

ting, reconstituting, and transforming physical education  
 rable children, youth, and families. *Journal of Teaching in*  
 -25.

and progressives. *Hull House and the New immigrants*,  
 ersity of Chicago Press.

ucation and sport: A contemporary introduction. Boston:

ack masculinity and sports. In M.A. Messner & D.F. Sabo  
*gender order. Critical feminist perspectives* (pp. 109-114).  
 inetics.

90). Toward a critical feminist reappraisal of sport, men,  
 A. Messner & Sabo D.F. (Ed.), *Sport, men, and the gender*  
*spectives* (pp. 1-18). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

ivism as teaching: Jane Addams and Ida B. Wells. In M.S.  
 eiler, *Pedagogies of resistance. Women educator activists*,  
 ew York: Teachers College Press.

ie circle": Jane Addams, gender, and the re/definition of  
 rocco, & O.L. Davis Jr., "Bending the future to their will".  
*tion, and democracy* (pp. 73-91). Lanham, MD: Rowman

on and administration of playgrounds and recreation. New  
 pany.

earch on physical activity and health: Selected topics, 1867  
 74-287.

d anatomy are destiny!?: Brains, bodies and exercise in  
 an thought. *Journal of Sport History*, 18, 31-54.

cholarship in the history and physical education and sport:  
*Research Quarterly*, 54, 93-103.

). *Hull-House maps and papers*. New York: Thomas Y.

g the social fabric. *Pragmatism and feminism*. Chicago:

illy wounded woman. *Women, doctors, and exercise in the*  
 icago: University of Illinois Press.

## Service-Bonded Inquiry Revisited: A Research Model for the Community-Engaged Professor

Tom Martinek, Don Hellison, and Dave Walsh

The intent of this article is to inform readers about ways in which scholarly inquiry can be expanded. An overview and a refinement of a research approach called *service-bonded inquiry* are provided. Service-bonded inquiry is a response to the call for changing the way research is interpreted, conducted, and evaluated. At the heart of this approach is the integration of service and scholarship. Service-bonded inquiry attempts to equip community-engaged professors with a framework for answering the many questions generated from working in school and service programs and engaging in the lives of kids. First, a description of service-bonded inquiry is given along with the required steps for doing this type of research. Next, an example of a study that applies the concepts of service-bonded inquiry is provided. Finally, ways that by-products of service-bonded inquiry can be evaluated are suggested.

For years, the mission statements of universities and colleges have proclaimed a commitment to producing new knowledge through scholarly inquiry. These statements often underscore the importance of research serving the community and even the world! Recently, these proclamations have been publicly challenged by political watch dogs and community members themselves. A major focus of these criticisms is the enormous gap that exists between what universities produce as knowledge and how the public can use that knowledge. This gap has been created largely by the perceived irrelevant nature of research and its inability to address real societal problems. The gap is widened by views that this knowledge is strictly used in academic circles. Eugene Rice (1996), former Director of the American

---

Tom Martinek is with the Department of Exercise and Sport Science at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. E-mail: martinek@uncg.edu. Don Hellison is with the College of Education at the University of Illinois at Chicago. Dave Walsh is with the Department of Kinesiology at San Francisco State University.

Association for Higher Education Forum on Faculty Roles and Reward Systems warns us that the current issue facing higher education today, one that generates the greatest concern by the public, is the mismatch between universities' priorities and societal needs. Downward swings in rural and urban economics, increased pathology of youth lifestyles, decreased educational resources due to reprioritization of spending (e.g., military expenditure), and shifting roles of schools (e.g., full-service schools) have presented formidable challenges for teachers and community youth leaders. As a result, calls for help by community leaders are increasingly being directed to universities.

Providing and assisting in programs that serve youth and their families, evaluating and contributing resources to these programs, and giving much needed staff development opportunities are but a few of the requests received by universities from urban and rural agencies. We feel that these calls must be heeded. If they are not, the public's perception of university faculty roles will become even more skeptical. Hal Lawson (1997) stresses that regaining public trust will take more than paying mere lip service to its constituencies who often view professors and their programs as public property.

### The Emerging Community-Engaged Professor

A sense of urgency to respond to community needs is beginning to be felt by some institutional leaders. For example, a recent issue of *Quest* was devoted to changing the way we view the professoriate and research. In that issue, the Dean of the Graduate School at Virginia Polytechnic and State University, Karen Depauw, proclaims that universities of the 21<sup>st</sup> century must be willing to "dance to change":

To dance with change, universities must balance relentless demands and dreams of society, be viable and stable, be philosophical and historically grounded, meaningful and practical, and interactive, responsive, and proactive. (Depauw, 2003, p. 19)

Recently, universities have begun to respond to the challenges placed upon them by society. This response has come mainly from professional schools that prepare people to work in the community settings (e.g., schools, recreation centers, YMCAs, and YWCAs, etc.). A key element in their response is to reinforce and support faculty engagement in the twenty-first century (Christina, 2000). Participating in urban and rural immersion programs, joining university and community partnerships, and teaching in youth programs have now become part of the college experience for faculty and their students. In addition, "full service" schools have been established to meet the pressing needs of nearby underserved neighborhoods. As a result, university faculty become key players in these "community hubs" by engaging their academic and teaching resources to address community problems.

At the forefront of this response is the redefinition of faculty roles—that is, to recognize and even promote the concept of the "community-engaged professoriate." Community-engaged professors do research in the community setting and produce information that practitioners can use. That is, they honor their social responsibility

to meet community-neighborhood needs. They attempt to do research, and teaching with these needs. Krahenbuhl not only have knowledge and technical skills but also possess the ability to work with other people.

The concept of the community-engaged professor involves educators immerse themselves in places where sweat and blood are shed: classrooms, community centers, playgrounds, and so on. It requires passion and commitment for doing the right things that lead to successes and failures, acceptance and rejection, criticism and overwhelming support (Martinek, & Hellison, 2003). They become "self-collaborators" (Hellison & Templin, 1997) in the concept of the professor-as-teacher-as-researcher.

Interestingly, the three of us have taken slight detours in our careers to become community-engaged professors. We have served as mentor in youth programs based upon the Social Responsibility Model (Hellison, 2003). Our vocation as faculty as well as undergraduate and graduate students of their ivory tower to run programs and work with students also collect and analyze program evaluation data to assess impact on kids and improve their programs. They all bring personal qualities from these experiences.

For the first author (Tom) this work follows over 20 years of research. Documenting the way teachers view the self-perceptions of young people was a focal point of the research was done in school and sport settings, its in the context of the Pygmalion theory (Martinek, 1997). Occasional research practitioners. But, for the most part, findings were shared with the community through journal publications. A nagging question: How could this research help kids and those who work with them? The question meant being out in community settings and working with community leaders. Armed with some of his past findings and research, he now derives knowledge by doing, feeling, and reflecting.

The journey for the second author (Don) has been over thirty years, his professional career has encompassed where enhancing personal and social responsibility work. Developing and teaching in programs have allowed youngsters realize the contributions they can make in the community. He has placed him in detention centers, community recreation centers, and regular school settings. Alternative approaches to research. Personal written accounts, translating ideas into practice. Reasons for successes and failures were but a few used for continual discovery and renewal.

