gard argued that HPE will promote "the  
82 punitive, judgemental, time-consuming, intellectually arid and potentially unhealthy  
83 surveillance of [young people's] bodies and behaviour" (p. 835). HPE, in Gard's  
84 view, will be forced into a world that thinks "being healthy is a simple matter of being  
85 told, adopting and repeating a set of easily describe behaviours" (p. 839).  
86 Consequently, Gard (2014) suggested that "flesh and blood teachers" (p. 831) are at

87 risk of being replaced by health-related DigiTech. In other words, the perceived  
88 capabilities of DigiTech could further endorse societal, economic and politically  
89 supported discourses of performativity in education (see Evans, 2013; Apple, 2007),  
90 meaning that teachers no longer have their traditional role in promoting physical  
91 activity and health.

92         Similar to Gard, Lupton (2015) was pessimistic about the role of teachers in  
93 HPE as a result of the growth of DigiTech in education. Lupton (2015), however, was  
94 particularly concerned about the dangers of DigiTech leading to a whole school  
95 approach to data-led surveillance of each individual child. Lupton (2015, p. 126)  
96 suggested that the proliferation of health promotion and fitness apps and self-tracking  
97 devices means that it is only a matter of time before “the ethos and practices of self-  
98 responsibility” come to represent “key forces in behaviour change” for young people  
99 in HPE. Drawing on her own typology of five modes of self-tracking (see Lupton,  
100 2014), Lupton (2015) challenged the reader to consider how long it will be before  
101 ‘private’ self-tracking becomes ‘communal’ (i.e. in a class), ‘pushed’ (i.e. teacher  
102 initiated), ‘imposed’ (i.e. health interventions), and ‘exploited’ (i.e. used for the  
103 purposes of others). Consequently, Lupton (2015, p. 127) posed a controversial  
104 question about the likelihood of reaching a situation where “students are forced to  
105 wear heart-rate monitors to demonstrate that they are conforming to the exertions  
106 demanded of them by the HPE teacher?” Nevertheless, it is also possible to argue for  
107 another more positive way of viewing this issue. Other subject areas in the school  
108 curriculum, including Maths, English and Science, are making extensive use of  
109 learners’ data to drive more personalised forms of learning (see Apple, 2007). Perhaps  
110 it is possible to argue for new pedagogically-appropriate futures for HPE based on the  
111 use of individuals’ health and fitness data? We will return to this issue later.

Williamson (2015) was similarly pessimistic about the proliferation of DigiTech in education, arguing that wearable technologies<sup>1</sup> will eventually control and govern the educational process. In this scenario, Williamson (2015, p. 135) claimed that HPE could become a site where the use of existing DigiTech such as “fitness testing, movement analysis software, kinetic videogaming and digital pedometers” (Williamson, 2015, p. 135) will be replaced by an “algorithmic skin” (p.133). This skin was defined as “an artificial informational membrane that continually interacts with, and is activated by, a densely coded informational environment” (ibid, p. 148). As a result, Williamson predicted that commercially produced DigiTech will begin to govern the educational process because of its capabilities to produce ‘evidence-based’ results. Here again, however, a counter view might be that – at the very least - such results are based on real rather than proxy and rather unreliable or self-reporting evidence. Through an algorithmic skin teachers could access new forms of evidence about young people’s physical activity levels. Comparably to Sandaña (2014, p.4) we might argue that such “data is a gift, so be thankful when it is given to you”.

In summary, Gard, Lupton and Williamson have outlined ways in which a data-driven society - exaggerated by the use of DigiTech– could lead to levels of body surveillance that are unintended, unimagined and/or untested. This is a future for HPE that seems to bypass teachers. In other words, DigiTech could ultimately deprive teachers of the opportunity and capability to teach. Yet, how realistic – or indeed unduly pessimistic - are these dystopian views?

The three authors made little attempt to ground their arguments in the evidence base on (i) what kinds of DigiTech young people and their teachers use

---

<sup>1</sup> Wearable technologies are variously described as “self-tracking, personal informatics, personal analytics or technologies of the ‘quantified self’” (Williamson, 2015, p. 134).

currently in and beyond formal HPE settings; (ii) teachers' and young people's contemporary views on DigiTech; and (iii) the pedagogical implications of the wider physical, social, and economic architectures of schools and classrooms that support technology-mediated teaching and learning. In other words, it seems that what is missing in their arguments is a focus on the potential for new pedagogies of DigiTech; for example, current or imagined links between pedagogy and DigiTech that could work to enhance or even 'accelerate' (Fullan, 2013a) young people's learning in HPE. In the next section, therefore, we use a three dimensional concept of pedagogy as a framework for addressing our first question: *how could a pedagogically-driven approach to the use of DigiTech in HPE benefit young people's learning?*

## **2. The pedagogies of DigiTech in HPE**

Pedagogy is a complex and slippery concept with a range of definitions (see Dron, 2014). Nonetheless, a widely adopted conceptualisation in physical education and sport pedagogy is that pedagogy is the connection between three dimensions, (i) learners and their learning, (ii) teachers and their teaching and (iii) knowledge in context (Armour, 2011; Quennerstedt et al., 2016). As Armour (2011, p.14) put it: "the key point to grasp about any pedagogical encounter between teacher/coach and young learner is that all three dimensions of pedagogy are present and interacting". In this categorisation of pedagogy, the learners/learning dimension "foregrounds children and young people as diverse learners and the ways in which they can be supported to learn effectively" (*Ibid*, 2011, p.13); the teachers/teaching dimension positions teachers as lifelong learners "who continuously and critically reflect upon their personal capabilities to meet the needs of young learners" (*ibid*, p.14); while



knowledge/context refers to the value that is placed on what is selected to be taught or learnt and the contingent contextual factors. But, how does a focus on the three dimensions of pedagogy shed new light on the potential of DigiTech to support learning in and beyond HPE?

