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

2026, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 66-84

Integrating Character Education into Physical Education through Teacher Professional Learning A Conceptual Framework Informed by an Indonesian University Community Engagement Report

Muchamad Arif Al Ardha[1*], Heryanto Nur Muhammad[1], Nurhasan[1], Advendi Kristiyandaru[1], Rahmawati Al Adha Nikmah[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:
character education; physical education; teacher professional development; personal and social responsibility; cooperative learning; Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This conceptual article develops a framework for integrating character education into Indonesian physical education through teacher professional learning. The framework is informed by a university community engagement report prepared with the Teacher Professional Education programme at Universitas Negeri Surabaya and a targeted narrative synthesis of international journal literature. The report is treated as a programme design document because it explicitly identifies attendance records, paired assessment scores, teaching products, classroom observations, and student outcomes as unavailable for verification. Consequently, the article reports a conceptual contribution rather than intervention effectiveness. The proposed framework links observable character objectives with responsibility-based teaching, structured cooperative tasks, supported student agency, reflection, and explicit transfer beyond physical education. Teacher learning follows a cycle of collaborative planning, rehearsal, feedback, classroom enactment, and revision. Evaluation distinguishes programme delivery, teacher learning, instructional quality, student behaviour, and transfer. The framework provides a context-sensitive basis for developing teaching modules while preserving the distinction between intended mechanisms and demonstrated outcomes. Future studies should examine feasibility, implementation fidelity, measurement quality, and sustained behavioural change before making causal claims or scaling the programme.

Journal of Early Childhood Motor Development
ISSN: 3164-3272 (Online)
https://journals.smartmotionedu.id/index.php/jecmd
2026, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 66-84

INTRODUCTION

Character education in physical education concerns how young people learn to act responsibly toward themselves and others during movement, competition, cooperation, and disagreement. Lessons provide visible situations in which students share equipment, negotiate rules, report scores, respond to mistakes, and distribute opportunities. These situations create educational possibilities, but participation alone does not establish that moral learning has occurred. Reviews describe broad potential benefits of physical education while also showing that outcomes depend on the learning environment, the quality of teaching, and the outcomes selected for assessment (Bailey et al., 2009; Bailey, 2006; Opstoel et al., 2020).

A central problem is the distance between naming a value and teaching it. A lesson plan may list honesty or cooperation without identifying the behaviour students should practise, the task conditions that invite that behaviour, or the evidence that would show progress. Teachers consequently need more than a vocabulary of virtues. They need strategies for translating intentions into movement tasks, decisions, feedback, and assessment. Research on teachers' interpretations of personal and social development is particularly relevant because it directs attention to how educational aims become operational classroom practices (Opstoel et al., 2022).

This problem is addressed in the Indonesian subject Pendidikan Jasmani, Olahraga, dan Kesehatan, commonly abbreviated as PJOK. The source report describes a university community engagement programme involving the Teacher Professional Education programme, or PPG, at Universitas Negeri Surabaya. It identifies limited pedagogical understanding and limited access to mentoring as programme concerns. The intended response combines workshops, teaching simulations, module development, and follow-up support. These concerns are the programme authors' stated rationale; the supplied report does not provide a separately documented needs-assessment dataset.

Although the document is labelled a final report, its substantive results chapter states that implementation records and assessment evidence remain unavailable. This distinction changes the appropriate article genre. It would be misleading to convert planned workshops into completed interventions, or literature-supported expectations into measured local outcomes. The present article therefore develops a conceptual framework grounded in the documented programme design and international scholarship. It does not present an experimental study, an evaluation of participant improvement, or a systematic review.

The article addresses three questions. First, how can character values be translated into teachable and observable practices in physical education? Second, what professional learning arrangements could support teachers in enacting those practices? Third, what evidence would be required to distinguish programme delivery from changes in teaching, student behaviour, and transfer? Its contribution is a coherent design and evaluation framework for university–teacher education partnerships, with explicit boundaries around what the available documentation can establish.

