Journal of Early Childhood Motor Development
ISSN: 3164-3272 (Online)
https://journals.smartmotionedu.id/index.php/jecmd

2026, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 85-102

Teaching Fair Play through School Physical Education: A Document Based Pedagogical Framework for Character Education

Muchamad Arif Al Ardha[1]*, Afifan Yulfadinata[1], Kolektus Oky Ristanto[1], Fuad Noor Heza[1], Anam Syaifuddin[2], Sigra Santika Satria Dhani[3]

[1]*Faculty of Sport Science and Health, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia*
[2]*SMA Negeri Model Terpadu, Bojonegoro, Indonesia*
[3]*SMP Lab School Unesa 3, Surabaya, Indonesia*

Correspondence Email: muchamadalardha@unesa.ac.id

Article Info:
Received: *2-11-2026*
Revised: *9-11-2026*
Accepted: *12-11-2026*
Online: *12-11-2026*

Keywords:
fair play; character education; physical education; personal and social responsibility; school sport; document analysis

ABSTRACT

This article examines how a community engagement programme at Lab School Unesa, Indonesia, can translate fair play intentions into explicit teaching practices and an accountable evaluation framework. A single institutional report was analysed through structured extraction of its problem statements, intended participants, activities, stakeholder responsibilities, outcomes, and supporting evidence. A purposive narrative synthesis of 60 journal articles informed interpretation and framework development; it was not a systematic review. The document identified three connected priorities: students' understanding of fair play, teachers' capacity to integrate character education into physical education, and parental support. However, the report did not provide verified attendance, intervention exposure, participant assessments, systematic observations, or completed output records. The findings therefore concern programme design and reporting, rather than demonstrated changes in students. The resulting framework connects explicit value instruction, inclusive game experiences, rotating responsibilities, guided reflection, and reinforcement across school and home. It separates programme delivery from conceptual understanding, observed conduct, and transfer beyond sport. An accompanying evaluation matrix specifies feasible evidence for each domain and highlights the need to examine implementation before interpreting outcomes. The article offers a contextually grounded design resource for Indonesian school physical education while establishing clear conditions for future empirical testing.

Journal of Early Childhood Motor Development
ISSN: 3164-3272 (Online)
https://journals.smartmotionedu.id/index.php/jecmd
2026, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 85-102

INTRODUCTION

School physical education creates repeated situations in which students must negotiate rules, respond to success and disappointment, share limited resources, and recognise the rights of others. These situations give fair play a practical educational meaning. A student may acknowledge an unnoticed foul, invite a less skilled classmate into play, or challenge an unsafe action respectfully. Such decisions connect movement learning with moral reasoning and social responsibility. Nevertheless, the educational value of these experiences depends on how teachers organise and interpret them. Reviews describe opportunities for personal and social development in physical education, while also identifying considerable variation in programme design and outcome measurement (Gould & Carson, 2008; Opstoel et al., 2020; Wandzilak, 1985).

Fair play should therefore be treated as an explicit learning purpose. Historical work on values education in physical activity and multidimensional accounts of sportspersonship provide a basis for distinguishing rule compliance, respect for others, commitment, and responses to competitive situations (Vallerand, Brière, Blanchard, & Provencher, 1997; Vallerand, Deshaies, Cuerrier, Brière, & Pelletier, 1996; Wandzilak, Carroll, & Ansorge, 1988). This distinction matters because students may obey formal rules while excluding peers, humiliating opponents, or attributing defeat to officials. Equally, respectful disagreement with an incorrect decision need not constitute disrespect. Character education requires attention to reasons, relationships, and consequences rather than obedience alone.

The institutional setting examined here is a community engagement programme titled Pendidikan Nilai-Nilai Fair Play dalam Olahraga untuk Membangun Karakter Peserta Didik di Lab School Unesa. The report situates the initiative in Surabaya and frames low understanding of fair play, limited integration of character education into physical education, and insufficient parental reinforcement as priority concerns. These statements establish the programme's rationale; they are not prevalence estimates derived from a documented student survey. The programme proposes teacher development, student education, learning materials, practical games, reflection, and family engagement.

The report also makes an unusually consequential qualification: its results chapter is a proposal-based draft, without the field records needed to verify participation or educational change. That qualification determines the appropriate scientific contribution. Presenting the initiative as a completed effectiveness study would exceed its evidence. A more defensible contribution is to examine whether its design connects identified needs, pedagogical mechanisms, stakeholder responsibilities, and measurable outcomes. Fair play reviews and research on moral behaviour indicate why these connections require explicit attention (Abad Robles, Navarro Domínguez, Cerrada Nogales, & Giménez Fuentes-Guerra, 2021; Kavussanu, 2008; Kavussanu & Stanger, 2017; Navarro Domínguez, Cerrada Nogales, Abad Robles, & Giménez Fuentes-Guerra, 2021).

This article addresses three questions. First, what priorities, activities, and evidence limitations can be established from the institutional document? Second, how can relevant scholarship inform a coherent fair play teaching framework for this setting? Third, what evidence would be necessary to evaluate implementation and outcomes without confusing intended benefits with achieved results? The contribution is a document based conceptual framework and evaluation specification, rather than a validated intervention or a systematic synthesis of intervention effects.