### ***Learners and learning***

In 2016, teachers and other educators are faced with a generation of young learners who identify with selfies, hashtags, and emojis, and who see sharing, liking, tweeting, blogging and vlogging as everyday practices (Rich & Miah, 2014; Selwyn & Stirling, 2016; Tom, 2012). Digital devices, applications (apps<sup>2</sup>) and social networking sites are readily accessible and are used by many young people on a daily basis (Greenhow & Lewin, 2016; Lenhart, 2015). It has been estimated, for example, that 71% of American adolescents use the social networking site ‘Facebook’ as a platform for communication (Lenhart, 2015). This use of social media by adolescents is, perhaps, unsurprising given that:

- i) Children begin web ‘surfing’ and accessing social media from as young as age four (Taranto et al., 2011);
- ii) Young people are being deliberately targeted as consumers of DigiTech (Williamson, 2015; Öhman et al., 2014); and
- iii) DigiTech is accessible to a wide range of youth in diverse socio-economic contexts (Greenhow & Lewin, 2016).

The seemingly unstoppable growth in young people’s engagement with DigiTech in their personal lives (Rosen, 2010; Selwyn & Stirling, 2016) means that these technologies are socially and culturally relevant. Although, as Rosen (2010) suggests, the social relevance of DigiTech could act as a type of leverage to engage young

---

<sup>2</sup>An application programme is a computer programme designed to perform a group of coordinated functions, tasks, or activities for the benefit of the user

people in learning, there are significant risks to young learners and on this point we agree with the arguments of Gard, Lupton and Williamson.

Health-related - extending to medical - DigiTech has the potential to have a profound positive or negative impact on young people's learning about health, physical activity and the body, both within and outside of formal education experiences. On the negative side of the argument, the social construction of particular body ideals is evident in the popular practice of taking and posting 'selfies' (Miguel, 2016; Warfield et al., 2016). Extending 'old media', selfies exaggerate the self-presentation of filtered, gendered, ideal and 'perfect' bodies because they are socially constructed, actualized and re-enforced through online networks (Warfield et al., 2016). This is a particular concern when a connection is made between the images presented and shared in selfies and presumptions made about 'health' (see, for example, [healthyselfies.org](http://healthyselfies.org)) and, what we might term, *un-healthy* selfies. Further illuminating the concerns raised about 'teen magazines' and 'size 0' discourses (Kerner, 2013), there is evidence that young people are using selfies as a communication mechanism through which to engage with specific groups and that this acts to reinforce un-healthy discourses and behaviours (see #thinkspiration on Twitter as an example). What we can conclude from these examples is that the rise of 'healthism' (an ideological, neo-liberal and public construct of health) in adults, and concerns about individual autonomy, self-monitoring and obsession/addiction seen in social media (Lupton, 2015) are also growing concerns for youth (Rich & Miah, 2014).

Further risks arise from the extensive digital footprints that young people are creating and, as is the case of in HPE, the digital footprints teachers might be encouraging young people to create. Halford (2016), for example, raised questions

210 about what is considered public or private on social media sites. In challenging what  
211 might be considered ‘private’, Halford (2016) suggested that a person, a company or  
212 even the host site (e.g. Facebook) are able to access the digital data, regardless of  
213 privacy protection plans, guidelines, and regulations. The HPE profession must  
214 consider, therefore, whether digital images, and personal data about the body and/or a  
215 child’s health generated in HPE lessons could and should be accessible to others  
216 outside of the education content.

217         Yet, there is another way of looking at learners and learning and DigiTech in  
218 HPE. For example, as seen in other educational contexts (see Greenhow & Lewin,  
219 2016), there is significant potential for teachers to connect young people’s uses of  
220 DigiTech with their learning experiences in HPE. Indeed, because DigiTech already  
221 provides an accessible and potentially rich resource for learning about health, physical  
222 activity and the body, it could also provide a useful resource for teachers to construct  
223 and deliver forms of knowledge to young people in ways that are engaging,  
224 immediate and attractive (Casey, Goodyear & Armour, 2016). Calls from political,  
225 research and practice fields certainly seem to support such a view, highlighting the  
226 urgent need to understand how technologies can support young people’s learning in  
227 optimal ways (Fullan, 2013a; DCMS, 2015; UNESCO, 2015; Kong et al., 2014). It is  
228 certainly safe to assume that DigiTech will influence young people’s learning about  
229 physical activity and health regardless of the position a teacher takes on the matter.  
230 There is clearly a need, therefore, for further critical, informed and profession-wide  
231 debate around the rise of ‘healthism’ and the ethical issues of DigiTech and what this  
232 means for learners and their learning. In line with Gard, Lupton and Williamson, we  
233 agree that it is unacceptable to ‘glorify’ the capacity of DigiTech to educate, and yet  
234 to be unaware (or plead ignorance) of the implications; for example, the ethical

challenges posed by public data. The prevalence of DigiTech in the lives of young people, however, means that teachers cannot simply ignore the dangers whilst simultaneously grasping the opportunities of DigiTech. So what is the evidence on teachers' views on and uses of DigiTech in HPE?

### ***Teachers and teaching***

Any debate about the role of DigiTech in HPE must have a focus on the role of teachers given the arguments that teachers have the greatest impact on students and their learning (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012; Hattie, 2012, 2009). When compared to, for example, the school context, parents, home, resources, or the quality of a school's leadership, it is consistently argued that teachers are highly influential (Apple, 2007) and should be placed at the forefront of reform efforts to improve education (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012; Hattie, 2012, 2009). Clark (1995, p.3), for example, argued that "teachers are the human point of contact with students. All other influences on the quality of education are mediated by who the teacher is and what the teacher does". Developing a knowledge-base about what teachers learn, do and practise is, therefore, vital for the creation of effective and contemporary policies, programmes and practices (Cordingly et al., 2015; Hattie, 2009). Yet, what teachers think, say, and do with DigiTech has received rather little consideration.

