1 **Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility and Transfer of Learning:**
2 **Opportunities and challenges for teachers and coaches.**
3

4

5

6 The Transfer of Learning (TOL) from the gym to other areas of participants' lives has always been a

7 central focus for the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (TPSR) Model. The degree to

8 which TOL is successfully facilitated in the reality of TPSR based teaching and coaching is, however,

9 uncertain. The research findings are mixed both in the commitment to TOL and the level of success

10 that has been achieved. The interest in TOL is not restricted to the area of TPSR or physical education

11 and sport in general, but is an area of strong academic interest with a long history of research and

12 debate. This article draws on the knowledge and understandings of TOL from this wider literature to

13 explore ways in which to help facilitate TOL for practitioners of TPSR.

14

15

16 *Key words;* personal and social responsibility, physical activity, transfer of learning

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility and Transfer of Learning: Opportunities and
26 challenges for teachers and coaches.

27   Transfer of learning is a fundamental assumption of educators. We trust that whatever

28   is learned will be retained or remembered over some interval of time and used in

29   appropriate situations (Ripple & Drinkwater, 1982).

30   The role of developing good character, and of socialising students into becoming good citizens,

31 is one that has been regularly allocated to physical education and sport (Pitter & Andrews, 1997). The

32 belief that what students learn in these contexts influences their beliefs and behaviours in other areas

33 of their lives is powerful and well documented (Miller & Jarman, 1988; Siedentop, 1991). Sport, for

34 example, has a long history of being used as a means of developing "good character". The English

35 public school system's deliberate introduction of sports and games is one well known example while

36 the 19th Century Church's emphasis on healthy activity as part of the Muscular Christianity movement

37 is another (Redman, 1988). These beliefs remain current with contemporary writers continuing to

38 champion the field as a potential context for social and moral development (see for example Gordon,

39 2010; Launder & Piltz, 2013; Tinning, MacDonald, Wright, & Hickey, 2001).

40   Within physical education, one model that is overt in its intention to facilitate positive social

41 and moral behaviour, and explicitly identifies TOL as an integral part of its pedagogical approach, is

42 Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (TPSR; Hellison, 2003, 2011). The model was originally

43 developed in the USA by Don Hellison, a Chicago-based academic and teacher, and has gained a

44 degree of popularity among those involved with the use of physical-based contexts as a means to

45 helping participants develop value based life skills (Gordon, 2011; Hellison, 2011).While initially

46 designed for and implemented in schools physical education programs, TPSR has since been

47 introduced into a number of different contexts including after school programs, schools based clubs,

48 adventure based programs and programs for underserved children (Hellison et al., 2000; Walsh,

49 Ozaeta, & Wright, 2010; Wright, Li, Ding, & Pickering, 2010). The model has also developed an

50 international following with it being used in a number of other countries including New Zealand,

2

51   Spain, Ireland, and Canada (Beaudoin, 2012; Escarti, Gutierrez, Pascual, & Marin, 2010; Gordon,

52   2011; Hellison, 2011).

53   The interest in TOL is not restricted to the area of TPSR or physical education and sport in general

54   but is an area of strong academic interest with a long history of research and debate (Leberman,

55   McDonald, & Doyle, 2006). There is much to be learnt from the wider understanding of TOL which

56   has the potential to help facilitate greater TOL for practitioners of TPSR. This article draws on the

57   knowledge and understandings of TOL from this wider literature to explore ways in which to help

58   facilitate TOL for practitioners of TPSR.