For third author (Dave), nine years of experience in community programs have placed him on a career path that deal with the same problems he faced early in his career. At the University of Illinois at Chicago, he worked on the Community Leader Project. During this time, he created commu-

on Forum on Faculty Roles and Reward Systems, facing higher education today, one that generates the mismatch between universities' priorities and needs in rural and urban economics, increased pathologic educational resources due to reprioritization of tax revenue, and shifting roles of schools (e.g., full-service schools). These challenges for teachers and community youth help by community leaders are increasingly being

in programs that serve youth and their families, resources to these programs, and giving much needed attention are but a few of the requests received by universities. We feel that these calls must be heeded. If they are, the university faculty roles will become even more pressing as the loss of public trust will take more time to rebuild its constituencies who often view professors and

### Community-Engaged Professor

Responding to community needs is beginning to be felt. For example, a recent issue of *Quest* was devoted to the professoriate and research. In that issue, the Virginia Polytechnic and State University, Karen ties of the 21<sup>st</sup> century must be willing to "dance

with universities must balance relentless demands of society, be viable and stable, be socially grounded, meaningful and practical, and be proactive. (Depauw, 2003, p. 19)

We have begun to respond to the challenges placed on us. The response has come mainly from professional schools in community settings (e.g., schools, recreation centers, etc.). A key element in their response is to engage in the twenty-first century (Christina, and rural immersion programs, joining university and teaching in youth programs have now become a part of faculty and their students. In addition, "full service" has been established to meet the pressing needs of nearby communities. As a result, university faculty become key players in engaging their academic and teaching resources to

The response is the redefinition of faculty roles—that is, to the concept of the "community-engaged professoriate." This is to research in the community setting and produce practical use. That is, they honor their social responsibility

to meet community-neighborhood needs. They attempt to interconnect programs, research, and teaching with these needs. Krahenbuhl (2003) feels these people not only have knowledge and technical skills but also possess a "social quotient" that defines their ability to work with other people.

The concept of the community-engaged professoriate also suggests that educators immerse themselves in places where sweaty kids reside—school gyms, classrooms, community centers, playgrounds, and church basements. It is their passion and commitment for doing the right things that nudges them through periods of successes and failures, acceptance and rejection, optimism and pessimism, and isolation and overwhelming support (Martinek, & Hellison, 1997). They also become "self-collaborators" (Hellison & Templin, 1991) whose role supports the concept of the professor-as-teacher-as-researcher.

Interestingly, the three of us have taken slightly different paths during our careers to become community-engaged professors. We now either direct, teach, and/or mentor in youth programs based upon the second author's Personal and Social Responsibility Model (Hellison, 2003). Our work involves other university faculty as well as undergraduate and graduate students who leave the comfort of their ivory tower to run programs and work with inner city kids. Faculty and students also collect and analyze program evaluation data in order to assess their impact on kids and improve their programs. They also learn more about their own personal qualities from these experiences.

For the first author (Tom) this work follows over 19 years of doing traditional forms of research. Documenting the way teacher and coach expectations mold the self-perceptions of young people was a focal point of his studies. While this research was done in school and sport settings, its intent was mainly on testing and retesting Pygmalion theory (Martinek, 1997). Occasionally, results were shared with practitioners. But, for the most part, findings were only funneled to the academic community through journal publications. A nagging question persisted, however. How could this research help kids and those who work with them? Answering this question meant being out in community settings and helping youth and program leaders. Armed with some of his past findings and mostly guided by his own ideas, he now derives knowledge by doing, feeling, and reflecting.

The journey for the second author (Don) has followed a different path. For over thirty years, his professional career has embraced a "kid first" philosophy where enhancing personal and social responsibility has been the centerpiece of his work. Developing and teaching in programs have allowed him to help underserved youngsters realize the contributions they can make to their community. His work has placed him in detention centers, community recreation facilities, and alternative and regular school settings. Alternative approaches to discovery have guided his research. Personal written accounts, translating ideas into action, and figuring out reasons for successes and failures were but a few of the many strategies that he used for continual discovery and renewal.

For third author (Dave), nine years of extensive involvement in youth programs have placed him on a career path that helps underserved youngsters deal with the same problems he faced early in his life. As a graduate student at the University of Illinois at Chicago, he worked diligently in Don's Urban Youth Leader Project. During this time, he created community partnerships with schools

and youth agencies as well ran after-school sport programs. His connections with inner city kids and their lives further crystallized his commitment to helping them overcome their fear and reach their potentials. This, in turn, reinforced those very same goals in his career and life. He is now well positioned at San Francisco State University to continue his work with inner city kids and service agencies.

Although we cling to these ways of knowing, our work is often scrutinized by our academic counterparts. Developing and running programs for kids, working with teachers and youth program leaders, and engaging university students in real world stuff are often viewed as not being academic enough. Where's your research? What theory are you testing? Are you publishing this work in scholarly journals? Aren't your data too soft?

Fielding these questions constantly reminds us (and others who do this work) of two important things. First, the discipline of physical education (or kinesiology or whatever we call ourselves) is steeped in traditional thought about what research and scholarship should be. This has come about by becoming entrenched in our parent disciplines' research agendas so that we can be more like them. Second, if professors' roles are to be expanded, so too must be the university's view of research. Socialized by multiple years of the "university experience," most faculty, students, and administrators embrace a rather narrow view of scholarly inquiry. We believe that by widening the boundaries of research, universities will be able to craft their own unique character and structure multiple roles for faculty who are attempting to address societal burdens. This will give the researcher-as-teacher more solid footing to conduct what Schon (1987) calls "practice-based" inquiry.

Several years ago, two of us (Tom & Don) published an essay about a new research approach called *service-bonded inquiry* (Martinek & Hellison, 1997). The article informed readers about ways in which the views of scholarly inquiry could be expanded. It was a response to the call for changing the way we interpret and conduct research. At the heart of this approach was the integration of service and scholarship. Service-bonded inquiry attempts to equip community-engaged professors with a framework for answering the many questions generated from working in school and service programs and engaging in the lives of kids. It also offers important segues between ideas and program development. We also suggested a variety of data-gathering strategies that could be used to depict the complex nature of working with children and youth.

This article revisits our original concept of *service-bonded inquiry*. Our purpose is to reinforce the intent of service-bonded inquiry and clarify its use and how it can be evaluated. It is not our intent to suggest that service-bonded inquiry replace more traditional models of research. Rather, we want to encourage universities to place service-bonded inquiry on equal footing with traditional forms of research.

First, we describe what service-bonded inquiry is and the required steps for doing this type of research. These steps must be acknowledged when describing the by-products of community engagement. Next, we provide an example of a study that applies the concepts of service-bonded inquiry. Finally, we suggest how faculty and service-bonded inquiry by-products can be evaluated. Criteria for evaluating the faculty's work are forwarded as potential rubrics, thereby legitimizing its place in the academic community.

## What Is Service-Bonded

Service-bonded inquiry focuses on kids and integrating the tripartite of teaching, research, and service. It offers ways in which this integration can take various forms. Practical inquiry (Schubert, 1986), reflective inquiry (Duckworth, 1987), curriculum as teacher (Housner, 1996), action research (Patton, 1987), and creative evaluation (Patton, 1987) are paradigmatic forms of service-bonded inquiry. Some have been recently represented in an article by Tom & Don (1997) which profiles the application of service-bonded inquiry to evaluate the efficacy of responsibility from these methodologies have been various stories and perceptions, kid quotes, interview transcripts, "friends," personal journal entries, school records, and so on. While some researchers tell about the human qualities of teaching, others focus on ways, using methodologies that align well with the research.

While it appears that there is considerable interest in service-bonded inquiry can be conducted, we believe that it is essential (Martinek & Hellison, 1997). They serve as a framework for service-bonded inquiry:

- Examine personal values
- Conduct research in a particular setting
- Start with an idea
- Implement
- Disseminate

### *Examine Personal Values*

An important starting point is closely examining our values in improving the lives of kids. Our interest in personal values in school curriculum (Schubert 1986), especially in the context of our individual interest. There are many values in the academic environment. For us the important qualities of skills, interests, and personal identity are all part of what we do as scholarship. Making a difference in practice for doing service-bonded inquiry. Consequently, we actively plan and running programs become a part of our service-bonded inquiry agenda. Contributing to the field is our counterpart to those researchers who delve into the field. Most important is maintaining a steadfast commitment to the values of those with whom we work. Embracing our values assuredly nudge other researchers closer to a way of doing responsive research.

