Sport Social Work Journal

Engaging Youth with the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility Framework: Sport Psychology Graduate Students' Experience in a Service-Learning Course

Olivia Wyatt
Department of Counseling Psychology and Applied Human Development, Boston University

Val Altierie, Jr.
Independent Scholar

John McCarthy
Department of Counseling Psychology and Applied Human Development, Boston University

Laure Hayden
Department of Counseling & Sport Psychology, University of Massachusetts

Meredith Whitley
School of Health Sciences, Adelphi University

Robert Diehl
Counseling Psychologist, Private Practice

Ariel Tichnor-Wagner
Department of Counseling Psychology and Applied Human Development, Boston University

---

Purpose: *Grounded in the framework of Hellison's (2011) Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility framework, this study sought to understand how graduate students learned to facilitate a youth physical activity program while participating in a service-learning course designed to promote sport for development.* ***Methods:*** *This study utilized a thematic analysis approach. Researchers interviewed one cohort of master's students (n=5) studying counseling and sport psychology who participated in the service-learning course.* ***Results:*** *Identified themes included: (1) supervision and consultation, (2) observation, and (3) self-reflection, along with emergent sub-themes when relevant.* ***Conclusions:*** *This research provides insight into how future service-learning courses in the field of counseling and sport psychology can be developed to facilitate graduate student learning, exploring key elements for student self-reflection and*

supervision. ***Applications in Sport:*** *The results can be valuable for sport psychologists, sport social workers, mental performance consultants, physical education teachers, and coach educators to design practicum and/or developmental experiences to augment their learning of how to work with youth.*

Keywords: Service-learning; sport for development; sports-based youth development; sport psychology; graduate training

Sport is being utilized as a vehicle for social change that can make an impact on pressing social issues such as addressing peace through sport, ameliorating health disparities, promoting economic development, etc. (Anderson-Butcher, 2019). There are many ways across disciplines that describe ways of using sport and physical activity to benefit youth that have a range of goals and approaches and outcomes. Sport for Development (SfD) is transdisciplinary, with sport psychology recognized as a core discipline contributing to this work (Whitley et al., 2022). Another common way to characterize this type of work is sport-based youth development (SBYD; Weiss et al., 2012; Weiss, 2013).

Within the field of sport psychology, there is a call for sport psychologists and mental performance consultants to become more engaged with addressing social inequities and directing services toward communities who have historically been marginalized (Camiré et al., 2022; Compton, 2022; Krane & Waldron, 2021). To serve such communities well, it requires sport psychology students to gain important basic cultural awareness and a set of skills to help them navigate responsibly in community settings that are sometimes quite different from their university. Some in the field of sport psychology have engaged with these issues through a SfD lens (Blom et al., 2015; Whitley et al., 2022).

Within sport psychology graduate programs, in which there is often a bias towards working in elite and high performance contexts, there exists an opportunity to engage students in community-based work that aims to develop a sense of connection and caring for others to address social inequities, which aligns with SfD and SBYD approaches, as much of the literature focuses on adjacent fields, like kinesiology (Whitley et al., 2017).

One way sport psychology students can learn to do SfD and SBYD work is through service learning. Service-learning, an often-used teaching modality in higher education, has become increasingly popular in sport and physical activity-based settings (Chiva-Bartoll & Fernández-Rio, 2022; Chiva-Bartoll et al., 2019; Francisco-Garcés et al., 2022; Salam et al., 2019; Whitley & Walsh, 2014). However, to date, most literature exploring the intersection between service-learning and SfD comes from the sport management field (Bruening et al., 2015; Bush et al., 2016; Klein et al., 2023).

When examining service-learning programs, it is important to consider the curricular framework being implemented because we need to add to our understanding of useful frameworks for working with staff and youth (Holt et al., 2017). In the current study, the teaching personal and social responsibility (TPSR; Hellison, 2011) framework is utilized because it has been implemented and researched in SfD and SBYD programs across the world. Through

© 2024 Wyatt et al. Distributed under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license. SSWJ 6(1). Find Issues at OpenJournals.bsu.edu/SportSocialWorkJournal and SSWJ.org. https://doi.org/10.33043/xbb7d82z.

the stories of sport psychology graduate students, the present study seeks to add to the existing literature by exploring how they learn in an established SfD service-learning program that utilizes the TPSR framework.

Service-Learning

Service-learning emphasizes experiential-based work, wherein students learn how to work with a given population in their chosen discipline by being present on-site with the students and immediately immersed in practical experience (Salam et al., 2019). Students often have on-site mentors who facilitate programming alongside them in this course-based practice. The presence of mentors helps to support students' growth while encouraging them to implement new approaches that they learn in the traditional classroom setting (Bringle & Hatcher, 1995) Further, in the associated coursework at their school, students engage in an array of reflective exercises, writing prompts, and discussions to help further their understanding of the course's focus and discipline, as well as "an enhanced sense of civic responsibility" (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996, p. 222). In a systematic review of service learning in higher education within sport and physical education, Chiva-Bartoll and colleagues (2019) found overall positive benefits for students engaging in service-learning courses, reporting that many studies indicated self-described student development in professional skills around civic activity, teaching, and understanding of cultures. This discussion was echoed by Francisco-Garcés and colleagues (2022) as they called for a deeper understanding of the reflective process in service learning.

Field experiences are especially valuable for students to be able to take the concepts and theoretical orientations they are learning in their classwork and put them into practical use, some call this going from theory to practice/praxis. Educational philosopher John Dewey (1938) noted, "There is no such thing as educational value in the abstract." Reflective practice is a critical component to students' growth in field experiences. Reflective practice is an iterative cycle of considering, analyzing, and evaluating situations that help inform individuals' future actions in similar situations, e.g., improving one's own coaching and consulting skill working in a youth program (Cropley et al., 2010). This process is often situated within experiential learning to facilitate one's development (Kolb, 1984). These sorts of situated-learning experiences that happen in the field when coupled with reflective practice can lead to deep learning experiences because students must actively match what they know and have learned to a dynamic context.

Sport for Development

The societal importance of sport as a vehicle for social change has been depicted in film (e.g., Invictus) and emphasized disciplines in academia and in the government like the State Department, as evidenced by funding for international SfD programming run by universities in the United States (Burton, 2023).

In the United States, there are many ways that SfD has materialized, with SfD often promoted via (SBYD) programs and other community-based programs that use physical activity as the vehicle for engagement (Weiss et al., 2012; Weiss, 2013). A recent systematic review of SBYD interventions in the U.S. found limited efficacy for these programs as related to public health goals and called for a better understanding of how program leaders are trained to evaluate

© 2024 Wyatt et al. Distributed under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license. SSWJ 6(1). Find Issues at OpenJournals.bsu.edu/SportSocialWorkJournal and SSWJ.org. https://doi.org/10.33043/xbb7d82z.

the programs' effectiveness more rigorously (Whitley et al., 2019). This limited efficacy was driven mostly by inconsistent quality of methods and challenges with intervention fidelity (Whitley et al., 2019). Given that there are so many programs attempting to deliver benefits of their programs to their participants, there is a need for understanding how to develop the personnel who run those programs, that is the mentors and coaches who interact directly with youth.

