

Carlos Eduardo Gonçalves
Sean P. Cumming
Manuel J. Coelho e Silva
Robert M. Malina
(Editors)

Sport and Education

Tribute to Martin Lee

Don Hellison¹; Sarah Doolittle²
University of Illinois, USA¹; Adelphi University, USA²

MORAL EDUCATION IN THE PRACTICE OF SPORT AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

1. Preliminary and introduction

Martin Lee dedicated himself to the study of sport and moral education. This volume honors his work by exploring the state of the art of sport and physical activity in the moral development of youth. Given the range of theoretical-philosophical moral education orientations, this task is particularly daunting.

For our contribution and in line with our backgrounds, we have narrowed the scope of this task to one physical activity-moral education approach, Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (TPSR), and the implications we can draw from our experiences in the development, implementation, and spread of this approach. Although conceptualized as a holistic developmental approach for working with underserved youth (i.e., youth who live in low income, violence-prone communities), the model's relevance for moral education is well known, as reflected in an invitation to present at the National Conference of the Association for Moral Education (Hellison, Martinek, & Walsh, 2004) and by references in the literature to TPSR as a "moral craft" (Kirk, 1991, pp. 246-248) and as one of several "sport and physical education intervention programs for moral development in children" (Vealey, 2006, p.150). The history, conceptual framework, and research related to this approach are described below, followed by a consideration of the problem of implementing moral education beyond the realm of academic discourse to broad-based practice. But first, some contextual remarks.

2. Moral education and physical activity

There is no dearth of promulgations, claims, and arguments regarding the physical activity-moral education relationship. The sport and physical education literature is replete with references to moral education, as well as character education, fair play, and other related constructs. Shields and Bredemeier (1995) did an admirable job of reviewing much of this literature within the context of moral theory. Another example, in the *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, is a three issue series on character development (e.g., Docheff, 1997) directed toward teachers,

coaches and teacher educators in physical education and physical activity. Both of these examples indicated a strong interest in the US about moral education in the context of physical education, sport and physical activity, from both theoretical and practical points of view.

From the theoretical point of view, issues in the literature center around differentiating moral issues from personal preferences and conventional behavior (Nucci, 1982); and resolving conflicts among various theories and philosophies, including social learning (Bandura, 1977), cognitive/constructivist development (Kohlberg, 1981), interaction morality (Haan, 1991), and the more social-emotional dimensions of empathy (Hoffman, 1984) and caring (Gilligan, 1982; Noddings, 1984). In this chapter, we focus instead on the practical aspects of moral education for youth in physical education and physical activity programs. Such programs can be grouped as two types: theory-into-practice and practice-into-theory.

3. Theory into practice

Much has been written about the physical activity-moral education relationship. Most of this work consists of borrowing, modifying, or creating a conceptual framework that is then tested in a practical setting, such as youth sport, in-school physical education, or other physical activity programs. Some examples of theories that have been tested in practice are:

- Kohlberg's constructivist theory of moral development with preadolescent school children in play settings (Horrocks, 1977).
- Giebink and McKenzie's (1985) behaviorist-oriented pro-social conceptual framework in a residential camp setting.
- The combination of interaction morality and structural developmental moral education in an elementary school physical education program (Romance, Weiss, and Bockoven, 1986).
- A comparison of social learning and structural moral development in a children's sports camp (Bredemeier, Weiss, Shields, and Shewchuck, 1986).
- An in-school physical education experimental study of the constructivist-based Fair Play for Kids model (Gibbons, Ebbeck, and Weiss, 1995).
- A conceptual framework for promoting life skills through sport implemented in sports clinics for youth (Hodge and Danish, 1999).