While DigiTech is celebrated for its "astounding and abounding creativity" (Fullan, 2013a, p.36), it has been argued that innovation in its use in education has stagnated (Apple, 2006; Robinson, 2011). Few teachers are able to incorporate DigiTech into the pedagogical context in purposeful ways that extend pedagogical capacity (see Fullan, 2013a). While there is much talk about how the latest 'gizmos and gadgets' could leverage young people's learning (Rosen, 2010), and the ways in which 'big' edu-businesses are focussed on designing and marketing educational

260 DigiTech to ‘transform’ teaching and learning (Enright et al., 2016; Gard, 2014;  
261 Lupton, 2015; Williamson, 2015), technology-mediated teaching and/or learning is  
262 not a mainstream practice. Indeed, Fullan (2013a) among others (c.f. Hastie et al.,  
263 2010; Palao et al., 2015; Selwyn, 2015), has argued that the use of DigiTech in  
264 schools is “conspicuous by its absence or by its superficial, *ad hoc* use” (p.13).  
265 Vrasidas (2014), similarly, reported that only 35% of teachers use DigiTech in the  
266 classroom, while Sipilä (2013) demonstrated that almost half of teachers feel under-  
267 prepared to use DigiTech to support learning. In the context of HPE, Kretchmann’s  
268 (2015) small-scale study in Germany indicated that half of teachers surveyed felt they  
269 had enough experience to integrate DigiTech into HPE. Yet more than 80% of  
270 teachers suggested that they did not have enough pedagogical knowledge and  
271 experience of how integrate DigiTech effectively and that they wanted access to more  
272 pedagogical scenarios that exemplified DigiTech use in HPE. Indeed, most teachers  
273 expressed a preference for traditional technology (i.e. images and blackboards), rather  
274 than, for example, more recent collaborative, user-focussed, and interactive  
275 technologies, such as social media, apps, and ‘mobile’ devices.

276         The evidence-base on teachers, therefore, seems to suggest that while young  
277 people are active users and consumers of DigiTech, teachers are resistant and they  
278 struggle to integrate DigiTech in pedagogically sound or innovative ways. The  
279 literature suggests that large numbers of teachers are either resistant or even ‘Luddite’  
280 in this regard. Drawing on the work of Webster and Robins (1986) and Bromley  
281 (1998), Reid (2009) explored the usefulness of employing a Luddite analysis to  
282 generate an understanding of resistance to technology in education. Reid (2009, p.

290) suggested that Luddism<sup>3</sup> was not a fight against technology *per se* but one against “a particular kind of political economy and ideology...[which] changed the traditional patterns of social life”. Reid argued firstly that Luddism served as a refusal to isolate technology from social relations, and secondly that technological change presented a threat to a particular kind of life. Common populist terms used today to describe opposition or resistance to technologies or technological change include ‘technophobe’, ‘non-techie’, ‘dinosaur’, ‘fossil’ and ‘diehard’. The ‘Luddite’ question arises, therefore: “what changes to the traditional patterns of social life are these modern day Luddites raging against?”

It could be argued that, much like most existing continuing professional development (CPD) experiences (Cordingly et al., 2015), the CPD mechanisms to support teachers in using DigiTech in new and pedagogically appropriate ways has been either absent or ineffective. As a result, DigiTech use is driven by so called ‘early-adopters’; innovative, passionate and enthusiastic teachers who are inspired by their personal interest in technologies and their belief that DigiTech can enhance young people’s learning (Casey et al., 2016). The lack of high quality CPD is a problem for these early adopters (lack of critical challenge) as much as it is for the wider Luddite teacher population (lack of knowledge and confidence). Equally, and as we will discuss in the next section, school and classroom contexts are not always conducive to DigiTech use. A lack of support within the local context has long been regarded as a powerful mediating factor in inhibiting teachers’ attempts to change, learn and develop (Fullan, 2015) either with or without CPD mechanisms in place. Perhaps the most effective form of CPD in HPE we could imagine would be where early adopters and Luddites were able to work together within a three-dimensional

---

<sup>3</sup> A member of any of the various bands of workers in England (1811-16) organized to destroy manufacturing machinery under the belief that its use diminished employment. (Dictionary.com)

critical, pedagogical and analytical framework. The ambition would be to support both groups to challenge the views of the other, from the starting point that neither is inherently ‘correct’. This type of CPD activity is aligned with the concept of ‘effective’ CPD as proposed by Armour, Quennerstedt, Chambers and Makopoulou (2015) who argued for CPD that allows teachers to focus on complexity, addresses contemporary challenges, bridges research and practice, and nurtures their career-long growth as learners. Yet, as numerous PE-CPD studies have reported (see Parker & Patton, in press) few such opportunities are available. It is difficult to imagine, therefore, how HPE teachers (early adopters and Luddites alike) can currently have the kinds of structured discussions that would support them to use DigiTech in pedagogically sound ways.