There are several existing programs that work to develop their trainers and facilitators (e.g., coaches) to promote sports-based youth development. In one model, the Center for Healing and Justice Through Sport (CHJS) employs an array of training designed to meet the youth's need—whether that be training a coach, a staff, or an entire organization (CHJS, 2023). CHJS derives their training model through sport-based youth development, trauma-informed sport, and an emphasis on girls in sport, targeting engagement events that can last as little as 90 minutes or follow an organization for over a year (CHJS, 2023). Another, Up2Us Sports, developed the first certification in SBYD and focuses many of its offerings to help facilitators build relationships; manage mental and physical health, like youth experiences of trauma; and engage with youth exhibiting challenging behaviors (Up2Us Sports, 2023). Finally, part of the Positive Coaching Alliance's offerings are online workshops and courses designed to impact team dynamics and culture, with one recent workshop geared toward battling racism through sport (Positive Coaching Alliance, 2023). Each of these organizations seek to partner with existing teams and sports communities to help deliver these services to foster youth development through sport.

Another model of programming for SBYD is Doc Wayne, an organization that trains their own coaches as both licensed clinicians and youth development professionals (Doc Wayne, 2023a). Through this hybrid approach integrating trained mental health professionals, youth participating in Doc Wayne programming engage in sport as a vehicle for group and individual therapy. Further, they integrate evidence-based practices like dialectical behavior therapy; attachment, regulation, and competency; and personal and social responsibility (Doc Wayne, 2023b). All these models demonstrate effective ways of integrating SfD into community programs in youth sport. What is currently missing when it comes to understanding the development of SBYD facilitators and trainers is a focus on the dynamics of their learning experiences. Specifically, while the previous models describe what they teach facilitators, there is a gap in the literature in understanding how these facilitators learn and what could improve their training experiences.

Service-learning courses have become an increasingly utilized model to train those preparing to work in sport for development (Bruening et al., 2015; Huffman & Hillyer, 2014; Whitley & Walsh, 2014). For example, Whitley and Walsh (2014) outline a framework for implementing service-learning courses in physical activity settings. Further, they discuss the efficacy of a physical activity-based service-learning course and the students' personal, academic, and intellectual development as well as their increased social and community engagement (Whitley & Walsh, 2014). In the same year, Huffman and Hillyer (2014) outlined a service-learning course and program they have established, focusing on how and why the course was developed as well as how it benefited the students and community. In 2015, Bruening and colleagues found increased social capital development in undergraduate students participating in a service-learning course designed for SfD. These studies all highlight the importance of service-

© 2024 Wyatt et al. Distributed under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license. https://doi.org/10.33043/xbb7d82z.

learning courses in SBYD, and their work has paved the way for future scholars to create similar programs. However, there continues to be a missing discussion in the literature as to *how* students learn (Francisco-Garcés et al., 2022; Huffman & Hillyer, 2014; Whitley et al., 2017). Wright and colleagues (2016) further focused on "how" knowledge is transferred from teacher to student and discussed the effectiveness of one such model to do so— the TPSR framework (Hellison, 2011). Through this present study, we hope to add to the work on pedagogy and provide service-learning program leaders with an understanding of how they can better support student development via the TPSR framework.

Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility

TPSR is an established pedagogical model that has previously been situated within SfD, as it indicates processes for training facilitators while incorporating a flexible teaching approach (Whitley et al., 2017; 2022). TPSR was developed by Don Hellison as an approach to teaching students' physical education while also strengthening students' character (Hellison, 1999; 2011). One of the primary goals of TPSR is to teach students how to transfer what they learn about being responsible for themselves and others into other settings in their lives (Hellison, 2011). At its core, TPSR works as a "framework—not a rigid structure or blueprint—of basic values, ideas, and implementation strategies that honor the craft of teaching" (Hellison, 2011, p. 17). Embedded within the TPSR framework is a core set of values that guide the structure and facilitation of programs based on this model, emphasizing (a) putting children first; (b) human decency; (c) holistic self-development; (d) and a way of being. To put children first is to prioritize their needs and support them to "become better people" (Hellison, 2011, p. 18). Hellison (2011) underscored human decency by emphasizing teaching youth the importance of kindness and support over acts of selfishness and conflict promotion. Further he noted the importance of holistic self-development focuses on affective, cognitive, and psychomotor development. By living these core values through actions, this process becomes "a way of being" for students and facilitators versus "a way of teaching"—a learning opportunity for both students and program facilitators (Hellison, 2011, p. 19).

To further support facilitators in learning how to engage in this way of being, Hellison (2011) outlined five program leader responsibilities: (a) gradual empowerment; (b) self-reflection; (c) embedding TPSR in physical activities; (d) transfer; and (e) being relational with kids. Gradual empowerment refers to program leaders allowing students to have more autonomy over the program as they are ready. Next, self-reflection is key for facilitators to pause and assess how they may better help students. Embedding TPSR within the physical activity session works to ensure the TPSR values are practiced throughout the program sessions versus added lectures from the facilitators. Transfer is the process by which facilitators help students connect TPSR values to elements of their lives outside of physical activity; some researchers have called this aspect "transferable life-skills" (Hellison, 2011). Finally, being relational with kids centers on meeting them where they are and seeing the value in everyone's strengths, perspectives, and autonomy (Hellison, 2011).

While Hellison's (2011) framework is one that was used in physical education and physical activity settings primarily, it has not typically found purchase as a framework for study in counseling and sport psychology programs. Positive youth development approaches align well

© 2024 Wyatt et al. Distributed under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license. SSWJ 6(1). Find Issues at OpenJournals.bsu.edu/SportSocialWorkJournal and SSWJ.org. https://doi.org/10.33043/xbb7d82z.

with counseling psychology-based approaches which are person-centered and strengths-based (Weiss et al., 2012). The instructional value of learning how to use Hellison's (2011) framework aligns with what counseling students need to learn how to do, specifically when learning how to empower student agency through providing youth opportunities to exercise their "voice and choice." As sport psychology graduate programs leaders aim to develop socially conscious practitioners, they could benefit from insight into how graduate students learn and what knowledge, skills, and abilities help graduate students learn.

The Program

The service-learning course in this study is designed around a physical activity program at a secondary school in an urban area in the Northeast. The course is for graduate students in counseling and sport psychology, designed to mirror the themes in the TPSR framework to enhance their learning. The program has been run by a faculty advisor and his graduate students since Fall 2007. The program engages high school students (henceforth, "program participants") in physical activity in the school's weight room, gym, and dance studio. The program is designed to help promote the program participants' physical health and development while simultaneously teaching them to take personal and social responsibility in this setting (Hellison, 2011). Guided by the tenets of the TPSR framework, the faculty advisor and five master's students facilitate between 10 and 25 program participants' development through structured activities, coaching, and mental skills consulting per session. Four additional doctoral students participated as facilitators periodically throughout the program. Like the master's students, the doctoral students worked directly with the youth. In addition, some took on informal mentorship roles to the master's students and modeled program leadership. Over time, in keeping with the TPSR framework, the graduate students shift the ownership of group leadership and processes to the program participants, so they feel empowered to take on the roles of leader, facilitator, and supporter to better coach themselves and fellow students through the sessions.

