The Handbook of Physical Education

Edited by
David Kirk, Doune Macdonald and
Mary O'Sullivan

London • Thousand Oaks • New Delhi

Editorial arrangement and Introduction
© David Kirk, Doune Macdonald and Mary O'Sullivan 2006

© Sage Publications Ltd 2006

First published 2006

Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, or criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, this publication may be reproduced, stored or transmitted in any form, or by any means, only with the prior permission in writing of the publishers, or in the case of reprographic reproduction, in accordance with the terms of licences issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside those terms should be sent to the publishers.

SAGE Publications Ltd
1 Oliver's Yard
55 City Road
London EC1Y 1SP

SAGE Publications Inc.
2455 Teller Road
Thousand Oaks, California 91320

SAGE Publications India Pvt Ltd
B-42, Panchsheel Enclave
Post Box 4109
New Delhi 110 017

British Library Cataloguing in Publication data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN-10 0 7619 4412 5
ISBN-13 978 0 7619 4412 6

Library of Congress Control Number: 2006920927

Typeset by C&M Digitals (P) Ltd., Chennai, India
Printed on paper from sustainable resources
Printed in Great Britain by The Cromwell Press Ltd, Trowbridge, Wiltshire

5.4 Social and individual responsibility programs

DON HELLISON AND TOM MARTINEK

Introduction

This chapter traces our journey through the physical education curriculum research literature related to social and individual responsibility, highlighting conceptual issues, major research findings, applications to policy and practice, and major trends and future directions. This is no easy task, because the core concept, individual and social responsibility, is open to a number of interpretations, blurring the boundaries of our search. Moreover, curriculum research itself has been conceptualized in a number of ways.

To address these issues, we begin with a brief history of the responsibility-related literature in physical education which immediately underscores the importance of defining the core concept. To address this issue head on, this history is followed by a cursory review of the underpinnings and conceptualization of social and individual responsibility in three fields with strong linkages to physical education in order to arrive at supportable definition of individual and social responsibility. We then share our perspective on curriculum research in order to provide a basis for identifying the research questions and methodological approaches that occupy the attention of physical education curriculum scholars interested in social and individual responsibility, thereby providing a framework for describing the physical education responsibility-based curriculum research findings. The chapter concludes with applications to policy and practice and future directions.

History

Although earlier examples of efforts to link physical activity to instrumental goals dot the pages of history – e.g. the Greek "sound mind in sound body", the chivalric ideal of the Middle Ages (Broekhoff, 1968), and "muscular Christianity" in Europe – its most elaborate rationale emerged in England in the mid-1800s. At that time English school sports began to embrace a moral ideology of "athleticism", viewing sports as a vehicle for teaching moral courage, teamwork, "manliness", social control, socialization and, in general "character training." Since private boarding schools were intended to produce future government and society leaders, sports were mostly governed by the students themselves (Sage, 1990).

Although the primary objective of early physical education programs in the United States was physical health, even prior to the twentieth century some American physical educators – for example, Dudley Sargent, some leaders of the German Turners, and the YMCA – envisioned a connection between physical education and social and emotional well-being. For both the Turners and the YMCA, this interest in broadening the focus of physical education was influenced by earlier trends in Europe, for the former the German turnvereine movement and for the latter the European "muscular Christianity" movement. Their ideas, however, were vague, and drew on speculation and personal observations. It was not until after 1900, that "character development" began to vie with physical health for dominance. This new focus received a substantial boost from three forces. First, the American progressive education movement, an extension of "natural" education based on the work of Rousseau and others in Europe, recognized the uniqueness of children and emphasized the whole child. Second, the emergence of sport opened the door to utilizing play, cooperation, and competition for educational purposes. Third, industrialization and urbanization which began to impact society in the nineteenth century, brought urgency to the unique needs of children and youth. By 1930, the slogan "education through the physical," in contrast to education of the physical", become common among physical education leaders such as Thomas Wood, Clark Hetherington, and their students J.B. Nash and Jesse Feiring Williams (and his student Delbert Oberteuffer) and sparked a number of heated debates (Gerber, 1971; Siedentop, 1990).

Although England had promoted self-governed school sport for the upper class, the notion of

becoming more socially and individually responsible was infrequently included in the extensive rhetoric of character development and education through the physical in America in the first half of the twentieth century. Miller and Jarman (1988), in their review of this history, cited only two related quotes, both at mid-century: "To give youth some freedom of choice ... so that they may develop the ability to make wise choices by their own judgment" (Cowell and Hazelton, 1955 as cited in Miller and Jarman, 1988: 74). "A well-directed physical education program should [include] ... responsibility for the consequences of [one's] ... behavior" (Manley, 1958 as cited in Miller and Jarman, 1988: 75).

Core concepts

The primary contribution of the early historical record to defining individual and social responsibility in physical education was its focus on physical activity as a medium for social and emotional outcomes. The idea of students being taught to take responsibility for their choices and behavior in physical education appeared here and there but was not central to the themes of the education through the physical movement. It was not until the publication of *Beyond balls and bats* (Hellison, 1978) that a curriculum model for teaching social and personal responsibility (TPSR) was introduced. Hellison was a late entrant to physical education, already having studied history as an undergraduate and sociology as a master's student, worked as a college admissions counselor, and spent a tour of duty in the armed forces before he entered a physical education teacher certificate program. The perspective he brought to the field emerged quickly in the publication of his first book, *Humanistic physical education* (Hellison, 1973). The values explicated in that book were augmented substantially by his regular practice of teaching underserved and so-called at risk youth part-time along with his university duties. These factors and particularly his failure to reach the youth in his charge led to his first version of TPSR. Because he has continued to teach urban youth, TPSR continues to evolve (Hellison, 1985, 1995, 2003; Hellison and Templin, 1991). Hellison's conceptualization of responsibility, derived totally from practice and his own background and values, can be summarized as helping students take responsibility for their own development and well-being and for contributing to the well-being of others. The details of TPSR are described below (see physical education philosophical contributions). (For additional early background, see Hellison et al., 2000; and Hellison, 2003.)

TPSR hovered on the margins of the physical education profession for several years, although a few teachers here and there found in it a kindred spirit. However, as problems with children and youth, whether poor or affluent, escalated, TPSR began to be adopted and adapted in a variety of settings in North America and several other countries. Most of this activity involved altering in-school physical education practices, but extended day programs both in schools and community youth organizations were affected to some extent as well. Occasionally a brave interscholastic youth coach attempted to introduce aspects of TPSR. For many of these pioneers, TPSR was first viewed as a class management approach, but at least some of these teachers found themselves changing their relationships with students and broadening their physical education goals as a result of utilizing TPSR (e.g., Mrugala, 2002). As a result of this activity, TPSR began to be identified as an exemplary curriculum model (Bain, 1988; Kirk, 1992; Steinhardt, 1992) and as an approach relevant for underserved youth (e.g. Siedentop, Mand, and Taggart, 1986).

In 1996, Hellison formed a partnership with five other faculty members who had adapted TPSR to their own work, who taught underserved kids as university professors, and who had developed professional preparation courses and programs focused on serving underserved populations (Hellison and Kallusky, 1999). The partnership promoted TPSR by conducting workshops for teachers and youth workers and publishing a book describing various ways to utilize TPSR in in-school and other settings, and how to use such programs to link universities and communities (Hellison et al., 2000).

The primary contribution of the early historical record to defining individual and social responsibility in physical education is its focus on physical activity as the medium for instrumental social and emotional outcomes. Over the past 30 years, Hellison has built on this legacy by his conceptualization, implementation, and field-testing of personal and social responsibility in physical education. In order to more fully understand the underpinnings and specific components of individual and social responsibility, we turn to a selected review of the literature in three fields closely aligned with physical education: education, psychology, and youth development.

The education literature on social and individual responsibility

We begin by looking at the affective domain. Beane offered an in-depth conceptualization of affect in the curriculum which,

> ... in the broadest sense, is concerned with personal social development. It includes knowledge, skills, behaviors and attitudes related to personal interests, social relations, and the

> integration of the two ... [indicating] that affect is situated in the curriculum in all experiences that involved self-perceptions, values, morals, ethics, beliefs, social predispositions, appreciations, aspirations, and attitudes. (1990: 10)

Beane (1990) also drew upon the work of Wight (1972) to describe an "elaborate set of goals based on self ..., others ..., and the environment ..." (p. 8). His list of goals for the "others" in a person's life included "social responsibility". Although Beane and Wight's ideas are grounded in the broader perspective of personal and social development rather than responsibility, they do lay the affective and social development groundwork for more specific treatments.