During our combined 65 years of work, we have found one constant that determines our relationships. All that we have done, whether

school sport programs. His connections were crystallized his commitment to helping their potentials. This, in turn, reinforced his life. He is now well positioned at San Francisco State University. His work with inner city kids and service

of knowing, our work is often scrutinized. Running programs for kids, working with students, and engaging university students in real academic enough. Where's your research? Publishing this work in scholarly journals?

It reminds us (and others who do this work) of the decline of physical education (or kinesiology) in traditional thought about what research can tell us about by becoming entrenched in our ways that we can be more like them. Second, if we must be the university's view of research, "university experience," most faculty, students, and a narrow view of scholarly inquiry. We believe that research, universities will be able to craft their multiple roles for faculty who are attempting to give the researcher-as-teacher more solid calls "practice-based" inquiry.

Don & Don) published an essay about a new *service-bonded inquiry* (Martinek & Hellison, 1997). The views in which the views of scholarly inquiry call for changing the way we interpret research. This approach was the integration of service-bonded inquiry attempts to equip community-engaged research, addressing the many questions generated from research and engaging in the lives of kids. It also led to program development. We also suggested that research could be used to depict the complex nature

of the concept of *service-bonded inquiry*. Our goal is to describe service-bonded inquiry and clarify its use and our intent to suggest that service-bonded research is a form of research. Rather, we want to encourage research on an equal footing with traditional forms

of service-bonded inquiry is and the required steps for research must be acknowledged when describing the research. Next, we provide an example of a study led in inquiry. Finally, we suggest how faculty research can be evaluated. Criteria for evaluating research rubrics, thereby legitimizing its place

## What Is Service-Bonded Inquiry?

Service-bonded inquiry focuses on kids and their lives. It honors the process of integrating the tripartite of teaching, research, and service. Several paradigms have offered ways in which this integration can take place (Martinek & Hellison, 1997). Practical inquiry (Schubert, 1986), reflective scholarship (Schon, 1987), teacher and researcher (Duckworth, 1987), curriculum as craft (Kirk, 1991), researcher as teacher (Housner, 1996), action research (Martinek & Schempp, 1988), and creative evaluation (Patton, 1987) are paradigms that collectively represent a generic form of service-bonded inquiry. Some examples of these forms of inquiry have been recently represented in an article by Hellison and Walsh (2002). Their 30-year chronology profiles the application of traditional and creative approaches used to evaluate the efficacy of responsibility-based youth programs. Emerging from these methodologies have been various data sources such as instructors' stories and perceptions, kid quotes, interview transcripts, comments from "critical friends," personal journal entries, school records, and informal conversations. These researchers tell about the human qualities of teachers, families, and kids in a variety of ways, using methodologies that align well with their studies.

While it appears that there is considerable flexibility in the way service-bonded inquiry can be conducted, we believe that certain steps should be taken (Martinek & Hellison, 1997). They serve as the proverbial compass for doing service-bonded inquiry:

- Examine personal values
- Conduct research in a particular setting
- Start with an idea
- Implement
- Disseminate

### *Examine Personal Values*

An important starting point is closely examining your personal values about improving the lives of kids. Our interest in program development and the out of school curriculum (Schubert 1986), especially as it relates to underserved youth, is just that: our individual interest. There are many choices afforded us within the academic environment. For us the important question is "what's worth doing?" Our skills, interests, and personal identity are all wrapped up in what we have chosen to do as scholarship. Making a difference in people's lives must be a prime motive for doing service-bonded inquiry. Consequently, getting involved with them and actively planning and running programs becomes an essential part of a service-bonded inquiry agenda. Contributing to the humanity of people provides a nice counterpart to those researchers who delve into more traditional forms of research. Most important is maintaining a steadfast connection to the lives, feelings, and values of those with whom we work. Embracing such a "real world" view will assuredly nudge other researchers closer to accepting service-bonded inquiry as a way of doing responsive research.

During our combined 65 years of working with youth and teachers, we have found one constant that determines our success and failure: the power of relationships. All that we have done, whether good or not so good, has taught us

an important lesson. We have found that kids will remember what you said to them some of the time. And, they will remember what you did with them some of the time. But, most importantly, they will *always* remember how you made them feel. This lesson drives us closer to knowing what must be done to improve the lives of kids. It also anchors us to long-term stays with programs and their stakeholders, thus avoiding temptations to do "bump and run" research.

### *Research in a Specific Setting*

Service-bonded inquiry takes place in a specific community setting (Martinek & Hellison, 1997). The researcher must be willing to leave the academic high ground of the university and venture into the "swamp of practice" (Schon, 1987). Experiences in the real world of practice range from just hanging out to more formal involvement. Viable community connections are thus nurtured and sustained. Forming these community connections enables the necessary cross-pollination of ideas, resources, cultural knowledge, and expertise between university and agency personnel. Past president of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), Ann Lieberman (1997), suggests that links between research and practice are forged when researchers combine their work with practitioners and those with whom they work. In some cases, community programs are brought to the university setting because of a scarcity of space and equipment. In either case, the challenge for faculty to wade into the swampy lowland of practice is often daunting. Not doing this will mean that the *real problems* in *real settings* will never be addressed. Michael Scriven (1997), another former AERA president, has pointed out the following:

The great and culpable problem—though by no means the only one—is that we (researchers) have refused to go to the source. We have behaved like amateur prospectors who think it is beneath them to learn from practice of successful prospectors and instead go to lectures by professors of mineralogy. (p. 20)

### *Start With an Idea*

The words of Scriven bring us to the next step in doing service-bonded inquiry: coming up with an idea for responding to the needs of a particular setting. Knowing what to look at, how to look at it, and how to change it require patience and clear thought when prospecting for solutions to real world problems. Different problems require different approaches, even if the "waters" by necessity are murky.

A common starting point is to consult the literature to see what has been done and to gain some understanding what has worked (Martinek & Hellison, 1997). An *idea* is then found in either existing theory or by modifying an existing theory in order to address the problem. Schubert (1986) argued, however, that adopting extant theory rarely works. That is, theories are irrelevant when applied to professional practice—even when modified. Joseph Schwab (1971) offers another view of the utility of extant theory. He views theory as an eclectic art form. He argues that sensitivity to the idiosyncrasies of the setting and its members must be heightened so that theories can be modified or even created.

Many examples of modifying theory to create ideas are present in the literature. Romance, Weiss, and Brockoven's (1986) adaptation of Norma Haan's

(1977) moral development became the focus problem. David Walsh (2003) borrowed the "teaches themselves" theory (Oyserman, Terry, & Bybee, 2002) program to foster career aspirations in underserved youth through a Youth Leader Corps program (Martinek & Scamuffa, 1997) to foster the leadership qualities of underserved youth by learned helplessness (Martinek & Griffith, 1997) (Burns, 1978; Gilligan, 1982; Kohlberg, 1981).