The participating high school housing the program will be referred to as (pseudonym: Central High School (CHS) in an urban area in the Northeast. In the current academic year, CHS's students primarily identify as Hispanic (approximately 60 percent[1]) and African American (approximately 30 percent). About four percent of students identify as White. The current demographics parallel the demographic identities during the time of this study. CHS has been a chronically underperforming Title 1 school with an average of 680 students and graduation rates ranging from 50 to 60 percent. Title 1 schools have at least 40 percent of their students from low socioeconomic background and are part of a federal education program to support these students (U.S. Department of Education, 2018).

Present Study

The current study sought to explore how graduate students in sport psychology learned how to engage youth with the TPSR model via a service-learning based course. To understand how the graduate students learned, they (n=5) were interviewed about their experiences. This cohort engaged with two separate program groups (n=10 to 25 in each session) in the program,

[1] Approximations are provided to protect the anonymity of the school.

© 2024 Wyatt et al. Distributed under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license. SSWJ 6(1). Find Issues at OpenJournals.bsu.edu/SportSocialWorkJournal and SSWJ.org. https://doi.org/10.33043/xbb7d82z.

one in each first and third period at CHS, which left the second period for the graduate students' service-learning course. The service-learning course is designed to help graduate students in counseling and sport psychology learn how to work with youth in physical activity-based settings. More specifically, the course outlines the following learning goals: (a) teach graduate students how to better engage with youth utilizing the TPSR framework within and around the physical activity, (b) strengthen the graduate students' counseling, sport psychology, and reflection skills, and (c) provide an environment conducive to learning in a welcoming space. The service-learning course is designed as group supervision, with a flexible agenda to allow graduate students to bring questions, concerns, and discussion topics to the group at any point throughout class.

This paper aims to fill a gap in the current literature by exploring the experiences of graduate students pursuing their master's in counseling and sport psychology through a service learning-based course. Through the analysis of interviews with graduate student facilitators, we strive to answer two main research questions: (1) How did graduate students learn to better engage with youth through the TPSR framework? and (2) What did graduate students report enhanced their learning in working with youth through the TPSR framework?

Methods

The thematic inquiry explored here draws from the philosophical assumptions of ontological relativism (i.e., multiple, created, individualized realities exist) and epistemological constructionism (i.e., our knowledge is constructed and imperfect) (Smith & Sparkes, 2009a, b; Smith, 2016). Thematic analysis was chosen for this study's analytic approach as it seeks to capture individuals' meaning making (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Specifically, narrative constructionism posits a "socio-cultural-oriented approach that conceptualizes human beings as meaning-makers who use narratives to interpret, direct and communicate life and to configure and constitute their experience and their sense of who they are" (Smith, 2016, p. 204). This is important for the current study as we sought to capture the individuals' own understanding of their learning versus via an external source. Through these lenses, we were best able to explore individuals' experiences and thought processes about how they learned.

Participants

The current study's findings are derived from five qualitative interviews[2] from one complete master's level cohort of the program's facilitators who study counseling and sport psychology, (henceforth, "the graduate students"). The graduate students ranged in age from 23-28. Interviews were conducted after they completed their service-learning course; therefore, there was no association between participating in the interview and their performance in the service-learning course. Graduate students were recruited and engaged in a semi-structured interview conducted by a doctoral student who had experience as a program facilitator and, therefore, was knowledgeable about the program. The graduate students met at a school of education office to protect their privacy. All policies and protocols were approved by

[2] Pseudonyms are used for each participant throughout to protect their identities using processes reviewed in Heaton (2022).

© 2024 Wyatt et al. Distributed under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license. SSWJ 6(1). Find Issues at OpenJournals.bsu.edu/SportSocialWorkJournal and SSWJ.org. https://doi.org/10.33043/xbb7d82z.

[BLINDED]'s IRB. Graduate students and program participants at CHS reported many intersecting identities, with a range of representation across ethnic groups, SES, family structure, religious affinity, gender identity, and sexual orientation.

Study Procedures

The semi-structured interviews included 16 prompts with follow-up questions asked as needed, lasting between 30 to 50 minutes. Based on previous literature, the questions were designed to elicit stories in diverse ways (Smith & Sparkes, 2009a, b). Through the prompts, the graduate students were asked to share: (1) their key experiences as a graduate student that year, (2) where the program fits into their academic experience, (3) what came to mind when thinking of the program, (4) how the program approaches working with youth, (5) how prepared they thought they were based on previous life and professional experiences, (6) how the program was perceived by high school student participants, (7) if and how the program has influenced high school student participants and what explains their growth, (8) how the program facilitators engaged high school student participants throughout the program, (9) connections with adolescents, (10) difficulties they had at the program, (11) what they would do differently if they were to begin the year again, (12) what they learned while working in the program and how they learned it, (13) what they would recommend to make the program better, (14) takeaways from the experience, (15) how they could have been prepared better, and (16) what they would tell to another graduate student they were recruiting to work at the program. While some interview questions were more geared toward the research questions for this study than others, discussions around how the graduate students learned were consistently present throughout the interviews. The interviews themselves took place as a back-and-forth conversation, which impacted graduate students answering each question—they often would answer a previous question while responding to the next.

Interviews were recorded with audio only files and later transcribed verbatim by a graduate student researcher who was neither involved in the interview process nor knew the identity of any of the graduate student participants. Another graduate student researcher then checked the transcripts for accuracy, and the two researchers discussed any areas of discrepancy.

Positionality

Author One identifies as a White cisgender woman who works as a doctoral student. She previously participated as a facilitator in the program after the present study was conducted. At the time of coding, Author One was a first-year doctoral student whose advisor was the program director, which could have biased the coding in a more positive light. At the time of participating in the program and in analyzing the data, Author One had limited exposure to the TPSR framework, which enabled her to code with minimal bias toward the framework.

Author Two identifies as a White, straight, cisgender man and worked with the program for 13 years beginning with the first year of the program. His advisor for his master's and doctoral work is the program director and the data for his dissertation came from interviews with former program participants. He worked closely with the five graduate student study participants.

© 2024 Wyatt et al. Distributed under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license. SSWJ 6(1). Find Issues at OpenJournals.bsu.edu/SportSocialWorkJournal and SSWJ.org. https://doi.org/10.33043/xbb7d82z.

Author Three identifies as a White, straight, cisgender man who both founded the program described in this study and acts as the program director. Author Three acts as the advisor for other authors on this paper. He has extensive experience with the TPSR model, sport psychology, sports-based youth development, and coaching.