Education scholars have specifically cited the need for responsibility in the school curriculum. For example, Sizer (1992: 59) was critical of pedagogical approaches that "thwart opportunities for young people to take responsibility ... [and] develop the habit of delivering on that responsibility". Haberman (2000) agreed, pointing out that urban schools have become preoccupied with control and compliance which are an integral part of the school culture. Bredemeier (1988) found that urban teachers rejected the indoctrination approach, instead favoring student decision-making with attention to consequences, control over their own behavior rather than teacher control, and acceptance of responsibility for their actions. Tappan (1992: 387) also weighed in on the indoctrination issue, pointing out that students need to "discuss, examine, and reflect critically on values and ethical positions within a diverse, complex, and ever-changing society". Jones and Tanner (1981: 497) argued that "training children for freedom requires different kinds of plans and structures than training them for slavery". Kamii et al. (1994) advocated autonomy as the major goal of education, and emphasized self-governing in moral as well as cognitive areas.

Berman's (1997: 12) work is perhaps the most in-depth treatment of social responsibility, which he defined as "a person's relationships with others and with the larger political and social world". He emphasized the development of a social conscience that encompasses concern about social issues, ethical considerations of both justice and caring, and the process of meaning-making and identity formation. Such an agenda cannot be imposed, but since children want to make sense of, and engage in, the world around them, age-appropriate processes need to be utilized to facilitate their engagement. Berman's conceptualization does empower students, but unlike most others who focus on both personal and social responsibility, he restricts his perspective to social responsibility.

An alternative view to responsibility as empowerment was provided in Wentzel's (1991) review of the relationship between social responsibility and academic achievement. The studies reviewed by Wentzel were based on her definition of social responsibility as "adherence to social rules and role expectations" (1991: 2). Using this definition, she concluded that: "social responsibility can facilitate learning and performance outcomes by promoting positive interactions with teachers and peers and, from a motivational perspective, by providing students with additional incentives to achieve" (1991: 1).

The psychology literature on social and individual responsibility

Psychologist deCharms' (1976) developed a theory of motivation closely aligned with children and youth taking personal and social responsibility, which he successfully implemented in a research project with urban elementary school children in the classroom. His theory is based on teaching students to be "origins" rather than pawns in their lives. By that he meant setting internal standards, striving against external forces (even if unsuccessful), and doing as one must rather than as one pleases. The social responsibility of being an origin is to treat others as origins as well, for example by taking responsibility for the consequences of one's actions toward others.

Other psychologists have also advocated responsibility as a core affective and social development concept in schools. Elias and his associates (Elias et al., 1997: 1) argued that everyone wants schools to prepare students "to become knowledgeable, responsible, and caring adults". Their conceptualization of responsibility includes both personal and social dimensions: "For children to become responsible, they must be able to understand risks and opportunities, and be motivated to choose actions and behaviors that serve not only their own interests but those of others" (1997: 1).

The concept of constructivism has recently received attention in both psychology and education. Constructivism often refers to an active learner who constructs knowledge. In teaching, this means "helping learners to engage actively in independent thinking, problem-solving, and discovering ... through an open-ended non-linear process" (Rovegno and Kirk, 1995: 462). Perhaps Tonis best summarized the relation of constructivism to social and individual responsibility:

> Curricula structured within a constructivist theory of learning provide students with multiple opportunities to participate, take responsibility for personal and social actions, and facilitate the participation of others. Often this occurs within a personalized environment in which students set goals and monitor their own progress. (1999: 167)

The youth development literature on social and individual responsibility

Youth development scholars have also addressed the importance of responsibility in their work. In Benson's (1997) assets-based approach to today's kids, empowerment, meaning shifting power and decision-making from the teacher or program leader to students, is one of seven types of assets he advocated. One social responsibility benchmark of empowerment is serving in the community regularly. Another Benson (1997: 32) asset type, social competencies, includes "knows how to plan ahead and make choices" and "seeks to resolve conflict nonviolently".

McLaughlin's research on successful community youth organization programs for inner city youth emphasized the importance of trusting and empowering youth (McLaughlin, 2000; McLaughlin et al., 1994), a point reinforced by a review of similar studies of best practices in inner city extended day programs (Hellison and Cutforth, 1997).

The underserved youth resiliency literature (e.g. Wang and Gordon, 1994) focuses on the strength of kids' resistance to environmental forces. That literature, while diverse in its recommendations of positive factors affecting youth, often cites responsibility-related concepts such as empowerment, independent decision-making, and being pro-active.

The critical pedagogy literature on social and individual responsibility

Paulo Freire (e.g. 1970/1993), who spent much of his life fighting oppression and championing liberation, is universally recognized as an early leader in critical pedagogy. He was critical of what he calls the banking concept of education which "erroneously assumes that students are not active agents in the world ... [and] in their own education" (Fowler, 1998: 319). Instead, Freire offered liberation characterized by strategies such as problem-posing, reflection, and dialog. Freire's work can be viewed as a kind of responsibility-based education, although this is true only insofar as the broader educational goals are consistent with Freire's revolutionary objectives (Aronowitz, 1993).

More recently, Rovegno and Kirk (1995) broadened what they call socially critical work beyond rights-based social justice and empowerment to include an ethic of relational caring and responsibility. Although they navigate through a wide range of literature to make their case, their conceptualization of responsibility, unlike caring and social justice, is left vague. However, they do draw on TPSR in the physical education literature (see the history and philosophical contributions sections) along with other examples to buttress their case. Macdonald and her associates (2002) also refer to TPSR in their discussion of the socially critical perspective's "commitments to social justice, equity, inclusivity, and social change" (p. 140) but argue that, while TPSR and other perspectives "work toward realizing such commitments ... [they do not] frame their research around these assumptions and purposes" (p. 140). Bain (1988) also identified TPSR as a curricular example of critical reflection in physical education

Defining social and individual responsibility

The primary contribution of the early historical record was its focus on physical activity as the medium for instrumental social and emotional outcomes, although Hellison's work over the past thirty years extended beyond this contribution (and is described in detail below). Since social and individual responsibility was not central to early physical educators' conceptualization of social and emotional well-being, we turned to elements of the literature from related fields and found several points of agreement concerning the core concept:

- Personal and social development provides a conceptual foundation for including responsibility in curriculum work.
- Both individual and social responsibility are included in most definitions of responsibility.
- Responsibility entails shifting power to students to help them to make good decisions not only for themselves but in relation to others, to set internal standards, and to plan ahead (to be pro-active).
- Social responsibility requires the development of a social conscience.
- Responsibility also entails being accountable by delivering on one's responsibilities, which often involves striving against external forces.
- Responsibility includes not only behaviors but values, attitudes, and self-perceptions.
- Support for a common conceptualization comes not only from "mainstream" education scholars but those in youth development and psychology as well.

A curriculum research perspective

Having taken a brief excursion into the history and conceptual treatments of our core concept, individual and social responsibility, we now turn to curriculum research that focuses on this topic. However, given the range of, and to some extent controversy surrounding, curriculum research, it is crucial to first share our definition of curriculum

research, thereby enabling us to identify the research questions and approaches that occupy the attention of curriculum scholars interested in social and individual responsibility. We agree with curriculum scholar Bill Schubert who stated:

> Curriculum research goes hand in hand with curriculum scholarship ... [and] is more broadly conceived [than social and behavioral methodologies]. Although it often includes social and behavioral methodologies, curriculum scholarship is more properly denoted by the terms inquiry, studies, theory, and perspectives rather than research. (1987: 420)

Schubert supported this conceptualization by describing in some detail its origins and early research, recent paradigms and categories, and emergent trends. His state-of-the-art curriculum text, *Curriculum: Perspective, Paradigm, and Possibility* (1986), provides further evidence in the form of detailed chapters devoted to philosophy in curriculum, curriculum policy creation, and the paradigms of perennial analytic categories, practical inquiry, and critical praxis. Edmund Short's (1991) book-length treatment of curriculum research, *Forms of Curriculum Inquiry*, includes 17 forms of curriculum inquiry. Among the many methodologies are three forms of philosophical curriculum research including, though data collectors may shudder at the thought, the speculative essay. Among other forms of curriculum inquiry are the scientific, evaluative, ethnographic, phenomenological, theoretic, and aesthetic.

Curriculum research, therefore, can be either philosophical or empirical. Curriculum research is sometimes empirical, because studies are needed to evaluate the fidelity and impact of various curriculum approaches. Curriculum research is sometimes philosophical, because the primary curriculum question is "What kind of knowledge and experience enable a person to lead a good and fulfilling life?" (Schubert, 1986: viii). The branch of philosophy most relevant here is axiology, which "rather than being concerned with what is ... focuses on what should be ... [I]t looks at specific values ... such as the composition of the good life" (Kretchmar, 1994: 16).

Sport philosopher Scott Kretchmar distinguished between empirical and philosophical research by pointing out that philosophers, unlike most of the work in fields such as history, physiology, and sociology "do not take the empirical turn. Rather they look inward to find their data" (1994: 13–14), utilizing reflection, abstraction, judgment. Their tools, then, are reflective in nature rather than empirical.