59   **Transfer of learning and TPRS**

60   The important place that TOL holds in TPSR is shown by the way it is structurally positioned

61   in the model. TPSR has five goals (or levels) for students to experience and learn to apply within their

62   lives (Hellison, 2011). The five goals are Respect, Effort /Participation, Self-direction, Caring for

63   others and TOL to contexts outside of the gym (Hellison, 2011; Hellison, et al., 2000). A student

64   demonstrates respect by behaving in a manner that does not interfere with another student's right to

65   learn in a psychologically and physically safe environment, or the teacher's right to teach. Effort is

66   demonstrated by students being involved and participating in the programme, being willing to make

67   an effort when things get tough, and trying new things. Self-direction is designed to extend students

68   from participation to beginning to take personal responsibility for their learning and wellbeing. This

69   goal includes demonstrating the ability to set and work towards personal goals. The fourth goal of

70   caring is intended to help students develop empathy towards others and is demonstrated by their

71   willingness to help others when needed. TOL is the final goal and refers to the application of the

72   learning of the other four goals in contexts outside of the programme. This could include school,

73   home, work or in their community in general. TOL is the most difficult goal to observe demonstrated

74   as by definition it occurs away from the TPSR context. In most situations teachers/leaders rely on

75   self-reporting from participants to gauge whether TOL has occurred (Hellison, 2011; Hellison &

76   Walsh, 2002). While it is beyond the scope of this article to describe TPSR in detail, readers who

77   wish to gain a deeper understanding of the model should refer to either of the Hellison's texts

78   referenced in the reference list.

79   The results of research attempting to establish the degree to which learning from participation

80   in TPSR is transferred to contexts outside "the gym" are mixed. Hellison and Walsh (2002) reviewed

81   26 research articles on TPSR and reported strong evidence from some studies to support that TOL

82   had occurred. Six studies reported an improvement in self-control and two in improved effort in other

83   classrooms. One quasi-experimental study (Cummings, 2000) reported a reduced dropout rate in high

84   school but no significant difference in absenteeism or grade retention. Other studies reported weaker

85   evidence and "three of the studies that focused on transfer reported that none had taken place"

86   (Hellison & Walsh, 2002, p. 301).

87   Subsequent research has continued to produce mixed conclusions about the success of TPSR

88   in generating TOL. Walsh, et al. (2010) in a study of a two-year out of school coaching programme

89   using multiple sources of qualitative data concluded that the study "provided sufficient evidence from

90   both youth participants and adult participants to support transference of the four primary TPSR goals

91   to the school environment" (p. 15). Escarti and colleagues (2010) examined 30 at risk students in a

92   Spanish secondary school physical education programme over the course of an academic year. Using

93   interview data from the students, parents and teachers the study concluded that the TPSR based

94   "program helped them [students] to improve their responsibility both in school and in other contexts"

95   (p. 675). In contrast Martinek, Schilling and Johnson (2001) study of sixteen elementary students

96   found that, with the exception of effort, the youngsters struggled to transfer the goals of the

97   afterschool club into the classroom. Gordon (2010) used a quasi-experimental approach to compare

98   two classes being taught TPSR with two being taught without any aspects of TPSR pedagogy. For the

99   vast majority of students being taught physical education based on the TPSR, there was little

100 acknowledgement or understanding of transferability of learning. For two students, however, the

101   model had a substantial impact on their lives outside of the physical education classroom. As one

102   student stated:

103   Yeah and outside of school and everything. I mean, everything you can do can go back to that

104   [TPSR]. Everything in life really. At work you can say, Oh yeah. I didn't really work that

105   good. So the next time I will try harder (p. 30).

106   As part of a national survey of New Zealand secondary school physical education programs

107   teachers (158) who taught TPSR were asked to indicate on a scale of 0 (totally disagree) to 9 (totally

108   agree) their reaction to the statement "Teaching physical education with TPSR leads to positive

109   outcomes in other areas of the school" (Gordon, 2011). The average response of 6.7 (SD 1.5) would

110   indicate that many of these teachers believe that teaching TPSR has some transferable outcomes. The

111   limitations of the survey did not allow for an exploration of how teachers judged positive changes had

112   occurred.