Author Four identifies as a White, straight, cisgender woman who has been a faculty member and administrator at a Northeastern U.S. university for 13 years. She has experience developing and implementing sport for development programs, many of which incorporate Hellison's TPSR framework. Author Four believes that sport-based programming can yield numerous benefits for participants when developed and implemented intentionally and appropriately. Author Four did not engage in data collection or analysis for this project but rather served as a thought and writing contributor.

Author Five identifies as a White, straight, cisgender woman with over 15 years of experience as a scholar and practitioner in sport for development, including the TPSR model, along with experience designing, implementing, and evaluating service-learning coursework.

Finally, Author Six identifies as a White, straight, cisgender man who grew up in a predominantly white, upper middle-class community. He worked with the program during his doctoral study and the program director served as a dissertation committee member. This author collected these interviews during the end of his first year of doctoral study.

Thematic Analysis

To answer the research questions, thematic analysis was identified as the most appropriate analytic plan (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Vasmoradi et al., 2013). Based on investigator triangulation, one doctoral and one master's level student researchers coded the data independently and as an iterative process described below that is commonly used in sport for development literature (Braun et al., 2016; Massey & Whitley, 2016; Merriam & Tisdell, 2015; Smith, 2016). Using inductive coding, the researchers took a bottom-up approach where themes were generated from the data itself versus utilizing pre-determined theoretical underpinnings. While reading the transcripts initially, the researchers engaged in indwelling, listening to the audio recordings and writing memos of what stood out as relevant to the research questions (Smith, 2016). The researchers then took a few weeks off from looking at the data and completed a second iteration of reading the transcripts, looking for high-level notes related to the research questions. After the initial memos, researchers coded meaning units in NVivo 12. Meaning units were classified as phrases, sentences, or paragraphs in the effort to keep the participants' stories intact, noting that more than one theme could be present (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015; see Table 1 for further detail). The transcripts were read multiple times throughout analysis. Twice, after the initial indwelling and after coding in NVivo, the two graduate student researchers met to discuss themes and discrepancies for both individual participants and the cohort, resolving differences through referencing participants' quotes and exploring their own positionalities. Also, for discrepancies, the coders discussed how they conceptualized the type of growth and came to a consensus on final themes.

© 2024 Wyatt et al. Distributed under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license. SSWJ 6(1). Find Issues at OpenJournals.bsu.edu/SportSocialWorkJournal and SSWJ.org. https://doi.org/10.33043/xbb7d82z.

The research team involved in the coding process were two graduate students in sport psychology who had worked within the program but not at the time of the interviews, and the two program directors who were present at the program supporting the study participants and leading the service-learning course. Before and after the initial round of coding, one of the program directors met with the two graduate student researchers to discuss the process of coding and discussing discrepancies.

Table 1.

Initial codes grouped to form theme	*n* of graduate students contributing (N=5)	*n* of transcript excerpts assigned
Theme 1: Supervision and Consultation	5	34
Supervision and mentorship from professor		
Service-learning course on-site		
Consultation with peers		
Theme 2: Observation	5	27
Atmosphere and Environment		
Coach's interactions		
High school students' interactions		
Theme 3: Self-reflection	3	14

Trustworthiness

To maintain trustworthiness and methodological integrity, the researchers who coded the data engaged in reflexivity journaling to consider their perspectives about the data and analysis (Levitt, 2020). Further, the recordings and transcriptions were reviewed by two researchers who were not part of the program at time of study implementation and did not know any identifying information about the participants. While also engaging in triangulation, this supports the credibility of the data. Multiple authors of this paper also checked and rechecked the data collection and analytic process to ensure confirmability.

Results

In support of both research questions–how the graduate student facilitators learned to engage with youth through the TPSR framework and what enhanced their learning–three themes emerged from analysis of the transcripts: (1) supervision and consultation, (2) observation, and (3) self-reflection. For the themes, the following subthemes further expanded the concepts illustrated within the first two main themes, emphasizing what went well for this cohort's learning: (1) supervision and mentorship from professor, service-learning course on-site, consultation with peers; and (2) atmosphere and environment, Coach's interactions, high school students' interactions.

© 2024 Wyatt et al. Distributed under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license. SSWJ 6(1). Find Issues at OpenJournals.bsu.edu/SportSocialWorkJournal and SSWJ.org. https://doi.org/10.33043/xbb7d82z.

Supervision and Consultation

The use of supervision and consultation was mentioned by all five graduate students throughout their interviews. Graduate student facilitators remarked that they learned best through three means: on-site collaboration with professor and program leader, service-learning course discussion, and consultation with peers.

Supervision and Mentorship from Professor

Every graduate student interviewed talked about the role of the professor in shaping their learning at the program—who was referred to as "Coach" throughout. Both Oak and Aspen spoke to how they were able to learn via Coach empowering them as he recognized where they were at in terms of skills and experiences while also being present in case they needed anything. They spoke about how he set the tone for how the program would be run and adapted throughout the year. Ash stated, "[Coach said,] 'you'll see they're going to look different on the last day and when you leave it's not going to be the same.'" At a separate time in the interview, Ash also discussed Coach setting the tone: "Coach always says, 'pleasantly persistent.' And just kind of giving them their space when they need it, but still letting them know like, 'Hey, I'm here, and I still care. I am still here, and I care,' instead of just yelling or doing what teachers or parents do."

This emphasis on learning from Coach about how to demonstrate care to high school students was also evident throughout all the interviews. Rowan said:

> I learned that it's important to ask people to do it. They were coaching instead of forcing. It took me a while, but I do remember that vividly. We had talked about it several times, but as a coach, I'm just so used to like showing […] and saying like "Hey, like correct this, correct this," instead of having them show me or whatever else it may be. […] Again, like I said, I learned to meet people where they are even more than I had done so previously because everybody isn't ready to just dive in and workout.

Service-Learning Course On-Site

The second most common modality through which four of five graduate students learned was their service-learning course, specifically as it was on-site. The service-learning course lasted for an hour between two periods of the program each week. Ash said, "It was so fresh in our minds. [We] could bring any questions or problems or concerns and get everyone's opinions on how someone else could have done something differently or better." Talking through alternative ways of approaching students also supported Aspen's learning, and they highlighted how quickly they could incorporate those different perspectives. Aspen said, "I think that's a cool thing about having the [service-learning course] right there and at [the high school] is that we talked about [change] we could apply and then right after I could apply it."

This was elevated further by multiple graduate students noting how having the service-learning course on-site, between sessions supported their learning style. Ren stated, "For someone who has a very active mind, such as myself, it's very hard for me to focus sometimes and very often, like as soon as I think, and I forget it. So, it was cool for me to have practice in

© 2024 Wyatt et al. Distributed under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license. SSWJ 6(1). Find Issues at OpenJournals.bsu.edu/SportSocialWorkJournal and SSWJ.org. https://doi.org/10.33043/xbb7d82z.

the middle of [the program] because all of it was like so fresh." Oak echoed this sentiment, stating that they felt they were able to learn more efficiently in the service-learning course as a self-described "verbal processor."