### ***Knowledge in Context***

In education systems, the “knowledge to be taught, coached or learnt is always a context-bound decision that reflects, reinforces, reproduces (and sometimes challenges) what powerful individuals or groups believes is valuable at any given time” (Armour, 2011, p.13). Considering this point in the case of DigiTech in HPE raises a host of interesting questions about who is driving what. For example, the wider societal context is one where there is an easy of access to mobile health apps; indeed Lupton (2015) puts the figure at over 100,000 such apps available on major app stores and this number is rising all the time. Meanwhile, in HPE, there is a close alignment between the leading HPE physical activity/health discourses (see Gard, 2014) suggesting that DigiTech is already driving forms of knowledge that arise in our HPE curricula on health and fitness. Yet, the implications of this trend appear not to have been recognised in formal education policy (see DCMS, 2015 as an example). Moreover, within the local context of schools and teachers’ classrooms, there is little

evidence of radical change and innovation driven by technology tools or devices. We do acknowledge that change has occurred i.e. in the expectations that teachers use technologies to provide further understanding of 'learning' in HPE and in the introduction and sustained use of DigiTech such as games analysis, Heart Rate Monitors, pedometers, apps in phones etc. That said, there is evidence to suggest that schools and teachers continue to value traditional sports skills and games (Kirk, 2010) or, in Nordic countries, dance/gymnastics and outdoor activities (Quennerstedt, 2008). Meanwhile, young people are living in a parallel world of DigiTech that promotes views on health and fitness that sometimes accord with – and also challenge – our traditional practices in HPE.

At the policy level, the contemporary National Curriculum and Standards operating in a number of countries agree that as a result of a highly effective PE programme, all pupils should be able to lead what they term 'healthy' or 'health-enhancing' lives. Yet, the small number of available analyses on the use of DigiTech in HPE suggests that the forms of knowledge promoted tend to reinforce historical knowledge patterns. For example, DigiTech has been used to promote knowledge about skills and games (see Sinelnikov, 2013) and dance (Öhman et al., 2014). While it has been argued that new models, methods and 'innovative' pedagogical strategies should shift learning away from a focus on specific activities in HPE (O'Sullivan, 2013), teachers' personal philosophies, training, and the school context all seem to act to reproduce the traditional activity focus (Kirk, 2010).

The pedagogical questions to be asked at this stage, therefore, are about the power of the context to adapt to, adopt or even shape new forms of knowledge that may or may not be positive. There is no doubt that DigiTech is opening up new possibilities and spaces in and through which to learn. If these spaces, however,



continue to be constrained by data reporting, limited curriculum opportunities and traditional practices and outcomes, then the best result we can hope to achieve is slightly better solutions to the same problems (Robinson, 2011). Moreover, if teachers are unsupported by appropriate forms of CPD, they will either use DigiTech in essentially uncritical ways that are more informed by technology than pedagogy, or avoid it (Howard & Mozejko, 2015). DigiTech is, after all, only as “good as the pedagogical methods it employs” (Ferster, 2014, p. 176).

### **Summary**

Thus far, we have articulated an apparent disconnect between the debates on the use of DigiTech in education, and questions about pedagogy. Specifically, we have raised concerns about young people’s learning on health through DigiTech *outside* of the school context and the implications for teachers and teaching *within* the school context. We have echoed some of the pessimistic views of Gard, Lupton, and Williamson, while also suggesting that there might be alternative readings of the future of DigiTech in HPE.

In the next section, we challenge ourselves and the wider HPE profession to think differently about DigiTech in HPE and we answer our second question: *what steps are required to develop new DigiTech pedagogies?* We argue that we need to focus on a complex, multi-layered understanding of pedagogy; i.e. in those places where learning, teaching and context converge- to consider what might be possible for DigiTech in HPE. In other words, as a profession, we argue for the need to engage in ‘blue skies’ thinking and critical yet constructive dialogue to imagine new futures for HPE and the development of new - pedagogies supported by DigiTech - in driving radical change.

### Section three: 3. What steps are required to develop new DigiTech pedagogies?

As the papers in Sport, Education and Society show, DigiTech in HPE is becoming an important facet of the wider discussions in our field. Yet, the works of Gard, Lupton and Williamson illustrate a curious lack of discussion about the role of *pedagogy* in the analyses of the role of DigiTech in HPE. In our recent book (see Casey et al., 2016) we set out to address this gap. The original aim was to consider a concept that Casey (2014) had identified as ‘pedagogies of technology’ in HPE, as exemplified in thirteen pedagogical cases (Armour 2014) of teachers and their uses of DigiTech. The concept of pedagogies of technology was explained as follows:

Pedagogies of technology are critically aware and technically competent pedagogies that can be developed in practice to maximise the latent potential of technologies to accelerate learning in meaningful ways that meet the individual needs of diverse learners. The starting point for a pedagogy of technology is a desire to do things differently, rather than to do the same things using ‘flashy’ tools and gizmos.

(Casey et al., 2016, p.7)

Individual teachers at the heart of each case came from different countries, and the resulting pedagogical cases were similar in style to the original model developed by Armour (2014). The narrative at the heart of the cases centred on an HPE teacher/practitioner who uses DigiTech. From this starting point, analyses were undertaken by academics from different disciplines, including pedagogy and, for the purposes of CPD, the teacher/practitioner was asked to conclude the chapter with their reflection on the analysis.

So what did we learn? Firstly, a critical review of all the pedagogical cases suggested that the term ‘pedagogies of technology’ can indeed be helpful in

407 foregrounding the ways in which individual practitioners ‘do’ something  
408 pedagogically different with technology. At the same time, and echoing the evidence  
409 presented earlier, we concluded that we saw very little in the cases that was genuinely  
410 radical or innovative. So, although many practitioners and scholars have positioned  
411 DigiTech as a kind of “supertool”, we were struck by the lack of new forms of  
412 learning, different types of teaching, or indeed any alternative HPE contexts for  
413 learning. What we saw instead was that DigiTech enabled teachers and students to do  
414 the same things faster and more efficiently, albeit after some teachers had invested  
415 time and effort in learning how to use different technologies. We were left wondering  
416 whether what we saw in the cases was the limit of our imagination as a profession.