113   In one before-school basketball coaching and an apprentice teaching programme (Hellison &

114   Wright, 2003), the principal of the school hosting the club reported a strong belief that the values and

115   behaviours learned at the club were transferred into the school context. In her view "despite the fact

116   that the club only serves about 15 kids at a time in a school of 600 ... club members' positive

117   leadership in school had changed the culture of the school" (p. 371). In the same programme, 43 end-

118   of-year evaluations were completed between 1993 and 2000. All evaluations asked, "Has the club

119   improved you as a person or helped with anything other than basketball"? Of the 43 responses, 38

120   were in the affirmative and, of these; five gave specific examples of improvements outside the gym

121   that participants attributed directly to the programme.

122   Some programs have been deliberately structured to develop TOL. Hammond-Diedrich &

123   Walsh (2006) selected students from four TPSR based programs and placed them in leadership roles

124   teaching groups of younger students at a university sponsored programme. A variety of data sources

125   were used to investigate the programme, including formal interviews, lesson observations and field

126   notes. Each of the leaders made mention of the transferral of their learning in the TPSR programs to

127   their roles in the leadership programme. A number also commented on the positive impact the

128   programme had had outside of the gym context. These included reference to situations at home and at

129   school where they believed they had developed greater empathy with the frustrations involved in

130   parenting and teaching.

131   The importance of attending to TOL throughout a TPSR programme was illustrated by

132   Walsh et al. (2010) in their examination of the TOL from a coaching club programme to participants'

133   school environment. In their programme, which showed TOL for many participants, the leaders

134   "discussed transference with the youth participants from the first session onwards" (p. 26). One of the

135   major recommendations from this two-year study was that leaders and teachers, who wished to

136   encourage TOL, should follow a similar process.

137   **Contemporary conceptualisations of transfer of learning**

138   When looking to better facilitate TOL in TPSR there is much to be gained from examining

139   the knowledge and understanding developed about the process in areas outside of sport and physical

140   education. Perkins's and Salomon's (1990) appropriated the traditional *Little Bo-Peep* nursery rhyme,

141   to illustrate the competing approaches to teaching for TOL.

142   Little Bo-Peep has lost her sheep

143   And does not know how to find them.

144   Leave them alone and they'll come home

145   Wagging their tails behind them.

146   The rhyme provides a useful lens for considering how TPSR is taught and the assumptions

147   around the longer-term outcomes attributed to TPSR. The implicit or tacit understanding of the

148   relationship between teaching and TOL that underpins TPSR fits with Perkins and Salomon's

149   depiction of the everyday theory of many teachers as the "Bo-Peep theory" of teaching for TOL. In

150 this depiction TOL takes care of itself: "Leave them alone and they'll come home wagging their tails

151 behind them." This is the tacit theory of TOL and it is ubiquitous. TPSR educators join others in

152 assuming that providing students are introduced to values, concepts and skills, and have had

153 opportunities to apply them then TOL is sure to follow.

154 Next is the Lost Sheep or more aptly the Black Sheep theory of TOL, which is essentially that

155 TOL does not happen (Fogarty, Perkins, & Barrell, 1992). Surprisingly for many, the research

156 evidence is convincing that while TOL between similar tasks [near TOL] and settings is common "the

157 theory of identical elements", TOL to new tasks and settings [far TOL] is rare. Detterman and

158 colleagues launched a searing and influential denunciation on general TOL (i.e., TOL to a new

159 situation) arguing that when far TOL does occur it has been specifically trained for (Detterman, 1993).

160 TOL has proved to be difficult both to find research evidence for, and to achieve, prompting the

161 conclusion that TOL was the Black Sheep of the family (Fogarty, et al., 1992) Just as the Black Sheep

162 of the family is often not mentioned, the possibility that TOL or learning from TPSR does not occur is

163 seldom discussed.

164 Perkins and Salomon (1990) proposed a third alternative metaphor for TOL, which they

165 referred to as the Good Shepherd approach and was based on Perkins' work on thinking skills.

166 Within this theoretical orientation, TOL is predicated on mediation, and requires deliberate

167 shepherding. TOL is not left to chance, but is built into the instructional design "When transfer is

168 provoked, practiced, and reflected on, transfer is easy to achieve" (Fogarty *et al*., 1992,p.xvii). It is

169 essentially the good shepherd approach that is promoted by Walsh, et al. (2010) in their coaching club

170 programme.