Consultation with Peers

A final sub theme that emerged under the umbrella of supervision and consultation was learning through consultation with peers. Three of five participants spoke about the importance of informal conversations with their fellow graduate student facilitators about how to approach an individual high school student and receive general emotional support. For example, Oak stated, "[From early on,] our communication was good. At times we'd be like, that student may not be doing okay—make sure we check in with them. I think we all learned to also pick our heads up and check in with each other." They continue to talk about how that created an environment where all facilitators felt supported. On an individual level, Ren talked about how another facilitator specifically helped them to interact with a high school student, describing how "[another graduate student facilitator] was helpful bringing my attention to the actual level at which you're talking to someone." When asked directly how they learned the skills, Aspen's first statement was "the support from everybody," and continued to talk about their peers directly noting that if they had a difficult interaction with a student, they would go to their peers for help.

Observation

All participants spoke about the role observation had in how they learned. In this study, observation is operationalized through Holder and Winter's (2017) exploration of expert sport psychology practitioners' experiences with observation, whereas observation includes watching the dynamics of an individual's behavior, people's interactions, and "get[ting] an overall feel for a situation" (p. 11). There were distinct learning opportunities via observing the environment, Coach, and the high school students themselves.

Atmosphere and Environment

Consistent across all five graduate students was a description of how the program produced an environment conducive to learning. While not always explained tangibly, there was an essence or feel to the space the graduate student facilitators could describe. For example, Rowan was the only graduate student who did not note a specific person that they observed, but when asked how they were able to learn, they stated, "I think just the atmosphere in general gave me the free space to kind of have that opportunity more so than anything." This was echoed by Ash, as they noted that "noticing the environment" was crucial to their development. They explained that noticing how all people involved in the weight room interacted with each other helped them learn—from doctoral students working with the program participants to Coach interacting to the support from the other master's students. All graduate students described an element of consistency, which showed up while observing the space—like watching Coach greet each student as they walked in the room, which they then began to do. In addition, the norms established for the first and third period programs around checking in regularly and having consistent expectations for the program came from observing interacting dynamics rather than an individual source. For example, Ren stated "the consistency in the structure [of each program

© 2024 Wyatt et al. Distributed under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license. https://doi.org/10.33043/xbb7d82z.

period]" helped the students, which in turn helped Ren learn how to better engage with them. While talking about watching these dynamics unfold, they stated, "It was never overt. It was never telling them what to do. So, I think that that balance of consistency while granting autonomy kind of helped [the program] along." Finally, multiple graduate students noted the TPSR framework as a contributing factor to the environment that was cultivated.

Coach's Interactions

When all five graduate student facilitators were asked who helped them learn, the first response was always Coach. In talking about how he helped them, three elaborated on a few distinct behaviors Coach modeled during the first and third periods of the program that helped him relate to the program participants, and the graduate student facilitators stated they sought to replicate them. By observing Coach engage with program participants in a certain way, the graduate student facilitators learned how they might also engage with program participants. For example, Ash said:

> Watching how Coach talked to them was very different than I'd seen any, anyone ever did anything. Especially because he is so tall and he's clearly older than all of us in there. And, and they just respect him. Like he was just, he would just be laying on the floor, which is probably weird to a kid, but they respond to it because he's not way up here and he's not. He's just very calm. I think you must be calm with these students.

Later in their interview, they continued, "what always comes to mind is an image of [Coach] kneeling or he's always lower than or just alongside them just to subtly teach. So, I think our role is to sort of be the opposite of what they see every single day." Relatedly, while talking about learning from Coach's body position with the students, Oak said, "I think that it's just like a metaphor for all the work we do at [the program]. It's never like top down. It's always okay, I'm aligned with you, I'm next to you. How can we get what you want out of this space?" Through these observations of Coach, the graduate student facilitators saw improvement in their own coaching skills.

Multiple graduate students spoke to observing Coach engage students as it related to differences in culture–including gender identity, language, and race. Ash described how Coach would "try to speak a little Spanish to [the program participants], whether it sound[ed] silly or not," which helped shift the culture of the group. Further, Aspen said:

> Seeing Coach [engaging the program participants] and me being like, okay, I need to bite my tongue and identify when I'm about to either scream or discipline and just take a step back and be like, okay, I need a break. I'm seeing him doing it. […] We had an incident once between two kids at one kid was clearly like bullying the other one in our space and he took the kid aside and conversed with him versus yelling and giving him a punishment or whatnot. It is a different way. And I think, now looking back at it, [it's] a lot more powerful because you give the kid a voice rather than just telling him you're a bad kid and shut up and sit on the side. You know, not giving him an opportunity to learn from what he did.

© 2024 Wyatt et al. Distributed under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license. SSWJ 6(1). Find Issues at OpenJournals.bsu.edu/SportSocialWorkJournal and SSWJ.org. https://doi.org/10.33043/xbb7d82z.

High School Students' Interactions

Finally, three of five graduate students spoke about how observing the program participants' dynamics facilitated their own growth in the space. The importance of taking a step back and seeing what the program participants would do helped the facilitators better understand how to meet the program participants where they were. For example, Ash stated they learned a lot by "seeing them what they would flock to before class started." This helped them to identify ways to connect with the program participants. For Rowan, they tried to zoom out and look at the group before "div[ing] right in," as was their natural tendency. By "surveying the landscape first," Rowan described that they were able to adapt from a "one size fits all model" and tailor their approach to individual students. While talking along a similar vein, Ren stated that "getting to watch [the students] experience that was humbling and eye opening." As the graduate students spent more time observing at the outset, they noted feeling more confident in their ability to facilitate.

Self-Reflection

A final theme that emerged throughout the interviews was the importance of self-reflection for their own learning. Three of five graduate students noted this through multiple avenues, including journaling, self-reflection in clinical practicum supervision, and internally checking in with how they were feeling. Across the three graduate students' description of how they learned to engage with the program participants through self-reflection were distinct mentions of which methods of reflection helped them process most deeply. For example, when asked how they learned at the program, Aspen described their self-reflection process:

> I learned to not classify, not jump to conclusions to not a label. To be open to all the kids, give them a chance, cause they're kids, you know. […] When I felt that anger towards [a] kid, instead of letting it consume me, kind of taking a step back and be like, 'okay, so let me approach this a different way or maybe let me communicate to this kid how he's making me feel. And maybe he'll find some insight.' […] Being there for them, kind of like tuning into what I'm feeling but not letting it like dominate my actions, which is hard. […] So, identifying how I was feeling, talking about [it,] and not just letting it rot inside me.