In our opinion, physical education research has been hampered by two forces: The positivistic experimental paradigm of the flagship subdiscipline exercise physiology, and the subdisciplinary structure itself which encourages replication of the parent discipline's perspectives and methodologies, thereby discouraging innovation and, in Bressan's (1982, 1987) view, true scholarly work. Crum (1986) raised more general questions about the data-based nature of physical education research in the United States, especially in comparison to Europe's more theoretical orientation. We joined in the dissent by developing service-bonded inquiry (1997; Martinek et al., 2004) which builds the development of ideas into the research process, similar to several earlier efforts such as Joseph Schwab's practical inquiry (e.g. 1971) and Kirk's (1991) curriculum as craft. Kirk's argument supports our broad definition of curriculum research in this way:

> If curriculum work is viewed as a precise, technological exercise that involves logical lockstep, sequential reasoning along with rational action and quantitative measurement, then we may be sacrificing quality for mere technical sophistication. It is possible to advocate an altogether different view of design in curriculum work through the view of curriculum as craft, which involves disciplined action, but builds into the exercise the values and beliefs which lead teaching as well as ways of handling uncertainty, spontaneity, creativity, and ambiguity. (1991: 260)

Our view, then, is that curriculum research methods can be broadly classified as either philosophical – which draws primarily on reflection rather than empirical data, or empirical which relies on analyses of quantitative and/or qualitative data.

Major philosophical findings

Based on our interpretation of curriculum research described in the introduction, major findings for physical education curriculum research in personal and social responsibility can be divided into two parts: philosophical and empirical. The research questions and research methodologies differ depending on this classification. Philosophical research inquires into value-based issues such as what is worth while to know and experience and utilizes research methods such as reflection, imagination, conceptual analysis, and theorizing. By classifying curriculum work in this way, innovative reflectively based curricular ideas of physical education teachers such as John Hichwa and Kevin Kaardal (see below), who are not considered nor do they consider themselves curriculum scholars, qualify for inclusion. Our emphasis is on physical education curriculum and instruction contributions but also include sport psychology and adapted physical education.

ncourages replication of the parent
pectives and methodologies, thereby
nnovation and, in Bressan's (1982,
scholarly work, Crum (1986) raised
uestions about the data-based nature
cation research in the United States,
parison to Europe's more theoretical
joined in the dissent by developing
nquiry (1997; Martinek et al., 2004)
e development of ideas into the
similar to several earlier efforts such
's practical inquiry (e.g. 1971) and
rriculum as craft. Kirk's argument
d definition of curriculum research

ork is viewed as a precise, tech-
cise that involves logical lock-
f reasoning along with rational
antitative measurement, then
rificing quality for mere techni-
on. It is possible to advocate an
rent view of design in curricu-
gh the view of curriculum as
volves disciplined action, but
exercise the values and beliefs
hing as well as ways of han-
y, spontaneity, creativity, and
: 260)

that curriculum research meth-
assified as either philosophical –
rily on reflection rather than
pirical which relies on analyses
r qualitative data.

ical findings

tation of curriculum research
oduction, major findings for
rriculum research in personal
ity can be divided into two
nd empirical. The research
rch methodologies differ
lassification. Philosophical
value-based issues such as
know and experience and
ds such as reflection, imagi-
sis, and theorizing. By clas-
k in this way, innovative
ilar ideas of physical educa-
John Hichwa and Kevin
are not considered nor do
curriculum scholars, qual-
phasis is on physical edu-
instruction contributions
psychology and adapted

Physical education curriculum and instruction contributions

Gibbons and Bressan (1991) offered a comprehensive theoretical framework for the affective domain in physical education. Their framework emphasized taking social–moral responsibility which they explained as: "the development of a moral attitude ... to be based upon students' acquisition of the ability to balance their decision-making among the competing claims associated with their concept of autonomy, their concept of altruism, and their concept of responsibility" (1991: 87).

The responsibility theme has been continued in more current physical education literature as well. The concept of student empowerment is apparent in Siedentop's Sport Education model (1994), which is the focus of another chapter in this *Handbook*. While the original model (Siedentop,1980) was grounded in play theory and Siedentop's interest in preserving the best of the sport culture, empowerment of students soon became central to its practice and to subsequent descriptions of sport education. Students coach, officiate, keep statistics, and perform other duties related to organized sport while being members of a team for a season (e.g. of soccer, basketball, track and field). Hastie and Buchanan (2000) combined and field-tested a combination of sport education and TPSR (Hellison, 2003). Their "mixed model" placed more emphasis on taking personal and social responsibility in the various sport seasons but did not include transfer outside the sport setting as advocated by TPSR.

Ennis's Sport for Peace model (Ennis et al., 1999) resembles sport education but emphasizes conflict resolution and the role (and plight) of inner city girls in physical education. Students learn to solve conflicts and to include girls, with boys skilled at dominant inner city sports (especially basketball) being given responsibility to help the girls become productive members of their teams. The sport education model facilitates this process by prioritizing the team approach and recording team statistics including wins and losses, thereby pressuring coaches to be effective in their roles. Ennis (1999: 167) also referred to "[taking] responsibility for personal and social actions including goal-setting and monitoring their own progress" as part of her advocacy of a constructivist theory of learning. She also emphasized the need for "trusting and caring teacher-student relationships" (1999: 167) as an important but often ignored factor in curriculum theory, a point also made and elaborated upon by Hellison (2003) in facilitating TPSR.

Noddings (1992) is an unlikely contributor to the physical education literature, yet she directly addressed school physical education, providing a radical departure from traditional practices. She argued for combining several middle and high school departments such as physical education, home economics, health education, driver training and for eliminating the supervision of sport and exercise, substituting instead learning "to take responsibility for our fitness [by providing] open discussion on issues of fitness" such as the "selfish and unproductive" character of the recent fitness movement and issues of competition and cooperation (1992: 75).

The influence in physical education of Freire's conceptualization of responsibility (as construed above) is apparent in some of the themes that surfaced in Miguel Fernández-Balboa's (1997) edited volume on critical postmodernism in physical education and sport. In that same volume, however, Hellison (1997) raised questions about the transformation of theory into curriculum practice in the critical postmodernist movement. More to the point, Rovegno and Kirk (1995), arguing that the ethic of justice and emancipation is too narrow a theoretical base for socially critical physical education curriculum work, offered a reconceptualization that included an ethic of care and responsibility. Although their argument was presented above in the review of critical pedagogy literature, it needs to be included here as well since they are physical education scholars, and their article appeared in a physical education journal.

Social and individual responsibility also has been extended to include citizenship. Laker (2000) contended that the concept of citizenship consists of three strands: moral responsibility, community engagement, and political literacy. All three strands represent stepping stones for being a desirable citizen in today's society. Laker and others (see Allen, 1997) claimed that many school curricula need to offer a multitude of opportunities for heightening the sense of responsibility and citizenship in youth. Gaining the necessary skills of being a responsible citizen can only occur when the school culture is fashioned in a way that authentically fosters the development of these skills. Schools that are harnessed with test score mandates along with interschool competition for top scores make the foundation for teaching responsibility shaky at best.

Laker (2000) emphasized the importance of physical activity and sport play in cultivating responsibility attitudes and behaviors in children and youth. He reinforced the notion that the interactive nature of sport sets the stage for teaching important life lessons (e.g. fair play, being good losers, including others). He cautioned, however, that like schools, raising the competitive stakes in sport will surely undermine the chances for life skills to be experienced and learned.

Stiehl's (1993) "Becoming Responsible" model conceptualized responsibility as taking care of one's self (for example, making and keeping commitments, setting goals), others (for example, honoring others rights, dignity, and worth; working together on common goals), and the environment (for

example, respecting property, recognizing the importance of taking care of the environment). The addition of caring for the environment is not common in the responsibility literature but was a core concept for Wight (1971, 1972 as cited in Beane, 1990). The Becoming Responsible model includes specific steps (for example, learning to use responsibility-based language and behaviors), strategies to become more responsible (for example, changing how the teacher and students talk and act), and an advanced personal responsibility project based on Becoming Responsible principles.