METHODS

Design and Source Document

The study used structured qualitative document analysis to examine one 54-page institutional PDF supplied for this article. The filename labels it as a final report, while its cover identifies it as a progress report dated August 2025. Its content includes programme justification, proposed solutions, delivery arrangements, results and conclusions chapters, references, and personnel information. The analysis treated the PDF as the primary case record and interpreted its statements in relation to their documentary function. Document analysis can clarify institutional assumptions and programme logic, but documentary assertions do not independently verify events (Bowen, 2009).

The unit of analysis was a programme statement concerning a need, intended actor, activity, responsibility, outcome, or supporting record. Administrative biographies and unrelated research histories were excluded from the pedagogical analysis. Names and the correspondence address were retained for the draft author line because they appear in the report; final author order, affiliation details, and contributions require agreement among the named authors. No student-level records, interviews, observations, or unpublished assessment datasets were available.

Extraction and Evidence Classification

The document was read to identify its central programme narrative and then examined for the relationship between proposed activities and reported evidence. An extraction matrix recorded six fields: stated problem, intended participant, planned activity, responsible actor, intended outcome, and available verification. Statements were assigned to one of three categories: documentary description of the programme, proposed delivery or outcome, and empirically supported accomplishment. Placement in the third category required an identifiable supporting record or result in the supplied file. An aspiration or a repeated claim did not satisfy that requirement.

The analysis proceeded through familiarisation, extraction, comparison across sections, and interpretive grouping. Its categories were largely directed by the programme logic rather than generated from participant accounts. Although thematic analysis provides a useful account of iterative interpretation, this exercise does not claim a full inductive thematic study, independent coding, saturation, or intercoder reliability (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The

evidence classification was especially important where the report used results-oriented headings but explicitly stated that empirical evidence was absent.

Literature Identification and Use

The contextual literature was assembled purposively from the report's references and targeted searches concerning fair play, sportspersonship, moral behaviour, Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility, Sport Education, cooperative learning, teacher development, parenting, life skills transfer, and programme evaluation. Searches and bibliographic checks were undertaken on 12 November 2026 using scholarly web discovery and Crossref metadata, supplemented by publisher and open article records. Journal articles with direct pedagogical, conceptual, measurement, or methodological relevance were retained. Books, dissertations, and unrelated administrative sources were excluded from the 60-item journal bibliography.

This was a narrative selection to inform framework construction. The requested number of references determined the bibliography size; it does not represent a count of eligible studies from an exhaustive search. No PRISMA flow, comprehensive screening denominator, duplicate screening, formal risk-of-bias assessment, or pooled analysis was undertaken. Metadata verification establishes bibliographic identity, not independent replication of each article's findings. Detailed effect estimates were therefore not used to predict local outcomes. The conceptual synthesis gives priority to the fit between a source's subject and the design issue under discussion.

Framework Construction and Ethical Boundaries

The pedagogical framework was developed by linking the report's three priorities with literature-informed teaching processes and observable evidence. Proposed components were checked for consistency with the programme's school setting, dependence on teacher capacity, and feasibility of documentation. Intervention description and process evaluation scholarship informed the distinction between what is delivered, how it operates, and what outcomes may follow (Durlak & DuPre, 2008; Hoffmann et al., 2014; Moore et al., 2015). The resulting framework has not undergone expert validation or classroom testing.

The analysis did not recruit participants or process individual student data. The supplied document does not establish an ethics approval number, consent procedure, or permission to publish identifiable student information; none is inferred here. Future classroom research involving minors would require the institutionally applicable review, guardian consent and student assent procedures, and secure data handling before collection begins. Permission to use the institutional document and the final declarations must be confirmed by the authors before journal submission.

Journal of Early Childhood Motor Development
ISSN: 3164-3272 (Online)
https://journals.smartmotionedu.id/index.php/jecmd
2026, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 85-102

RESULTS

Programme Priorities and Intended Beneficiaries

The document consistently centres fair play as an educational purpose and identifies honesty, respect, cooperation, discipline, and acceptance of results as intended values. Its main problem narrative positions students as learners whose competitive decisions require pedagogical attention. Teachers are positioned as facilitators who need practical strategies, while parents are expected to reinforce the same values outside school. The documentary finding is the presence of this three-level design; it does not demonstrate the degree of need in any participant group.

The proposed solutions address these priorities through teacher workshops, a fair play module, student discussion and simulation, recognition of sportsmanlike conduct, and parent socialisation. In principle, these activities connect classroom instruction with the wider sporting environment. However, the source does not establish student age, school level, participant count, recruitment procedures, attendance by session, or actual exposure. These omissions prevent assessment of programme reach, developmental suitability, or completeness of delivery.

Coherence and Discrepancies in the Record

The case narrative is accompanied by administrative inconsistencies. The cover and approval material refer to 2025, while another section lists an implementation period in 2024. The cover identifies IGORNAS Jawa Timur as the partner, whereas the main programme narrative identifies Lab School Unesa as the setting and beneficiary. Some passages refer to university students and digital holistic physical education teaching materials, which do not align directly with the school fair play focus. These discrepancies are treated as documentary limitations rather than resolved through assumptions.