These sample studies show how theories can be developed into practical programs or experiences for children and youth and yield positive outcomes that approach the ones intended. Too often, however, these programs have limited impact other than on the groups of youth and practitioners who are directly related to the original research project. When the researcher moves on to new initiatives, the program and its principles often become difficult to sustain. Furthermore, unless effective materials and trainers become available, few additional groups can take advantage

of the innovation. To combat this problem, theory-into-practice research sometimes includes published guidelines or manuals so that practitioners can put the approach into practice. Examples include:

- The Fair Play for Kids curriculum guide for elementary classrooms and gyms (Commission for Fair Play, 1990).
- Specific recommendations for physical education teachers, coaches, athletic administrators, players, and parents by Shields and Bredemeier (1995).
- The SUPER sports clinic program manual (Danish, 1998).
- Ennis and her associates' (1996) Sport for Peace model.

Despite these efforts, theory-into-practice approaches have yet to show sustained implementation by practitioners outside of a research setting and little dissemination or further development beyond the first initiative. These theory/research-based approaches are presented in research journals and academic conferences, and thus appear to be most valuable in developing the literature base and expanding understanding of moral development and moral education strategies. They have less influence on large numbers of youth or practitioners. This may be explained in several ways. First, access by practitioners to this information as well as to training for implementation and technical assistance appears to be limited. Professionals who work daily with students and youth generally do not have easy access to the academic journals or discourse on moral development. Furthermore, youth sport leaders and physical education teachers tend to be more interested in ideas and programs that address the real problems and issues they experience daily. They are less interested in the validation of theoretically driven educational approaches or the production of rigorous research results. To complicate matters, if moral development programs, theories and philosophies do not in some way connect with practitioners' current beliefs about children and youth, or beliefs about teaching, sport, or physical activity, they are easily ignored or dismissed as irrelevant. Even when programs do appeal to practitioners, additional barriers hinder sustained implementation, which will be discussed in a section below.

4. Practice-into-theory

We argue that the models of physical activity-moral education most frequently adopted by practitioners are those that begin in practice and gradually build a conceptual framework that can be disseminated. We call these initiatives practice-into-theory. Examples include:

- Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (Hellison, 1978; 2003)
- Adventure education (Rohnke, 1977; Rohnke & Butler, 1995)
- Cooperative learning in physical education (Grineski, 1989; 1996)
- Sport Education (Siedentop, Mand and Taggart, 1986; Siedentop, Hastie & van der Mars, 2004).

The development of these educational approaches has been, for the most part, a trial and error process in practice, initiated by a single originator and close colleagues. When the original ideas seem to "work" with youth, a conceptual framework or set of principles is established and presented to teachers, coaches and youth leaders through conferences, workshops, and publications. When perceived as credible and feasible, practitioners replicate or, more often, adapt the approach to their contexts, students, and pedagogies. In addition, if they appeal to teachers' beliefs and/or pedagogical practices, and appear to work with children and youth, these approaches earn devoted followers who also present and publish their interpretations of the approach in practitioner conferences and publications.

In this way, practice-into-theory moral education approaches spread from one practitioner to others, with variable degrees of fidelity, but also expanding and deepening the original principles (and sometimes distorting original principles beyond recognition). Nevertheless, these practice-into-theory approaches have been successfully "scaled-up" (Coburn, 2003) to many teachers, coaches and youth workers because they offer practical solutions to real problems as well as feasible strategies that appear likely to produce the desired outcomes. They sometimes lack sound theoretical credentials and/or a rigorous research base until much later in the process, if at all.

Similar to theory-into-practice approaches, the impact of these models on participants is difficult to determine, because such research is notoriously difficult to conduct, and because quality control showing fidelity to the original approach is problematic. With this disadvantage, however, comes an advantage: Research may be less important in implementation because practitioners are less concerned about program efficacy as determined by research results than they are by finding alternative ideas and strategies that, from their experience, appear to enrich their programs or improve their own practices. TPSR is one practice-into-theory moral education approach that has been widely adopted and adapted since it was developed in the 1970's. By examining this approach, its past and present, our intention is to address sustained implementation of moral education programs in practice.

5. Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility

TPSR has one of the longest legacies and a substantial and growing research base that makes it worth studying to understand the implementation process. It is a practice-into-theory moral education approach that has been widely disseminated and continually sustained for several decades in school physical education, extended day physical activity programs, and a few organized sport programs in many states in the US, some Canadian provinces, and in Spain and New Zealand. Of the practice-into-theory approaches identified above, it is the one that most deliberately aims for moral education, with sport or physical activities viewed as the vehicle for personal and social development with young people.

TPSR began very simply as one program leader's search for a way to convert physical activity into a medium for helping youth from low income, violence-prone communities. The earliest written accounts of TPSR reflect its rudimentary beginnings. In 1973, just one paragraph out of an entire book titled *Humanistic Physical Education* was

devoted to a pre-TPSR program for underserved youth (Hellison, 1973, p. 94). By 1978, an entire book was devoted to describing TPSR in practice in an "inner city" secondary school physical education program (Hellison, 1978). Based on continued practice with underserved youth and augmented by physical educators who learned of this approach and developed their own adaptations, TPSR gradually became more substantive and nuanced (Hellison 1985; Hellison & Templin, 1991; Hellison, 1995; Hellison, 2003) and began to be recognized as a curriculum model (Jewett & Bain, 1985; Silverman & Ennis, 2003; Metzler, 2005) and a moral education approach (Kirk, 1991; Vealey, 2006). Various scholars from the subdisciplines began to recognize the contribution of TPSR, for example, sport sociology (Rees, 2001; Harris, 2006), sport psychology (Solomon, 1997; Vealey, 2006); sport pedagogy (Ennis, 2006), and adapted physical education (Winnick, 2000; Sherill, 2004). TPSR was also a part of the youth development field as it evolved into its own specialization (Hellison, Cutforth, Kallusky, Martinek, Parker & Stiehl, 2000; Kahne, Nagaoka, Brown, O'Brien, Quinn, & Thiede, 2000).

Traditional qualitative and to some extent quantitative research studies trailed behind the development of this practice-into-theory model but eventually strengthened the model's claims. The bridge between practice and research began with a practice-based research approach, service-bonded inquiry (Martinek & Hellison, 1997; Martinek, Hellison & Walsh, 2004), which broadened curriculum research beyond its more typical data-based positivist design toward reflection, imagination, and philosophy. Studies through more traditional methods followed, for example, Hellison & Walsh's (2002) literature review of 26 studies, a longitudinal study by Hellison and Wright (2003), Watson and her associates' (2003; Newton et al, 2006) psychometric investigations of TPSR, and Mrugala's (2002) practitioner testimony documentation.

In its current form, TPSR utilizes strong instructor-participant relationships based on specific guidelines accompanied by gradual empowerment and group and self-reflection as tools to help youth take more personal responsibility - conceptualized as self-motivation and goal-setting - and more social/moral responsibility - conceptualized as respect for others and helping others - as well as transferring these responsibilities to other aspects of their lives. Strategies have been developed to integrate these responsibilities into physical activity and to deal with problems that arise, such as conflicts and accountability, and applications outside of physical activity are routinely discussed. Although moral education only focuses on TPSR's social/moral components, this program/curriculum model is intended to be holistic and therefore includes self-development.

Although the beginnings of TPSR predate the following conceptual developments, TPSR received belated support from deCharms' (1976) early motivation work as well as Conrad and Hedin's (1981) social responsibility framework, which consists of attitude (sense of responsibility), competence (ability to help), and efficacy (knowledge that one can make a difference). Two recent orientations from the emerging field of youth development, positive youth development and relational youth work (Edginton & Randall, 2005), promote values and concepts similar to those of TPSR. Positive youth development emphasizes developmental stages and personal growth, while relational youth work focuses on development through youth-youth worker relationships.