Hellison's (1978, 1985, 1995, 2003) TPSR (teaching personal and social responsibility; also known as the responsibility model) conceptualization of responsibility, augmented by the work of others (e.g. Hellison et al., 2000; Martinek et al., 1999), has made some inroads in the practice of both school based and agency-based physical education programs for a number of years, as noted in the history section above. In his latest work, Hellison (2003) tried to make clear that this approach is a set of ideas, not a rigid blueprint, which includes these components:

- Physical activity is a potentially powerful vehicle for teaching life skills and values, while at the same time promoting physical activity content learning.
- The overarching purpose is to help students take responsibility for their own well-being and development and for contributing to well-being of others.
- To help students focus on what to take responsibility for, five goals or levels are suggested, along with the caveat to adjust these as necessary: (1) Self-control and respect for others' rights and feelings; (2) participation, effort, self-motivation; (3) self-direction; (4) helping others and leadership; and (5) transfer outside the gym.
- Five themes characterize daily practice: Develop a respectful kids first relationship with students, integrate responsibility with physical activity, gradually empower students, promote group and self-reflection, and teach for transfer outside the gym.
- A daily format is suggested (but not mandated) to facilitate putting the purpose and themes into practice: Relational time, awareness talk, physical activity lesson, group meeting, and reflection time.
- A wide range of specific instructional strategy and assessment ideas are offered as examples of the implementation of personal and social responsibility.

A specific empowerment-oriented conflict resolution strategy compatible with TPSR was developed and field-tested earlier by Horrocks (1978). He called his idea the "Talking Bench". Students who had a conflict went to the talking bench to work out their differences, reporting back to the teacher when the matter has been settled satisfactorily. DeLine's (1991) "no plan no play" strategy, in which students who have difficulty playing with other students are required to submit an improvement plan before reentering the game, is also compatible with TPSR.

Some best practice models of physical education practitioners reflect these teachers' responsibility-based philosophical stance. For example, Hichwa, 1993 National Association of Sport and Physical Education Middle School Teacher of the Year and author of *Right fielders are people too* (1998) emphasized "the 3 Rs in physical education" (p. 35): Respect, responsibility, and resourcefulness. Responsibility is conceptualized as:

- "Condition, quality, fact, or instance of being responsible.
- Obligation, accountability, dependability.
- Responsible ... able to distinguish between right and wrong, and to think and act rationally, and hence accountable for one's behavior." (1998: 36)

His definition of respect, "to show consideration for [and] to feel or show honor or esteem for" (1998: 36), could also be considered part of his responsibility conceptualization.

Although he does not use the term responsibility, Kaardal's (2001) "goal-directed physical education" is a best practice approach based on individual responsibility. He defined "success for [the various groups of children in any school] ... according to their [chosen] goals and abilities" (2001: 7), rather than specifying those goals for them.

> Physical education needs to provide a range of options, not only of activities, but of the primary motivators of physical activity for different students [such as] ... social ... competitive, and personal satisfaction ... [and] the levels at which they'll participate in those programs (beginning, intermediate, advanced or elite) ... Our programs should *empower* students through giving them choice ... [our italics]. (2001: 8)

Carefully planned individualized instruction and reflection journals are but two of the many processes Kaardal used to reach his goals.

The Sports Plus model (Beedy, 1997), which is intended as an extended day rather than in-school program, has been adopted by several school districts in collaboration with other agencies (for example, the YMCA, the public library). This model is based on five core values, one of which is responsibility, defined as "being accountable for one's actions to self and others [and] acknowledging duties to self and others" (1997: 20).

Sport psychology contributions

Sport psychologists Shields and Bredemeier (1995) viewed physical education as a "rich environment for dealing with moral issues" (1995: 201), particularly if teachers and coaches share power with students (i.e. empowerment). Their comprehensive

review and critique of, as well as their contributions to, moral theory and empirical studies of social–moral development in sport and physical education added significantly to our understanding of social development in physical education. Moreover, some aspects of their work shed light on the moral aspects of responsibility development in physical education as well as youth sport, for example by explicating a process for critically analyzing moral situations, developing moral self-efficacy, and taking moral action.

The Life Development Intervention and Life Skills Orientation is one of two perspectives in a framework designed for prevention and intervention by sport psychologists Hodge and Danish (1999; see also Danish and Nellen, 1997). The purpose of this approach is to develop the "ability to do life planning, be self-reliant, and seek the resources of others" (1999: 64), thereby promoting responsibility. Two of the programs based on this perspective involve sport and physical education, which are used as attractive vehicles for teaching life skills. One program, Going for the Goal (GOAL), uses sport as a metaphor for life skills in ten sessions focused on goal-setting, overcoming obstacles, rebounding from difficulties, and developing a plan to reward themselves. The other program, Sports United to Promote Education and Recreation (SUPER), consists of ten three hour sport clinics designed to teach sport skills, learn life skills that are related to sports such as goal-setting and anger management, and to play the sport.

Adapted physical education contributions

Lavay et al. (1997) offered Becoming Responsible (Stiehl, 1993) and TPSR (Hellison, 2003) (as well as Glasser's reality therapy) as alternatives to behavioral methods of management for adapted physical education students. Adapted physical education textbooks by Sherrill (2004) and Winnick (2000) applied TPSR to adapted physical education.

Summary of the field's philosophical contributions

- Physical education has been envisioned as vehicle for teaching social and individual responsibility by a number of scholars, teachers, and youth program leaders.
- A number of curriculum models focus on, or include, social responsibility and individual goals and strategies, including Sport Education, Sport for Peace, Becoming Responsible, Sports Plus, and TPSR.
- Sport psychology has also contributed responsibility-based approaches to moral development and life skills development.
- Adapted physical education has recently embraced responsibility as an alternative curriculum approach.

Major empirical findings

While philosophical research can answer curriculum questions such as "What kind of knowledge and experience [in physical education] enable a person to lead a good and fulfilling life?" (Schubert, 1986: viii), empirical research is needed to address evaluation questions that require both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis, such as whether any of these philosophical approaches work in practice.

Cheffers (1987) was perhaps the first scholar in physical education curriculum and instruction to conduct a systematic program of research on children to take responsibility. Between 1972 to 1982, his research team investigated the efficacy of children's decision-making and found that a structured decision-making approach, with choices and management strategies, fostered shared decision-making better than either a teacher-centered approach or total freedom. They utilized a variety of research methods in this work, including the creation and validation of both psychometric and process–product instruments as well as interviews and field notes.

Three physical education curriculum models described above have received attention from researchers. Siedentop (1994) argued that Sport Education is congruent with authentic assessment, because records kept are authentically connected to the intended outcomes of Sport Education. He gave six specific examples of how such records can be used in the service of assessment. Moreover, empirical studies have supported the model's claims (e.g. Grant, 1992; Hastie and Sharpe, 1999). Recently, Wallhead and Ntoumanis (2004) compared sport education to a traditional physical education class to determine the effect of sport education on motivational responses. Analysis of the data from variety of pre-post psychometric scales and questionnaires indicated that sport education increased perceptions of autonomy and a task-oriented climate in comparison to the control group. (Sport education is the focus of Chapter 5.3) The second curriculum model, Sport for Peace, which can be viewed as a spinoff of Sport Education, also has an empirical base (e.g. Carson, 1992; Ennis et al., 1999) comprised of a variety of qualitative methods. The empirical work of the third model, TPSR, is described in some detail in a separate section below.

Sport psychology research

Sport psychologists Hodge and Danish (1999) addressed the difficulty of evaluating responsibility-based programs:

> Few instruments enable a researcher to measure different outcomes and still have the properties necessary to compare experimental

> and control participants. Even fewer consider positive outcomes such as those identified in the Task Force on Education of Young Adolescents (1989) report. Although quantitative measures may permit such analyses, they are labor-intensive, difficult to use, and expensive with large groups. (1999: 70)

For these reasons, Hodge and Danish used Goal Attainment Scaling to measure on a five point scale the level of success that a participant achieves in pursuing a stated goal. They also collected other quantitative and qualitative data for both participants and a control group. Results included participants' achievements in the program such as achieving the goals they set and associated learning as well as improvements outside the program such as better school attendance and fewer health-compromising behaviors compared to controls.

Also in the realm of sport psychology, the structural developmental approach to moral development, while not using the term responsibility, promotes moral decision-making. Romance and his associates (1986) conducted an innovative elementary physical education experiment based on five physical activity-based strategies using the structural developmental approach to moral development. In all of these strategies, children were asked to solve conflicts that derived from implementation of the strategies. During an 8-week program for two fifth grade classes, pre–post interview scores based on Haan's interactional moral development instrument revealed that students in the experimental group improved significantly compared to controls in their ability to reason morally in relation to the conflicts. Other studies (Bredemeier et al., 1986; Gibbons et al., 1995) found similar results.

