

# Don Hellison's Scholarship Reconsidered

Paul M. Wright and Karisa Fuerniss    Nicholas Cutforth  
Northern Illinois University    University of Denver

**Purpose:** Don Hellison's scholarship made a lasting impact on the academic literature, policy, and practice of physical education and sport pedagogy. In this essay, we summarize and interpret Don's perspective on scholarship, his own work, and the literature that it spawned. **Method:** Don's work, published and unpublished, as well as the rapidly expanding body of teaching personal and social responsibility literature was analyzed using Boyer's comprehensive framework for scholarship reconsidered. **Results:** Don was a strong advocate for broader definitions of scholarship in kinesiology, whose work integrated the scholarship of discovery, integration, application, and teaching. This influence remains evident in the teaching personal and social responsibility literature. **Discussion/Conclusions:** Amid calls for broader and more flexible definitions of scholarship in higher education, Don was a role model who demonstrated what is possible in this regard in the field of kinesiology.

**Keywords:** scholarship of application, scholarship of discovery, scholarship of integration, scholarship of teaching, teaching personal and social responsibility

Theory surely leads to practice. But practice also leads to theory. And teaching, at its best, shapes both research and practice. Viewed from this perspective, a more comprehensive, more dynamic understanding of scholarship can be considered, one in which the rigid categories of teaching, research, and service are broadened and more flexibly defined (Boyer, 1990, p. 16).

The quotation mentioned earlier speaks to a tension in academia regarding the nature of scholarship (O'Meara, 2015). While the dominant view equates scholarship with research (and often only specific types of research), 30 years ago, Boyer (1990) challenged narrow mainstream definitions of scholarship that are conflated with certain research products and activities (e.g., peer-reviewed publications and external grants). During his over 40-year career, Don Hellison voiced many of the same concerns and advocated for broader and more flexible definitions of scholarship within the field of kinesiology and its various subdisciplines. Reflecting on his alternative approach to scholarship in a piece coauthored with a longtime friend and collaborator Tom Martinek, Don stated:

Now in my twentieth year in Chicago, I am still teased by colleagues in the field about the dearth of data in my work. Once again, I've "gotten away" with making my scholarship up, in my earlier years using a weak version of Donald Schon's reflective scholarship (1987), and more recently, guided by service-bonded inquiry (Martinek & Hellison, 1997; Martinek, Hellison, & Walsh, 2004; Hellison & Martinek, 2009, p. 268)

Despite his self-deprecating style, Don was strongly critical of the incentives systems and rewards structures in place within institutions of higher learning. Regarding the tenure and promotion

processes, he once wrote, "Specific guidelines were less prescribed 'back in the day.' As one small example, although I was granted tenure by my first university, I am doubtful that my current university would have tenured me with the same record" (Hellison, 2008, p. 10). Don sometimes referred to Boyer (1990) in framing his arguments, stating, for example:

New ways of doing scholarship are ever so slowly finding their way into the tenure-promotion process at some universities, but Boyer's model specifically and service-based (engaged) scholarship in general are still fighting for a place at the table. I am forever grateful that things were not so locked down when I was going through the process. (Hellison, 2008, p. 10)

Around the time Boyer (1990) was making a case for broader perspectives on scholarship, Don's work was being recognized as an innovative and practical approach to the curriculum by many (e.g., Bain, 1988; Kirk, 1992; Siedentop, Mand, & Taggart, 1986; Steinhardt, 1992). However, some were dubious. Regarding its practical effectiveness, Struna described Don's work "... as a plan for final disaster" (1986, p. 10). Weiss and Bredemeier (1990) provided a more positive review, but pointed out that Don's approach had not been developed systematically and that it lacked theoretical support. Because Don's approach to scholarship did not fit with recognized theory and research paradigms in physical education (Georgiadis, 1992), his work is conspicuously absent in reviews of research produced at that time (e.g., Bain, 1990; Silverman, 1991).

Despite concerns and perceived weaknesses, Don's work has had an immense impact in terms of scholarship, policy, and practice. This is not just true in the United States but internationally where his influence can be found in dozens of countries and on every continent (see Gordon & Beaudoin, 2020; in this special issue). So, how do we reconcile the widespread and deep impact of his scholarship with the fact that it has often been dismissed as marginal or second-class research? (Georgiadis, 1992; Hellison & Martinek, 2009; Hellison & Walsh, 2002; Wright, 2009). This special issue reflects on and celebrates Don's life and legacy;

Wright and Fuerniss are with the Northern Illinois University, Dekalb, IL, USA. Cutforth is with the University of Denver, Denver, CO, USA. Wright ([pwright@niu.edu](mailto:pwright@niu.edu)) is corresponding author.

therefore, it provides an ideal space to (re)consider the influence of his scholarship. We argue that within the larger field of kinesiology, Don was one of the strongest advocates for a broader definition of scholarship. Moreover, he was a role model for others with different, often marginalized, perspectives on the role of the academy, who embraced the desire to make different sorts of impact and navigate uncharted territory. To make this case, in this article, we describe and interpret Don's scholarship and the teaching personal and social responsibility (TPSR) model literature using Boyer's (1990) framework. Prior to this analysis, we provide background information regarding Don's views on scholarship as well as the growth and expansion of the TPSR literature.

## Don's Views on Scholarship

Throughout his career, Don was concerned and quite vocal about the narrow views of scholarship that dominated the field of kinesiology. He wrote often and passionately about his belief that broader and more inclusive definitions needed to be recognized. On the assumed superiority of empirical research and the scientific method, Don stated:

Beliefs and values fall outside the province of science; data-based studies can tell us to some extent what works but not what is worth doing. Throughout my career I have emphasized the influence of values and beliefs in our work. In my experience, practitioners are less interested in data that support some new approach than in whether or not the approach matches their beliefs and values about teaching and coaching. And those of us in higher education need to take a hard look at our own values and beliefs, including the belief that data-based studies should dominate our work. (Hellison, 2008, p. 8)

As Don enacted his values in alternative forms of scholarship, his approach was often viewed with skepticism. Writing with Tom Martinek and Dave Walsh, he reflected:

Developing and running programs for kids, working with teachers and youth program leaders, and engaging university students in real world stuff are often viewed as not being academic enough. Where's your research? What theory are you testing? Are you publishing this work in scholarly journals? Aren't your data too soft? (Martinek et al., 2004, p. 400)

Don argued that a range of approaches to scholarship should be valued because of their ability to address different aims and reflect different ways of knowing. Don, with Tom Martinek, stated:

We also believe that other styles for doing research do exist. These are called humanistic styles, which seek to understand and contribute to human growth and well-being. Humanistic styles drive the investigator to use a vast array of strategies to describe innovative concepts, relationships between researcher and researched, and in-depth characterizations of people and conditions. (Martinek & Hellison, 1997, p. 109)

Because such views were not widely embraced in their academic discipline, Don and Tom Martinek often looked to other fields for alternative approaches to scholarship, observing, for example:

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 . . . Philosophical research inquires into value-based issues such as what is worthwhile to know and experience and utilizes research methods such as reflection, imagination, conceptual analysis, and theorizing. (Hellison & Martinek, 2006, p. 614)

Elsewhere, this duo (Martinek & Hellison, 1997) acknowledged that their views and approaches to scholarship were borrowed heavily from several alternative research methodologies, including practical inquiry (Schubert, 1986), reflective scholarship (Schon, 1987), teacher as researcher (Duckworth, 1987), curriculum as craft (Kirk, 1991), action research (Martinek & Schempp, 1988), and researcher as teacher (Housner, 1996). Georgiadis (1992) conducted an extensive content analysis of Don's writing (published and unpublished) from 1968 to 1992 and concluded that his process epitomized Schwab's (1969, 1971, 1973, 1983) practical inquiry paradigm, which was focused on generating situational insight through practice and reflection on the interaction of the learners, the teacher, the subject matter, and the immediate socio-cultural environment.