Accordingly, the present analysis retains Lab School Unesa as the intended school setting because that interpretation is supported by the title, problem formulation, and programme objectives. IGORNAS is described only as a named partner whose precise operational role remains unverified. No actual intervention year, number of sessions, or participant total is assigned. The requested budget is not treated as disbursed expenditure. This bounded interpretation preserves the report's central pedagogical purpose without converting uncertain administrative entries into research facts.

Status of Implementation and Outcome Evidence

The results chapter explicitly states that attendance lists, actual activity dates, observation records, before-and-after assessments, a final module, and evidence of outputs were not supplied. It includes example sentences with blank fields for later completion. Those passages are reporting templates rather than data. Neither effectiveness statistics nor qualitative participant testimony can be reconstructed from them. The conclusions chapter similarly limits its conclusions to design suitability and the need to verify accomplishments.

Journal of Early Childhood Motor Development
ISSN: 3164-3272 (Online)
https://journals.smartmotionedu.id/index.php/jecmd
2026, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 85-102

Table 1 summarises the resulting evidentiary boundary. The central finding is a gap between an articulated programme logic and the documentation necessary to evaluate it. That gap is itself relevant to programme development: it identifies what must be recorded before claims about student change, teacher competence, or sustainable school culture can be assessed.

Table 1. Programme claims and evidence available in the source document

Domain	Documentary basis	Permissible interpretation
Student need	Narrative descriptions of limited fair play understanding	A stated programme concern; no measured prevalence
Teacher development	Workshops and module development proposed	An intended strategy; no verified competence change
Student participation	Education, games, simulation and reflection planned	No confirmed reach, dose or behavioural effect
Parent engagement	Socialisation and reinforcement proposed	No verified attendance or change in family support
Programme outputs	Articles, media, video, intellectual property and cooperation listed	Targets only; completion evidence not supplied
Administrative identity	Conflicting year, partner and beneficiary entries	Requires institutional clarification before empirical reporting

A Framework Connecting Values with Learning Opportunities

The conceptual result is an integrated teaching sequence with five connected processes: clarify a value, create an opportunity to enact it, distribute responsibility, examine the decision through reflection, and reinforce the value across settings. These processes operationalise the report's intended activities. They are proposed design principles, not observations of lessons already delivered.

For example, a teacher can introduce honesty by discussing why an unnoticed foul matters, arrange a game with student officiating, rotate the official and player roles, and ask students to explain a disputed incident. The teacher then helps students identify a comparable situation in classroom work or family life. The value becomes visible in a decision and its explanation. In this framework, winning remains compatible with educational goals when the conditions of competition protect participation and dignity.

Journal of Early Childhood Motor Development
ISSN: 3164-3272 (Online)
https://journals.smartmotionedu.id/index.php/jecmd
2026, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 85-102

DISCUSSION

From General Sportsmanship to Explicit Moral Learning

The document's emphasis on fair play is educationally promising, but a broad value label is insufficient to guide instruction. The distinction between understanding, intention, and behaviour should shape lesson planning. A student may identify an appropriate response on a worksheet while behaving differently when peers reward aggression. Research on observed behaviour and the measurement of prosocial and antisocial conduct offers a reason to examine actions and their recipients separately (Kavussanu & Boardley, 2009; Kavussanu, Stamp, Slade, & Ring, 2009). Helping a teammate and refraining from insulting an opponent are related but distinct outcomes.

Teachers also need to attend to how students justify questionable conduct. Moral disengagement research provides a conceptual basis for examining excuses that minimise harm, shift responsibility, or normalise unfair behaviour (Boardley & Kavussanu, 2007; Kavussanu, 2006; Kavussanu & Roberts, 2001). In a school lesson, these ideas can inform questions about responsibility without labelling children as morally deficient. A disagreement can be examined through what happened, who was affected, what alternatives were available, and how the relationship might be repaired.

The sportspersonship literature further suggests that fair play is multidimensional. For this programme, each target value should be expressed as an age-appropriate learning intention and at least one observable indicator. Honesty may involve reporting one's own rule violation; respect may involve listening and disagreeing without humiliation; cooperation may involve offering meaningful roles to classmates. The teacher should also invite discussion about unfair rules or inaccessible tasks. Fair play education loses credibility when students are asked to respect a structure that repeatedly excludes them.

Combining Pedagogical Resources with Clear Boundaries

Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility offers a suitable organising resource because the programme explicitly seeks personal conduct, interpersonal respect, and transfer. Reviews and implementation research support attention to both teaching processes and intended developmental outcomes (Aygun et al., 2024; Hellison & Walsh, 2002; Pozo, Grao-Cruces, & Pérez-Ordás, 2018; Shen, Martinek, & Dyson, 2022). For Lab School Unesa, this means that responsibility should appear in teacher language, task choices, opportunities for student leadership, and reflection. A brief speech at the beginning of a lesson cannot establish sustained enactment of a responsibility model.