TPSR model research

A number of studies have been conducted on Hellison's TPSR curriculum model. All of the studies ($n = 26$) that focused on underserved or at-risk children and youth, both published and unpublished and dating from 1978 to 2001, were analyzed and summarized by Hellison and Walsh (2002). All were program evaluations, and 21 of the 26 were case studies based on either qualitative data sources or some combination of qualitative and quantitative data. Four research questions were explored across the 26 studies, three of which involved assessing TPSR outcomes. The other focused on TPSR processes. Findings were grouped into strong and weaker evidence based on the number and quality of the studies and nature of the findings. When the results of these studies across a 23-year time period are compared to the summary of TPSR principles provided above, several conclusions emerge, including:

- Strong support for "Physical activity as a potentially powerful vehicle for teaching life skills and values, while at the same time promoting physical activity content learning."
- Strong support for "The overarching purpose [as helping] students take responsibility for their own well-being and development and for contributing to well-being of others."
- Variable support for program participants improving on the five goals (or levels) that help students focus on what to take responsibility for. Of the 19 studies that investigated this question, 14 studies reported self-control improvement and 12 reported effort improvement, but only eight showed self-direction improvement and only seven supported improvement in helping others. Perhaps surprisingly, of the 11 studies that investigated transfer of these goals outside the program, strong evidence was found for the transfer of several goals. However, the findings were generally stronger in the program, and some evidence showed non-transfer as well. The two studies that investigated the impact of cross-age teaching (older students teaching younger students TPSR in the gym) found strong support for a number of positive outcomes.
- Uneven support regarding the five themes that characterize daily practice and a daily format to facilitate putting the purpose and themes into practice. Exploration of the processes experienced by program participants turned up some evidence for interacting with a caring adult and having fun. However, the design of this review as well as the design of most of the studies were not conducive to answering these process-oriented questions.

A study one one TPSR-based extended day program, published after the above review of research (Hellison and Wright, 2003), was carried out over a nine year period, based on nine years of attendance records and nine years of post-program qualitative student evaluations of the program. Results showed that program retention rates surpassed the average dropout pattern for inner city youth in extended day programs, and in anonymous program evaluations over the nine years consistently showed perceived improvements in personal and social responsibility as consequences of their participation in the program. They also emphasized the importance of having a respectful, caring program leader.

Wright and White (2004) studied the implementation of TPSR with cerebral palsy children, providing empirical evidence concerning its effectiveness and thus testing the philosophical notions of adapted physical education scholars described above. Based on medical records, fieldnotes, and interviews with participants' physicians, therapists, and parents, Wright and White concluded that the intervention increased participants' sense of ability, produced positive feelings about the program and

positive social interactions, and had therapeutic relevance.

Recently, Watson and her associates (Watson et al., 2003) developed the Contextual Self-Responsibility Questionnaire based on TPSR and administered the questionnaire to 135 underserved youth who participated in a National Youth Sports Program summer camp. Validity was checked by conducting an exploratory factor analysis, revealing that the participants merged the two advanced TPSR goals, thereby producing "less-than-perfect" alignment between TPSR and the questionnaire items. Regardless, the questionnaire roughly reflected participant perceptions toward TPSR. Since no intervention was involved, the primary contribution of this study was to add a psychometric tool to TPSR methodology. However, descriptive statistics of the results showed that the participants perceived themselves to be taking personal and social responsibility, and the more they perceived TPSR to be emphasized, the more robust the results. In fact, "a significant proportion of affect and attitude were explained by the [questionnaire]" (p. 228). The researchers surmised that the NYSP teaching staff's training in TPSR as part of their university professional preparation program influenced these findings.

Project effort research

Three of the studies reviewed by Hellison and Walsh (2002) were products of a University of North Carolina at Greensboro research and development program based on TPSR called Project Effort, but the responsibility-based research being carried out there is extensive and therefore warrants additional attention. By presenting the methods and findings of specific studies, a more complete understanding of TPSR research can be achieved.

Project Effort is aimed at fostering responsibility values for underserved youth through participation in a values-based sports club guided by TPSR. Empowering students is a centerpiece of the program. Empowerment means giving the club members "choices and voices". This means giving young people meaningful and genuine choices along with opportunity for expression and dialogue. Elementary and middle school students work with the responsibility values and are empowered through a number of learning experiences. These include peer and cross-age teaching opportunities, choices regarding specific activities, and time for personal reflection.

An important extension of the sports club is a mentoring program. University students receive extensive education to enhance their cultural competence and learn strategies for goal setting. The main goal of the mentoring program is to help the students transfer the values learned in the sport club to the school setting. As in the sports club, TPSR serves as a framework to guide the mentor and student in goal setting efforts.

Early evaluation of the mentoring program focused on school performance measures (Hellison et al., 1996; Martinek et al., 1999). Nine-week grades, recorded reprimands, mentor journal entries, and office referrals were obtained from school records. The club members' teachers were also informally asked to comment on how hard they thought they were trying in their daily work. Overall improvement in students' engagement in class work along with increases in grade-point average and with decreases in reprimands and office referrals were reported. Teachers also noted that barriers to preventing positive impact included home (for example, unstable family conditions) and environmental (for example, gang involvement) factors.

In a follow-up study by Martinek et al. (2001), a shift from looking at performance outcomes was made. Instead, the researchers focused on outcomes that more clearly reflected actual transfer of club goals to the classroom. Using a "creative evaluation" strategy (Patton, 1987), teacher and mentor journals, and student exit interviews were analyzed. A "program-goal matrix" was developed to determine the level of performance of each participant. Results indicated that the youngsters were able to apply the goal of "trying hard" in the classroom most of the time. They struggled, however, to transfer some of the other values to the classroom (i.e. self-control and respect for others, self-direction, helping others). One particular problematic area was the club members' inability to set personal goals in the classroom setting. Our own past work (see Martinek and Hellison, 1997, 1998) found that both environmental and personal barriers are main culprits in preventing successful application of responsibility value outside the gym. Similarly, mentors in this study cited the youngsters' personal values as formidable obstacles to goal setting. Devaluing the school experience, possessing combative values, and feeling helpless in meeting teacher expectations were frequently mentioned in the mentor journals.

Another area of evaluation of Project Effort was to find out why young people stay in the program. For years retention has always been an important consideration with program planners. To clear our thinking about why young people "hang in there", Schilling (2001) examined underserved youth perceptions of commitment to Project Effort. Using a case study approach, she described the levels of program commitment of seven veteran club members. She was also interested in identifying the reasons for being committed. The length of involvement in Project Effort among the participants ranged from four to seven years. One-on-one interviews were augmented by focus group interviews which were the primary data sources for her study.

Some of the reasons that kept the participants in the program were the program's activities and

organization, relationships with the staff and program leader, and the program's environment (i.e. having fun, being in a positive place, having a snack). They also described the nature of being committed. Things like being "into the program," "always coming to the club", and "having fun" were typically mentioned as indicators. An important aspect underlying these findings was the interconnection between showing responsible behavior and being a good club member.

Barriers to commitment were also highlighted. For a few club members, the type of activities and repetition of things were two inhibitors to program commitment. Schilling's study also reemphasized the importance placed on having program leaders who truly internalize and practice the responsibility values. This seemed to be a primary factor in keeping the kids connected to the program goals of Project Effort. We believe that this is an area that needs considerable attention from program evaluators. Sport Psychologist Scanlon and her colleagues (Scanlon et al., 1993) also underscored the need to look at leader attributes. They claimed that it is probable that certain types of program leaders are particularly successful with values-based models. Knowing what characteristics make leaders effective in values-based sport programs will undoubtedly have important implications in the professional training of future leaders.

We are beginning to see the development of sport programs that encourage adolescent youth to be caring and compassionate leaders – a focus of the more advanced levels of Hellison's model (especially Level Four). Broadening the definition of leadership is fundamental in these programs. Van Linden and Fertman (1998) promoted the notion that leaders need to think for themselves, communicate their thoughts and feelings to others, and help others to act in ethical and socially responsible ways. Such qualities are characterized as those that reflect caring and compassion for others.

Some recent program developers have found that getting young people to acquire these qualities requires early exposure and practice using the responsibility values. Programs like those in Greensboro, Chicago, and Denver have club participants learning a set of skills and attitudes through planned physical activities. Emerging from these programs have been research data describing how adolescent youth respond to the challenges of being responsible for the welfare of others.

For example, Cutforth and Puckett (1999), in a study reviewed by Hellison and Walsh (2002), examined a summer apprentice teacher program at the University of Illinois at Chicago in which a group of urban young people taught basketball to young children attending a summer sports camp. The program captured the interests and talents of the youth who struggled with behavior problems, truancy, and grades during the school year. Quantitative and qualitative results including interviews and field notes showed that the teachers gained self confidence, concern for others, intrapersonal and interpersonal skills, problem-solving skills, and enthusiasm for learning.

The development of youth leadership ability was also examined in a program called the Youth Leader Corps at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. Two evaluation studies have emerged from this program. In one study, Schilling and her colleagues (Schilling et al., 2001) examined data from informal observation notes and journal entries. They found that getting adolescent youngsters to be compassionate leaders involved the application of various levels of empowerment. The first level was simply providing an open forum for youngsters to share their ideas. Open dialogue among staff and club participants gave opportunity for expressing perceptions and attitudes. The second level entailed having youth participants make decisions within the program or activity, moving beyond discussion to action. Choices in activity, with whom to work, or even deciding how the program should run were some of the ways in which decision-making was given to the participants. The third level of empowerment was peer teaching. At this level, club members' decisions and actions directly impacted the experiences of their fellow club members. Coaching responsibilities (e.g. running team drills, reinforcing teamwork) were also given to those club members ready to take on more advanced leadership roles. The most advanced level of empowerment occurred at the fourth responsibility level. At this level the club members became involved with cross-age teaching. They took responsibility for teaching younger children in a different environment than the sport club. They planned for and taught in their own sport club, reinforcing the TPSR levels of responsibility.