Tom Martinek and Don eventually articulated a unique brand of scholarship called service-bonded inquiry (Martinek & Hellison, 1997; Martinek et al., 2004). This was presented as an alternative for those in kinesiology-related fields who wanted to integrate practical application and service in their scholarship. They opined:

The other road has few travelers other than practitioners. One reason for this is that the less traveled road has been obscured by the prominence of the more traditional paradigms of research . . . We call our approach service-bonded inquiry to suggest the integration of service and scholarship . . . Contending with the issue of relevance in research depends on how willing we are to acknowledge differences in the way we seek knowledge and truth. (Martinek & Hellison, 1997, p. 108)

The hallmarks of service-bonded inquiry begin with acknowledging the values and beliefs of the investigator to clarify the purpose and set the intention of the work (Martinek & Hellison, 1997). With this grounding, the investigator intervenes in a specific community setting or program to address a specific issue or problem. In devising and refining a plan, the investigator not only looks to extant literature but also draws from their values and beliefs, past experience, and creativity. Finally, during implementation, the investigator jumps in with both feet and engages in a process of trial and error. Because of the engaged and practical nature of service-bonded inquiry, the dissemination process and products are not limited to academic outlets. On this point, Martinek and Hellison explained:

Along with teaching and service, publishing should remain a way of disseminating the service-bonded investigator's work. However, the traditional way of measuring the worth of research needs to be changed. Only accepting articles that adhere to technical styles of inquiry will significantly lessen the chances for creative ideas and products to ever reaching print and practitioners. (Martinek & Hellison, 1997, p. 116)

Therefore, with Dave Walsh, they argued for a wider range of products for service-bonded inquiry projects, stating, "These outlets typically include written publications, workshops, and other alternative outlets (e.g., videos, newsletters, and websites)" (Martinek et al., 2004, p. 400).

In keeping with his commitment to a broad view of research, Don did not propose that service-bonded inquiry was a superior approach that should supplant others. Rather, he believed it should simply be considered a valid option. Again, with Martinek, he wrote:

While it would be foolhardy to ignore the importance of past forms of research, making kids' lives better must become a part of our research agenda. This will require a new vision and renewal of our real purpose for being in higher education. Service-bonded inquiry is our response to a call for change in the way we view and conduct research. (Martinek & Hellison, 1997, p. 119)

## Growth and Expansion of TPSR Scholarship

As context for an analysis of Don's scholarship and its legacy, it is important to describe this body of work and its expansion over time. For this overview, we describe shifts in the body of written work on TPSR as an indicator of trends in TPSR scholarship. It is important to note that this is not a systematic review of the literature. Moreover, we do not limit our description to empirical peer-reviewed articles. Our aim here is to set the stage for our subsequent analysis by giving the reader a sense of the growth of the TPSR literature. We trace this story through four different eras defined by some of Don's landmark contributions. In describing these eras, we note who was contributing to this literature, the nature of their work, and the types of products they generated.

### Prior to 1978

This first era comprises Don's early writing, done prior to 1978. The era culminates in Don's germinal work, *Beyond Balls and Bats* (Hellison, 1978). Don's writing was all solo-authored based primarily on physical education settings in Portland, OR, where he was living at the time (refer to Jacobs & Templin, 2020; in this special issue for more on Don's biography). In addition to journal articles, Don's writing in this era took diverse forms including letters to the editor, book reviews, magazine articles, conference proceedings, and a published poem! These products were reviewed by Georgiadis (1992) who concluded that the nature of his writing was reflective in nature and conveyed Don's emerging ideas about humanistic approaches to physical education (Hellison, 1973a). From this early stage, Don was deliberating on the question of "what is worth doing?" (Hellison, 2008). To grapple with this, he explored his personal values and considered ways that they could be integrated into practice (Hellison, 1973a, b). In addition to approximately 20 reflective pieces and two peer-reviewed articles, this phase of scholarship culminated in the publication of Don's pivotal book. Reflecting on this milestone, Hellison and Martinek pointed out that "it was not until the publication of *Beyond Balls and Bats* (Hellison, 1978) that a curriculum model for teaching social and personal responsibility was introduced" (2006, p. 611). See Richards and Shiver (2020) in this special issue for more on the progression of the TPSR model.

### 1978–1994

Having sown the seeds of the TPSR model, Don's second era of scholarship begins. The era from 1978 through 1994 marks the time between the publishing of *Beyond Balls and Bats* and the release of the first edition of Don's book, *Teaching Personal and*

*Social Responsibility Through Physical Activity* (Hellison, 1995). The phase is characterized by the emergence of coauthored pieces, greater productivity in terms of peer-reviewed publications, and Don's move to the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) in 1986. While Don was still writing about physical education, his publications also included his fieldwork in after-school programs and a growing interest in working with underserved youth in inner-city environments (Hellison, 2008). During this era, Don was the sole author of 15 peer-reviewed academic and professional articles. From UIC, Don also began writing with his doctoral students and collaborators in the field (e.g., DeBusk & Hellison, 1989; Hellison & Cutforth, 1992; Hellison & Georgiadis, 1992; McBride & Hellison, 1986). Many articles like these addressed the goals of physical education and also explored the effectiveness of specific strategies in practice. In this way, Don and his collaborators considered not only "what is worth doing" but also answered the question of "is it working?" (Hellison, 2008). While maintaining a reflective component in scholarship (e.g., Don wrote more than 20 additional reflective pieces in this era), scholars also began to share more structured descriptions of the programs that they were conducting. For example, Georgiadis (1990) wrote the first published piece on the TPSR model that did not include Don as an author. The article describes Nikos' basketball program at a residential boys' home in Chicago using the TPSR model.