6. Toward widespread implementation of physical activity-moral education programs

114

While originally one teacher's attempt to address issues in his work with youth in a single program, TPSR has been implemented and developed by many others due at least in part to several factors that affect the spread of educational innovations generally. Scaling-up any educational program or initiative implies that the change is intended for many more youth than one person or program can reach. If "reaching out broadly" is intended by the developers, they must be concerned not only with developing and testing their theories, publishing guidelines, describing programs, and researching impact in single cases. They must also consider "what it really means for an external reform to be successfully implemented" by others in their own unique contexts (Coburn, 2003, p.4). As Coburn and others theorize, innovations become authentically adopted and sustained by practitioners when they reflect certain characteristics. The program or approach needs "depth" to connect with existing beliefs and to have the potential to expand or change those beliefs; "sustainability" to continue after the initial impulse through networks of like-minded colleagues or through available workshops and publications; "spread" beyond one context or person to others, especially to others in authority or toward institutional and policy levels; and "shift in ownership," giving practitioners flexibility and encouragement to interpret the approach to suit their unique context or constituents' needs. TPSR is a good example of a moral education program that has been successfully implemented on a large scale, and shows how these characteristics support implementation.

Depth: Unlike other innovations TPSR has been under development throughout its 30 year history, a continual tinkering of a few goals and strategies primarily through practice, but also informed by literature. The model persisted perhaps because the fundamental goals and principles are simple and presented in relatively commonsensical terms. Goals are defined as observable behaviors in a developmental frame, and are persuasive to both practitioners and scholars. The strategies presented are structurally similar to those already in use by teachers and coaches. Thus, the TPSR model is congruent with the beliefs and pedagogical structures held by many teachers and youth workers and thus easy to adopt. The model appeals to practitioners because it provides a relatively straightforward response to common "behavior" problems first, but then the principles can be explored and more sophisticated strategies can be employed as experience or commitment increases. In essence, this model has been sustained in practice perhaps because the goals and strategies are simple, but rich.

Sustainability: The original ideas have been continually presented primarily to teachers, coaches, and youth workers for over thirty years. Additionally, materials and publications have been aimed at practitioner audiences first, and scholarly audiences secondarily. Within the presentations and publications, variations designed by practitioners and researchers have been presented as valid contributions to the model, and passed on to others as possibilities to consider. In short, rather than designing and delivering a packaged program and then abandoning it for a new project, TPSR has been presented as a collective work in progress that may have something in it worth trying for professionals in many different physical activity contexts. Scholars and practitioners who adopt or adapt TPSR for their own use often extend the model to new contexts or groups of youths, rather than abandoning it for a completely new idea or research agenda.

Shift of ownership: With widespread implementation, quality control becomes an issue. As Mrugala's (2002) study points out, many people who believe they are implementing TPSR do so only superficially as a management tool, and miss essential aspects of the original intent. But there is also ample evidence of thoughtful adaptation and practices consistent with the fundamental principles in program descriptions and research studies published by experienced practitioners in some settings (see for example Stiehl & Galvin, 2005; practitioner Jeff Walsh's adaptation in Hellison, 1983; practitioner descriptions in Hellison, 2003). These adoptions and adaptations have developed because throughout the development of TPSR, practitioners have been encouraged to take ownership of the model by adopting parts of the model that "fit" and adapting the language and strategies to work in their unique contexts. Shifting ownership of the approach from the original developer to the people engaged with youth has the advantage of many people trying the model, with the disadvantage that many may in fact be implementing something completely unrecognizable to the original developer.

Spread: In addition to live presentations and discussions with in-service teachers and coaches, published materials have been written in ways that are easily accessed by people engaged day-to-day with students, athletes and youth. Articles about TPSR continue to be published, and it appears in many textbooks intended for initial and graduate study in physical education curriculum and instruction (e.g., Graham, Holt-Hale & Parker, 2004; Lund & Tannehill, 2005; Metzler, 2005; Rink, 2004; Siedentop & Tannehill, 2000). With this presence in professional physical education literature, TPSR has become established as an alternative curriculum or instructional approach, familiar to many novice and experienced teachers. From textbook to policy is not a difficult process. With the development of content standards by the national professional associations and by state level education policy making bodies, TPSR goals and principles are now becoming obvious influences in policy documents.