A fifth level is empowering youth to take control of their own future. It is uncertain as to whether youth leaders ever get to experience this most advance level of empowerment. They will need to be ready to assume the difficult responsibility of making society a better place to live. How this takes place is unclear. Empowerment at this level will be dependent on how well a youngster can successfully manage the responsibilities offered at the previous levels.

In another study on youth leadership, Martinek and Schilling (2003) looked at how youth participants advance in their leadership skills. Similar to earlier investigations, interview, journal entries, and informal observations served as the major data sources. The program attempted to foster the leadership qualities of underserved high school youth, guided by the learned helplessness theory (Martinek and Griffith, 1993) as well as moral development theories (Burns, 1978; Gilligan, 1982; Kohlberg, 1971). The study showed that youth progress in

leadership along a continuum of leadership qualities, beginning with personal needs and eventually maturing into a compassionate leader. The stages of development found the leaders either placing emphasis on either: (a) personal needs (stage 1), (b) teaching skills (stage 2), (c) reciprocal learning (stage 3), or (d) compassionate leadership (stage 4). The evaluation also showed that operating at these stages was fluid for the leaders; that is, they fluctuated from level to level depending on their personal struggles outside the program. The developmental framework to ease feelings of uncertainty by giving the staff members a sense of what should come next when setting personal and program goals for the youth leader corps members.

TPSR research in Spain and New Zealand

Escarti and her research team (2005) at the University of Valencia in Spain have been conducting TPSR intervention investigations over the past several years. The first focused on underserved youth in an after-school coaching club (Hellison et al., 2000). The second involved elementary school PE teachers using TPSR. Also in Spain at the University of Madrid, faculty member Pedro Martin (2000) implemented TPSR with low income youth and reported positive changes in their values but frustration with the social and economic barriers they face in improving their lives outside the physical activity setting.

Gordon (2005) conducted a six month implementation of TPSR in a New Zealand secondary school. Two classes were based on TPSR, and two classes acted as controls. All four classes were taught by the same teacher. Both qualitative and quantitative data were collected, including daily notations of student behaviors, number of detentions, goal-setting and self-reflection records kept by the students, interviews with the teacher and selected students from all four classes. Results indicated that behavior, class atmosphere, and relationships with the teacher improved in the TPSR classes but not in the controls. A small number of students in the TPSR classes also transferred what they had learned to other contexts outside the program. Initially the teacher had problems giving up control but eventually stated that TPSR was a success and that she would continue to use it.

Summary of empirical research

The empirical literature on responsibility in physical education and sport programs, while not extensive, does address the concern of scholars who have complained about the absence of data based research in this area (e.g. Newton et al., 2001; Shields and Bredemeier, 1995). Since Cheffers and his associates' early work (1987), both Hodge and Danish (1999) and Romance and his associates (1986) have produced promising results for their philosophical frameworks, the former for life skills and sport and the latter for applying structural developmental moral reasoning to physical education. Two physical education curriculum models, Sport Education and Sport for Peace, also have an empirical basis, as has the TPSR curriculum model. The most robust and significant line of TPSR research is that of Project Effort. A unique component of Project Effort is the development and utilization of individual mentors for program participants. Empirical studies from Project Effort researchers have for the most part focused on retention in responsibility-based programs, transfer of responsibilities from the gym to the classroom, and the development of youth leadership. In this work, as well as in the other TPSR studies noted above, the results are uneven but promising, especially when taking into consideration the low income minority characteristics of most student participants.

Applications to policy and practice

Practice

Much of the philosophical and empirical research reported above was based on practice and fed back into efforts to improve practice. In fact, rather than theory and research dictating practice, an interplay between the two exists. Some speculative essays cited above, for example, often consisted at least in part of reflections based on experiences in practice. In a similar way, some empirical studies cited above were often conducted by a teacher-as-researcher, thereby linking research and practice in ways that no other approach can match, despite the scoffing of some traditional researchers at such biased and value-oriented inquiry. In fact, almost all TPSR research has used some version of teacher-as-researcher, practical inquiry, or service-bonded inquiry. Fortunately, criticism of this family of research methods is in decline, at least for now.

In addition to Gordon's New Zealand physical education teacher study reported above, Mrugala's (2002) exploratory qualitative internet survey of over fifty school physical educators who claim that they use TPSR shed considerable light on the difficulties of putting such curriculum models into practice. This purposive sample of mostly elementary school teachers heard about TPSR from a number of sources; many never had listened to or read the work of someone whose expertise lies with TPSR. The vast majority adopted this approach to

deal with discipline problems and implemented it primarily by posting the "levels" on the gym wall, despite strong cautions about using the model this way (Hellison, 2003). Perhaps the most surprising finding was that some, but certainly not all, of the sample reported improving their relationships with their students and becoming more focused on the whole child, despite their initial motivation to improve discipline and their interpretation of TPSR as posting the levels.

Policy

Kahne's (1996) vision for reframing educational policy provides principled advocacy for more democratic and humanistic policy work and moves the discussion to policies that support responsibility-based curriculum theory and practice. He argued that current policies are based mostly on utilitarian and rights-based theories that prioritize equity, efficiency, and excellence, whether policy makers are aware of these theories or not. Kahne, however, advocated a shift in emphasis toward democratic communitarian and humanistic theories, which offer "powerful critiques of the dominant emphasis on utility and rights" (1996: 3). A shift toward self-actualization and the creation of a democratic community in education policy, while not popular among policy analysts, would in Kahne's view be welcomed by the education community. The upshot would be to promote personal and social development in a systematic way, rather than, as policy makers tend to do, promote a litany of desirable educational ends such as self-esteem, honesty, well-roundedness, critical thinking, even though "there is little evidence that all of these goals can be pursued simultaneously or even on agreement of the meaning of the varied terms" (1996: 5–6).

Specific policy applications of personal and social responsibility can be found in suggested or mandated curriculum documents at both the national and international level, as the following examples show.

One of the seven National Association of Sport and Physical Education's (NASPE) standards (National Association for Sport and Physical Education, 1995) is demonstrating responsible personal and social behavior in physical activity settings. Parker and Hellison (2001), building on TPSR, developed a specific curricular example of this standard. This example described responsibility-based physical education learning outcomes, instructional strategies (including transfer from the physical activity setting to other aspects of students' lives), and assessment ideas. In addressing another of the NASPE standards, "understanding and respect for differences among people in physical activity settings" (p. 28), Doolittle and Demas (2001) offered 23 "positive examples" of this standard in practice. Many of these positive examples of understanding and respect involved students taking social responsibility.

Several Canadian curriculum guides include references to teaching responsibility. For example, Saskatchewan (Nick Forsberg, personal communication, 2003) has embedded TPSR in physical education in all grades except grades nine and ten, which utilize the more holistic wellness subject matter to embed TPSR concepts. Even the terms used in the curriculum documents parallel TPSR language quite closely. The New Foundland– Labrador physical education curriculum framework (Mark Jones, personal communication, 2003) uses responsibility language throughout which is particularly evident in the sections on philosophy, the nature of physical education, essential graduation learnings, and key stage curriculum outcomes. This language is strongest for physical education in the intermediate years.

In New Zealand's curriculum framework (Barrie Gordon, personal communication, 2003), responsibility is included in several of the curriculum's eight groupings of essential skills. Examples include taking responsibility for one's own actions, taking responsibility for one's health and safety, and developing a sense of responsibility for the well-being of others.

England's recent emphasis on social inclusion and disaffected youth has given social responsibility a foothold there as well. Holroyd and Armour (2003) of the Institute of Youth Sport at Loughborough University included responsibility as one of several components comprising a promising physical education curriculum for disaffected youth, citing Sport Education, Sport for Peace, and TPSR as specific examples.

And most recently, several regions of Indonesia are beginning to create community sport programs based on personal-social responsibility ideology (Mutohir, 2003). With economic and human resources hanging in the balance, several local governments are looking at ways to empower its citizens and reconstruct a value system that fosters honesty and sustainable development.

Summary of practice and policy

Much of the responsibility curriculum research is linked directly to practice and reflects an interplay between theory and practice. Mrugala (2002) and Gordon (2004) explored practicing physical education teachers' implementation of responsibility-based curriculum ideas. Responsibility has also appeared, sometimes prominently, in curriculum policy documents in the United States, Canada, New Zealand, and England.