### 1995–2011

The third era of TPSR literature comprises the period between the first and the last edition of *Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility Through Physical Activity* (Hellison, 1995, 2003, 2011). This era also saw a growing interest in TPSR among teachers and researchers in the United States and other countries such as Brazil (e.g., Monteiro, Pick, & Valentini, 2008), Canada (e.g., Beaudoin, Brunelle, & Spallanzani, 2008), New Zealand (e.g., Gordon, 2010), Spain (e.g., Escarti, Pascual, & Gutierrez, 2005), and South Korea (e.g., Choi & Park, 2007). In addition to applications in physical activity settings, during this era, Tom Martinek and his students began writing about their integration of a one-on-one mentoring component with their TPSR program approach called Project Effort (e.g., Martinek, Schilling, & Johnson, 2001). Peer-reviewed articles and book chapters about the model became more prominent throughout this era (e.g., approximately 50 professional and academic articles and 17 book chapters were published). In fact, the first review of TPSR scholarship titled "Responsibility-Based Youth Programs Evaluation: Investigating the Investigations" was also published (Hellison & Walsh, 2002). This review included several unpublished projects and theses as well as a few published empirical studies. However, as Wright (2009) observed, by the end of this era, publishing activity was increasing considerably, including a growing focus on measurement and model fidelity (Li, Wright, Rukavina, & Pickering, 2008; Watson, Newton, & Kim, 2003; Wright & Craig, 2011). While more mainstream quantitative and qualitative approaches to research were being added to the TPSR literature, overall, this body of work stayed true to its roots in that "almost all TPSR research continued to use some version of teacher-as-researcher, practical inquiry, or service-bonded inquiry" (Hellison & Martinek, 2006, p. 621).

### Since 2011

The current era of TPSR scholarship includes Don's last publication: "Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility: Past, Present



and Future” (Martinek & Hellison, 2016). However, while Don’s published work was coming to an end, numerous scholars around the world were making significant contributions to the TPSR literature. The settings and contexts for TPSR application expanded with the addition of studies on the application of TPSR with students in general education classrooms (e.g., Escarti, Llopis-Roig, & Wright, 2018), as a context for university students to engage in service learning (e.g., Whitley & Walsh, 2014) and as a framework in international sport for development programs (Whitley, Massey, Camiré, Boutet, & Borbee, 2019; Wright, Jacobs, Ressler, & Jung, 2016). Scholarship in this era is characterized by a continued emphasis on methodological rigor and implementation fidelity (see Pozo, Grao-Cruces, & Pérez-Ordás, 2018 for a recent review). Best practices for professional development (e.g., Gray, Wright, Sievwright, & Robertson, 2019), alignment with social and emotional learning (e.g., Gordon, Jacobs, & Wright, 2016), and better ways to operationalize and assess transfer (Jacobs & Wright, 2018; Wright, Richards, Jacobs, & Hemphill, 2019) are strands of interest that have grown in strength. While the TPSR Alliance (Balague, 2016; Walsh & Wright, 2016) monitors this rapidly growing body of scholarship connected to the TPSR model, it is daunting to document the steady flow of published products (e.g., approximately 110 peer-reviewed articles published since 2011).

At the time of this writing, our efforts to catalog and summarize Don’s scholarship and the broader TPSR literature account for approximately 40 reflective pieces (e.g., published letters, poems, book reviews, articles published in magazines, and speeches from conferences), 10 books, 20 book chapters, 180 peer-reviewed articles, as well as dozens of unpublished projects, theses, and dissertations that Don advised. This trail of written work helps to tell the story of Don’s scholarship and its legacy. In the following section, we apply Boyer’s framework to this literature by considering the extent to which Don’s work aligned with the emerging alternative definitions of scholarship and how those alignments may have changed as the TPSR literature has evolved.

## TPSR Scholarship Reconsidered

As noted earlier, Don was a strong advocate for expanding the definition of scholarship within the kinesiology field. Boyer (1990) championed this case across the academic disciplines and even offered an alternative framework. Setting the problem, Boyer wrote:

What we now have is a more restricted view of scholarship, one that limits it to a hierarchy of functions. Basic research has come to be viewed as the first and most essential form of scholarly activity, with other functions flowing from it. Scholars are academics who conduct research, publish, and then perhaps convey their knowledge to students or apply what they have learned. The latter functions grow out of scholarship, they are not considered a part of it. (Boyer, 1990, p. 15)

To argue for a more comprehensive view of scholarship, Boyer examined the various purposes served by scholarship in the academy and in society. He also considered the range of forms that scholarship may take and the functions it may serve, concluding:

But the work of the scholar also means stepping back from one’s investigation, looking for connections, building bridges

between theory and practice, and communicating one’s knowledge effectively to students. Specifically, we conclude that the work of the professoriate might be thought of as having four separate, yet overlapping, functions. These are: the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application; and the scholarship of teaching. (Boyer, 1990, p. 16)

In the following sections, we describe each of these functions in more detail and examine ways that they were evident in Don’s scholarship and subsequently in the work done by others whom he inspired. Although these aspects of scholarship (discovery, integration, application, and teaching) are interconnected, we agree with Boyer that there is value “in analyzing the various kinds of academic work, while also acknowledging that they dynamically interact, forming an interdependent whole” (Boyer, 1990, p. 25). We believe this analysis is useful in portraying the comprehensive and layered approach to scholarship that Don championed.

## Scholarship of Discovery

The scholarship of discovery relates primarily to the generation of new information, insight, and understanding. It is within this aspect of scholarship that empirical research resides. While mainstream technical forms of research are often prized in academia, they are not the only forms that serve this function. According to Boyer, “the scholarship of discovery, at its best, contributes not only to the stock of human knowledge but also to the intellectual climate of a college or university” (1990, p. 17). With or without empirical data, scholars who are thought leaders can challenge the status quo, influence the conversation, and shift bodies of literature.

As explained earlier, Don’s scholarship was based on what he described as humanistic, reflective, and philosophical methods. As he applied these methods to his practical work, he was engaged in the scholarship of discovery. The volume and varied forms of writing that he produced in the early decades of his career chronicle the process of discovery that led to the TPSR model (Georgiadis, 1992; Hellison & Martinek, 2006). Invoking Boyer’s (1990) framework, Don and his collaborators made this connection, stating, “Alternative approaches to discovery have guided his [Don’s] research. Personal written accounts, translating ideas into action, and figuring out reasons for successes and failures were but a few of the many strategies that he used for continual discovery and renewal” (Martinek et al., 2004, p. 399). As was noted elsewhere, “Trying out ideas, reexamining personal value systems, and solving ‘real world’ problems constitute possibilities for discovery” (Martinek & Hellison, 1997, p. 109).

Don’s scholarship laid the foundation for a rapidly expanding body of literature. Aside from occasional forays into data-driven projects (generally with collaborators, e.g., DeBusk & Hellison, 1989), Don’s scholarship of discovery was rooted in his humanistic style. However, as decades passed, the volume and variety of investigations related to TPSR greatly increased. For example, in 2002, Don and Dave Walsh published a review of 26 (published and unpublished) TPSR program evaluations that showed the emergence of more data-driven approaches using more traditional methods of qualitative and quantitative data collection. While this empirical approach differed from Don’s personal style, he was not opposed to it, noting with Martinek, “More technical research methods may also help in the ongoing evaluation process” (Martinek & Hellison, 1997, p. 115). In fact, as the TPSR literature has grown, the strand of discovery coming from technical research

methods has strengthened considerably (Hellison & Martinek, 2006; Wright, 2009). This has included the development and publication of validated surveys (e.g., Li et al., 2008; Watson et al., 2003; Wright et al., 2019), in-depth case studies (e.g., Martinek et al., 2001; Walsh, Ozaeta, & Wright, 2010), and qualitative program evaluations (e.g., Cutforth & Puckett, 1999; Schilling, 2001; Wright & Burton, 2008) to examine the experience and impact of TPSR programs on youth participants.