Creating an idea from scratch is even more difficult. Unfortunately, working with one's own idea in a service-bonded setting. According to Sloan (1983), the unit created by a culture that embraces theoretic Metzler (1994) further claims that such a "model" is not a reason and knowledge. John Heron (1981) suggests that diversity in research is promoted. Evidently, trendy research or what Robert Slavin (1989) calls "fashionable" research. Siedentop's *Sport Education* (Siedentop, 1995) idea becomes a useful commodity for practitioners. It brings contemporary sport culture into daily physical education to improve secondary school physical education. *Sport for Peace* (Ennis et al., 1999) and the "Sport Education" model (Hellison, 2003). These researchers have identified values, teaching experiences, and interaction

### *Implement*

The next step is to implement the plan. The approach (Siedentop & Hellison, 1995) is service-bonded research. Unlike traditional inquiry, it is an evolving process. Flexible and evolving structure allows for use of predetermined timetables, designs and procedures. That is, the researcher puts the idea into practice and it's back to the reflection drawing board again. The problem has been addressed. Mary Kennedy (1997) and ambivalence of this process reflect the fact that the final program is much different from the original. In addition, that program's outcomes are often not achieved for years (called the "sleeper effect"; Likierman, 1997).

Given the above, it is important that the process during the implementation process. Long-term support is encouraged. For example, we teach in several ways. One of us (Tom) also teaches a mentoring program where graduate students to work one-on-one with service-bonded students (Tom & Dave) join up with university students to teach the Personal and Social Responsibility Model. This model helps us to formulate new ideas and sculpt programs. Those who are serving as well as those who work with the model are exploring new methods for program evaluation.

ids will remember what you said to them  
ber what you did with them some of the  
ays remember how you made them feel.  
hat must be done to improve the lives of  
s with programs and their stakeholders,  
nd run" research.

in a specific community setting (Martinek  
be willing to leave the academic high  
the "swamp of practice" (Schon, 1987).  
e range from just hanging out to more  
nections are thus nurtured and sustained.  
ables the necessary cross-pollination of  
expertise between university and agency  
:an Educational Research Association  
ests that links between research and  
abine their work with practitioners and  
as, community programs are brought to  
of space and equipment. In either case,  
e swampy lowland of practice is often  
the *real problems in real settings* will  
(7), another former AERA president, has

-though by no means the only  
/e refused to go to the source.  
prospectors who think it is  
lice of successful prospectors  
fessors of mineralogy. (p. 20)

xt step in doing service-bonded inquiry:  
e needs of a particular setting. Knowing  
to change it require patience and clear  
al world problems. Different problems  
aters" by necessity are murky.  
the literature to see what has been done  
orked (Martinek & Hellison, 1997). An  
or by modifying an existing theory in  
i) argued, however, that adopting extant  
relevant when applied to professional  
wab (1971) offers another view of the  
s an eclectic art form. He argues that  
g and its members must be heightened  
ated.

y to create ideas are present in the  
's (1986) adaptation of Norma Haan's

(1977) moral development became the foundational underpinning for solving a  
problem. David Walsh (2003) borrowed the tenets of Daphna Oyserman's "possible  
selves" theory (Oyserman, Terry, & Bybee, 2002) to develop his specialized sport  
program to foster career aspirations in underserved youth. Also, there is Tom's  
Youth Leader Corps program (Martinek & Schilling, 2003). The program attempts  
to foster the leadership qualities of underserved high school youth and is guided  
by learned helpless (Martinek & Griffith, 1993) and moral development theories  
(Burns, 1978; Gilligan, 1982; Kohlberg, 1984).

Creating an idea from scratch is even more challenging; it requires imagination.  
Unfortunately, working with one's own idea has little credibility within a university  
setting. According to Sloan (1983), the university's narrow view of research is  
created by a culture that embraces theoretical and technical paradigms of study.  
Metzler (1994) further claims that such a "monolithic" culture imposes barriers to  
reason and knowledge. John Heron (1981) suggests we need to loosen our thinking  
so that diversity in research is promoted. By cultivating ideas, we avoid doing  
trendy research or what Robert Slavin (1989) describes as "bandwagon hopping."  
Siedentop's *Sport Education* (Siedentop, 1994) is an excellent example of how an  
idea becomes a useful commodity for practitioners. His idea of blending the values  
of contemporary sport culture into daily physical education practice has been used  
to improve secondary school physical education. Other examples include Ennis's  
*Sport for Peace* (Ennis et al., 1999) and the Personal and Social Responsibility  
model (Hellison, 2003). These researchers have drawn their ideas from personal  
values, teaching experiences, and interactions with youngsters and teachers.

### Implement

The next step is to implement the plan. Trial and error or a "ready-fire-aim"  
approach (Siedentop & Hellison, 1995) is the modis operandi for the service-  
bonded researcher. Unlike traditional inquiry, implementation is a dynamic and  
evolving process. Flexible and evolving strategies will overshadow the popular  
use of predetermined timetables, designs and measures, and statistical treatments.  
That is, the researcher puts the idea into practice, perhaps clumsily at first. Then  
it's back to the reflection drawing board again . . . and again, adjusting this, adding  
and subtracting that until it appears from the researcher's perspective that the  
problem has been addressed. Mary Kennedy (1996) points out that the ambiguity  
and ambivalence of this process reflect the very nature of teaching. Quite often,  
the final program is much different from that of the one originally planned. In  
addition, that program's outcomes are often transitory and sometimes don't show  
up for years (called the "sleeper effect"; Likona, 1991).

Given the above, it is important that the researcher actively participates  
during the implementation process. Long-term involvement in the program is also  
encouraged. For example, we teach in several after-school programs. In addition,  
one of us (Tom) also teaches a mentoring class to prepare undergraduate and  
graduate students to work one-on-one with sport club participants. The others (Don  
& Dave) join up with university students to teach kids in the inner city setting using  
the Personal and Social Responsibility Model. The demands of our work continually  
help us to formulate new ideas and sculpt patterns of engagement with the kids we  
are serving as well as those who work with them. They also give us opportunity  
to explore new methods for program evaluation.

### *Disseminate*

A fundamental assumption underlying service-bonded inquiry is that its products can help its stakeholders: program leaders, parents, policy makers, and other university people involved with community programs. Getting ideas out there will depend on the efficacy of their outlets. These outlets typically include written publications, workshops, and other alternative outlets (videos, newsletters, websites). *Utility* for these outlets will be contingent on certain requirements. The first is being able to communicate results in a way that the stakeholders can understand. We have found that program leaders, teachers, and parents have little interest in esoteric findings that are typically geared for academic audiences. Language that only academicians will understand, sophisticated statistical treatments, and irrelevant information will most likely be ignored.

Another requirement is that results must be presented as possibilities, not as "rules of action" (Kliebard, 1993). Often, the results of service-bonded inquiry are not generalizable and, therefore, consumers must be able to decide whether ideas are meritorious. Their values and practice situations will help them decide whether the ideas should be used, modified, or discarded.

*Publications.* Publications through journals and books have the potential to serve as helpful outlets for service-bonded inquiry. However, the criteria for accepting service-bonded inquiry research must be expanded for this to happen. Academic outlets like the *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, and *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology* must modify editorial policy to serve the needs of practitioners. This is no less true for our parent discipline journals. Former editor of the *Educational Researcher*, Robert Donmoyer (1996), urged that the gatekeepers of "research journals" reconsider the criteria for accepting research submissions. The measuring stick must be flexible and so too must be the editorial board members. Coherent descriptions (i.e., case studies, stories, biographies, etc.) must fall in the lap of reviewers who are accepting of alternative ways of reporting research.

Similarly, journals that address the needs of practitioners (e.g., *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*; *Journal of Elementary Physical Education; Strategies*) must all be deemed credible outlets. Or, new journals that are open to service-bonded inquiry contributions may need to be created.

Typically, tenure and promotion committees frown on outlets of these sorts. Reprioritizing the value place on these journals recognizes the contributions of those who work in community and school programs. It will also encourage faculty to sustain their efforts in describing their ideas for better practice in community programs.