Programme studies in school and youth settings provide contextual examples of responsibility-oriented practice (Escartí, Gutiérrez, Pascual, & Marín, 2010; Lee & Martinek, 2009; Pascual et al., 2011). Their role here is illustrative. Differences in age, teacher preparation, culture, and delivery intensity prevent direct prediction of outcomes in Surabaya. If the school later claims implementation of a named model, the report should describe which defining practices were used, how regularly they occurred, and what

adaptations were made. A module informed by a model should not automatically be described as a validated application of that model.

Sport Education contributes another set of practical resources, including affiliation, student roles, record keeping, and organised competition. Reviews establish a substantial literature on learning and social experience within the model, while leaving open questions about implementation and contextual transfer (Araújo, Mesquita, & Hastie, 2014; Evangelio Caballero, Sierra-Díaz, González-Víllora, & Fernández-Rio, 2018; Farias, Mesquita, & Hastie, 2016; Hastie, Martínez de Ojeda, & Calderón Luquin, 2011; Wallhead & O'Sullivan, 2005). In this case, rotating responsibilities can help students encounter the consequences of decisions from different positions. A player who later becomes an official may recognise why respectful communication and clear rules matter.

Nevertheless, role allocation must be equitable. A technically skilled student should not permanently become team captain while less skilled students remain peripheral assistants. Reviews of personal and social outcomes in Sport Education and a citizenship-oriented intervention provide reasons to make participation and responsibility visible (Bessa, Hastie, Araújo, & Mesquita, 2019; Viciana, Casado-Robles, Pérez-Macías, & Mayorga-Vega, 2020). Teachers can keep a simple rotation register and ask students whether their assigned responsibilities were meaningful. These records would establish access to opportunities rather than prove character change.

Cooperative learning can make the social conditions of practice more deliberate through shared goals, individual accountability, supportive interaction, and group reflection. Its theoretical relationship with other student-centred approaches and its application in elementary physical education are relevant to the proposed programme (Casey & Goodyear, 2015; Dyson, 2001; Dyson, Griffin, & Hastie, 2004). A practical task might require each group member to explain a fair play decision or demonstrate how to include another participant. Group success should depend on contributions from all students, while assessments still identify individual understanding.

A hybrid design can draw on these resources without implying that combining models is inherently superior. An intervention concerning Sport Education and sportspersonship and a comparison of responsibility-oriented teaching combinations demonstrate the relevance of examining the particular configuration used (Burgueño & Medina-Casaubón, 2020; Pan, Huang, Lee, & Hsu, 2019). For the present programme, a small, teachable set of practices is preferable to an extensive terminology list. The essential design question is whether the chosen structure supplies repeated opportunities to make, explain, and revisit fair decisions.

Competition and The Motivational Environment

Competition exposes students to emotionally meaningful situations, which makes it useful for fair play learning but also creates risks of exclusion and hostile comparison. Motivational climate research and self-determination theory suggest attending to how competence, autonomy, belonging, and success are communicated (Ntoumanis & Standage, 2009; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Vasconcellos et al., 2020). Teachers can preserve challenge while

recognising improvement, effort, strategic cooperation, and respectful conduct. Such recognition should be specific enough for students to understand which action is being valued.

The report proposes a Fair Play Student of the Month award. This can become a teaching resource if the criteria identify concrete behaviour and students understand how decisions are made. It may become counterproductive if the same popular or highly skilled students receive recognition or if children behave fairly only when an award is available. Recognition should therefore include reflection on the action, opportunities to improve, and protection against public shaming. Research connecting responsibility, sportsmanship, and violent attitudes supports examining these dimensions together rather than treating one award as a comprehensive indicator (Courel-Ibáñez, Sánchez-Alcaraz, Gómez-Mármol, Valero-Valenzuela, & Moreno-Murcia, 2019).

Direct fair play interventions and school behaviour programmes provide examples of making social goals explicit in physical education (Gil-Madrona et al., 2019; Hassandra, Goudas, Hatzigeorgiadis, & Theodorakis, 2007). They do not establish that the present programme has achieved the same results. For Lab School Unesa, an appropriate first step would be a small documented pilot that records whether students understand the activities and whether teachers can deliver them consistently. Any later outcome study should use these feasibility findings to refine the intervention before expanding it.

Teacher Development as Supported Classroom Practice

The report appropriately identifies teacher capacity as a central condition. A workshop may introduce concepts, but integrating values into live games requires teachers to notice incidents, interpret competing concerns, manage emotions, and respond without stopping meaningful movement learning. Research on professional learning in physical education highlights collaborative and practice-connected approaches (Armour, Quennerstedt, Chambers, & Makopoulou, 2017; Armour & Yelling, 2007). For this case, teacher development could include co-planning, demonstration lessons, brief observation, and joint revision of materials.

A module should provide more than definitions of honesty or respect. It should include learning intentions, examples of dilemmas, adaptable activity rules, prompts for reflection, indicators for observation, and advice on responding to conflict. Teachers should be able to adjust activities to students' developmental and movement needs. The module's version, review history, and classroom use should be recorded separately from teacher confidence. A completed document and competent implementation are different accomplishments.