In the past decade, strands of empirical research have emerged to examine program implementation (e.g., Carbonell et al., 2012) and the professional development of teachers and coaches in the TPSR model (e.g., Hemphill, Templin, & Wright, 2015; Wright, Jacobs, Howell, & Ressler, 2018). Many of these recent studies have made use of systematic observation instruments developed to assess responsibility-based teaching and learning behaviors (Escartí, Wright, Pascual, & Gutiérrez, 2015; Wright & Craig, 2011). Wright (2009) has observed that despite the rapid expansion of more mainstream research, it is important to note that Don's legacy in the scholarship of discovery has not waned in the TPSR literature. Mainstream methodologies have added to but not supplanted the humanistic, reflective, and practical forms of inquiry that Don employed (e.g., Coulson, Irwin, & Wright, 2012; Cutforth, 1997; Gray et al., 2019).

## Scholarship of Application

The scholarship of application is closely akin to what many call scholarship of engagement (Boyer, 1996). This aspect of scholarship is essentially about applying, developing, and testing knowledge in practical settings where it may contribute to the good for individuals and communities. According to Boyer:

New intellectual understandings can arise out of the very act of application – whether in medical diagnosis, serving clients in psychotherapy, shaping public policy, creating an architectural design, or working with the public schools. In activities such as these, theory and practice vitally interact, and one renews the other. (Boyer, 1990, p. 23)

On the distinction between the scholarship of application from more superficial acts of service, Boyer explains:

To be considered scholarship, service activities must be tied directly to one's special field of knowledge and relate to, and flow directly out of, this professional activity. Such service is serious, demanding work, requiring rigor – and the accountability – traditionally associated with research activities. (Boyer, 1990, p. 22)

Because of Don's commitment to a balance between theory and practice, it is difficult to discuss his scholarship of application separately from his scholarship of discovery. However, we use this opportunity to explore this commitment and how it has influenced a larger body of literature. Reflecting on his beliefs about bridging theory and practice, Don wrote:

The partnership of theory and practice has been discussed since I came into the field, but in the current climate of specialization, it may be judged as naïve or problematic, or even irreverent (blasphemous?). It might seem an impossible task to ask heavy-duty university researchers who are interested in physical activity programs, as well as the various practitioners who use physical activity to work with kids in and

out of school, to draw on and consider contributing to both theory and practice. I believe that each side has so much to learn from the other that we ought to consider reaching across the chasm more often. (Hellison, 2008, p. 9)

Don's commitment was evident in that he spent most of his career carving out time on a weekly basis to venture into what he referred to as the “swamp of practice.” He taught in alternative schools, ran extended day programs on school grounds and in community centers, and formed enduring partnerships with schools and youth-serving organizations in some of the most underserved sections of the cities where he lived and worked. For a vivid illustration of how Don's scholarship of application played out in practice, readers are referred to the article by Martinek and Hemphill (2020) in this special issue. For an in-depth treatment of how the TPSR model evolved over time as a result of his practical work, see the article by Richards and Shiver (2020) in this special issue.

As noted earlier, Don's commitment to the scholarship of application led Georgiadis (1992) to describe his curriculum development process as an exemplary case of practical inquiry. The depth of this commitment and its unique application in the field of kinesiology led Martinek and Hellison (1997) to propose their notion of service-bonded inquiry. The example and mentoring provided by Don and Tom Martinek influenced a growing network of their students and collaborators. By the late 1990s, a semiformal partnership of like-minded scholars had formed around their shared interest in TPSR and positive youth development. This partnership included Don, Tom Martinek, Nick Cutforth, Missy Parker, James Kallusky, and Jim Stiehl. On their practical work, Don and Tom wrote, “The partnership promoted TPSR by conducting workshops and publishing a book [Hellison et al., 2000] describing various ways to utilize TPSR in school and other settings, and how to use such programs to link universities and communities” (Hellison & Martinek, 2006, p. 611).

As noted earlier, the number of scholars implementing TPSR and contributing to the literature has expanded rapidly in recent decades. However, an overall grounding in the scholarship of application has persisted. Reflecting on this later in his career, Don shared:

I have come to favor a blend of theory and practice from my own experience. Teaching/taking personal and social responsibility (TPSR) through physical activity was initially developed totally in practice for a number of years, and even now is modified by continued practice as much as by the research (thanks to Tom Martinek, Dave Walsh, Paul Wright, and others) that was missing in earlier days. (Hellison, 2008, p. 9)

In addition to more rigorous methods, there has also been growth and expansion in the topics explored by TPSR scholars. This trend is reflected in the literature that has been influenced by Don's original work. For example, the growing strand of scholarship rooted in professional development is generated primarily from applied work done in partnership with teachers, coaches, and youth workers in real-world settings (e.g., Coulson et al., 2012; Escartí et al., 2018; Gray et al., 2019; Hemphill et al., 2015; Pascual et al., 2011; Wright, Jacobs, Ressler, & Howell, 2017; Wright et al., 2016). For more detail on this line of research, see the article by Dunn and Doolittle (2020) in this special issue. In this regard, the trend that Hellison and Martinek (2006) noted persists: “Much of the philosophical and empirical research . . . 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” (p. 621).

## Scholarship of Integration

Boyer (1990) posited that finding connections across disparate bodies of knowledge was, in itself, a worthwhile and distinct form of scholarship. He described the scholarship of integration as characterized by crossing the lines of academic disciplines and contexts. It involves synthesizing information and drawing interpretations from a more comprehensive analysis of previously disconnected bodies of knowledge and fields of practice. In his words, “By integration, we mean making connections across the disciplines, placing the specialties in larger context, illuminating data in a revealing way, often educating nonspecialists, too” (Boyer, 1990, p. 18).

The scholarship of integration is a thread that can be traced through Don’s career. As explained in the biographical article by Jacobs and Templin (2020) in this special issue, Don’s early life involved the study of history and sociology as well as experience as an officer in the military. Hence, he began his academic career with an eclectic background, which set a tone he maintained as a scholar. In the 1970s, because no kinesiology scholars were focused on his emerging ideas about the nature and purpose of physical education, Don looked to other influences, such as humanistic psychology, for concepts he could infuse into his teaching (Hellison, 1978). For decades, related fields continued to inform the development of TPSR. Hellison and Martinek (2006) noted, for example, “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” (p. 611). As explained in the discussion of Don’s scholarship of discovery, he also actively sought out alternative views of scholarship when he found those in his own discipline too narrow to serve his purposes.