*Workshops.* Workshops are also powerful venues for showing how ideas can be applied to practice. For years, workshops have been instrumental in allowing university faculty to share their work with practitioners. There is probably no better way to bring faculty face to face with practitioners than by having them engage in half or all day sessions in their gym, playground, or recreation center. Many would argue that the fidelity of these workshops depends on how well they are delivered and the appropriateness of their content. Fortunately, we see numerous examples of how university faculty have used workshops to share their ideas. George Graham's *Master Teacher Program* (Graham, 2001) is one example of how the workshop has served as a national platform for helping teachers provide

effective elementary physical education programs. SPARK's program (Sallis et al., 1997), which to promote physical activity in their schools, international audiences have benefited from Personal and Social Responsibility Model workers, and other service providers have (based on ideas) from these workshops and recreation centers.

*Alternative Outlets.* Videos, CDs also have served the needs of practitioners significantly increased in quality and sophistication. Teachers, coaches, and program leaders have outlets. Only recently have we seen universities showcasing their work. For example, Jay N. of Illinois at Chicago had students of their choreograph, act, and film a video showing spirit of the Personal and Social Responsibility a unique product, developed by students who meant to be personally and socially responsible. produced newsletters that have described their after school clubs. Throughout the years, the parents, club members, university students, and provosts and chancellors!

The groundswell of computer technology websites that portray numerous programs is another important outlet—perhaps more accessible to a service-bonded researcher. Along with program practitioners evaluating, and interacting with kids can be websites together takes time and requires ability to reach a multitude of practitioners internationally) is considerable. One of us (Timothy) components of his after-school and mentorship program (McLaughlin, & Schilling, 1999). Program results, youth, and program evaluation data are included.

There is little doubt that institutions are open to these suggestions. However, if universities are being an outreach institution, alternative outlets supporting more traditional scholarship must broaden their guidelines for evaluating service-bonded work. "Impact" will then take precedent over traditional work that has typically been used. If this is not done, service-bonded work will only continue to be rhetorical and not take

### *Example of Service-Bonded Inquiry*

In order to gain a clearer understanding of the "career club" (Walsh, 2003) provides us with guidance of service-bonded inquiry to help a program. That need was to have a broader a

...ing service-bonded inquiry is that its program leaders, parents, policy makers, and community programs. Getting ideas out there. These outlets typically include written alternative outlets (videos, newsletters, websites). ... on certain requirements. The first is being ... the stakeholders can understand. We have ... and parents have little interest in esoteric academic audiences. Language that only ... ated statistical treatments, and irrelevant

... must be presented as possibilities, not as ... the results of service-bonded inquiry are ... ers must be able to decide whether ideas ... e situations will help them decide whether ... iscarded.

...gh journals and books have the potential ... onded inquiry. However, the criteria for ... ch must be expanded for this to happen. ... aching in Physical Education, Research ... urnal of Sport and Exercise Psychology ... eeds of practitioners. This is no less true ... er editor of the *Educational Researcher*, ... the gatekeepers of "research journals" ... ch submissions. The measuring stick must ... al board members. Coherent descriptions ... (c.) must fall in the lap of reviewers who ... rting research.

...he needs of practitioners (e.g., *Journal ... Dance; Journal of Elementary Physical ... ed credible outlets. Or, new journals that ... tributions may need to be created.*

...ommittees frown on outlets of these sorts. ... journals recognizes the contributions of ... l programs. It will also encourage faculty ... ir ideas for better practice in community

... powerful venues for showing how ideas ... kshops have been instrumental in allowing ... a practitioners. There is probably no better ... ractioners than by having them engage ... , playground, or recreation center. Many ... orkshops depends on how well they are ... ir content. Fortunately, we see numerous ... ve used workshops to share their ideas. ... ram (Graham, 2001) is one example of ... nal platform for helping teachers provide

effective elementary physical education programs. Another is Tom McKenzie's SPARK's program (Sallis et al., 1997), which served the needs of teachers who strive to promote physical activity in their school programs. And finally, national and international audiences have benefited from the workshops that focus on Hellison's Personal and Social Responsibility Model. Numerous teachers, coaches, youth workers, and other service providers have reported bringing the information (based on ideas) from these workshops back to their school gyms, playgrounds, and recreation centers.

*Alternative Outlets.* Videos, CDs, DVDs, newsletters, and websites also have served the needs of practitioners. Their content and accessibility have significantly increased in quality and sophistication over the years. Historically, teachers, coaches, and program leaders have been the architects of these alternative outlets. Only recently have we seen university faculty begin to use them for showcasing their work. For example, Jay Nacu and Stein Garcia at the University of Illinois at Chicago had students of their after-school martial arts club write, choreograph, act, and film a video showing how martial arts interplay with the spirit of the Personal and Social Responsibility Model. This video demonstrated a unique product, developed by students who took ownership in showing what it meant to be personally and socially responsible. Two of us (Tom and Don) have produced newsletters that have described both hard and soft outcomes of their after school clubs. Throughout the years, these newsletters have been shared with parents, club members, university students and faculty, and administrators—even provosts and chancellors!

The groundswell of computer technology has also produced numerous websites that portray numerous programs for professionals. A website can be another important outlet—perhaps more accessible than others—for the service-bonded researcher. Along with program profiles, specific strategies for teaching, evaluating, and interacting with kids can be part of the website's content. Putting websites together takes time and requires continual updating. However, their ability to reach a multitude of practitioners and other researchers (nationally and internationally) is considerable. One of us (Tom) has a website describing program components of his after-school and mentoring program, Project Effort (Martinek, McLaughlin, & Schilling, 1999). Program resources, strategies for working with youth, and program evaluation data are included on this website.

There is little doubt that institutions of higher education will struggle with these suggestions. However, if universities are truly to live up to their claim of being an outreach institution, alternative outlets must receive the same respect as those supporting more traditional scholarship. Tenure and promotion committees must broaden their guidelines for evaluating faculty who use these outlets for their work. "Impact" will then take precedent over the "scholarly publication" benchmark that has typically been used. If this is not done, then outreach claims of universities will only continue to be rhetorical and not taken seriously.

**Example of Service-Bonded Inquiry**

In order to gain a clearer understanding of this approach, David Walsh's "career club" (Walsh, 2003) provides us with a specific example. He used the guidance of service-bonded inquiry to help address a specific need of youth in his programs. That need was to have a broader and healthier view of the future.

*Values and Beliefs of the Investigator.* For over nine years, Dave developed, taught in, and evaluated extended day programs based on the Personal and Responsibility Model (Hellison, 2003), a model aimed to empower youth to become more personally and socially responsible. These programs aligned tightly with Dave's values and beliefs in that they allowed him to work with small numbers of youth over long periods of time, with the overall goal of improving their lives. Such a structure provided ample opportunities to prioritize the development of relationships with the youth, focus on their emotional, social, and physical well-being, and empower them to make wise decisions for themselves.

*Research in a Particular Setting.* The Career Club was implemented at an elementary school in an underserved community on the near West Side of Chicago. This school, which borders on academic probation, was chosen because Dave had been teaching in and running a Personal and Social Responsibility Model program at this site for four previous years. The Career Club ran for nine sessions—participants were seventh and eighth graders who were already members of this program—with the assistance of five university undergraduate and graduate students.

*Starting With an Idea.* It was evident to Dave that many youth participating in the Personal and Social Responsibility Model programs were not transitioning well to the work world, college, or to vocations that are viewed by society as being acceptable. In response to this need, he created the "career club" with the philosophy that an early experience in occupational exploration may better prepare these youth who seemed unsure, unaware, and/or confounded as to their future possibilities.