Fidelity should be understood as evidence about whether core learning opportunities occurred, together with documentation of sensible adaptations. The proposed monitoring should identify whether a value was introduced, a practical decision opportunity was provided, participation was distributed, and reflection followed. Existing work on fidelity in school responsibility programmes is particularly relevant to this distinction (Escartí, Llopis-Goig, & Wright, 2018). A teacher may adapt a game's rules while preserving the intended

moral learning process; conversely, following an activity sheet exactly may still leave quieter students excluded.

Parents and The Wider School Environment

Parents influence how children interpret performance, disappointment, and the behaviour of opponents and officials. The report's parent component should therefore focus on usable communication rather than attendance alone. Parenting scholarship in youth sport and research on the broader developmental contexts of organised sport provide useful contextual perspectives (Bean, Fortier, Post, & Chima, 2014; Harwood & Knight, 2015). A short school guide might encourage parents to ask what the child learned, how teammates were supported, and how a difficult decision was handled.

The role of adults extends to coaches, officials, and spectators. Work on a respect initiative in football and on referees' educational perspectives illustrates why the sporting environment cannot be reduced to student behaviour (Andersson, 2019; Brackenridge, Pitchford, & Wilson, 2011). In the school setting, adults should apply agreed communication standards, avoid humiliating responses, and use consistent approaches to disagreement. Public praise for winning at any cost would undermine a lesson that asks students to acknowledge their own fouls.

Parent attendance, receipt of a guide, and later changes in communication must be reported as separate indicators. Sending an invitation does not demonstrate engagement, and participation in a meeting does not establish behavioural change. The school can collect anonymous feedback on clarity and feasibility before considering follow-up interviews or parent diaries. Such records should be proportionate to the programme's capacity and avoid intrusive monitoring of family life.

Transfer Beyond The Playing Field

A central ambition of character education is that students use what they learn beyond sport. Positive youth development scholarship and reviews of life skills identify transfer as an important but demanding educational problem (Fraser-Thomas, Côté, & Deakin, 2005; Hermens, Super, Verkooijen, & Koelen, 2017; Holt, 2025; Holt et al., 2017). The framework therefore includes explicit connections between a game situation and another setting. A student might compare acknowledging a foul with acknowledging an error in group work, while recognising that the contexts are not identical.

Conceptual work on life skills transfer also directs attention to developmental settings and relationships (Jacobs & Wright, 2018). Youth leadership, coaching, and life skills transfer research provides additional resources for designing these connections (Gould, Collins, Lauer, & Chung, 2007; Martinek, Schilling, & Johnson, 2001; Pierce, Gould, & Camiré, 2017). In this programme, transfer can be supported through short reflection prompts, examples from classroom cooperation, and opportunities to report or discuss a later decision. Transfer should remain a hypothesis until evidence from the receiving setting is available. A sportsmanship questionnaire administered immediately after a lesson cannot independently demonstrate fair conduct at home or in another class.

Journal of Early Childhood Motor Development
ISSN: 3164-3272 (Online)
https://journals.smartmotionedu.id/index.php/jecmd
2026, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 85-102

A useful distinction is between transfer opportunity, student intention, reported application, and independently observed application. These levels require different evidence and should not be combined into a single success statement. A future study could begin with feasibility questions: whether children understand the transfer prompts, whether teachers can collect brief examples, and whether another classroom teacher can provide observations without excessive burden. This approach makes the developmental ambition assessable while respecting uncertainty.

Proposed Evaluation and Research Agenda

A future evaluation should begin by confirming the programme's administrative identity, target group, actual dates, and institutional roles. It should then document reach, dose, delivery quality, adaptation, and participant response before drawing conclusions about outcomes. Implementation research indicates why the quality of delivery can influence the interpretation of programme results (Durlak & DuPre, 2008; Moore et al., 2015). An absent effect may reflect an ineffective mechanism, insufficient exposure, unsuitable measurement, or a combination of these factors.

Table 2 translates the framework into a prospective evaluation matrix. The indicators are recommendations for future use. No values in the table represent findings from the supplied report. Instruments should undergo age and language adaptation, review for cultural relevance, and pilot testing. Measures developed for competitive athletes should not be transferred unchanged to schoolchildren. Observation also requires definitions, sufficient opportunities for behaviour, and procedures for checking agreement between observers.

Table 2. Prospective evidence matrix for a fair play education pilot

Domain	Proposed indicator	Evidence and interpretation
Reach and exposure	Unique participants; attendance; session duration	Dated rosters and logs; distinguish reach from completion
Implementation	Value instruction, decision opportunities, role rotation and reflection	Lesson checklist and sampled observation; record adaptations
Understanding	Recognition and explanation of age-appropriate fair play dilemmas	Piloted scenario tasks; separate knowledge from conduct
Prosocial conduct	Helping, encouragement and inclusive role sharing	Observation with opportunities and context recorded
Antisocial conduct	Insults, deliberate unfair play and exclusion	Separate frequency and severity; avoid inferring change from silence
Teacher practice	Use of objectives, feedback and reflective questions	Lesson plans and observations; attendance alone is insufficient

Journal of Early Childhood Motor Development
ISSN: 3164-3272 (Online)
https://journals.smartmotionedu.id/index.php/jecmd
2026, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 85-102

Domain	Proposed indicator	Evidence and interpretation
Home reinforcement and transfer	Value-focused discussion and application in another setting	Parent feedback and cross-setting examples; distinguish report from independent observation

If feasibility is established, a subsequent study could compare the programme with usual physical education at the class level, provided the available number of classes and school arrangements justify that design. Baseline differences, clustering, missing data, and teacher involvement would need to be addressed in advance. If only a single group can be studied, before-and-after differences should be reported as changes following participation, with limited causal interpretation. Estimates and uncertainty should receive more attention than a binary statement of statistical significance.