As with other aspects of Boyer’s framework, Don’s affinity for the scholarship of integration is seamlessly integrated into the story of TPSR scholarship and the corresponding literature. For example, beginning in the late 1990s, Don and several of his collaborators began to frame their work within the emerging interdisciplinary field of positive youth development (e.g., Hellison & Cutforth, 1997; Hellison et al., 2000; Hellison & Martinek, 2006). This shift did not divorce TPSR from its roots in physical education, but highlighted that as a theory-in-action, TPSR had much to gain from and offer other bodies of knowledge and spheres of practice. Two articles in this special issue illustrate how Don’s work had comparable relevance to and impact on the fields of physical education pedagogy (see van der Mars, 2020) and sport-based youth development (see Martinek & Hemphill, 2020). Many scholars aspire to have that level of impact in one field, but because Don did not restrict himself in terms of predetermined disciplines, his influence was all the more widespread.

The scholarship of integration continues to thrive in the TPSR community. Similar to the earlier integration of TPSR with positive youth development, there is a current surge of integration with the social and emotional learning movement in physical education and sport pedagogy (Gordon et al., 2016; Jacobs & Wright, 2014; Richards, Ivy, Wright, & Jerris, 2019; Wright, Gordon, & Gray, *in press*). Although this wave of interest was growing as Don’s active contributions waned, it was a connection he had already made: “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” (Hellison & Martinek, 2006, p. 611).

We conclude this section with two more examples. First, current TPSR scholars are connecting their work with other bodies of knowledge and fields of practice, including educational psychology, sport-based youth development, and science education, to propose a conceptual model for the transfer of learning, which is central to TPSR (Jacobs & Wright, 2018; Wright et al., 2019). Second, there is a growing connection between TPSR and the international sport for peace and development movement (Kidd, 2013; Spaaij & Jeanes, 2013). While sport for peace and development has been gaining momentum for years in terms of policy, funding, and research (Kidd, 2013), there has been a lack of concrete and practical approaches to pedagogy and training (Wright, 2017). TPSR scholars have demonstrated that the model’s practical strategies can make a legitimate contribution in this arena, and that the sport for development field offers new opportunities for TPSR to become more intentional about addressing social change at the community level (Jacobs, Castañeda, & Castañeda, 2016; Whitley et al., 2019; Wright et al., 2018; Wright et al., 2016).

## Scholarship of Teaching

In reconsidering scholarship, Boyer (1990) aimed to broaden our view of what counts as scholarship within the professoriate. He pointed out that the cycle of scholarship is not complete until knowledge generated from discovery, application, and integration is passed on through the scholarship of teaching. In teaching, scholars continue to develop their own understanding and sow the seeds for future discovery, application, and integration. According to Boyer (1990), “While well-prepared lectures surely have a place, teaching, at its best, means not only transmitting knowledge, but transforming and extending it as well” (p. 24). In this section, we consider Don’s scholarship of teaching within the confines of his academic programs and more broadly.

In Don’s university posts at Portland State University and the UIC, he taught a wide range of undergraduate and graduate courses. As Don described it, he was more of a generalist at Portland State, teaching everything from exercise physiology to tests and measurements (Van Oteghen, 2010). By the time he joined the faculty at UIC, kinesiology departments had become specialized to the degree that he only had to teach classes related to physical education teacher education. He taught what was required in this program and relished opportunities to infuse his more holistic beliefs and passions into the heavily prescribed world of teacher licensure. It was at UIC, especially in the graduate program, that Don found a greater opportunity to be creative and innovative as a teacher. He designed courses focused on youth development and supervised innumerable independent studies and culminating projects, theses, and dissertations, in which he empowered his students to not only receive but also test and generate knowledge in practical settings. Much of this work at UIC occurred under the umbrella of Don’s Urban Youth Leadership Project (UYLP; see Martinek and Hemphill, 2020; in this special issue). The programs offered through the UYLP were staffed by Don and a cadre of university students who approached him with a desire to learn about and contribute to this engaged scholarship initiative. Before and after school, in summer camps and in community centers, these programs were a training ground for Don’s university students and demonstration sites for visitors curious about TPSR. In these arrangements, Don’s students functioned more as partners and



collaborators who were encouraged to develop and test ideas in their own way (e.g., [Cutforth, 1997](#); [Walsh & Wright, 2016](#)). In these partnerships, Don was also involved in teaching, mentoring, and offering workshops to practitioners in schools and community agencies. For Don, the scholarship of teaching was not restricted to the academic community. Throughout his career, he was committed to sharing and developing his ideas with teachers, coaches, and administrators working in underserved communities. For more on this, see articles by Dunn and Doolittle ([2020](#)) as well as Gordon and Beaudoin ([2020](#)) in this special issue.

It is important to note that Don's approach to teaching university students and practitioners was difficult to discern from TPSR. While the audience, context, and subject matter were different from his youth programs, the central themes of TPSR (e.g., relational, empowerment-based, student-centered) were the same. According to Boyer ([1990](#)), "When defined as scholarship, however, teaching both educates and entices future scholars" (p. 24). This was evident in Don's case. Many of his former students and protégés have embraced and integrated lessons from Don into their professional work as teachers, coaches, school directors, and district administrators, as well as leaders in sport-based youth development organizations and charitable foundations. These individuals engage in the scholarships of discovery, application, and integration in the world of practice. Others have been inspired to carry on this tradition in higher education as professors who actively steer TPSR scholarship and teach/partner with the next generation of scholars.

The legacy of Don's scholarship of teaching may be most evident in the commitment to informal ways of mentoring and teaching that he modeled. When the UYLP was thriving at UIC, Don was just as likely to teach, learn from, and share with his students in coffee shops or over beers at neighborhood bars like Little Joe's on Taylor Street in Chicago's West Side, as he was to write in his office. His teaching and mentoring style (whether folks were registered students or not) was based on relationships. This spilled over into Don's work with collaborators from around the world. Visiting scholars frequently came to work with Don, and members of the professional community often sought him out at conferences. Don's firm belief in the power of relationships, learning with others, and the creativity that characterized these informal interactions was a driving force in establishing the TPSR Alliance with Balague ([2016](#)). For more detail on the formal and informal ways Don taught others about TPSR, see the article by Dunn and Doolittle ([2020](#)) in this special issue. Don's legacy of teaching is, perhaps, best illustrated in the community of practice the TPSR Alliance has become. It creates an egalitarian space where individuals with different experiences, backgrounds, and expertise can come together to share and learn from one another about the work they are doing based on the shared values that Don promoted and those that drew them into this work. In this and many other ways, a case can be made that Don's scholarship of teaching aligned with Boyer's ([1990](#)) standard, that is, "With this vision, great teachers create a common ground of intellectual commitment. They stimulate active, not passive, learning and encourage students to be critical, creative thinkers, with the capacity to go on learning after their college days are over" (p. 24).

## Conclusions and Final Thoughts

The purpose of this essay was to describe and interpret Don's original and impactful brand of scholarship. Because Don had strong opinions on the topic, we were able to draw from his own

writing to depict his views on the need for a broader and more comprehensive understanding of scholarship. After providing a sense of how the body of written work related to TPSR has grown and expanded since Don's early writing, we used Boyer's ([1990](#)) framework to assess Don's scholarship and the large body of work that he inspired.