New York State's recent initiative to include personal and social responsibility not only in curriculum documents, but also into state assessments is an example of spread beyond single practitioners and toward large-scale institutional mandates. The New York State Physical Education Profile (University of the State of New York, The State Education Department, in press) assessments for competence in physical activities include a required component of the student's demonstrated personal and social behavior while engaged in the activity. The rubric used to score this is directly designed from the TPSR's levels of personal and social responsibility. TPSR was chosen not only because it reflected the intent of the state learning standards to teach personal and social responsibility, character, civility and citizenship in physical activity settings, but because of the model's familiarity and appeal to physical education teachers in New York State. Together with a written assessment of moral reasoning, physical education teachers will be expected to address both moral behavior and moral reasoning in sport and physical activity settings.

With the publication of the New York State Physical Education Profile, and through a series of statewide workshops designed to assist teachers and administrators with using the assessments and with implications for their programs, TPSR will be featured as a recommended resource for curriculum development and instructional strategies that can help teachers and their students understand and act in ways that

are consistent with "personal and social responsibility", and "character, civility and citizenship" providing high level authority for physical activity based-moral education in physical education for New York State's students, and the potential to reach more than two million public school children in the context of physical education programs. This begins a new phase for TPSR and moral education programs.

TPSR studies thus far have been micro studies; i.e., investigations of a single program with applications to theory-in practice rather than populations (Patton, 1990), or cross case analysis of single programs (Merriam, 1998). The few large scale policy documents that include TPSR (Hellison & Martinek, 2006) do not mandate implementation and assessment procedures. Thus, adoption of the TPSR principles and now assessments designed from the TPSR goals in the New York State Profile offers an opportunity to study TPSR and moral education on a macro scale. It will be interesting to study the impact of a large-scale implementation of this moral education program and to see what effect such exposure will have on the TPSR model, and perhaps on moral education more generally.

7. Concluding remarks

The purpose of this chapter was to draw implications from our experiences in the development, implementation, and spread of one physical activity-moral education approach in order to move the problem of implementation beyond the realm of academic discourse to broad-based practice. While theory-into-practice studies in this area are plentiful, their adoption and sustainability in practice have not been clearly substantiated and so far remain problematic. On the other hand, practice-into-theory, although attracting less attention, may offer more promise for sustainability, spread, and the shift in ownership (or "buy-in") necessary to accommodate local modifications and practitioner perspectives.

TPSR was chosen to examine practice-into-theory more closely because of its long history and recognition in the literature. In addition, we have professional stakes in this approach. The first author (Don) created the conceptual framework through fieldwork with underserved youth and continues this work today, while the second author (Sarah) currently co-directs the New York State Physical Education Profile project in which TPSR is a prominent feature.

In terms of scaling up moral education approaches for widespread use in practice, TPSR has evolved from a single teacher's innovation and gradual spread to large numbers of practitioners by word of mouth, workshops, and publications. Most recently TPSR has been scaled up to state-level policy initiative. This process has evolved not through a systematic theory/research driven development, but through practical appeal to practitioners who work with students. The model consists of a set of goals that are easy to understand and hard to dispute, practical instructional strategies, and clear expectations for the relationships necessary for positive impact with students. It is a model that encourages teachers, coaches, and youth workers to adopt and adapt, but one that has enough potential "agreed upon personal and social characteristics" as well as "structural arrangements" (Sage, 1998) and specific educational process (Stoll

& Beller, 1998) to give it an identity. Over time, TPSR has developed substance and credibility to change practitioners' deeply held beliefs and pedagogies. It lends itself to adaptation both horizontally to a breadth of teachers, programs and students, and also vertically from single groups to high-level policies. This flexibility delivers the sense of ownership essential to the sustained adoption of any innovation.

While TPSR and moral education policy work is in its infant stages, the New York State example holds some promise for examining the effects of "scaling up" physical activity-moral education approaches. This example of moral education is one that will have both bottom-up (practitioner driven) and top down (policy driven) support, adding a new dimension to the field of moral education for youth.