171 **Near and far transfer**

172 A number of writers have differentiated between near and far TOL (Leberman, et al., 2006; Royer,

173 Mestre, & Dufresne, 2005) and the different mechanisms required in each case to facilitate TOL.

174 Salomon and Perkins(1989) described these as low road (near) and high road (far) mechanisms. Low

175 road is described as simple, automatic TOL that could be achieved with ease, for example changing

176 from driving a car to driving a van; while high road TOL is abstracted and involves higher-level

177 thinking skills. The teaching strategies, which support low road TOL, were designated by Perkins as

178 "hugging". Hugging strategies "hug close to" the situations the learning will be required for, that is

179 the learning and TOL tasks are very similar.

180 The TPSR context affords opportunities to facilitate low road TOL by demonstrating the

181 similarities and connections between the learning in TPSR and other areas of students' lives. TPSR's

182 inclusion of group discussion and individual reflection times offers opportunities for this to occur.

183 Students who develop sufficient respect in the physical education classroom to stop interfering with

184 the teaching and learning, for example, can be encouraged to attempt the same in another class within

185 the school. There does, however, need to be some caution when selecting contexts as being suitable

186 for near TOL. While there can be an assumption that classes in the same school will be suitable this is

187 not necessarily the case. Both Gordon (2010) and Lee and Martinek (2012) found that the distinctly

188 different classroom cultures that students faced when they moved out of physical education made

189 TOL difficult. In effect, despite the potential similarities the reality was that other classrooms were so

190 different that if TOL was to occur it would be more accurately described as far rather than near TOL

191 The teaching strategies, which support high road TOL, are characterised as bridging. High road

192 TOL grows out of deep learning, where the learner has learned concepts and principles and in order to

193 carry out a task must use higher-order thinking skills (Leberman, et al., 2006; Perkins & Salomon,

194 1990). Bridging strategies are similar to scaffolding; they mediate the processes of abstraction and

195 connection making, often using approaches such as analogies and metacognition. The teacher

196 provides concepts, principles and encouragement to learners that promote generalization (Fogarty, et

197 al., 1992; Perkins & Salomon, 1990).

198 Within TPSR instruction can be specifically designed to help students make the links or

199 connections between challenges and responses experienced in the TPSR classroom context, and the

200 challenges experienced in the wider school or community. Bridging is likely required as the evidence

201 suggests that even where problems appear analogous to instructors, learners often fail to

202 independently recognize the shared features of problems and the applicability of what they have

203 previously learned to the new situation (Dinsmore, Baggetta, Doyle, & Loughlin, 2014; Gick &

204 Holyoak, 1980).

205 　　　Facilitating far TOL in TPSR presents different challenges than those that are related to near

206 TOL. The research evidence is clear, that TOL to similar problems and contexts is more common that

207 the often hoped for TOL to new and different settings. It, therefore, cannot be assumed that the life

208 skills and values nurtured in TPSR programs will be adapted by students and used to meet the

209 challenges of future work, community, social, and family situations. How to successfully achieve this

210 TOL to other contexts becomes the challenge for the teacher/coach involved in TPSR.

211 　　　One technique may be to explain the concepts of near and far TOL to students and to identify

212 the difficulties inherent in achieving far TOL. This process is aligned with TPSR's philosophical

213 commitment to empowering students and giving them a greater understanding and control of their

214 learning (Wright, et al., 2010). This process would be enhanced by the use of carefully chosen

215 examples and the judicious use of questions that assist in understanding the new context and allow

216 students to identify similarities with earlier learning experiences.

217 　　　In the previous example of respect, where students had learned not to interfere with the

218 teaching and learning in the physical education classroom, it seems reasonable to develop the process

219 further after near TOL has occurred. This could include, for example, consideration of what respect

220 would look like in the wider community or in the choices participants make about what substances

221 they ingest into their bodies. Lee and Martinek (2013) described the need for clearly structured

222 processes to achieve (far) TOL:

223 　　　youth programs [need] to encourage participants to reflect on what and how they learned and

224 　　　examine the anticipated challenges and barriers to applying these skills to other contexts…

225   participants should have ample opportunity to practice the transferable skills in the program,

226   make plans for transfer and share reflection on their transfer efforts outside the program. (p.