For Don, the scholarship of discovery (which culminated in the TPSR model) was rooted in what he called humanistic or reflective methods that helped him address guiding questions, such as, "What's worth doing?" and "Is it working?" ([Hellison, 2008](#)). While this tradition of inquiry continues (e.g., [Coulson et al., 2012](#); [Cutforth, 1997](#); [Gray et al., 2019](#)), the TPSR literature has expanded with regard to more technical approaches to research and evaluation designed to assess the "Is it working?" question (for a recent review, see [Pozo et al., 2018](#)).

The scholarship of application could be the hallmark of Don's work. He worked tirelessly to break down the artificial barriers between theory and practice. This blurring of lines was seen as an affront to commonly accepted standards for rigor, but it resulted in an approach to teaching that has proven practical, relevant, and impactful in physical education ([Pozo et al., 2018](#)), youth development programs ([Petitpas, Cornelius, Van Raalte, & Jones, 2005](#)), competitive sport ([Ceccini, Montero, Alonso, Izquierdo, & Contreras, 2007](#); [Doganis, Goudas & Wright, 2019](#)), sport for development programs ([Whitley et al., 2019](#); [Wright et al., 2018](#)), and classrooms ([Escartí et al., 2018](#)). This corpus of scholarship seems to answer a question posed by Don and Tom Martinek: "Do we continue to journey down the path producing knowledge for only a select enclave of scholars or can we also venture down the path that brings relevance to real-life conditions?" ([Martinek & Hellison, 1997](#), p. 108).

Because Don disdained labels and the fragmentation that often comes with academic disciplines and departments, the scholarship of integration was natural for him. He was happy to draw ideas and practices (as well as approaches to scholarship) from fields such as humanistic psychology, curriculum studies, positive youth development, and more. Driven by a desire to figure out what was worth doing and whether his efforts were working, he had little time for academic fences. Based on the trajectory of the TPSR literature, it appears that this ethos is alive and well.

For Don, TPSR was a "way of being" ([Hellison, 2011](#)). The values and personal philosophy that gave rise to this model pervaded Don's scholarship of teaching. For so many who knew him well, it was impossible to distinguish Don the teacher from Don the friend, the collaborator, the mentor, or the fan. His respect for individuals' strengths and struggles, his willingness to share power, and his desire to foster creativity empowered so many and helped them not only learn but also contribute to this work. On the scholarship of teaching, Boyer ([1990](#)) wrote:

In the end, inspired teaching keeps the flame of scholarship alive. Almost all successful academics give credit to creative teachers – those mentors who defined their work so compellingly that it became, for them, a lifetime challenge. Without the teaching function, the continuity of knowledge will be broken and the store of human knowledge dangerously diminished. (p. 24)

Because of who Don was as a person, the relationships he formed, and the lessons he shared, the flame of his life's work burns brighter with time, even after his passing.

In this essay and other places in this special issue, many references have been made to two of Don's guiding questions, that is, "What's worth doing?" and "Is it working?" He sometimes

added a third question to the set, “What’s possible?” (e.g., [Hellison, 2011](#)). In many ways, Don’s career was about demonstrating possibilities. We believe that this is absolutely true regarding his scholarship. While Boyer’s (1990) case for a broader and more comprehensive view of the scholarship is appealing on many levels, we know of few individuals who have exemplified this as well as Don. Throughout his career, he critiqued narrow and restrictive views on scholarship. But perhaps most importantly, for more than 40 years of active scholarship, he walked the talk. Despite shifting trends and norms in the field of kinesiology and higher education, he stayed true to what he believed was worth doing ([Hellison, 2008](#)). True to his personal style, he showed us what independent and passionate scholars can accomplish when they attend equally to the value of discovery, application, integration, and teaching.

## References

- Bain, L.L. (1988). Curriculum for critical reflection in physical education. In R.S. Brandt (Ed.), *Content of the curriculum: 1988 ASCD year-book* (pp. 133–147). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Bain, L.L. (1990). Physical education teacher education. In W.R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 758–781). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Balague, G. (2016). Origins and evolution of the TPSR Alliance community of practice. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 87(5), 14–17. doi:[10.1080/07303084.2016.1157384](#)
- Beaudoin, S., Brunelle, J.P., & Spallanzani, C. (2008). Enseigner la responsabilité par l’activité physique [Teaching responsibility through physical activity]. *Propulsion*, 20(3), 14–16.
- Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Lawrenceville, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Boyer, E.L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 1(1), 11–20.
- Carbonell, A.E., Pascual, C., Gutierrez, M., Marin, D., Martinez, M., & Tarin, S. (2012). Applying the teaching personal and social responsibility model (TPSR) in Spanish schools context: Lesson learned. *Agora Para la Educación Física y el Deporte*, 14(2), 178–196.
- Ceccini, J.A., Montero, J., Alonso, A., Izquierdo, M., & Contreras, O. (2007). Effects of personal and social responsibility on fair play in sports and self-control in school-aged youths. *European Journal of Sport Science*, 7(4), 203–211. doi:[10.1080/17461390701718497](#)
- Choi, J., & Park, D. (2007). The effects of physical education lessons applied TPSR Model on the development of sociality of elementary school students. *Journal of Korea Sport Research*, 18(1), 537–548.
- Coulson, C.L., Irwin, C., & Wright, P.M. (2012). Applying Hellison’s responsibility model in a youth residential treatment facility: A practical inquiry project. *Agora*, 14, 38–54.
- Cutforth, N. (1997). What’s worth doing: Reflections on an after-school program in Denver elementary school. *Quest*, 49, 130–139. doi:[10.1080/00336297.1997.10484228](#)
- Cutforth, N., & Puckett, K. (1999). An investigation into the organization, challenges and impact of an urban apprentice teacher program. *The Urban Review*, 31, 153–172. doi:[10.1023/A:1023231523762](#)
- DeBusk, M., & Hellison, D. (1989). Implementing a physical education self responsibility model for delinquency prone youth. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 8, 104–112. doi:[10.1123/jtpe.8.2.104](#)
- Doganis, G., Goudas, M., & Wright, P.M. (2019). The unifying role of player responsibility in football. In E. Konter, J. Beckman, & T. Loughead (Eds.), *Football psychology: From theory to practice* (pp. 50–60). London, UK: Routledge.
- Duckworth, E. (1987). *The having of wonderful ideas and other essays on teaching and learning*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Dunn, R.J., & Doolittle, S.A. (2020). Professional development for teaching personal and social responsibility: Past, present, and future. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 39(3). doi:[10.1123/jtpe.2019-0226](#)
- Escarti, A., Llopis-Roig, R., & Wright, P.M. (2018). Assessing the implementation fidelity of a school-based teaching personal and social responsibility program in physical education and other subject areas. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 37, 12–23. doi:[10.1123/jtpe.2016-0200](#)
- Escarti, A., Pascual, C., & Gutierrez, M. (2005). *Responsabilidad personal y social a través de la educación física y el deporte [Personal and social responsibility through physical education and sports]*. Barcelona, Spain: GRAÓ.
- Escartí, A., Wright, P.M., Pascual, C., & Gutiérrez, M. (2015). Tool for Assessing Responsibility-based Education (TARE) 2.0: Instrument revisions, inter-rater reliability, and correlations between observed teaching strategies and student behaviors. *Universal Journal of Psychology*, 3(2), 55–63. doi:[10.13189/ujp.2015.030205](#)
- Georgiadis, N. (1990). Does basketball have to be all W’s and L’s?: An alternative program at a residential boys’ home. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 61(6), 42–43. doi:[10.1080/07303084.1990.10604549](#)
- Georgiadis, N. (1992). *Practical inquiry in physical education: The case of Hellison’s personal and social responsibility model* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL.
- Gordon, B. (2010). An examination of the responsibility model in a New Zealand secondary school physical education programme. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 29(1), 21–37. doi:[10.1123/jtpe.29.1.21](#)
- Gordon, B., & Beaudoin, S. (2020). Expanding the boundaries of TPSR and empowering others to make their own contributions. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 39(3). doi:[10.1123/jtpe.2019-0228](#)
- Gordon, B., Jacobs, J.M., & Wright, P.M. (2016). Social and emotional learning through a teaching personal and social responsibility based after-school program for disengaged middle-school boys. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 35(4), 358–369. doi:[10.1123/jtpe.2016-0106](#)
- Gray, S., Wright, P.M., Sievwright, R., & Robertson, S. (2019). Learning to use teaching for personal and social responsibility through action research. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 38(4), 347–356. doi:[10.1123/jtpe.2018-0190](#)
- Hellison, D. (1973a). *Humanistic physical education*. Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hellison, D. (1973b). To parents, coaches. *The Young Runner*, 24, 43–45.
- Hellison, D. (1978). *Beyond balls and bats: Alienated (and other) youth in the gym*. Washington, DC: American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation (AAHPER).
- Hellison, D. (1995). *Teaching responsibility through physical activity* (1st ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hellison, D. (2003). *Teaching responsibility through physical activity* (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hellison, D. (2008). This I believe about our field. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 79(7), 6–9. doi:[10.1080/07303084.2008.10598205](#)
- Hellison, D. (2011). *Teaching responsibility through physical activity* (3rd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hellison, D., & Cutforth, N. (1992). Reflections on reflective teaching in a physical education teacher education methods course. *The Physical Educator*, 49, 127–135.