8. References

- Bandura A (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- Bredemeier BJ, Weiss MR, Shields DL, Shewchuck RM (1986). Promoting moral growth in a summer sports camp: The implementation of theoretically grounded instructional strategies. *Journal of Moral Education*, 15, 212-220.
- Coburn CE (2003). Rethinking scale: Moving beyond numbers to deep and lasting change. *Educational Researcher*, 32, 3-12.
- Commission for Fair Play (1990). *Fair play for kids*. Ottawa, CA: Author.
- Conrad D, Hedin D (1981). *Instruments and scoring guide of the experiential education evaluation project*. St. Paul, MN: Center for Youth Development and Research, University of Minnesota.
- Danish S (1998). *The SUPER program*. Richmond VA: Life Skills Center, Virginia Commonwealth University.
- deCharms R (1976). *Enhancing motivation: Change in the classroom*. New York: Irvington.
- Docheff D (1997). Character in sport and physical education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 68, 34, 37.
- Edginton CR, Randall SW (2005) Youth services: Strategies for programming. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 76, 19-24.
- Ennis C, Solomon M, Loftus S, Owens L, McCauley M, Satina B, Mensch J (1996). *Sport for Peace*. College Park, MD: Author.
- Ennis CD (2006) Curriculum: Forming and reshaping the vision in a high need, low demand world of schools. *Quest*, 58, 41-59.
- Gibbons SL, Ebbeck V, Weiss MR (1995). *Fair play for kids*: Effects on the moral development of children in physical education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 66, 247-255.
- Giebink MP, McKenzie TL (1985). Teaching sportsmanship in physical education and recreation: An analysis of Interventions and generalization effects. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 4, 167-177.
- Gilligan C (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Graham G, Holt-Hale S, Parker M (2004). *Children moving: A reflective approach to teaching physical education*. Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Grineski S (1989). Children, games and pro-social behavior - Insight and connections. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 60, 8, 20-25.
- Grineski S (1996). *Cooperative learning in physical education*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

- Haan N (1991). Moral development and action from a social constructivist perspective, In WM Kurtines & JL Gewitz (Eds.), *Handbook of moral behavior and development: Vol. 1: Theory* (pp. 251-273). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Harris JC (2006). Sport sociology: Expanding horizons in the subdiscipline. *Quest*, 58, 71-91.
- Hellison D (1973). *Humanistic Physical Education*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hellison D (1978). *Beyond Balls and Bats: Alienated youth in the gym*. Washington, DC: AAHPERD.
- Hellison D (1983). Teaching self-responsibility (and more). *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 54, 23, 28.
- Hellison D (1985). *Goals and strategies for physical education*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hellison D, Templin T (1991). *A reflective approach to teaching physical education*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hellison D (1995). *Teaching responsibility through physical activity*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hellison D (2003). *Teaching responsibility through physical activity, 2nd ed.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hellison D, Cutforth N, Kallusky J, Martinek T, Parker M, Stiehl J (2000). *Youth development and physical activity: Linking universities and communities*. Champaign, IL: Human kinetics.
- Hellison D, Martinek T (2006). Social and individual responsibility programs. In D Kirk, M O'Sullivan, D MacDonald (Eds.), *Handbook of research in physical education*. London, England: Sage.
- Hellison D, Martinek T, Walsh D (2004). Service-bonded inquiry revisited: A research model for the community-engaged professor. *Quest*, 56, 397-412.
- Hellison D, Walsh D (2002). Responsibility-based youth programs evaluation: Investigating the investigations. *Quest*, 54, 292-307.
- Hellison D, Wright P (2003). Retention in an urban extended day program: A process-based assessment. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 22, 369-381.
- Hoffman ML (1984). Empathy, its limitations, and its role in a comprehensive moral theory. In WM Kurtines, JL Gewitz (eds.), *Morality, moral behavior, and moral development* (pp. 283-302). New York: Wiley.
- Hodge K, Danish S (1999). Promoting life skills for adolescent boys through sport. In AM Horne & MS Kiselica (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling boys and adolescent males* (pp. 55-71). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Horrocks R (1978). Resolving conflict in the gymnasium. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 49, 61.
- Jewett A, Bain L (1985). *The curriculum process in physical education*. Madison, WI: Wm C. Brown & Benchmark Publishers.
- Kahne J, Nagaoka J, Brown A, O'Brien J, Quinn T, Thiede K (2000). School and after-school programs as contexts for youth development: A quantitative and qualitative assessment. In MC Wang, WL Boyd (eds), *Improving results for children and families: Linking collaborative services with school reform efforts* (121-152). Greenwich, CT: IAP.
- Kirk D (1991). Curriculum work in physical education: Beyond the objectives approach? *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 12, 244-265.
- Kohlberg L (1981). *Essays on moral development: Vol. 1. The philosophy of moral development*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Lund J, Tannehill D (Eds.) (2005). *Standards-based physical education curriculum development*. Sudbury, MA: Jones & Bartlett Publishers.
- Martinek T, Hellison D (1997). Service-bonded inquiry: The road less traveled. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 17, 107-121.
- Martinek T, Hellison D, Walsh D (2004). Service-bonded inquiry revisited: A research model for the community-engaged professor. *Quest*, 56, 397-412.