227   308)

228   Holton and Baldwin's (2003) work needs to be considered during this process. They

229 emphasized the importance of being mindful that students' confidence to try new behaviors is

230 developed along with an understanding of the value of doing so and the positive outcomes that will

231 occur if they do.

232 **Learning and TOL**

233   A promising conceptualization of TOL that is pertinent for non-routine and complex learning

234 is that of Bransford and Schwartz (1999) who identified the difficulties in teaching for "far" TOL.

235 They reconceptualised TOL as preparation for future learning (PFL) where the desirable measures are

236 those that focus on understanding a learner's ability for new learning and being able to make

237 connections with their prior learning or experience. In a PFL approach to TOL the emphasis is on

238 structuring the new context, e.g. identifying people and material resources, thinking through what

239 questions will assist in understanding the new context and on how students can draw on earlier

240 learning experiences.

241   Teachers and coaches hoping to generate TOL to other areas of participants' lives need to

242 maximize the potential for this to happen through ensuring that quality and appropriate learning

243 occurs within the program. Learning and TOL are inextricably linked (Schon, 1987). Put simply TOL

244 cannot occur without learning. Quality learning needs to include time for reflection both 'in action"

245 which occurs when the participants are performing the activity and "on action" which occurs after the

246 activity is completed (Schon, 1987). Reflection-on-action, which plays an important role in learning,

247 was described by Garrick (1998) as requiring "conscious attention to distortions in our reasoning and

248 attitude" (p. 24). A programme that does not give participants genuine opportunities to experience

249 making choices and therefore the opportunity to reflect on action, for example, provides no learning

250   basis for TOL around making good choices in other areas of their lives. Simply talking about choices

251   means quality learning will not occur and the possibility of TOL is removed.   For this reason a

252   quality TPSR programme will have a strong focus on both learning and TOL.

253   **Planning for transfer of learning**

254   Holton and Baldwin (2013) identified a number of actions as central to increasing the

255   likelihood of TOL occurring. The first was identifying potential problems to achieving TOL early and

256   ensuring that these problems were then addressed at the initial planning stage. They emphasized

257   finding authentic opportunities for participants to use their learning in their lives and for participants

258   to be suitably prepared and have the personal capacity to take advantage of these opportunities when

259   they arose. Holton and Baldwin argued that participants would be more likely to attempt change if

260   they were convinced of the importance of what they were learning and believed that making the effort

261   will lead to worthwhile change. These ideas all make intuitive sense when looking for ways of

262   facilitating TOL in TPSR.

263   **Goals and levels**

264   One decision within the TPSR model that will have an impact on TOL is whether the five

265   goals are presented as independent goals or, as is commonly done, as a series of hierarchically

266   structured levels. The authors believe that the use of hierarchically structured levels, rather than goals,

267   has the potential to limit learning in TPSR, and restrict understanding about the use of learning in

268   other contexts. If students consider the goals as five levels to be climbed sequentially this may lead

269   them to believe that they have to successfully achieve the other four levels before considering TOL.

270   This would negate the purpose of TPSR, which is to identify, support and encourage TOL at all stages.

271   The student who has learnt to be non-disruptive in class but who does not participate has met the goal

272   of respect by changing their behavior to allow the teacher to teach and fellow students to learn. The

273   student could be encouraged to consider how this learning applies to other contexts in their lives. If

274   students and/or teachers and coaches believe that TOL should only be addressed after students have

275   successfully demonstrated their ability to participate at the other four levels then important

276   opportunities are lost.