Qualitative evidence could explain how students experience recognition, peer roles, and disagreement. Interviews or structured reflections should include quieter students and those who find competition difficult, rather than only enthusiastic participants. Observation of classroom practice could identify whether the framework protects inclusion. Such data would help explain mechanisms and adaptations; they would not compensate for missing outcome measurements or justify unsupported generalisations.

The first development cycle should prioritise a usable module, clear behavioural definitions, and reliable delivery records. A second cycle could examine feasibility and acceptability, followed by an appropriately designed outcome study. Wider implementation should depend on evidence that teachers can maintain the practices and that students experience the programme as fair. This staged agenda provides a route from a community engagement proposal to a credible body of research.

Limitations

The analysis is based on one institutional document and cannot establish what occurred outside that record. The source contains template material, inconsistent administrative details, and explicit gaps in implementation evidence. Those features limit both descriptive certainty and transferability. No independent verification with teachers, students, parents, or partner organisations was undertaken. The proposed framework consequently represents an interpretation and design contribution rather than a validated explanation of school practice.

The literature component is purposive and shaped partly by the requested bibliography size. It is vulnerable to selection bias and does not establish an exhaustive balance of favourable and unfavourable findings. Much of the cited literature comes from settings outside Indonesia or from youth sport rather than compulsory physical education. The article therefore uses it to justify design questions and conceptual distinctions, without assuming cultural equivalence or forecasting local effects.

The framework itself requires co-development with teachers and students. Operational definitions, teaching examples, recognition practices, and parent communication may need substantial adaptation to the school level and local circumstances. No claim is made that the proposed combination is the most effective approach or that all components are necessary. Empirical testing must examine both educational benefits and possible unintended consequences, including exclusion, compliance without understanding, and burdens on teachers.

CONCLUSION

The Lab School Unesa report articulates a coherent aspiration to connect student fair play, teacher pedagogy, and parental reinforcement, but it does not provide the evidence needed to demonstrate implementation or character development. Its strongest contribution at this stage is a programme design that can be clarified, documented, and tested. The proposed framework translates general values into explicit instruction, inclusive decisions during games, shared responsibility, reflection, and connections beyond sport. Separating delivery, understanding, conduct, and transfer makes future claims more precise. Progress toward an international empirical publication will depend on verified programme records and ethically collected participant evidence; the present manuscript contributes a conceptual basis for that work.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgement of Lab School Unesa, IGORNAS Jawa Timur, and other contributors should be finalised after their roles and permission are confirmed.

FUNDING STATEMENT

Funding. The source identifies the Unesa non-APBN community engagement scheme and lists a proposed budget of IDR 30,000,000. Award status, grant identifier, and actual funding received must be confirmed before submission.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Ethics and consent. This article analyses a supplied institutional document and reports no newly collected participant data. The authors must confirm the applicable institutional determination and permission to use the source. No ethics approval number or participant consent is asserted.

REFERENCES

Abad Robles, M. T., Navarro Domínguez, B., Cerrada Nogales, J. A., & Giménez Fuentes-Guerra, F. J. (2021). The development of respect in young athletes: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLOS ONE, 16*(6), e0252643. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0252643

Andersson, E. (2019). A referee perspective on the educational practice of competitive youth games: Exploring the pedagogical function of parents, coaches and referees in grassroots soccer. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 24*(6), 615–628. https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2019.1652806

Araújo, R., Mesquita, I., & Hastie, P. A. (2014). Review of the status of learning in research on Sport Education: Future research and practice. *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine, 13*(4), 846–858. https://www.jssm.org/jssm-13-846.xml-Fulltext

Armour, K., Quennerstedt, M., Chambers, F., & Makopoulou, K. (2017). What is 'effective' CPD for contemporary physical education teachers? A Deweyan framework. *Sport, Education and Society, 22*(7), 799–811. https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2015.1083000

Armour, K. M., & Yelling, M. (2007). Effective professional development for physical education teachers: The role of informal, collaborative learning. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 26*(2), 177–200. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.26.2.177

Aygun, Y., Boke, H., Yagin, F. H., Tufekci, S., Murathan, T., Gencay, E., ... Ardigò, L. P. (2024). Emotional and social outcomes of the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility model in physical education: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Children, 11*(4), 459. https://doi.org/10.3390/children11040459

Bean, C., Fortier, M., Post, C., & Chima, K. (2014). Understanding how organized youth sport may be harming individual players within the family unit: A literature review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 11*(10), 10226–10268. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph111010226