The career club hoped to extend the Personal and Social Responsibility Model's notion of offering empowerment through coaching roles by using these experiences as a vehicle to envision, explore, and contemplate meaningful possible futures. The program tried to accomplish this through two specific goals: (a) empower youth to experience and reflect on coaching as an occupation by coaching basketball to a group of fourth graders and (b) link the skills (e.g., goal setting, communication, organizational, etc.) acquired from coaching to the occupation or career of their choosing.

*Implementation: "Ready-Fire-Aim" in Action.* The concept of "ready-fire-aim" in service-bonded inquiry refers to the practice of implementing a new program idea without working through all the nuances, followed by reflection to fine tune or even significantly change the original plan of action. Such a cycle that continues until the modifications become minimal provided a template for career club implementation.

With the generalities in place, Dave quickly became aware that the specifics of actual implementation required constant modification and improvisations to the initial plan. He immediately noticed that one of the major "ready-fire-aim" changes in the career club meant lessening the intensity of the coaching responsibilities due to a lack of career club members' enthusiasm. The proposed plan included having the "coaches" run four consecutive station rotations to provide them with an opportunity to refine their coaching skills through repetition. Instead, they became overworked, anxious, and aggravated with their coaching responsibilities. The coaching format Dave created was simply too intense with too much responsibility for them to handle.

To appease the coaches, Dave reduced their responsibilities to two station rotations, followed by offense and defense strategies. Perceiving themselves as

still overworked and therefore being disengaged, Dave changed to one-on-one sessions with graders one-on-one. They were able to work in a relaxed manner. They were rid of the full group, thereby enjoying and participating in a "tolerable." This strategy was very successful for each of the following sessions.

Although the coaches became more engaged in coaching, the two main career club goals were beyond their capacity to initiate any kind of meaningful work. In the second session, Dave attempted to coach, but the goals to coach were analogous to those requiring a lot of choosing. Even after extended discussions and no sign that they could even initiate meaningful comments were too vague, and he lacked the

These difficulties suggested a need for more specific, and concrete tasks. Rather than abstract, tangible, real-world tasks that directly impacted their lives and life choices. Dave introduced a more structured approach (Yowell, 2000), that is the detailed needs of the youth. He conveyed the procedural nature of success as coaches, but for the realization of their goals began unabashedly talking about their future and how to achieve their aspirations.

As the sessions progressed, new challenges emerged in the career club format. The coaches came to realize that it was more difficult than they ever anticipated. Their own goals would also be more difficult to achieve. The task of coaching into an exercise that would be shown as concretely as possible that any one coach would entail a similar set of procedural steps.

In the sixth session, an additional session was added called "It's Your Responsibility, It's Your Life." This session focused on the connection between the hard work involved in the practical realization of their personal goals. A new segment was added called "Coach Preparing You" where they shared their coaching strategies. Each coach shared their own and negative experiences that brought them to the seventh session, these ongoing challenges were discussed to find a balance of equilibrium and began to solidify into a "standard" format.

The career club was both a service-bonded and a research-based program. Research questions aimed to deal with the current and future. In order to maximize the current and future data sources were collected including direct observations to aid this process. The data collected as the program progressed with new realizations. For example, asking formal questions as to the effectiveness of which was not a part of the program at

investigator. For over nine years, Dave extended day programs based on the Personal (2003), a model aimed to empower youth to be responsible. These programs aligned tightly with the overall goal of improving their lives, providing opportunities to prioritize the development of their emotional, social, and physical well-being decisions for themselves.

g. The Career Club was implemented at a community on the near West Side of Chicago. Informal probation, was chosen because Dave had a Personal and Social Responsibility Model program at the Career Club ran for nine sessions—participants were already members of this program—with undergraduate and graduate students.

It was evident to Dave that many youth participating in Personal and Social Responsibility Model programs were not transitioning to vocations that are viewed by society as being desirable. He created the "career club" with the philosophy that practical exploration may better prepare these youth for their future possibilities.

The Career Club and the Personal and Social Responsibility Model program mentored through coaching roles by using these roles to explore, and contemplate meaningful possible options to accomplish this through two specific goals: (a) present on coaching as an occupation by coaching others and (b) link the skills (e.g., goal setting, problem solving, acquired from coaching to the occupation or

*Aim" in Action.* The concept of "ready-fire-aim" refers to the practice of implementing a new plan through all the nuances, followed by reflection to the original plan of action. Such a cycle that repeats over time provided a template for career

Dave quickly became aware that the specifics of the program required instant modification and improvisations to the plan. One of the major "ready-fire-aim" changes was the intensity of the coaching responsibilities and the youth's enthusiasm. The proposed plan included frequent station rotations to provide them with an opportunity to learn skills through repetition. Instead, they became overwhelmed with their coaching responsibilities. The program was simply too intense with too much responsibility

and reduced their responsibilities to two station rotations and defense strategies. Perceiving themselves as

still overworked and therefore being disinterested, they began coaching the fourth graders one-on-one. They were able to be creative and coach just one youngster in a relaxed manner. They were rid of the stress of organizing and dealing with a full group, thereby enjoying and participating in a new dynamic they viewed as "tolerable." This strategy was very successful and became a programmed segment for each of the following sessions.

Although the coaches became aware, self-evaluated, and set goals for their coaching, the two main career club goals created were excessively general in their capacity to initiate any kind of meaningful transference to their own future choices. In the second session, Dave attempted to convey the notion that the skills required to coach were analogous to those required for the realization in any career of their choosing. Even after extended discussions and demonstrations, he received no responses and no sign that they could even remotely understand the connection. His comments were too vague, and he lacked the foresight to give them specific examples.

These difficulties suggested a new strategy replete with more practical, specific, and concrete tasks. Rather than provide obtuse concepts, they needed tangible, real-world tasks that directly related to skills capable of impacting their lives and life choices. Dave introduced the concept of "procedural knowledge" (Yowell, 2000), that is the detailed necessary steps needed to achieve future decisions. He conveyed the procedural knowledge necessary to not only achieve success as coaches, but for the realization of their careers of choice. The coaches began unabashedly talking about their futures and learning the necessary steps to achieve their aspirations.

As the sessions progressed, new components were added and deleted from the career club format. The coaches came to understand that coaching is much more difficult than they ever anticipated. They also began to realize that accomplishing their own goals would also be more difficult than they had initially thought. Breaking down the task of coaching into an exercise in procedural knowledge, they were shown as concretely as possible that any and all careers they chose for themselves would entail a similar set of procedural difficulties and opportunities.

In the sixth session, an additional segment was added to the program entitled, "It's Your Responsibility, It's Your Life." This addition aimed to further reinforce the connection between the hard work involved in coaching and what was necessary for the practical realization of their possible futures. In addition, another new segment was added called "Coach Preparation Time," designed to better assist them with their coaching strategies. Each session provided a host of both positive and negative experiences that brought about several ready-fire-aim changes. By the seventh session, these ongoing changes and improvisations reached a level of equilibrium and began to solidify into the beginning of the career club's daily, "standard" format.

The career club was both a service to the community and a research project. Research questions aimed to deal with the successes and failures of the program in order to maximize the current and future implementation of the career club. Several data sources were collected including documents, logs, interviews, and participant-observations to aid this process. The data collected were modified and altered as the program progressed with new realizations as to how to run such a program, for example, asking formal questions as to the impact of learning procedural knowledge, which was not a part of the program at onset.

*Dissemination.* Although the career club developed into a standard format, with a particular set of youngsters, in a particular setting, run by a specific instructor, it did not guarantee a projected impact into other settings. Instead, career club ideas and findings were disseminated as possibilities for teachers, youth workers, the research community, and policy makers. For example, this article is one of the first outlets for career club dissemination; abstracts are also being submitted to national and international conferences, in addition to article preparation for practitioner and research-based journals.