277   **Discussion**

278   It should be acknowledged that for a variety of reasons a firm commitment to TOL is not always

279   present in TPSR based programs. Mrugala (2002), for example, in his work with teachers using TPSR

280   found a high percentage were motivated to introduce TPSR as a way of improving classroom

281   management, rather than as a means towards teaching personal and social responsibility. In some

282   situations teachers/coaches using TPSR may therefore have little or no commitment to TOL and may

283   see it as unimportant or as an "extra" outcome that if it occurs is a bonus rather than a fundamental

284   aspect of the model.

285   For other teachers/coaches there is a genuine interest in facilitating TOL as an integral part of

286   their programs. In attempting to find ways in which to better facilitate TOL, they are acknowledging

287   the value of TOL within the model and committing to achieving TOL as part of their role.

288   It is timely for all teachers/coaches using TPSR to consider TOL within their programs. For

289   some it may mean acknowledging that TOL is an integral part of TPSR. For others it may mean

290   moving beyond the assumption that, like Little Bo-Peep's sheep, if TOL is left alone it will come

291   home wagging its tail happily and to move more towards the good shepherd approach. This approach

292   requires that teachers/coaches actively and consistently shepherd participants towards achieving TOL

293   as a fundamental part of their programs. For those who are already strongly committed to facilitating

294   TOL there may be an opportunity to consider additions or changes within their programs to increase

295   the levels of TOL that are occurring.

296   Whatever the philosophical position taken by teachers and coaches using TPSR it must be

297   acknowledged that TOL has always been and remains central to the model. TPSR's originator Don

298   Hellison has consistently espoused the goal of TOL and it is therefore appropriate to conclude with

299   his views on the topic:

300   … I realized that transfer is really my ultimate goal in teaching kids to take personal   and

301   social responsibility. I had to build it into my goals or else leave it to chance. All along my

302   sense of purpose, my vision, my passion has been to help kids lead better lives. But their lives

303   don't end when they leave the gym (Hellison, 2011. P. 25)

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318   References

319   Beaudoin, S. (2012). Using responsibility-based strategies to empower in-service physical

320   education and health teachers to learn and implement TPSR. *AGORA, 14*(2), 161-177.

321   Bransford, J. D., & Schwartz, D. L. (1999). Rethinking transfer: A simple proposal with

322   multiple implications. *Review of Research in Education, 24*, 61-100. doi:

323   10.3102/0091732X024001061

324   Cummings, T. (2000). *Testing the effectiveness of Hellison's personal and social*

325   *responsibilty model: A dropout, repeated grade, and absentee rate comparison.*

326   Unpublished masters thesis, California State University, Chico.

327   Detterman, D. K. (1993). The case for the prosecution: Transfer as epiphenomenon. In D. K.

328   Detterman & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *Transfer on trial: Intelligence, cognition, and*

329   *instruction* (pp. 1–24). Norwood: NJ: Ablex.

330   Dinsmore, D., Baggetta, P., Doyle, S., & Loughlin, S. (2014). The role of initial learning,

331   problem features, prior knowledge, and pattern regognition on transfer success. *The*

332   *Journal of Experimental Education, 82*(11), 121-141.

333   Escarti, A., Gutierrez, M., Pascual, C., & Marin, D. (2010). Applications of Hellison's

334   Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility model in physical education to improve

335   self-efficacy for adolescents at risk of dropping-out of school. *The Spanish Journal of*

336   *Psychology, 13*(2), 667-676.

337   Fogarty, R., Perkins, D., & Barrell, J. (1992). *How to teach for transfer*. Cheltenham,

338   Victoria: Hawker Brownlow Education.

339   Garrick, J. (1998). *Informal learning in the workplace*. New York: Routledge Press.

340   Gick, M., & Holyoak, K. (1980). Analogical problem solving. *Cognitive Science, 7*, 155-170.

341 Gordon, B. (2010). An examination of the Responsibility Model in a New Zealand secondary

342 school physical education program. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 29*,

343 21-37.

344 Gordon, B. (2011). Teaching personal and social responsibility in New Zealand secondary

345 school physical education. *New Zealand Physical Educator, 44*(1), 18-21.