Major trends and future directions

Much remains to be done in physical education responsibility curriculum research. On the other

curriculum guides include
g responsibility. For example,
Forsberg, personal communica-
ded TPSR in physical education
ades nine and ten, which utilize
fness subject matter to embed
the terms used in the curricu-
el TPSR language quite closely.
. Labrador physical education
k (Mark Jones, personal com-
uses responsibility language
is particularly evident in the
y, the nature of physical educa-
on learnings, and key stage cur-
This language is strongest for
the intermediate years.
curriculum framework (Barrie
mmunication, 2003), responsi-
everal of the curriculum's eight
skills. Examples include taking
s own actions, taking responsi-
and safety, and developing a
for the well-being of others.
emphasis on social inclusion
has given social responsibil-
as well. Holroyd and Armour
te of Youth Sport at Lough-
ncluded responsibility as one
nts comprising a promising
curriculum for disaffected
ucation, Sport for Peace, and
nples.
several regions of Indonesia
e community sport programs
ocial responsibility ideology
ith economic and human
the balance, several local gov-
at ways to empower its citi-
a value system that fosters
le development.

tice and policy

bility curriculum research is
ctice and reflects an interplay
ractice. Mrugala (2002) and
ed practicing physical educa-
mentation of responsibility-
eas. Responsibility has also
prominently in curriculum
e United States, Canada, New
.

d future

done in physical education
lum research. On the other

hand, most of the work reviewed here is relatively recent, suggesting an upswing in interest that hopefully will continue. Even more recently, responsibility-based research has begun to be carried out internationally.

Such recency of interest and activity inevitably produces research gaps. Regarding TPSR, Martinek's Project Effort research (e.g. 2001, 2003) is an exemplar in attempting to close some of these gaps by focusing on specific issues such as youth leadership and transfer from the physical education program to the school.

Hodge and Danish's (1999) work on life skills through sport seems to be continuing, thereby building an even stronger data base for their compelling programs. Brenda Bredemeier and David Schields' Mendelson Center for Sports, Character, and Community held two national conferences on the Notre Dame campus, the second one with "sports, character, and responsible citizenship" as the conference theme. Such efforts also promise to yield additional related research.

Hellison and Walsh (2002) concluded their review of a number of TPSR studies with the following (abridged) remarks, perhaps reflecting the current state of the art in all physical education responsibility-based curriculum research:

> The 'Is it working' question remains a work in progress due to methodological issues and gaps in the evidence, but these ... studies, however limited, do enhance the theoretical and practical potential of [responsibility-based curriculum models] ... Moreover, future research can focus on the methodological shortcomings and evidence gaps as well as to build on what has already been accomplished. (2002: 304)

References

Allen, G. (1997). *Education at risk*. London: Cassell.

Aronowitz, S. (1993). Paulo Freire's radical democratic humanism. In P. McLaren and P. Leonard (Eds.), *Paulo Freire: A Critical Encounter* (pp. 8–24). London: Routledge.

Bain, L.L. (1988). Curriculum for critical reflection in physical education. In R. S. Brandt (Ed.), *Content of the curriculum: 1988 ASCD yearbook* (pp. 133–147). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Bain, L.L. (1992). Sport pedagogy. In J.D. Massengale and R.A. Swanson (Eds.), *The history of exercise and sport science* (pp. 18–37). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Beane, J.A. (1990). *Affect in the curriculum: Toward democracy, dignity, and diversity*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Beedy, J.P. (1997). *Sports plus: Positive learning using sports*. Hamilton, MA: Project Adventure.

Benson, P.L. (1997). *All kids are our kids: What communities must do to raise caring and responsible children and youth*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Berman, S. (1997). *The development of social responsibility as a meaning making process: The role of schools*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Bredemeier, B.J., Weiss, M.R., Shields, D.L. and Cooper, B. (1987). Promoting moral growth in a summer sport camp: The implementation of theoretically grounded instructional strategies. *Journal of Moral Education, 15*: 212–220.

Bredemeier, M.E. (1988). *Urban portraits: Teachers who make a difference*. New York: Lang.

Bressan, E.S. (1982). An academic discipline for physical education: What a fine mess! *NAPEHE Proceedings, 7*: 3.

Bressan, E.S. (1987). The future of scholarship in physical education. In J. Massengale (Ed.), *Trends toward the future in physical education* (pp. 25–36). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Broekhoff, J. (1968). Chivalric education in the Middle Ages. *Quest, 11*: 24–31.

Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper Collins.

Carson, T.B. (1992). Remembering, forward: Reflections of education for peace. In W. Pinar and W. Reynolds (Eds.), *Understanding curriculum as phenomenological and deconstructed text*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cheffers, J. (1987). Tuesdays and Thursdays with Boston's inner-city youth. *Quest, 49*: 50–66.

Crum, B. (1986). Concerning the quality of the development of knowledge in sport pedagogy. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 5*: 211–220.

Cutforth, N.J. and Puckett, K.M. (1999). An investigation into the organization, challenges, and impact of an urban apprentice teacher program. *The Urban Review, 31*: 153–172.

Danish, S. and Nellen, V.C. (1997). New roles for sport psychologists: Teaching life skills through sport to at-risk youth. *Quest, 49*: 100–113.

deCharms, R. (1976). *Enhancing motivation: Change in the classroom*. New York: Irvington.

DeLine, J. (1991). Why ... can't they get along? *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 62*: 21–26.

Doolittle, S. and Demas, K. (2001). Fostering respect through physical activity. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 72*: 28–33.

Elias, M.J., Zins, J.E., Weissberg, R.P. et al., (1997). *Promoting Social and Emotional Learning: Guidelines for Educators*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Ennis, C.D. (1999). Communicating the value of active, healthy, lifestyles to urban students. *Quest, 51*: 164–169.

Ennis, C.D., Solmon, M.A., Satina, B., Loftus, S.J., Mensch, J. and McCauley, M.T. (1999). Creating a sense of family in urban schools using the Sport for Peace curriculum. *Research Quarterly for Sport and Exercise, 70*: 273–285.

Escarti, A., Pascual, C., and Gutierrez, Melchor (2005). *Responsibilidad personal y social a traves de la education fisica y el deporte*. Barcelona, Spain: GRAO.

Fernández-Balboa, J.M. (Ed.) (1997). *Critical postmodernism in human movement, physical education and sport*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Fowler, S.B. (1998). "Under the shade of this mango tree": Reflections on a pedagogical practice that crosses disciplinary boundaries. *Quest, 50*: 319–322.

Freire, P. (1970/1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Continuum.

Gerber, E.W. (1971). *Innovators and institutions in physical education.* Philadelphia, PA: Lea and Febiger.

Gibbons, S.L. and Bressan, E.S. (1991). The affective domain in physical education: A conceptual clarification and curricular commitment. *Quest, 43*: 78–97.

Gibbons, S.L., Ebbeck, V. and Weiss, M.R. (1995). Fair play for kids: Effects on the moral development of children in physical education. *Research Quarterly for Sport and Exercise, 66*: 247–255.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Glass, R.D. (2001). On Paulo Freire's philosophy of praxis and the foundations of liberation education. *Educational Researcher, 30*: 15–25.

Gordon, B. (2005). *An evaluation of a six month implementation of the responsibility model in a New Zealand secondary school.* Doctoral dissertation, Massey University College of Education, Palmerston North, New Zealand.

Grant, B. (1992). Integrating sport education into the physical education curriculum in New Zealand secondary schools. *Quest, 44*: 304–316.

Haberman, M. (2000). Urban schools: Day camps or custodial centers. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82*: 203–208.

Hastie, P.A. and Buchanan, A.M. (2000). Teaching responsibility through sport education: Prospects for a coalition. *Research Quarterly for Sport and Exercise, 71*: 25–35.

Hastie, P.A. and Sharpe, T. (1999). Effects of a sport education curriculum on the positive social behaviors of at-risk rural adolescent boys. *Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk, 4*: 417–439.

Hellison, D. (1973). *Humanistic physical education.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hellison, D. (1978). *Beyond balls and bats: Alienated (and other) youth in the gym.* Washington, DC: AAHPER.

Hellison, D. (1985). *Goals and strategies for physical education.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Hellison, D. (1995). *Teaching responsibility through physical activity (1st ed.).* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Hellison, D. (1997). A practical inquiry into the critical postmodernist perspective in physical education. In J.M. Fernandez-Balboa, (Ed.), *Critical postmodernism in human movement, physical education, and sport* (pp. 197–205). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hellison, D. (2003). *Teaching responsibility through physical activity* (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Hellison, D. and Cutforth, N. (1997). Extended day programs for urban children and youth: From theory to practice. In H. Walberg, O. Reyes and R. Weissberg (Eds.), *Children and youth: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 223–249). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hellison, D., Cutforth, N., Kallusky, J., Martinek, T., Parker, M. and Stiehl, J. (2000). *Youth development and physical activity: Linking universities and communities.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Hellison, D. and Kallusky, J. (1999). The youth leader project partnership in physical education in higher education. *The Chronicle of Physical Education in Higher Education, 10*: 6, 14.