417         Some extracts from the practitioner reflections in the pedagogical cases are  
418 illustrative. Firstly, some teachers were unable to use DigiTech optimally in their  
419 practice because there was much they had never had the opportunity to learn – or had  
420 even considered as a learning possibility. For example, Dylan reflected “I would be  
421 interested in investigating the *lived experience* of students engaged in learning using  
422 the iPad” (Goodyear et al, 2016, p. 26). James commented: “Even though I consider  
423 myself a reflective practitioner, I had not connected my own professional journey to  
424 developments in technology... I have been taken back by the accuracy of the analysis  
425 from the academic experts and the amount of theory that highlights how and why  
426 these processes occur” (Chambers et al, 2016, p. 63). In another case, Beatrice noted  
427 that “in teaching it is important to take a critical look at pedagogies of technology and  
428 not think all teaching problems can be solved by technological solutions  
429 (Quennerstedt et al, 2016, p. 82) while Andy (Fletcher et al, 2016, p. 118) learnt that  
430 changing his mind about using DigiTech in an area of his practice “should not be  
431 looked at as a failure but as a strong example of sound pedagogical decision-making”.

432 Indeed, the ambition to learn openly from ‘mistakes’ was a recurring theme. As was  
433 noted earlier, some practitioners appear willing to invest significant amounts of time  
434 in learning how to use and experiment with different forms of DigiTech, Joey is a  
435 good example of this (Gleddie et al, 2016, p. 134) and he was clear that he would be  
436 able to learn most effectively where he could share both his successes and his failures:

437 I often share the “best” or in other words the refined or rehearsed  
438 version of what actually happened in my class. I receive digital pats on  
439 the back for my success, but I do not necessarily grow as a teaching  
440 professional as a result. To do that, I need to share the things that did not  
441 go as well in lessons and discuss what might have been missed  
442 opportunities in my teaching.

443 Secondly, following the practitioner narrative and the analysis from three  
444 different disciplinary perspectives, a pedagogy expert was tasked with locating the  
445 issues raised in a coherent pedagogical space. Pedagogues, however, struggled to do  
446 this in ways that opened up new and innovative pedagogical possibilities. For  
447 example, Castelli et al, (2016) drew on the established theories of problem-based  
448 learning as an analytical framework, Jones et al, (2016) (amongst others) used  
449 TPACK, Enright et al (2016) focussed on the privatisation of physical education –  
450 although they also include a section on ‘re-imagineering’ HPE, and Armour et al  
451 (2016) drew on narrative theory and Deweyian concepts.

452 What we learnt through the process of constructing pedagogical cases,  
453 therefore, is that defining pedagogies of technology was helpful in framing the task  
454 for the pedagogical case author teams and encouraging them to think innovatively.  
455 Yet, the cases revealed remarkably little practice that could be regarded as radical as a  
456 direct result of using DigiTech to support learning. Instead, we have come to the

conclusion that while DigiTech should be able to “deepen and accelerate learning” (Fullan, 2013b, p 28) and enable teachers to do things “differently”, we have missed out the prior-step of clarifying what is meant by “accelerating” learning in HPE, and *doing* things “differently”. Essentially, the question for the profession is: what can we imagine for HPE?

Reflecting on the pedagogical cases process, we are able to offer a brief example of how an understanding of the benefits of DigiTech might be enhanced by pedagogical analysis. We draw again on the pedagogy framework of learners and learning, teachers and teaching and knowledge in context (Armour, 2011) mentioned earlier. In their pedagogical case chapter, Quennerstedt et al. (2016) used Armour’s framework to consider Béatrice’s use of dance video games in her teaching. Quennerstedt et al. (2016) argued, from a *learners and learning* perspective, that the key is not to consider how students are learning but *what* they are learning. They posed the question: “is the aim to learn different movement qualities, a particular dance, rhythm, dance moves, creativity, biomechanical or physiological principles? (Quennerstedt et al., 2016, p. 79). From this perspective, DigiTech is not a “gizmo” but a pedagogical intent to help learners learn. Secondly, in focussing on *teachers and teaching*, Quennerstedt et al. (2016) concluded that Béatrice used DigiTech as a teaching *resource* and emphatically not as a substitute teacher. Thus, the dance video game was described as “an instructor, a source of inspiration and a resource for students”(p. 79). In their consideration of *context*, Quennerstedt et al. (2016) challenged the reader to contemplate, from a cultural, historical and subject area perspective, why dance is taught at all; for example, is it “an activity, a cultural form, a form of exercise or an aesthetic practice and expression?” (p. 80). This level of analysis offers rich possibilities for teacher learning in CPD.

The remaining task for this paper, therefore, is to provide the rationale for our claim that we need to open a profession-wide debate about the nature of radical pedagogies in HPE that make optimal use of the potential capacity of DigiTech while minimising the potential harms. Looking back to earlier sections of this paper, a useful starting point is Lupton's (2015, p. 127) question:

How far are we from a situation where "students are forced to wear heart-rate monitors to demonstrate that they are conforming to the exertions demanded of them by the HPE teacher?"

An immediate reaction might be negative, given the dangers posed by a growing focus on performativity as outlined by Gard (2014) and many others in our field (Enright et al. 2016; Gleddie et al, 2016) and within education more broadly (Apple, 2007). There might, however, be another response.

In their individual and collective arguments about DigiTech, Gard, Lupton and Williamson suggested that DigiTech could offer more personalised and individualised learning opportunities. Building on this view, and using Lupton's example above of the heart rate monitor, we would like to argue that teachers could use DigiTech to monitor and tailor 'physical exertions' to the individual student and that this might be a very good thing. Indeed, it might be a better pedagogical strategy based on accurate individualised data that allows teachers to better meet the needs of each student.