### Evaluating the Worth of Service-Bonded Inquiry

Anything that disrupts "business as usual" is bound to be challenged, even though trendiness, which seems to be a staple of at least some of the subdisciplines, may overshadow such challenges. Since service-bonded inquiry does not appear likely to become a trend, such challenges are all that more likely, and that is as it should be. A number of approaches to evaluating the worth of service-bonded inquiry, spanning the range from traditional to alternative, need to be considered.

Can the results of service-bonded inquiry be validated by more traditional research methods? We have tried to respond to this challenge by including traditional research methods in the service-bonded inquiry process. For example, Hellison and Wright (2003) analyzed nine years of quantitative retention data and qualitative student program evaluations to investigate the relationship between retention rates and student perceptions of the program's effectiveness for them in a service-bonded inquiry-based model. Martinek and his associates (Martinek, Schilling, & Johnson, 2001) analyzed both quantitative and qualitative data from teacher and staff journals and exit interviews in order to evaluate the extent of transfer from the service-bonded inquiry-based program to the academic classroom. Hellison and Walsh (2002) reviewed these and 24 other studies that conducted program evaluations of this service-bonded inquiry-based model and concluded that "... [despite] methodological issues and gaps in the evidence . . . these 26 studies, however limited, do enhance the theoretical and practical potential of [this service-bonded inquiry-based model]" (p. 304).

Are the results of service-bonded inquiry utilized by practitioners who attend workshops or read articles or books based on service-bonded inquiry? Until recently, only anecdotal evidence was available, and those accounts often described inaccurate interpretation and implementation of the specific service-bonded inquiry-based model that had been presented. Mrugala's (2002) study shed some light on this murky area. His purposive sample of 52 physical education teachers who completed an exhaustive qualitative internet survey mostly adopted the service-bonded inquiry-based curriculum model for the wrong reasons. Although a number of them gradually changed their practices so that they were more consistent with the model's intentions, they did so without knowledge that these changes were in fact essential to faithful implementation of the model. (Their motivation seemed to stem from how the small piece of the model that they had adopted gradually influenced their thinking about teaching.)

A recent anecdotal experience supports the need for additional evaluation in this area. After a two-day workshop on a service-bonded inquiry-based model,

some teachers in attendance described that had nothing to do with the model's the opposite! The lesson of this anecdote modification in the workshop presentation them from such workshops and presentation. Open-ended questionnaires and interview incorporated in future workshops. Similar more difficult, could be developed, for example as Mrugala did. In all probability, workshop the hands of tenure and promotion committees ways to present these "data" in credible fashion portrays the efficacy of these alternative (

Can service-bonded inquiry find champions and practitioners? Charlie Hoch (personally told us that the danger of such a practitioner will trust the results. It is common groups together represents a clash of culture and theory-building (and funding!), where "that works." The key issue is the definition of proof; practitioners want something that beliefs and values and perhaps what fits in by the administrative bureaucracy. This (e.g., Hubbard & Power, 1999) to the point teacher-as-researcher journals while work Kerr, 1999) goes untouched.

Our experience is that a number of service-bonded inquiry-based presentations academics are less likely to say to us "why this is because they've seen the data and they appreciate the difficulty of doing something trying to do it. Another factor is the growing Pressures on practitioners to provide results true for youth workers as well as teacher program evaluation for other reasons, primarily. Also, funding opportunities often require find funding has perhaps never been so good

Can service-bonded inquiry navigate a bandwagon and being ignored? Service applied research. Many important questions. Our point is that some do require wading. Furthermore, active involvement with one to reflection and modification in a unique research landscape, not to replace the research

It is perhaps more likely that service only because it does not serve the inter unfamiliar territory that requires considerable labor-intensive work with kids. Doctoral (

career club developed into a standard format, particular setting, run by a specific instructor, into other settings. Instead, career club ideas and possibilities for teachers, youth workers, the school. For example, this article is one of the first abstracts are also being submitted to national journals on article preparation for practitioner and

### of Service-Bonded Inquiry

as usual" is bound to be challenged, even staple of at least some of the subdisciplines, the service-bonded inquiry does not appear to be all that more likely, and that is as long as evaluating the worth of service-bonded inquiry to alternative, need to be considered. How can service-bonded inquiry be validated by more traditional methods and to this challenge by including traditional quantitative retention data and qualitative data to investigate the relationship between retention data and program's effectiveness for them in a service-bonded inquiry process. For example, Hellison and his associates (Martinek, Schilling, & Schilling, 2004) used quantitative and qualitative data from teacher and student to evaluate the extent of transfer from the program to the academic classroom. Hellison and his associates (2004) also conducted program evaluation studies that conducted program evaluation studies and concluded that "... these 26 studies, the empirical and practical potential of [this service-

bonded inquiry utilized by practitioners who are based on service-bonded inquiry? Until now, the evidence is limited, and those accounts often described the implementation of the specific service-bonded inquiry. Mrugala's (2002) study shed some light on the implementation of 52 physical education teachers who conducted an internet survey mostly adopted the service-bonded inquiry for the wrong reasons. Although a number of studies have been conducted so that they were more consistent with the evidence that these changes were in line with the model. (Their motivation seemed to be the model that they had adopted gradually

and reports the need for additional evaluation of a service-bonded inquiry-based model,

some teachers in attendance described the model they had learned about in ways that had nothing to do with the model's core concepts and were sometimes just the opposite! The lesson of this anecdote, in addition to the need for significant modification in the workshop presentation, is that what practitioners take away with them from such workshops and presentations needs to be systematically evaluated. Open-ended questionnaires and interviews could provide such data and need to be incorporated in future workshops. Similar procedures for articles and books, while more difficult, could be developed, for example, by conducting an internet survey as Mrugala did. In all probability, workshop and internet survey data will fall into the hands of tenure and promotion committee members. Faculty must then find ways to present these "data" in credible fashion so that it accurately and effectively portrays the efficacy of these alternative outlets.

Can service-bonded inquiry find common ground among *both* academics and practitioners? Charlie Hoch (personal communication, November 6, 2003), recently told us that the danger of such work is that neither the academic nor practitioner will trust the results. It is common knowledge that bringing these two groups together represents a clash of cultures. The academic world prizes evidence and theory-building (and funding!), whereas practitioners are looking for something "that works." The key issue is the definition of "what works." Academics want proof; practitioners want something that works in their classroom based on their beliefs and values and perhaps what fits into whatever mandates are handed down by the administrative bureaucracy. This issue has gotten increased attention (e.g., Hubbard & Power, 1999) to the point that teachers have started their own teacher-as-researcher journals while work written by academics (Anderson & Kerr, 1999) goes untouched.

Our experience is that a number of members of both groups will attend service-bonded inquiry-based presentations and read related literature. Moreover, academics are less likely to say to us "where's the data?" than in the past. Perhaps, this is because they've seen the data and been convinced, but more likely because they appreciate the difficulty of doing such work and especially our longevity in trying to do it. Another factor is the growing importance of program evaluation. Pressures on practitioners to provide results have never been greater, and this is true for youth workers as well as teachers. Academics are generally interested in program evaluation for other reasons, primarily that it is or can be research-based. Also, funding opportunities often require program evaluation, and the pressure to find funding has perhaps never been so great in many disciplines.

Can service-bonded inquiry navigate the uncertain terrain between becoming a bandwagon and being ignored? Service-bonded inquiry is not the answer to all applied research. Many important questions do not require wading in the swamp. Our point is that some do require wading, problem setting, and problem solving. Furthermore, active involvement with one's ideas as they are being tested leads to reflection and modification in a unique way. We only argue for a place in the research landscape, not to replace the research landscape.