This reflecting and developing their own awareness was echoed by other facilitators. For Oak's reflective process, they stated, "if I was resistant to working with a kid or like why, where does that come from? Or like, why do I gravitate more to this person and not this person? Truly reflecting on that. I was able to see what labels I am imposing and how can that be detrimental." Through taking the time to reflect, the facilitators described how they felt their learning was enhanced and they were better able to support the program participants.

Discussion

The present study highlights three areas related to how sport psychology graduate students learn to engage with youth in a service-learning based course via the TPSR framework: supervision and consultation, observation, and self-reflection. Within the first two themes,

© 2024 Wyatt et al. Distributed under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license. SSWJ 6(1). Find Issues at OpenJournals.bsu.edu/SportSocialWorkJournal and SSWJ.org. https://doi.org/10.33043/xbb7d82z.

subthemes provided more detail to illuminate what went well for their learning. Further, all themes related to the service-learning course learning objectives, which aligns with previous literature on how TPSR has been effectively taught to new facilitators (Dunn & Doolittle, 2020). These emerging themes begin to shed light onto how to craft service-learning courses and environments to better prepare facilitators to work with youth in athletic settings.

First, it is important to note that significant discussion of the TPSR framework itself did not emerge from the interview data. This likely occurred as the interview protocol asked only one question directly about TPSR, i.e., "How did the TPSR values align with your own?" As Coach and the doctoral students both oversaw the implementation of the TPSR framework, it is plausible the vernacular used in the TPSR framework was not salient to the master's students as these principles were already embedded in the way things were done consistently at the facilitation site. Further, the TPSR-based program is known by another name at the site, [BLINDED] and is consistently referred to by this other name rather than TPSR. Therefore, while themes are consistent with Hellison's (2011) framework, the data themselves did not result in overlapping jargon or phrasing.

First, for supervision and consultation, all graduate student facilitators noted the impact of at least two of the following: their professor shaping their learning experience, having their service-learning course on-site, and consultation with peers. Consistent with the literature on sport for development, having a professor or mentor who the students feel they can turn to for advice and skill-building is critical for efficacious work (Wright et al., 2016). When designing a service-learning course, the students will benefit from a professor who also immerses themselves in the environment and regularly engages with not only the population but also the surrounding school community.

Graduate student facilitators spoke at length about the benefits of having their service-learning course on-site, in-between two sessions of the program. Although not all five participants noted its importance, the depth of the support it provided highlights the importance of holding the graduate course at the high school. As one participant, Ash, noted, "[The experience] was so fresh in our minds." The set-up enabled the facilitators to make quick changes to their coaching approach, support each other in brainstorming alternative ways of approaching students and processing emotionally challenging situations immediately, and meet the needs of diverse learning styles. While this structure may not be feasible for all service-learning courses, there may be more ways to think creatively around scheduling and providing more opportunities for brief check-ins.

The final subtheme within supervision and consultation, consultation with peers, highlights the value brought by each individual and their experience. Learning transcends the typical professor-student dynamic and provides opportunity for a richer experience. Moreover, for professors, being able to share the space is even more important when working with youth as it models for the graduate students the ability to mitigate some power dynamics (Wollschleger, et al., 2020). In our case, this also provided opportunities for graduate students to learn from each other's unique cultural backgrounds and intersecting identities, as Coach and the other program directors and doctoral students held predominantly privileged identities.

© 2024 Wyatt et al. Distributed under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license. SSWJ 6(1). Find Issues at OpenJournals.bsu.edu/SportSocialWorkJournal and SSWJ.org. https://doi.org/10.33043/xbb7d82z.

The second major theme that emerged from analyses was the power of observation in shaping the graduate students' learning. Through observing the program participants themselves, the graduate student facilitators were able to engage in more thorough assessment and helped build rapport, as they could tailor their approach and interventions to the adolescents' interests. This was supported further by observing Coach's interactions with the students, another example of vicarious learning (Bandura et al., 1963). Multiple participants noted the way Coach recognized his position as a tall, White male and worked to get as close as he could to the same level as the students, by kneeling, sitting, or laying on the floor. All the graduate students recognized how small acts like these helped to create an atmosphere and environment of belonging, which was guided by the TPSR framework and trauma-informed approaches (Hellison, 2011; van der Kolk, 2014). Further, it highlights how Coach embodied the "way of being" Hellison (2011) outlines. Modeling this way is crucial while teaching personal and social responsibility to students via physical activity (Hellison, 2011). In running a service-learning program akin to the program described here, it is crucial the professor, mentor, or director thoroughly references established theories and practices like these to approach this work with youth.

Lastly, self-reflection played a significant role in how the graduate students learned, which is directly connected to the TPSR framework for facilitators (Hellison, 2011). This also aligns with Francisco-Garcés and colleagues (2022) who called more depth into the role reflective practice plays in service-learning. In our study, there was not one way to reflect that supported learning. Some graduate students felt writing in journals helped them process while others were able to tune into their thought processes more deeply through individual supervision. One participant, Oak, found self-reflection helpful via asking themselves questions like, "why, where does that come from?" when trying to understand how they felt about a particular high school student. This underscores the importance of providing students a variety of outlets for reflective processes for their learning (Hellison, 2011). In addition, students may benefit from periodic check-ins on how their reflections have developed throughout the course to aid them in finding a particular mode or method of reflection that works most effectively for them. For example, as was the case in this service-learning course, reflections can be conducted in both verbal and written form. In the course, graduate student facilitators discussed their experience and reactions on-site immediately after facilitating. Then, they met for a two-hour weekly practicum course on campus to discuss the TPSR model and how to increase implementation fidelity. Further, the students wrote biweekly reflection papers on both their experience and the TPSR implementation. Engaging students in an array of these reflection modalities may help to augment their learning, demonstrating an effective model of reflection currently missing in the coach education in higher education literature, as discussed in a recent literature review (Trudel et al., 2020).

Limitations

While this study had many strengths, it was not without its limitations. One of the most significant limitations is the effect of research bias, specifically, social desirability bias (Bergen, & Labonté, 2020). Even though the course had completed before conducting the interviews, the interviewer had worked extensively with the cohort of master's students involved in the program, which may have led the graduate students to say more about what and how they learned than

© 2024 Wyatt et al. Distributed under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license. SSWJ 6(1). Find Issues at OpenJournals.bsu.edu/SportSocialWorkJournal and SSWJ.org. https://doi.org/10.33043/xbb7d82z.

they would have with someone unfamiliar to the program. Further, the cohort of graduate students may have wanted future letters of reference or recommendation from Coach or another program director, which may have swayed their discussion of how they learned. While the researchers tried to protect against this bias by interviewing the graduate students after the course had been completed, it also added the limitation that graduate students were reflecting on learning, which could look different than if they were assessed along the way about their learning.

Second, the study itself drew the graduate student participants from only one cohort, although graduate students regularly transition in and out of the program over the years. This limits the ability for the study to have maximum variation and only provides a cross-sectional look at the students' learning (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015).