Although Gard, Lupton and Williamson suggested that such an approach could work to drive school improvement to the *exclusion* of teachers, it could also be argued that in the hands of skilful teachers, good data could be used to drive new and better forms of learning in HPE. Certainly, Hattie (2012, 2009), among others (e.g., Dinham, 2013) have argued that teachers who have the greatest impact on learning are those who can accurately diagnose and plan for the learning needs of their students. The

507 better the quality of the information a teacher has about a student, the more effective  
508 their pedagogies are likely to be. From this perspective, DigiTech has the potential to  
509 be an invaluable pedagogical device to support learning in individually and  
510 developmentally appropriate ways.

511         The problem, at this stage, is that we have not had a grand profession-wide  
512 debate that could inform our decisions about the use of DigiTech in HPE and its  
513 potential to change our practices for the better. A ‘profession-wide’ debate is not one  
514 that can rage in the pages of academic journals read mainly by other academics  
515 (Sandaña, 2014). As Sandaña (2014) suggests, if we keep doing this we will keep  
516 recycling the message of, “I got a different way of lookin’ at it”, and, in turn, the same  
517 pedagogical practices will most likely continue to exist. Instead, we ‘all’ need to  
518 ‘jump on’ the enthusiasm that DigiTech has in young people’s lives and begin to co-  
519 construct new and exciting futures for HPE.

520         A profession wide debate would involve policy makers, businesses, health  
521 professionals, technology experts, teachers, students, parents, and the wider  
522 community. In other words, anyone who is a participant in, or invested in HPE. We  
523 know from existing evidence-base that exercising the voices of all key stakeholders in  
524 HPE is a powerful mechanism for diagnosing learners’ needs, evaluating teachers and  
525 teaching, co-constructing new contexts for learning and creating effective practices  
526 within HPE (see Leatherdale et al., 2015, and Luguetti et al., 2015). We have been  
527 sensitised to the dangers of DigiTech in HPE by the ground-breaking work of Gard,  
528 Lupton, and Williamson yet, at the same time, their pessimistic views are somewhat  
529 ‘zoomed out’ from the realities of young people’s digital lives. We have learnt from  
530 the pedagogical cases process that new futures are possible for HPE, but that the  
531 collaborations we facilitated between academics and practitioners highlighted a lack

of radical change in HPE. By opening these debates and questions about co-constructing new forms of HPE within the social and cultural framework of DigiTech, to a wider audience, however, we might generate discussions that can lead to improvements to HPE.

We conclude this paper by drawing on Veletsianos (2016) to suggest that a focus on “emerging technologies” and “emerging practices” in digital learning could be a useful way forward. As Veletsianos (2016) argues, “emerging technologies” and “emerging practices” transcend disciplines and, moreover, what makes practice and technology emerging is not the technology, but rather the environments in which technologies and practices operate. Emerging technologies and practices, therefore, are foregrounded in the belief that technologies and practices shape and are shaped by sociocultural environments. Another notable characteristic of emerging technologies is that while there is significant potential for change, such potential has not yet been realised. This final characteristic is the key message of this paper. The ‘take home message’ we want to provide is that DigiTech crosses multiple sectors (e.g., education, journalism, sport), multiple contexts (e.g., home and school), and can be used in multiple ways (e.g., improve learner-learner interaction or personalised learning). As an academic profession, therefore, we will do our young learners a disservice if we simply subscribe to a pessimistic view of the role of DigiTech in HPE. As Veletsianos (2016) argues, DigiTech is not yet established in education. This provides an opportunity for pedagogy experts to shape debate, pedagogy and practice around DigiTech in HPE, rather than allowing technology experts to claim the territory.



## References

- Apple, M.W. (2006). Educating the “right” way: markets, standards, good, and inequality. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Apple, M.W. (2007) Ideological success, educational failure? On the politics of the no child left behind. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(2), 108-116.
- Armour, K. M. (Ed.). (2011). *Sport pedagogy: An introduction for coaching and teaching sport*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.
- Armour, K.M. (2014) (Ed). *Pedagogical Cases in Physical Education and Youth Sport*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Armour, K., Quennerstedt, M., Chambers, F. & Makopoulou, K. (2015): What is ‘effective’ CPD for contemporary physical education teachers? A Deweyan framework, *Sport, Education and Society*, DOI: 10.1080/13573322.2015.1083000
- Armour, K., Evans, G., Bridge, M., Griffiths, M., & Lucas, S. (2016). Gareth: The beauty of the ipad for revolutionising learning in physical education. In A. Casey, V.A. Goodyear, & K.M. Armour (Eds.) *Digital technologies and learning in physical education: Pedagogical cases* (pp. 213-230). London; Routledge.
- Casey, A. (2014). *Should we have a pedagogy of technology for physical education?* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association’s Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, 3-7 April 2014.
- Casey, A., Goodyear, V.A., & Armour, K.M. (2016) *Digital technologies and learning in physical education: Pedagogical cases*. London; Routledge.
- Chambers, F.C., Sherry, J., Murphy, O., O’Brien, W., & Brelín, G. (2016). James: Physical education teacher. In A. Casey, V.A. Goodyear, & K.M. Armour