- Hellison, D., & Cutforth, N. (1997). Extended day programs for urban children and youth: From theory to practice. In H. Walberg, O. Reyes, & R. Weissberg (Eds.), *Children and youth: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 223–249). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hellison, D., Cutforth, N., Kallusky, J., Martinek, T., Parker, M., & Stiehl, J. (2000). *Youth development and physical activity: Linking universities and communities*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hellison, D., & Georgiadis, N. (1992). Basketball as a vehicle for teaching values. *Strategies*, 4, 1–4.
- Hellison, D., & Martinek, T. (2006). Social and individual responsibility. In D. Kirk, M. O'sullivan, & D. Macdonald (Eds.), *Handbook of research in physical education* (pp. 610–626). London, UK: Sage.
- Hellison, D., & Martinek, T. (2009). *Youth leadership in sport and physical education*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Hellison, D., & Walsh, D. (2002). Responsibility-based youth programs evaluation: Investigating the investigations. *Quest*, 54(4), 292–307. doi:10.1080/00336297.2002.10491780
- Hemphill, M.A., Templin, T.J., & Wright, P.M. (2015). Implementation and outcomes of a responsibility-based continuing professional development protocol in physical education. *Sport, Education and Society*, 20(3), 398–419. doi:10.1080/13573322.2012.761966
- Housner, L. (1996, Winter). Curriculum and instruction academy. *Academy Action*, 3, 3.
- Jacobs, J.M., Castañeda, A., & Castañeda, R. (2016). Sport-based youth and community development: Beyond the ball in Chicago. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 87(5), 18–22. doi:10.1080/07303084.2016.1157386
- Jacobs, J.M., & Templin, T. (2020). The man behind the teaching personal and social responsibility model: A life history of Don Hellison. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 39(3). doi:10.1123/jtpe.2019-0220
- Jacobs, J., & Wright, P. (2014). Social and emotional learning policies and physical education: Column Editor: K. Andrew R. Richards. *Strategies*, 27(6), 42–44. doi:10.1080/08924562.2014.960292
- Jacobs, J.M., & Wright, P.M. (2018). Transfer of life skills in sport-based youth development programs: A conceptual framework bridging learning to application. *Quest*, 70(1), 81–99. doi:10.1080/00336297.2017.1348304
- Kidd, B. (2013). A new social movement: Sport for development and peace. In S.J. Jackson, & S. Haigh (Eds.), *Sport and foreign policy in a globalizing world* (pp. 36–46). London, UK: Routledge.
- Kirk, D. (1991). Curriculum work in physical education: Beyond the objectives approach? *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 12, 244–265. doi:10.1123/jtpe.12.3.244
- 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.
- Li, W., Wright, P.M., Rukavina, P.B., & Pickering, M. (2008). Measuring students' perceptions of personal and social responsibility and the relationship to intrinsic motivation in urban physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 27, 167–178. doi:10.1123/jtpe.27.2.167
- Martinek, T., & Hellison, D. (1997). Service-bonded inquiry: The road less traveled. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 17(1), 107–121. doi:10.1123/jtpe.17.1.107
- Martinek, T., & Hellison, D. (2016). Teaching personal and social responsibility: Past, present and future. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 87(5), 9–13. doi:10.1080/07303084.2016.1157382
- Martinek, T., Hellison, D., & Walsh, D. (2004). Service-bonded inquiry revisited: A research model for the community-engaged professor. *Quest*, 56(4), 397–412. doi:10.1080/00336297.2004.10491833
- Martinek, T., & Hemphill, M.A. (2020). The evolution of Hellison's teaching personal and social responsibility model in out-of-school contexts. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 39(3). doi:10.1123/jtpe.2019-0222
- Martinek, T.J., & Schempp, P.G. (1988). Chapter 1: An introduction to models for collaboration. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 7(3), 160–164. doi:10.1123/jtpe.7.3.160
- Martinek, T., Schilling, T., & Johnson, D. (2001). Transferring personal and social responsibility of underserved youth to the classroom. *The Urban Review*, 33, 29–45. doi:10.1023/A:1010332812171
- McBride, L., & Hellison, D. (1986). Toward wellness for high risk youth: A values education model. *Health Values*, 10, 37–42.
- Monteiro, T.R., Pick, R.K., & Valentini, N.C. (2008). Responsabilidade social e personal de crianças participantes de um programa de intervencao motora inclusiva [Social and personal responsiveness of children participating in an inclusive motor intervention program]. *Temas Sobre Desenvolvimento*, 16, 202–214.
- O'Meara, K. (2015). Dismantling inequality regarding scholarship. In H. Boyte (Ed.), *Democracy's education: Public work, citizenship, and the future of colleges and universities* (pp. 126–130). Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Pascual, C.B., Escarti, A., Guterrez, M., Llopis, R., Marin, D., & Wright, P.M. (2011). Implementation fidelity of a program designed to promote personal and social responsibility through physical education: A comparative case study. *Research Quarterly in Exercise and Sport*, 82, 499–511. doi:10.1080/02701367.2011.10599783
- Petitpas, A.J., Cornelius, A.E., Van Raalte, J.L., & Jones, T. (2005). A framework for planning youth sport programs that foster psychosocial development. *The Sport Psychologist*, 19(1), 63–80.
- Pozo, P., Grao-Cruces, A., & Pérez-Ordás, R. (2018). Teaching personal and social responsibility model-based programmes in physical education. *European Physical Education Review*, 24(1), 56–75. doi:10.1177/1356336X16664749
- Richards, K.A.R., Ivy, V.N., Wright, P.M., & Jerris, E. (2019). Combining the skill themes approach with teaching personal and social responsibility to teach social and emotional learning in elementary physical education. *Journal of Physical Education*, 90(3), 35–44.
- Richards, K.A.R., & Shiver, V.N. (2020). "What's worth doing?": A qualitative historical analysis of the TPSR model. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 39(3). doi:10.1123/jtpe.2019-0215
- 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. PubMed ID: 11770785 doi:10.1080/02701367.2001.10608972
- Schubert, W. (1986). *Curriculum: Perspective, paradigm, and possibility*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Schon, D.A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schwab, J.J. (1969). The practical: A language for curriculum. *School Review*, 78, 1–23.
- Schwab, J.J. (1971). The practical: Arts of eclectic. *School Review*, 79(4), 493–542. doi:10.1086/442998
- Schwab, J.J. (1973). The practical 3: Translation into curriculum. *School Review*, 81, 501–522.
- Schwab, J.J. (1983). The practical 4: Something for professors to do. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 13, 239–265.
- Siedentop, D., Mand, C., & Taggart, A. (1986). *Physical education: Curriculum and instruction strategies for grades 5–12*. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.
- Silverman, S. (1991). Research on teaching in physical education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 62(4), 352–364. PubMed ID: 1780555 doi:10.1080/02701367.1991.10607533