346 Hammond-Diedrich, K., & Walsh, D. (2006). Empowering youth through a responsibility-

347 based cross-age program: An investigation into impact and possibilities. *Physical*

348 *Educator, 63*(3), 134-142.

349 Hellison, D. (2003). *Teaching responsibility through physical education*. Champaign, IL:

350 Human Kinetics.

351 Hellison, D. (2011). *Teaching personal and social responsibilty through physical education*

352 (3rd ed.). Champaign:IL: Human Kinetics.

353 Hellison, D., Cutforth, N., Kallusky, J., Martinek, T., Parker, M., & Stiehi, J. (2000). *Youth*

354 *development and physical activity*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

355 Hellison, D., & Walsh, D. (2002). Responsibility-based youth programs evaluation:

356 Investigating the investigations. *Quest, 54*(4), 292-307.

357 Holton, E., & Baldwin, T. T. (2003). *Improving learning transfer in organizations*. San

358 Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

359 Launder, A., & Piltz, W. (2013). *Play practice* (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

360 Leberman, S., McDonald, B. L., & Doyle, S. (2006). *Transfer of learning: Participants'*

361 *perspectives of adult education and training*: Aldershot, UK: Gower.

362 Lee, O., & Martinek, T. (2012). Factors influencing transfer of responsibility-based physical

363 activity programs into classrooms. *Physical Educator, 69*, 188-207.

364   Lee, O., & Martinek, T. (2013). Understanding the transfer of values-based youth sport

365   program goals from a bioecological perspective. *Quest, 65*, 300-312.

366   Martinek, T., Schilling, T., & Johnson, D. (2001). Transferring personal and social

367   responsibility of underserved youth to the classroom. *The Urban Review, 33*(1), 29-45.

368   Miller, R. F., & Jarman, B. O. (1988). Moral and ethical character development: Views from

369   past leaders. *Journal of Physical Education Recreation and Dance, 59*(6), 72-78.

370   Mrugala, K. (2002). *Exploratory study of responsibility model practitioners.* Unpublished

371   doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Chicago.

372   Perkins, D. N., & Salomon, G. (1990). The science and art of transfer. Retrieved from

373   https://learnweb.harvard.edu/alps/thinking/docs/trancost.pdf

374   Redman, G. (1988). *Historical aspects of fitness in the modern world*. Champaign, IL:

375   Human Kinetics.

376   Ripple, R., & Drinkwater, D. (1982). Transfer of learning. In H. Mitzel (Ed.), *Encyclopedia*

377   *of educational research* (Vol. 4, pp. 1947-1955). NY: The Free Press.

378   Royer, J. M., Mestre, J. P., & Dufresne, R. J. (2005). Introduction: Framing the transfer

379   problem. In J. P. Mestre (Ed.), *Transfer of learning from a modern multidisciplinary*

380   *perspective* (pp. 1-52). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

381   Salomon, G., & Perkins, D. N. (1989). Rocky roads to transfer: Rethinking mechanisms of a

382   neglected phenomenon. *Educational Psychologist, 24*(2), 113-142. doi:

383   10.1207/s15326985ep2402_1

384   Schon, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

385   Siedentop, D. (1991). *Developing teaching skills in physical education*. Mountain View, CA:

386   Mayfield.

387   Tinning, R., MacDonald, D., Wright, J., & Hickey, C. (2001). *Becoming a physical education*

388   *teacher*. French Forest, Australia: Pearson Educational.

389   Walsh, D., Ozaeta, J., & Wright, P. (2010). Transference of responsibility goals to the school

390   environment: Exploring the impact of a coaching club program. *Physical Education*

391   *and Sport Pedagogy, 15*(1), 15-28.

392   Wright, P., Li, W., Ding, S., & Pickering, M. (2010). Integrating a personal and social

393   responsibility program into a wellness course for urban high school students:

394   Assessing implementation and educational outcomes. *Sport, Education and Society,*

395   *15*(3), 277-298.

396

397

398