It is perhaps more likely that service-bonded inquiry will be ignored, not only because it does not serve the interest of the researcher, but because it is unfamiliar territory that requires considerable risk-taking and involves long-term labor-intensive work with kids. Doctoral education needs to change here and there

to remedy this situation. Fortunately for service-bonded inquiry, small programs now exist at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, University of Illinois at Chicago, and Northern Colorado University. And, new programs using service-bonded inquiry are beginning to emerge as well, such as the ones at San Francisco State University and Memphis State University. We are hopeful that other institutions who continue to proclaim a commitment to community service will join this group.

One final thought: Enhancing school and community programs will require all universities to see that good research must combine working with teachers and youth workers and the knowledge they bring to the discussion. Furthermore, debate over what is credible and not credible will not help to broaden the view of research and scholarly work. Rather, we hope that universities will become inventive about method, content, writing, and audience. It will no doubt take courage for universities to change their mission to include "scholars of practice" (Lieberman, 1997) without marginalizing them. Perhaps, service-bonded inquiry is an important step in this process. At the very least, it is an idea and a possibility.

### References

- Anderson, G.L., & Kerr, K. (1999). The new paradigm wars: Is there room for rigorous practitioner knowledge in schools and universities? *Educational Researcher*, 28(5), 12-21, 40.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Christina, R.W. (2000). Advancing engagement in kinesiology and physical education (20<sup>th</sup> Dudley Sargent Lecture). *Quest*, 52, 315-329.
- Depauw, K.P. (2003). Changing faculty roles and responsibilities: Expanding the skill set of faculty perspective from a graduate dean. *Quest*, 55, 18-24.
- Donmoyer, D. (1996). Educational research in an era of paradigm proliferation: What's a journal editor to do? *Educational Researcher*, 25(2), 19-25.
- Duckworth, E. (1987). *The having of wonderful ideas and other essays on teaching and learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ennis, C. Solomon, M.A., Satina, B., Loftus, S.J., Mensch, J., & McCauley, M.T. (1999). Creating a sense of family in urban school using the "Sport for Peace" curriculum. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 70, 273-285.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Graham, G. (2001). *Teaching children physical education: Becoming a master teacher*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Haan, N. (1977). *Coping and defending: Processes of self-environment organizations*. San Francisco: Academic Press.
- Hellison, D., & Templin, T. (1991). *A reflective approach to teaching physical education*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hellison, D. (2003). *Teaching responsibility through physical activity*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hellison, D., & Walsh, D. (2002). Responsibility-based youth program evaluation: Investigating the investigations. *Quest*, 54, 292-307.
- Hellison, D., & Wright, P. (2003). Retention process-based assessment. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 32, 381.
- Heron, J. (1981). Philosophical basis for a new paradigm. *Human Inquiry* (pp. 19-35). Chichester, UK: John Wiley.
- Housner, L. (1996, winter). Curriculum and inquiry. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 25, 3.
- Hubbard, R.S., & Power, B.M. (1999). *Living the curriculum*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Kennedy, M. The connection between research and practice. *Educational Researcher*, 26(7), 4-10.
- Kirk, D. (1991). Curriculum work in physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 20, 160-165.
- Kliebard, H.M. (1993). What is a knowledge base for physical education? *Educational Researcher*, 63, 295-303.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *Essay of moral development: Moral development and education*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lawson, H. (1997). Children in crisis, the helping professions, and the role of universities. *Quest*, 49, 8-33.
- Lieberman, A. (1997). The vision thing: Educational research in the 21<sup>st</sup> century—Part 3: Perspectives on the role of the researcher. *Educational Researcher*, 26(7), 24.
- Likona, T. (1991). *Educating for character: Moral education and its role in schools*. New York: Bantam.
- Martinek, T. (1997). *Psycho-social dynamics of physical education: A Brown-Benchmark*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Martinek, T., & Hellison, D. (1997). Service-bonded inquiry. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 17, 1-10.
- Martinek, T. & Griffith, J.B. (1993). Working with students. *Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 64(1), 10-15.
- Martinek, T., McLaughlin, D., & Schilling, T. (1999). Beyond the gym. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 70(1), 25.
- Martinek, T. & Schempp, P. (1988). An introduction to service-bonded inquiry. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 7, 160-165.
- Martinek, T., Schilling, T., & Johnson, D. (2000). A program designed to foster personal and social responsibility. *The Urban Review*, 33(1), 29-45.
- Martinek, T., Schilling, T. (2003). Fostering character through physical education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 74(1), 10-15.
- Metzler, M.W. (1994). Scholarship reconsidered. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 23, 440-455.
- Mrugala, K. (2002). *An exploratory study of service-bonded inquiry*. Dissertation, University of Illinois at Chicago.
- Mrugala, K. (1993). *A model for student empowerment and implementation*. Master's thesis, University of Illinois at Chicago.



- Oyserman, D., Terry, K., & Bybee, D. (2002). A possible selves intervention to enhance school involvement. *Journal of Adolescence*, *25*, 313-326.
- Patton, M. (1987). *Creative evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Rice, R.E. (1996). *Making a place for the new American scholar. From the New Pathways Working Paper Series (Inquiry #1)*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Romance, T., Weiss, M., & Bockoven, J. (1986). A program to promote moral development through elementary physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, *5*, 126-136.
- Sallis, J.F., McKenzie, T.L., Alcaraz, J.E., Kolody, B., Faucette, N., & Hovell, M. (1997). The effects of a 2-year physical education program (SPARK) on physical activity and fitness in elementary school children. *American Journal of Public Health*, *87*, 1320-1334.
- Schon, D.A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schubert, W.H. (1986). *Curriculum: Perspective, paradigm, and possibility*. New York: McMillan.
- Schwab, J.J. (1971). The practical: Arts of eclectic. *School Review*, *79*, 493-542.
- Scriven, M. (1997). The vision thing: Educational research and AERA in the 21<sup>st</sup> century—Part 1: Competing visions of what educational researchers should do. *Educational Researcher*, *26*(4), 18.
- Siedentop, D. (1994). *Sport education: Quality physical education through positive sport experiences*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Siedentop, D., & Hellison, D. (1995). *Experiences in developing physical education curriculum: Ready, fire, aim*. Presentation at the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, Portland, OR.
- Slavin, R.E. (1989). PET and the pendulum: Faddism in education and how to stop it. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *70*(10), 452-458.
- Sloan, D. (1983). *Insight-imagination: The emancipation of thought and the modern world*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Walsh, D.S. (2003). *Helping youth explore coaching as a possible future: A career club for underserved youth*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Chicago.
- Yowell, C. (2000). Possible selves and future orientations: Exploring hopes and fears of Latino boys and girls. *Journal of Early Adolescents*, *20*, 245-280.

## Recruitment Techniques Understudied and Their Impact for Physical Activity

Maria Kosma, B.S.  
and Jeffrey

The inclusion of a representative sample of women, minorities, older adults, and underserved youth in physical activity promotion studies is a priority. This paper provides empirical evidence of effective recruitment methodology for both overrepresented and underrepresented populations. The purpose of this paper was to overview recruitment techniques derived from active and underrepresented populations. Additional recruitment methods are proposed considering characteristics and target population among all people—regardless of age and gender—is important for determining

Considering the benefits of physical activity associated with inactive lifestyles, physical activity is a priority (United States Department of Health and Human Services, 2000). Over the last decade, several state and federal motivational programs to increase physical activity in underrepresented populations (e.g., Caucasians and African Americans of high socioeconomic status). However, there has been increased inclusion of understudied populations (e.g., women, and minorities) in physical activity promotion (1994, 2000). Similarly, health promotion

Maria Kosma is with the Department of Physical Education, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803. E-mail: mkosma@lsu.edu  
Jeffrey McCubbin are with the Department of Exercise Science, University of Oregon, Corvallis.