581 (Eds.) *Digital technologies and learning in physical education: Pedagogical*  
 582 *cases* (pp. 49-68). London; Routledge.  
 583 Cordingley, P., Higgins, S., Greany, T., Buckler, N., Coles-Jordan, D., Crisp, B.,  
 584 Saunders, L., & Coe, R. (2015). *Developing great teaching: lessons from the*  
 585 *international reviews into effective professional development*. London, UK:  
 586 Teacher Development Trust.  
 587 Clark, C.M. (1995). *Thoughtful teaching*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press  
 588 Dinham, S. (2013). Connecting clinical teaching practice with instructional  
 589 leadership. *Australian Journal of Education*, 57, 225–236.  
 590 DCMS (2015). *A new strategy for sport: consultation paper*. UK; DCMS.  
 591 Dron, J. (2102). The Pedagogical-technological Divide and the Elephant in the Room.  
 592 *International Journal on E-Learning*, 11(1), pp. 23-38.  
 593 Enright, E., Robinson, J., Hogan, A., Stylianou, M., Hay, J., Smith, F. & Ball, A.  
 594 (2016). Jarrod: The promise and messy realities of digital technology in  
 595 physical education. In A. Casey, V.A.Goodyear, & K.M. Armour (Eds.)  
 596 *Digital technologies and learning in physical education: Pedagogical cases*  
 597 (pp. 173-190). London; Routledge.  
 598 Evans, J. (2013) Physical Education as porn!, *Physical Education and Sport*  
 599 *Pedagogy*, 18:1, 75-89, DOI: 10.1080/17408989.2011.631002  
 600 Fletcher, T., Vasily, A., Bullock, S.M., Kosnik, C., & Ní Chróinín, D. (2016). Andy:  
 601 Blogging with students - educational visions and digital realities. In A. Casey,  
 602 V.A. Goodyear, & K.M. Armour (Eds.) *Digital technologies and learning in*  
 603 *physical education: Pedagogical cases* (pp. 104-120). London; Routledge.  
 604 Fullan, M. (2013a). *Stratosphere: Integrating technology, pedagogy, and change*  
 605 *knowledge*. Toronto, Ontario: Pearson.

606 Fullan, M. (2013b). The new pedagogy: Students and teachers as learning partners.  
607 *Learning Landscape*, 6, 23–29.

608 Gard, M. (2014). eHPE: A history of the future. *Sport Education and Society*, 219 (6),  
609 827-845.

610 Goodyear, V., Blain, D., Quarmby, T.& Wainwright, N (2016). Dylan: The use of  
611 ‘mobile’ ‘apps’ within a tactical inquiry approach. In A. Casey, V.A. Goodyear,  
612 & K.M. Armour (Eds.) *Digital technologies and learning in physical education:  
613 Pedagogical cases* (pp. 13-30). London; Routledge.

614 Gleddie, D., Feith, J. Howe, P.D., Larsson, H., Cale, L. & Casey, A. (2016). Joey:  
615 Social media as a tool for professional development. In A. Casey, V.A.  
616 Goodyear, & K.M. Armour (Eds.) *Digital technologies and learning in physical  
617 education: Pedagogical cases* (pp. 121-136). London; Routledge.

618 Greenhow, C. and Lewin, C. (2016). Social media and education: reconceptualizing  
619 the boundaries of formal and informal learning. *Learning, Media and  
620 Technology*, 41(4), pp.6-30.

621 Halford, S. (2016, March). *The Ethical Disruptions of Social Media Research: tales  
622 from the field*. Paper presented at the Social Media & Social Science Research  
623 Ethics conference, London, UK.

624 Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2012). *Professional capital: transforming teaching in  
625 every school*. New York: Teachers College Press.

626 Hastie, P.A., Casey, A., & Tarter, A-M (2010). A case study of wikis and student  
627 designed games in physical education. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*,  
628 19 (1), 79-91.

629 Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*.  
630 London, UK: Routledge.

631 Hattie, J. (2009) *Visible learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to*  
632 *achievement*. Oxon: Routledge.

633 Howard, S.K. & Mozejko, A. (2015). Teachers: Technology, change and resistance In  
634 M. Henderson and G. Romeo (eds), *Teaching and Digital Technologies: Big*  
635 *Issues and Critical Questions* , Cambridge University Press. pp. 307-317).

636 Jones, E., Schupbach, R., Harvey, S. Bulger, S., & Voelker, D. (2016). Rick:  
637 ‘Energize and educate at every age’ - technology integration over a teaching  
638 career. In A. Casey, V.A. Goodyear, & K.M. Armour (Eds.) *Digital*  
639 *technologies and learning in physical education: Pedagogical cases* (pp. 154-  
640 172). London; Routledge.

641 Kerner, C. (2013). *Relationships between body image, motivation and physical*  
642 *education (PE) experiences in 13-14 year old boys and girls*. Unpublished PhD  
643 thesis: University of Bedfordshire.

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

645 Kong, S.C., Chan, T-W., Griffin, P., Hoppe, U., Huang, R., Kinshuk, Looi, C.K., et  
646 al. (2014). E-learning in school education in the coming 10 years for developing  
647 21<sup>st</sup> century skills’ critical research issues and policy implications. *Educational*  
648 *Technology and Society*, 17(1), 70-78.

649 Kretschmann, R. (2015). Physical education teachers’ subjective theories about  
650 integrating information and communication (ICT) into physical education. *The*  
651 *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 14, (1), 68-96.

652 Leatherdale, S.T., Brown, S.K., Carson, V., Childs, R.A., Dubin, J.A., Elliott, S.J.,  
653 Faulkner, G., et al., (2014). The COMPASS study: a longitudinal hierarchical  
654 research platform for evaluating natural experiments related to changes in

655 school-level programs, policies and built environment resources. *BMC Public*  
656 *Health*, 14, 331.