Hellison, D., Martinek, T. and Cutforth, N. (1996). Beyond violence prevention in inner-city physical activity programs. *Peace and Conflict Journal of Peace Psychology, 2*: 321–337.

Hellison, D. and Templin, T. (1991). *A reflective approach to teaching physical education.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Hellison, D. and Walsh, D. (2002). Responsibility-based youth programs evaluation: Investigating the investigations. *Quest, 54*: 292–307.

Hellison, D. and Wright, P. (2003). Retention in an urban extended day program: A process-based assessment. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 22*: 369–381).

Hichwa, J. (1998). *Right fielders are people too.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Hodge, K. and Danish, S. (1999). Promoting life skills for adolescent boys through sport. In A.M. Horne and M.S. Kiselica (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling boys and adolescent males* (pp. 55–71). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Holroyd, R. and Armour, K. (2003). *Re-engaging disaffected youth through physical activity programs.* Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh.

Horrocks, R.N. (1978). Resolving conflict in the gymnasium. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance.* 49: 6.

Jones, R.S. and Tanner, L.N. (1981). Classroom discipline: The unclaimed legacy. *Phi Delta Kappan, 63*: 494–497.

Kaardal, K. (2001). *Learning by choice in secondary physical education: Creating a goal-directed program.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Kahne, J. (1996). *Reframing educational policy: Democracy, community, and the individual.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Kamii, C., Clark, F.B. and Dominick, A. (1994). Six national goals: A road to disappointment. *Phi Delta Kappan, 75*: 672–677.

Kirk, D. (1991). Curriculum work in physical education: Beyond the objectives approach? *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 12*: 244–265.

Kirk, D. (1992). *Articulations and silences in socially critical research on physical education: Towards a new agenda.* Paper presented at the AARE Annual Conference, Geelong, Australia.

Kohlberg, L. (1971). Stages of moral development as a basis for moral development. In C.M. Beck, B.S. Crittenden and E.V. Sullivan (Eds.), *Moral education: Interdisciplinary approaches* (pp. 23–92). Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Kretchmar, R.S. (1994). *Practical philosophy of sport.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Laker, A. (2000). *Beyond the boundaries of physical education.* New York: Routledge-Falmer.

Lavay, B.W., French, R. and Henderson, H.L. (1997). *Positive behavior management strategies for physical educators.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Martin, P.J.J. (2000). *An intervention model for values education to at risk youth through physical activity and sport*. Doctoral dissertation, Technical University of Madrid, Madrid, Spain.

Macdonald, D., Kirk, D., Metzler, M., Nilges, L.M., Schempp, P. and Wright, J. (2002). It's all very well, in theory: Theoretical perspectives and their applications in contemporary pedagogy. *Quest, 54*: 133–156.

Martin, P.S.S. (2000). *An intervention model for values education to at risk youth through physical activity and sport*. Doctoral dissertation, Technical University of Madrid, Madrid, Spain.

Martinek, T. and Griffith, J.B. (1993). Working with the learned helpless child. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 64*: 17–20.

Martinek, T. and Hellison, D. (1997). Service-bonded inquiry: The road less traveled. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 17*: 107–121.

Martinek, T. and Hellison, D. (1998) Values and goal setting with underserved youth. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 69*: 47–52.

Martinek, T., Hellison, D. and Walsh, D. (2004). Service-bonded inquiry revisited: A research model for the community-engaged professor. *Quest, 56*: 397–412.

Martinek, T., McLaughlin, D. and Schilling, T. (2004). Project effort: Teaching responsibility beyond the gym. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 70*: 12–25.

Martinek, T. and Schilling, T. (2003) Developing compassionate leadership in underserved youth. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 74*: 33–39.

Martinek, T., Schilling, T. and Johnson, D. (2001). Evaluation of a sport and mentoring program designed to foster personal and social responsibility in underserved youth. *The Urban Review, 33*: 29–45.

McLaughlin, M.W. (2000). *Community counts*. Washington, DC: Public Education Network.

McLaughlin, M.W., Irby, M.A. and Langman, J. (1994). *Urban sanctuaries: neighborhood organizations in the lives and futures of inner-city youth*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, R.F. and Jarman, B.O. (1988). Moral and ethical character development: Views from past leaders. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 59*: 72–78.

Mrugala, J. (2002). *Exploratory study of responsibility model practitioners*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Chicago.

Mutohir, A.T. (2003). *Peace, friendship, and sustainable development*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Sport and Sustainable Development, Yogyakarta, West Java, Indonesia.

National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (1995). *Moving into the future: National physical education standards: A guide to content and assessment*. Reston, VA: National Association of Sport and Physical Education.

Newton, M., Sandberg, J. and Watson, D.L. (2001). Utilizing adventure education with the model of moral action. *Quest, 53*: 483–494.

Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Parker, M. and Hellison, D. (2001). Teaching responsibility in physical education: Standards, outcomes, and beyond. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 72*: 25–27.

Patton, M. (1987). *Creative evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Romance, T.J., Weiss, M.R. and Bockoven, J. (1986). A program to promote moral development through elementary school physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 5*: 126–136.

Rovegno, I. and Kirk, D. (1995). Articulations and silences in socially critical work on physical education: Toward a broader agenda. *Quest, 47*: 447–474.

Sage, G.H. (1990). *Power and ideology in American sport: A critical perspective*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Scanlon, T.K., Carpenter, P.J., Schmidt, G.W., Simons, J.P. and Keeler, B. (1993). An introduction to the sport commitment model. *Journal of Exercise and Sport Psychology, 15*: 1–15.

Schilling, T. (2001). An investigation of commitment among participants in an extended day physical activity program. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 72*: 355–365.

Schilling, T., Martinek, T. and Tan, C. (2001). Fostering youth development through empowerment. In B.J. Lombardo, T.J. Caravella-Nadeau, H.S. Castagno, and V.H. Mancini (Eds.) *Sport in the twenty-first century: Alternatives for the New millennium* (pp. 169–179). Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Schubert, W.H. (1982). Curriculum Research. In H.E. Mitzel (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, Vol. 1 (5th ed. pp. 420–431). New York: Free Press.

Schubert, W. H. (1986). *Curriculum: perspective, paradigm, and possibility*. New York: Macmillan.

Schwab, J.J. (1971). The practical: Arts of eclectic. *School Review, 79*: 493–542.

Shields, D.L.L. and Bredemeier, B.J.L. (1995). *Character development and physical activity*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Sherrill, C. (2004). *Adapted physical activity, recreation, and sport* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Short, E.C. (Ed.) (1991). *Forms of curriculum inquiry*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Siedentop, D. (1980). *Physical education: Introductory analysis* (3rd ed.). Wm. C. Brown.

Siedentop, D. (1990). *Introduction to physical education, fitness, and sport*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.

Siedentop, D. (1994). *Sport education: Quality PE through positive sport experiences*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Siedentop, D., Mand, C. and Taggart, A. (1986). Physical education: Curriculum and instruction strategies for grades 5–12. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.

Steinhardt, M. (1992). Physical education. In P.W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 964–1001). New York: Macmillan.

Sizer, T.R. (1992). *Horace's school: Redesigning the American high school.* Boston MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Stiehl, J. (1993). Becoming responsible: Theoretical and practical considerations. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 64*: 38–40, 57–59, 70–71.

Tappan, R.B. (1992). Educating for character: How our schools can teach respect and responsibility. *Journal of Teacher Education, 43*: 386–389.

Van Linden, J.A. and Fertman, C.I. (1998). *Youth leadership: A guide to understanding leadership development in adolescents.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Wallhead, T.L., and Ntoumanis, N. (2004). Effects of a sport education intervention on students' motivational responses in physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 23*: 4–18.

Wang, M.C. and Gordon, E.W. (Eds.) (1994). *Educational resilience in inner-city America.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Watson, D.L., Newton, M. and Kim, Mi-Sook (2003). Recognition of values-based constructs in a summer physical activity program. *Urban Review, 35*: 221–232.

Wentzel, K.R. (1991). Social competence at school: Relation between social responsibility and academic achievement. *Review of Educational Research, 61*: 1–24.

Wight, A.R. (1972). *Toward a definition of affect.* Salt Lake City, UT: Interstate Educational Resource Center.

Winnick, J. (2000). *Adapted physical education and sport* (3rd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Wright, P.M. and White, K. (2004). Exploring the relevance of the personal and social responsibility model in adapted physical activity: A collective case study. *Journal of Teaching Physical Education, 23*: 71–87.