An additional limitation to this study was the positionality of those in power versus participating as graduate students or high school students. As stated earlier, the three main people running the program identify as cisgender White males and both the group of graduate student facilitators and adolescent program participants held many intersecting underrepresented identities. This may have affected how the graduate students responded to the interviewer, potentially exacerbating the effects beyond social desirability bias. When looking to make social change, as is the purpose behind SfD and many service-learning courses in higher education, it is important to work toward having more positions of power held by those from historically marginalized populations Chiva-Bartoll & Fernández-Rio, 2022; Chiva-Bartoll et al., 2019; Francisco-Garcés et al., 2022; Kidd, 2008). Therefore, it may have been beneficial to directly ask questions in the interview about cultural factors and dynamics. For those looking to establish their own service-learning program, training should emphasize how master's students form connections with youth and how their individual identities emerge in the spaces they share with youth.

Further, many students at CHS face numerous challenges outside the classroom that contribute to their academic performance (communicated via school administration), like history of trauma, food insecurity, homelessness, abuse or neglect at home, limited access to adequate health care, and living in neighborhoods with regular crime and gang violence. These factors may contribute to students' present functioning and how they show up in the program space. While the graduate students worked to consider this while supporting the program participants to develop not only physical skills but also social and emotional skills, it would be important to consider these dynamics explicitly when asking about how the graduate students learned (Bergholz et al., 2016).

Future Research

In line with past scholars, future work in service-learning and SfD should address the effects of students' learning longitudinally (Francisco-Garcés et al., 2022). In addition, future studies could seek to understand the overlap between how the students learned and connections with the TPSR framework, as it has been used in multiple service-learning courses in sport (Hellison, 2010; Wright et al., 2016). Using the components of the framework not only for the

© 2024 Wyatt et al. Distributed under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license. SSWJ 6(1). Find Issues at OpenJournals.bsu.edu/SportSocialWorkJournal and SSWJ.org. https://doi.org/10.33043/xbb7d82z.

adolescents' development but also for the graduate student facilitators may facilitate deep learning through a parallel process.

In thinking about the major themes, service-learning courses in sport psychology could further explore the relationship between the graduate students and different supervisors or mentors to conceptualize the reasoning more strongly behind what elements are most conducive for learning. In addition, if any of the elements conducive for learning are advanced by having the supervisor on-site and interacting with the adolescents versus solely running the service-learning course. Finally, there is a need to better understand how individual identities, culture, and experience manifest in a group setting, and the strengths and areas for growth in supervisors mentoring individuals.

Conclusion

This study examined how sport psychology graduate students learned within a service-learning-based course. Key insights derived from interviews included the importance of seeking supervision from professors and peers; observing the environment, professor, and adolescents; and engaging in multiple forms of self-reflection. Findings from this study contribute to the intersection between service-learning and sport for development through a counseling and sport psychology lens. It provides future educators areas to emphasize in designing their pedagogical practices.

While this study indicates that learning situated in the community has value due to contact with the students, any future considerations of service-learning based programs also must consider how service-learning projects are positioned within the community, with collaboration and true partnership with those entities and stakeholders like schools and local sports-based programs, to develop robust, long-term university-community partnerships. Eby (1998) suggested the transformative potential of service-learning, but also has critiqued service-learning that might mislead students to have a truncated understanding of the systems in which students learn. This study highlights the importance of meticulously considering supervision and consultation, observation, and self-reflection when designing service-learning courses for graduate students working to develop their skills engaging youth in sports-based programming.

References

Anderson-Butcher, D. (2019). Youth Sport as a Vehicle for Social Development. *Kinesiology Review*, *8*(3), 180-187.

Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. A. (1963). Vicarious reinforcement and imitative learning. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *67*(6), 601.

Bergen, N., & Labonté, R. (2020). "Everything is perfect, and we have no problems": Detecting and limiting social desirability bias in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, *30*(5), 783-792.

© 2024 Wyatt et al. Distributed under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license. SSWJ 6(1). Find Issues at OpenJournals.bsu.edu/SportSocialWorkJournal and SSWJ.org. https://doi.org/10.33043/xbb7d82z.

Bergholz, L., Stafford, E., & D'Andrea, W. (2016). Creating trauma-informed sports programming for traumatized youth: Core principles for an adjunctive therapeutic approach. *Journal of Infant, Child, and Adolescent Psychotherapy, 15*(3), 244-253.

Blom, L. C., Judge, L., Whitley, M. A., Gerstein, L., Huffman, A., & Hillyer, S. (2015). Sport for development and peace: Experiences conducting US and international programs. *Journal of Sport Psychology in Action*, *6*(1), 1-16.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1995). A service-learning curriculum for faculty. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning,* 112-122.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (1996). Implementing service learning in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *67*(2), 221-239.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.

Braun, V., Clarke, V., & Weate, P. (2016). Using thematic analysis in sport and exercise research. In *Routledge handbook of qualitative research in sport and exercise* (pp. 213-227). Routledge.

Bruening, J. E., Peachey, J. W., Evanovich, J. M., Fuller, R. D., Murty, C. J. C., Percy, V. E., ... & Chung, M. (2015). Managing sport for social change: The effects of intentional design and structure in a sport-based service-learning initiative. *Sport Management Review*, *18*(1), 69-85.

Burton, G. (2023). *With support from the State Department, VCU's Center for Sport Leadership is leading sports diplomacy missions in Africa.* https://news.vcu.edu/article/2023/08/with-support-from-the-state-department-vcus-center-for-sport-leadership

Bush, K. A., Edwards, M. B., Jones, G. J., Hook, J. L., & Armstrong, M. L. (2016). Service learning for social change: Raising social consciousness among sport management students. *Sport Management Education Journal*, *10*(2), 127-139.

Camiré, M., Newman, T. J., Bean, C., & Strachan, L. (2022). Reimagining positive youth development and life skills in sport through a social justice lens. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *34*(6), 1058-1076.

Chiva-Bartoll, O., Ruiz-Montero, P. J., Martín-Moya, R., Pérez López, I., Giles Girela, J., García-Suárez, J., & Rivera García, E. (2019). University service-learning in physical education and sport sciences: A systematic review. *Complutense de Educación, 30*(4), 1147-1164.

Chiva-Bartoll, O., & Fernández-Rio, J. (2022). Advocating for service-learning as a pedagogical model in physical education: Towards an activist and transformative approach. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 27*(5), 545-558.

© 2024 Wyatt et al. Distributed under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license. SSWJ 6(1). Find Issues at OpenJournals.bsu.edu/SportSocialWorkJournal and SSWJ.org. https://doi.org/10.33043/xbb7d82z.

CHJS. (2023). *Coach and Staff Training.* https://chjs.org/focus/training/

Compton, B. B. (2022). Hope for a better future in an uncertain present: A social justice reflection in sport psychology. *Journal of Clinical Sport Psychology*, *16*(4), 439-452.

Cropley, B., Hanton, S., Miles, A., & Niven, A. (2010). The value of reflective practice in professional development: An applied sport psychology review. *Sport Science Review, 19*(3-4), 179.