- Spaaij, R., & Jeanes, R. (2013). Education for social change? A Freirean critique of sport for development and peace. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 18(4), 442–457. doi:[10.1080/17408989.2012.690378](https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2012.690378)
- Steinhardt, M. (1992). Physical education. In P.W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 964–1001). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Struna, N. (1986). *Specialization and fragmentation: In search of the "right" problem*. Paper presented at the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, Annual Conference, Cincinnati, OH.
- Van der Mars, H. (2020). Principled, modest, and giving ... Don Hellison's impact through the eyes of his peers. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 39(3). doi:[10.1123/jtpe.2019-0221](https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2019-0221)
- Van Oteghen, S.L. (2010). *Oral History of retired American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (AAHPERD) Leaders: Presidents and National Award Recipients, Interview with Dr. Donald R. Hellison* (pp. 1–70). University of Memphis: AAHPERD Archives.
- Walsh, D., Ozaeta, J., & Wright, P. (2010). Transference of responsibility model goals to the school exploring the impact of coaching club program. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 15, 15–28. doi:[10.1080/17408980802401252](https://doi.org/10.1080/17408980802401252)
- Walsh, D.S., & Wright, P.M. (2016). The TPSR Alliance: A community of practice for teaching, research and service. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 87(5), 35–38. doi:[10.1080/07303084.2016.1157394](https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2016.1157394)
- Watson, D.L., Newton, M., & Kim, M. (2003). Recognition of values-based constructs in a summer physical activity program. *The Urban Review*, 35, 217–232. doi:[10.1023/A:1025781603097](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025781603097)
- Weiss, M., & Bredemeier, B. (1990). Moral development in sport. *Exercise and Sport Science Reviews*, 18, 331–378. doi:[10.1249/00003677-199001000-00015](https://doi.org/10.1249/00003677-199001000-00015)
- Whitley, M.A., Massey, W.V., Camiré, M., Boutet, M., & Borbee, A. (2019). Sport-based youth development interventions in the United States: A systematic review. *BMC Public Health*, 19(1), 89. PubMed ID: [30658607](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30658607/) doi:[10.1186/s12889-019-6387-z](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-6387-z)
- Whitley, M.A., & Walsh, D.S. (2014). A framework for the design and implementation of service-learning courses. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 85(4), 34–39. doi:[10.1080/07303084.2014.884835](https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2014.884835)
- Wright, P.M. (2009). Research on the teaching personal and social responsibility model: Is it really in the margins? In L. Housner, M. Metzler, P. Schempp, & T. Templin (Eds.), *Historic traditions and future directions of research on teaching and teacher education in physical education* (pp. 289–296). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- Wright, P.M. (2017). *Using the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility model as a framework to guide sport for development programs* (pp. 3–16). Proceedings of the International Conference for the 6th East Asian Alliance of Sport Pedagogy, Korean Association of Sport Pedagogy, Seoul, South Korea.
- Wright, P.M., & Burton, S. (2008). Implementation and outcomes of a responsibility-based physical activity program integrated into an intact high school physical education class. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 27(2), 138–154. doi:[10.1123/jtpe.27.2.138](https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.27.2.138)
- Wright, P.M., & Craig, M.W. (2011). Tool for Assessing Responsibility-based Education (TARE): Instrument development, content validity, and inter-rater reliability. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science*, 15(3), 204–219. doi:[10.1080/1091367X.2011.590084](https://doi.org/10.1080/1091367X.2011.590084)
- Wright, P.M., Gordon, B., & Gray, S. (in press). Social and emotional learning in the physical education curriculum. In W.H. Schubert & M. Fang (Eds.), *Oxford encyclopedia of curriculum studies*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Wright, P.M., Jacobs, J., Ressler, J., & Howell, S. (2017). Chapter 4: The Belizean youth sport coalition. In C. Esherrick, R. Baker, S. Jackson, & M. Sam (Eds.), *Case studies in sport diplomacy* (pp. 51–67). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- Wright, P.M., Jacobs, J.M., Howell, S., & Ressler, J.D. (2018). Immediate outcomes and implementation of a sport for development coach education programme in Belize. *Journal of Sport for Development*, 6(10), 51–65.
- Wright, P.M., Jacobs, J.M., Ressler, J.D., & Jung, J. (2016). Teaching for transformative educational experience in a sport for development program. *Sport, Education and Society*, 21(4), 531–548. doi:[10.1080/13573322.2016.1142433](https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2016.1142433)
- Wright, P.M., Richards, K.A.R., Jacobs, J., & Hemphill, M.A. (2019). Measuring perceived transfer of responsibility learning from physical education: Initial validation of the transfer of responsibility questionnaire. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 38(4), 316–327. doi:[10.1123/jtpe.2018-0246](https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2018-0246)