657 Lenhart, A. (2015). Teens, social media and technology. Pew Research Centre.  
658 Available at:  
659 [http://www.pewinternet.org/files/2015/04/PI\\_TeensandTech\\_Update2015\\_040](http://www.pewinternet.org/files/2015/04/PI_TeensandTech_Update2015_040)  
660 9151.pdf

661 Luguetti, C., Oliver, K.L., Kirk, D., & Dantas, L. (2015). Exploring an activist  
662 approach of working with boys from socially vulnerable backgrounds in a sport  
663 context. *Sport, Education & Society*, iFirst

664 Lupton, D. (2014, August). *Self-tracking modes: Reflexive self-monitoring and data*  
665 *practices*. Paper presented at the Imminent Citizenships: Personhood and  
666 Identity Politics in the Informatic Age, Canberra. Retrieved from  
667 <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2483549>

668 Lupton, D. (2015). Data assemblages, sentient schools and digitized health and  
669 physical education (response to Gard). *Sport, Education and Society*, 20(1),  
670 122–132.

671 McKenzie, T.L. & Lounsbery, M.A.F. (2013). Physical Education Teacher  
672 Effectiveness in a Public Health Context, *Research Quarterly for Exercise and*  
673 *Sport*, 84:4, 419-430, DOI: 10.1080/02701367.2013.844025

674 Miguel, C. (2016). Virtual intimacy on social media: from selfies to the co-  
675 construction of intimacies through shared pictures. *Social Media + Society*,  
676 April-June, 1-10.

677 Palao, J.M., Hastie, P.A. and Guerrero, P. (2015). The impact of video technology on  
678 student performance in physical education. *Technology, Pedagogy and*  
679 *Education*, 24(1), pp. 51-63.

680 Parker, M. & Patton, K. (In Press). What Research Tells Us about Effective  
681 Continuing Professional Development for Physical Education Teachers. In:  
682 Ennis CD (ed) *Routledge Handbook of Physical Education*. Routledge:  
683 London.

684 Penney, D. & Chandler, T. (2000). Physical Education: What Future(s)?, *Sport,*  
685 *Education and Society*, 5:1, 71-87, DOI: 10.1080/135733200114442

686 Quennerstedt, M., Öhman, M., Eriksson, C. (2008). Physical education in Sweden – a  
687 national evaluation. *Education-line*, 1-17.

688 Quennerstedt, M., Gibbs, B., Almqvist, J., Nilsson, J. & Winther, H. (2016) Béatrice:  
689 Dance video games as a resource for teaching dance. In A. Casey, V.A.  
690 Goodyear, & K.M. Armour (Eds.) *Digital technologies and learning in physical*  
691 *education: Pedagogical cases* (pp. 69-85). London; Routledge.

692 Rich, E. and Miah, A. (2014). Understanding digital health as public pedagogy: a  
693 critical framework. *Societies*, 4(2), pp.296-315.

694 Rich, E. and Miah, A. (2016): Mobile, wearable and ingestible health technologies:  
695 towards a critical research agenda, *Health Sociology Review*,  
696 DOI:10.1080/14461242.2016.1211486

697 Öhman, M., Almqvist, J., Meckbach, J., & Quennerstedt, M. (2014). Competing for  
698 ideal bodies: a study of exergames used as teaching aids in schools. *Critical*  
699 *Public Health*, 24(2), pp.196-209

700 O’Sullivan, M. (2013). New directions, new questions: relationships between  
701 curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment in physical education, *Sport, Education*  
702 *and Society*, 18:1, 1-5, DOI: 10.1080/13573322.2012.719868

703 Reid, C. (2009) Technology-loving Luddites? Declining participation in high school  
 704 computing studies in Australia, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*,  
 705 30:3, 289-302, DOI: 10.1080/01425690902812562

706 Robinson, K. (2011). *Out of our minds: learning to be creative*. Chichester, UK:  
 707 Capstone Publishing ltd.

708 Rosen, L. (2010). *Rewired: Understanding the iGeneration and the way they learn*.  
 709 New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

710 Sandaña, J. (2014). Blue-collar qualitative research: a rant. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 1-5.

711 Selwyn, N. (2002) Telling tales on technology: the ethical dilemmas of critically  
 712 researching educational computing. Ashgate Press, Farnham, Surrey. ISBN  
 713 978-0-7546-1350-3

714 Selwyn, N. (2014). Distrusting educational technology: critical questions for changing  
 715 times. London: Routledge.

716 Selwyn, N. (2015). Minding our language: why education and technology is full of  
 717 bullshit ... and what might be done about it, *Learning, Media and Technology*,  
 718 DOI: 10.1080/17439884.2015.101252.

719 Selwyn, N., & Stirling, E. (2016). Social media and education...now the dust has  
 720 settled. *Learning, Media & Technology*, 41(1), 1-5.

721 Sinelnikov, O.A. (2013). Using the iPad in a sport education season. *Journal of*  
 722 *Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 83(1), 39-45.

723 Sipila, K. (2014). Educational use of information and communication technology:  
 724 teachers' perspective. *Technology, Pedagogy, and Education*, 23(2), 225-241.

725 Taranto, G., Dalbon, M., & Gaetano, J. (2011). Academic social networking beings  
 726 web 2.0 technologies to the middle grades. *Middle School Journal*, 42(5), 12-  
 727 19.

- 728 Warfield, K., Cambre, C., & Abidin, C. (2016). Introduction to the social media +  
 729 society special issue on selfies: me-diated inter-faces. *Social Media + Society*,  
 730 April-June, 1-5.
- 731 Webster, F., and K. Robins. (1986). *Information technology: A Luddite analysis*.  
 732 Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- 733 Williamson, B. (2015) Algorithmic skin: health-tracking technologies, personal  
 734 analytics and the biopedagogies of digitized health and physical education.  
 735 *Sport, Education and Society*, 20(1), pp. 133-151, DOI:
- 736 Veletsianos, G. (2016). *Emergence and innovation in digital learning: foundations*  
 737 *and applications*. AU Press; Athabasca University, CA.
- 738 Vrasidas, C. (2015). The rhetoric of reform and teachers' use of ICT. *British Journal*  
 739 *of Educational Technology*, 46(2), 370-380.