- Merriam S (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Metzler MW (2005). *Instructional models for physical education*. Scottsdale, AZ: Holcomb Hathaway.
- Mrugala J (2002). Exploratory study of responsibility model practitioners. Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Chicago.
- Newton M, Watson D, Kim M, Beacham A (2006). Understanding motivation of underserved youth in physical activity settings. *Youth and Society*, 37, 348-371.
- Noddings N (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education*. New York: Teachers Press.
- Nucci L (1982). Conceptual development in the moral and conventional domains: Implications for values education. *Review of Educational Research*, 52, 93-122.
- Patton M (1990). *Qualitative evaluation methods*. (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rees CR (2001). Character development, moral development, and social responsibility in physical education and sport: Towards a synthesis of subdisciplinary perspectives. *International Journal of Physical Education*, 38, 38-59.
- Rink J (2006) *Teaching physical education for learning*. Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Rohnke K (1977). *Cowstails and Cobras*. Hamilton, MA: Project Adventure.
- Rohnke K, Butler (1995). *Quicksilver: Adventure games, initiative problems, trust activities and a guide to effective leadership*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt Publishing.
- Romance, Weiss, Brockoven (1986). A program to promote moral development through elementary school physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 5, 126-136.
- Sage G (1998). Does sport affect character development in athletes? *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 69,1,15-18.
- Sherrill C (2004). *Adapted Physical Activity, Recreation and Sport*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Shields DLL, Bredemeier BJL (1995). *Character development and physical activity*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Siedentop D, Hastie P, van der Mars H (2004). *Complete guide to sport education*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Siedentop D, Mand C, Taggart A (1986). *Physical education teaching and curriculum strategies for grades 5-12*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- Siedentop D, Tannehill D (2000). *Developing teaching skills in physical education*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- Solomon G (1997). Does physical education affect character development in students. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 68, 38-41.
- Silverman SJ, Ennis CD, Eds (2003). *Student learning in physical education: Applying research to enhance instruction*. Campaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Steihl J, Galvin C (2005). School-based physical activity programs. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 76, 9, 25-31.
- Stoll S, Beller J (1998). Can character be measured? *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 69,1,19-24.
- University of the State of New York - The State Education Department (in press). *New York State Physical Education Profile*. Albany, NY: Author.
- Vealey RS (2006). Smocks and jocks outside the box: The paradigmatic evolution of sport and exercise psychology. *Quest*, 58, 128-159.
- Watson D, Newton M, Kim M (2003). Recognition of values-based constructs in summer physical activity program. *The Urban Review*, 35, 217-232.
- Winnick J (2000). *Adapted Physical Education and Sport*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.