Bessa, C., Hastie, P., Araújo, R., & Mesquita, I. (2019). What do we know about the development of personal and social skills within the Sport Education model: A systematic review. *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine, 18*(4), 812–829. https://www.jssm.org/jssm-18-812.xml-Fulltext

Boardley, I. D., & Kavussanu, M. (2007). Development and validation of the moral disengagement in sport scale. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 29*(5), 608–628. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.29.5.608

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal, 9*(2), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.3316/qrj0902027

Brackenridge, C., Pitchford, A., & Wilson, M. (2011). Respect: Results of a pilot project designed to improve behaviour in English football. *Managing Leisure, 16*(3), 175–191. https://doi.org/10.1080/13606719.2011.583406

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Burgueño, R., & Medina-Casaubón, J. (2020). Sport education and sportsmanship orientations: An intervention in high school students. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17*(3), 837. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17030837

Casey, A., & Goodyear, V. A. (2015). Can cooperative learning achieve the four learning outcomes of physical education? A review of literature. *Quest, 67*(1), 56–72. https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2014.984733

Courel-Ibáñez, J., Sánchez-Alcaraz, B. J., Gómez-Mármol, A., Valero-Valenzuela, A., & Moreno-Murcia, J. A. (2019). The moderating role of sportsmanship and violent attitudes on social and personal responsibility in adolescents. A clustering-classification approach. *PLOS ONE, 14*(2), e0211933. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0211933

Durlak, J. A., & DuPre, E. P. (2008). Implementation matters: A review of research on the influence of implementation on program outcomes and the factors affecting implementation. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 41*(3-4), 327–350. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-008-9165-0

Dyson, B. (2001). Cooperative learning in an elementary physical education program. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 20*(3), 264–281. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.20.3.264

Dyson, B., Griffin, L. L., & Hastie, P. (2004). Sport education, tactical games, and cooperative learning: Theoretical and pedagogical considerations. *Quest, 56*(2), 226–240. https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2004.10491823

Escartí, A., Gutiérrez, M., Pascual, C., & Marín, D. (2010). Application of Hellison's Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility model in physical education to improve self-efficacy for adolescents at risk of dropping-out of school. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology, 13*(2), 667–676. https://doi.org/10.1017/s113874160000233x

Escartí, A., Llopis-Goig, R., & Wright, P. M. (2018). Assessing the implementation fidelity of a school-based Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility program in physical education and other subject areas. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 37*(1), 12–23. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2016-0200

Evangelio Caballero, C., Sierra-Díaz, M. J., González-Víllora, S., & Fernández-Rio, F. J. (2018). The Sport Education model in elementary and secondary education: A systematic review. *Movimento, 24*(3), 931–946. https://doi.org/10.22456/1982-8918.81689

Farias, C. F. G., Mesquita, I. M. R., & Hastie, P. A. (2016). The Sport Education model: Research update and future avenues for practice and investigation. *Revista Portuguesa de Ciências do Desporto, 16*(1), 73–96. https://doi.org/10.5628/rpcd.16.01.73

Fraser-Thomas, J. L., Côté, J., & Deakin, J. (2005). Youth sport programs: An avenue to foster positive youth development. *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy, 10*(1), 19–40. https://doi.org/10.1080/1740898042000334890

Gil-Madrona, P., Gutiérrez-Marín, E. C., Cupani, M., Samalot-Rivera, A., Díaz-Suárez, A., & López-Sánchez, G. F. (2019). The effects of an appropriate behavior program on elementary school children social skills development in physical education. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*, 1998. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01998

Gould, D., & Carson, S. (2008). Life skills development through sport: Current status and future directions. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 1*(1), 58–78. https://doi.org/10.1080/17509840701834573

Gould, D., Collins, K., Lauer, L., & Chung, Y. (2007). Coaching life skills through football: A study of award winning high school coaches. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 19*(1), 16–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200601113786

Harwood, C. G., & Knight, C. J. (2015). Parenting in youth sport: A position paper on parenting expertise. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 16*, 24–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2014.03.001

Hassandra, M., Goudas, M., Hatzigeorgiadis, A., & Theodorakis, Y. (2007). A fair play intervention program in school Olympic education. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 22*(2), 99–114. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf03173516

Hastie, P. A., Martínez de Ojeda, D., & Calderón Luquin, A. (2011). A review of research on Sport Education: 2004 to the present. *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy, 16*(2), 103–132. https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2010.535202

Hellison, D., & Walsh, D. (2002). Responsibility-based youth programs evaluation: Investigating the investigations. *Quest, 54*(4), 292–307. https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2002.10491780

Hermens, N., Super, S., Verkooijen, K. T., & Koelen, M. A. (2017). A systematic review of life skill development through sports programs serving socially vulnerable youth. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 88*(4), 408–424. https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2017.1355527

Hoffmann, T. C., Glasziou, P. P., Boutron, I., Milne, R., Perera, R., Moher, D., ... Michie, S. (2014). Better reporting of interventions: Template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide. *BMJ, 348*, g1687. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.g1687

Holt, N. (2025). Positive youth development through sport: What works, under what circumstances, for whom? And what's next? *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 80*, 102917. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2025.102917

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. https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984x.2016.1180704