Doc Wayne. (2023a). *Community-based Clinical Services.* https://docwayne.org/clinical services/

Doc Wayne. (2023b). *Our Curriculum.* https://docwayne.org/our-curriculum/

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), 347-356.

Eby, J. (1998). "Why service-learning is bad." *Service Learning, General.* 27. https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slceslgen/27

Francisco-Garcés, X., Salvador-Garcia, C., Maravé-Vivas, M., Chiva-Bartoll, O., & Santos Pastor, M. L. (2022). Research on service-learning in physical activity and sport: Where we have been, where we are, where we are going. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *19*(11), 6362.

Hartmann, D., & Kwauk, C. (2011). Sport and development: An overview, critique, and reconstruction. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, *35*(3), 284-305.

Heaton, J. (2022). "*Pseudonyms are used throughout": A footnote, unpacked. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *28*(1), 123-132.

Hellison, D. (1999). *Teaching personal and social responsibility through physical activity*. 1st edition. Human Kinetics.

Hellison, D. (2011). *Teaching personal and social responsibility through physical activity*. Human Kinetics.

Holder, T., & Winter, S. (2017). Experienced practitioners' use of observation in applied sport psychology. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology*, *6*(1), 6.

Holt, N. L., Neely, K. C., Slater, L. G., Camiré, M., Côté, J., Fraser-Thomas, J., ... & Tamminen, K. A. (2017). A grounded theory of positive youth development through sport based on results from a qualitative meta-study. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 10*(1), 1-49.

© 2024 Wyatt et al. Distributed under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license. SSWJ 6(1). Find Issues at OpenJournals.bsu.edu/SportSocialWorkJournal and SSWJ.org. https://doi.org/10.33043/xbb7d82z.

Huffman, A. M., & Hillyer, S. J. (2014). Service-learning: An educational model for sport and community development. In *Sport, Social Development and Peace* (Vol. 8, pp. 67-86). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Kidd, B. (2008). A new social movement: Sport for development and peace. *Sport in Society*, *11*(4), 370-380.

Klein, M., Zastoupil, G. J., & Evanovich, J. (2023). "I realize my white privilege certainly has contributed to this whole experience": White undergraduate sport management students engagement with racism in a sport-for-development service-learning course. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, *1*(aop), 1-14.

Kolb, D. A. (2014). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. FT press.

Krane, V., & Waldron, J. J. (2021). A renewed call to queer sport psychology. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *33*(5), 469-490.

Levitt, H. M. (2020). Reporting qualitative research in psychology: How to meet APA Style Journal Article Reporting Standards (Revised Edition). In American Psychological Association eBooks. https://doi.org/10.1037/0000179-000

Massey, W. V., & Whitley, M. A. (2016). The role of sport for youth amidst trauma and chaos. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, *8*(5), 487-504.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2015). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. John Wiley & Sons.

Positive Coaching Alliance. (2023). *Online Courses.* https://positivecoach.org/online-courses/

Rollins School of Public Health (2023). Critical pedagogy. Retrieved from: https://sph.emory.edu/rollins-tlc/teach-learn-principles/critical-pedagogy/index.html

Salam, M., Awang Iskandar, D. N., Ibrahim, D. H. A., & Farooq, M. S. (2019). Service learning in higher education: A systematic literature review. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *20*, 573-593.

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.

Spaaij, R., Oxford, S., & Jeanes, R. (2016). Transforming communities through sport? Critical pedagogy and sport for development. *Sport, Education and Society*, *21*(4), 570-587.

Smith, B. (2016). Narrative analysis. In E. Lyons & A. Coyle (Eds.). *Analysing qualitative data in psychology (2nd ed)* (pp. 202-221). London: Sage.

© 2024 Wyatt et al. Distributed under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license. SSWJ 6(1). Find Issues at OpenJournals.bsu.edu/SportSocialWorkJournal and SSWJ.org. https://doi.org/10.33043/xbb7d82z.

Smith, B., & McGannon, K. R. (2018). Developing rigor in qualitative research: Problems and opportunities within sport and exercise psychology. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *11*(1), 101-121.

Smith, B., & Sparkes, A. C. (2009a). Narrative analysis and sport and exercise psychology: Understanding lives in diverse ways. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *10*(2), 279-288.

Smith, B., & Sparkes, A. C. (2009b). Narrative inquiry in sport and exercise psychology: What can it mean, and why might we do it? *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *10*(1), 1-11.

Trudel, P., Milestetd, M., & Culver, D. M. (2020). What the empirical studies on sport coach education programs in higher education have to reveal: A review. *International Sport Coaching Journal, 7(*1), 61-73.

U.S. Department of Education (2018). "Improving basic programs operated by local educational agencies (Title I, Part A)." https://www2.ed.gov/programs/titleiparta/index.html

Vaismoradi, M., Turunen, H., & Bondas, T. (2013). Content analysis and thematic analysis: Implications for conducting a qualitative descriptive study. *Nursing & Health Sciences, 15*(3), 398-405.

van der Kolk, B. A. (2014). *The body keeps the score: Brain, mind, and body in the healing of trauma.* Viking.

Up2Us Sports. (2023). *Up2Us Training: Training Coaches in SBYD.* https://www.up2us.org/up2us-training

Weiss, M. R., Kipp, L. E., & Bolter, N. D. (2012). Training for life: Optimizing positive youth development through sport and physical activity. In S. Murphy (Ed.), The Oxford handbook of sport and performance psychology (pp. 448-475). Oxford University Press.

Weiss, M. R. (2013). Back to the future: Research trends in youth motivation and physical activity. *Pediatric exercise science*, *25*(4), 561-572.

Whitley, M. A., & Walsh, D. S. (2014). A framework for the design and implementation of service-learning courses. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, *85*(4), 34-39.

Whitley, M. A., Collison-Randall, H., Wright, P. M., Darnell, S. C., Schulenkorf, N., Knee, E., … & Richards, J. (2022). Moving beyond disciplinary silos: The potential for transdisciplinary research in Sport for Development. *Journal of Sport for Development, 10*(2), 1-22.

© 2024 Wyatt et al. Distributed under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license. SSWJ 6(1). Find Issues at OpenJournals.bsu.edu/SportSocialWorkJournal and SSWJ.org. https://doi.org/10.33043/xbb7d82z.

Whitley, M. A., Farrell, K., Maisonet, C., & Hoffer, A. (2017). Reflections on service-learning: Student experiences in a sport-based youth development course. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 88*(7), 23-29.

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*, 1-20.

Wollschleger, J., Killian, M., & Prewitt, K. (2020). Rethinking service learning: Reciprocity and power dynamics in community engagement. *Journal of Community Engagement and Higher Education, 12*(1), 7-15.

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

© 2024 Wyatt et al. Distributed under CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license. SSWJ 6(1). Find Issues at OpenJournals.bsu.edu/SportSocialWorkJournal and SSWJ.org. https://doi.org/10.33043/xbb7d82z.