Jacobs, J. M., & Wright, P. M. (2018). Transfer of life skills in sport-based youth development programs: A conceptual framework bridging learning to application. *Quest, 70*(1), 81–99. https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2017.1348304

Kavussanu, M. (2006). Motivational predictors of prosocial and antisocial behaviour in football. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 24*(6), 575–588. https://doi.org/10.1080/02640410500190825

Kavussanu, M. (2008). Moral behaviour in sport: A critical review of the literature. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 1*(2), 124–138. https://doi.org/10.1080/17509840802277417

Kavussanu, M., & Boardley, I. D. (2009). The prosocial and antisocial behavior in sport scale. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 31*(1), 97–117. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.31.1.97

Kavussanu, M., & Roberts, G. C. (2001). Moral functioning in sport: An achievement goal perspective. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 23*(1), 37–54. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.23.1.37

Kavussanu, M., Stamp, R., Slade, G., & Ring, C. (2009). Observed prosocial and antisocial behaviors in male and female soccer players. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 21*(sup1), S62–S76. https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200802624292

Kavussanu, M., & Stanger, N. (2017). Moral behavior in sport. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 16*, 185–192. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.05.010

Lee, O., & Martinek, T. (2009). Navigating two cultures: An investigation of cultures of a responsibility-based physical activity program and school. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 80*(2), 230–240. https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2009.10599557

Martinek, T., Schilling, T., & Johnson, D. (2001). Transferring personal and social responsibility of underserved youth to the classroom. *The Urban Review, 33*(1), 29–45. https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1010332812171

Moore, G. F., Audrey, S., Barker, M., Bond, L., Bonell, C., Hardeman, W., ... Baird, J. (2015). Process evaluation of complex interventions: Medical research council guidance. *BMJ, 350*, h1258. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.h1258

Navarro Domínguez, B., Cerrada Nogales, J. A., Abad Robles, M. T., & Giménez Fuentes-Guerra, F. J. (2021). The development of fair play in physical education and school sports: A systematic review. *European Journal of Contemporary Education, 10*(2), 308–323. https://doi.org/10.13187/ejced.2021.2.308

Ntoumanis, N., & Standage, M. (2009). Morality in sport: A self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 21*(4), 365–380. https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200903036040

Opstoel, K., Chapelle, L., Prins, F. J., De Meester, A., Haerens, L., van Tartwijk, J., & De Martelaer, K. (2020). Personal and social development in physical education and sports: A review study. *European Physical Education Review, 26*(4), 797–813. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336x19882054

Pan, Y.-H., Huang, C.-H., Lee, I.-S., & Hsu, W.-T. (2019). Comparison of learning effects of merging TPSR respectively with Sport Education and traditional teaching model in high school physical education classes. *Sustainability, 11*(7), 2057. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11072057

Pascual, C., Escartí, A., Llopis, R., Gutiérrez, M., Marín, D., & Wright, P. M. (2011). Implementation fidelity of a program designed to promote personal and social responsibility through physical education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 82*(3), 499–511. https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2011.10599783

Pierce, S., Gould, D., & Camiré, M. (2017). Definition and model of life skills transfer. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 10*(1), 186–211. https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984x.2016.1199727

Pozo, P., Grao-Cruces, A., & Pérez-Ordás, R. (2018). Teaching personal and social responsibility model-based programmes in physical education: A systematic review. *European Physical Education Review, 24*(1), 56–75. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336x16664749

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 68–78. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.55.1.68

Shen, Y., Martinek, T., & Dyson, B. P. (2022). Navigating the processes and products of the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility model: A systematic literature review. *Quest, 74*(1), 91–107. https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2021.2017988

Vallerand, R. J., Brière, N. M., Blanchard, C., & Provencher, P. (1997). Development and validation of the multidimensional sportspersonship orientations scale. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 19*(2), 197–206. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.19.2.197

Vallerand, R. J., Deshaies, P., Cuerrier, J.-P., Brière, N. M., & Pelletier, L. G. (1996). Toward a multidimensional definition of sportsmanship. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 8*(1), 89–101. https://doi.org/10.1080/10413209608406310

Vasconcellos, D., Parker, P. D., Hilland, T., Cinelli, R., Owen, K. B., Kapsal, N., ... Lonsdale, C. (2020). Self-determination theory applied to physical education: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 112*(7), 1444–1469. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000420

Viciana, J., Casado-Robles, C., Pérez-Macías, L., & Mayorga-Vega, D. (2020). A Sport Education teaching unit as a citizenship education strategy in physical education. A group-randomized controlled trial. *Retos*, (38), 44–52. https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v38i38.73546

Wallhead, T., & O'Sullivan, M. (2005). Sport education: Physical education for the new millennium? *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy, 10*(2), 181–210. https://doi.org/10.1080/17408980500105098

Wandzilak, T. (1985). Values development through physical education and athletics. *Quest, 37*(2), 176–185. https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.1985.10483832

Wandzilak, T., Carroll, T., & Ansorge, C. J. (1988). Values development through physical activity: Promoting sportsmanlike behaviors, perceptions, and moral reasoning. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 8*(1), 13–22. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.8.1.13