Journal of Early Childhood Motor Development
ISSN: 3164-3272 (Online)
https://journals.smartmotionedu.id/index.php/jecmd
2026, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 66-84

CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS

Character as Situated Educational Practice

Character objectives should retain their ethical meaning while being expressed through actions that can be discussed and observed. Reporting an out-of-bounds ball honestly, allowing a less confident peer to contribute, or accepting a legitimate decision can provide concrete material for reflection. However, the interpretation of an action depends on circumstances. Silence may reflect uncertainty or exclusion rather than respect; high compliance may reflect fear rather than responsibility. Teachers should therefore combine behavioural observation with dialogue and avoid treating a single action as a stable personal trait. Scholarship on moral behaviour and social development offers a basis for examining these distinctions (Bredemeier & Shields, 1984; Cecchini, Montero, Alonso, Izquierdo, & Contreras, 2007; Kavussanu & Boardley, 2009; Kavussanu & Ntoumanis, 2003).

A useful starting point is to select a small number of values for each instructional unit and define their relationship to the movement objective. For example, a passing task may target ball control alongside equitable distribution of passes. Technical success and cooperation remain distinct assessment dimensions. A student can pass accurately while excluding peers, or show care while still developing motor competence. Keeping these dimensions separate reduces the risk that athletic performance becomes a proxy for character.

Personal and Social Responsibility

Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility, or TPSR, offers a pedagogical reference for respect, effort, self-direction, helping, leadership, and learning beyond the immediate activity. Its relevance lies in organising teacher–student relationships and opportunities for responsibility, rather than adding an isolated moral message at the end of a lesson. Reviews and evaluations provide a basis for considering responsibility-oriented approaches while also emphasising variation in programme quality and implementation (Aygun et al., 2024; Baptista et al., 2020; Escartí, Gutiérrez, Pascual, & Marín, 2010; Gordon, 2020; Hellion & Walsh, 2002; Pozo, Grao-Cruces, & Pérez-Ordás, 2018; Sánchez-Miguel, Álvarez-Sánchez, Hortigüela-Alcalá, Pérez-Pueyo, & Tapia-Serrano, 2025; Shen, Martinek, & Dyson, 2022).

For the proposed framework, responsibility is developed through supported choices and revisable commitments. Students can agree on a manageable task, explain their role, monitor whether they fulfil it, and discuss the consequences for others. Teacher guidance remains necessary, particularly when safety, exclusion, or unequal power affects participation. Student responsibility should not become a reason to withdraw support or to blame learners for conditions beyond their control. Implementation research is useful here because it separates the presence of a model label from the actual teaching processes students experience (Pascual et al., 2011).

Structured Cooperation and Student Roles

Cooperative learning provides a complementary account of how social interaction can be organised. Assigning students to groups is insufficient. Tasks need a shared goal, meaningful individual contributions, opportunities for mutual assistance, and time to examine group functioning. Reviews of cooperative learning in physical education highlight the importance of implementation quality and caution against generalising from short or fragmented applications (Bjørke & Mordal Moen, 2020; Boke et al., 2025; Bores-García, Hortigüela-Alcalá, Fernandez-Rio, González-Calvo, & Barba-Martín, 2021; Casey & Goodyear, 2015; Dyson, 2001; Dyson, 2002; Zach, Shoval, & Shulruf, 2023).

Sport Education contributes a further perspective on affiliation, role responsibility, and sustained participation. Roles such as equipment coordinator, observer, referee, or peer coach can create occasions to practise judgement and care. Their educational value depends on role clarity, equitable rotation, and feedback. Without these conditions, leadership may repeatedly accrue to confident or highly skilled students, while others perform peripheral tasks. Research on Sport Education and hybrid approaches provides a rationale for using roles deliberately, rather than assuming that competition or team membership automatically produces social development (Dyson, Griffin, & Hastie, 2004; Hastie & Buchanan, 2000; Hastie, de Ojeda, & Luquin, 2011).

Motivation and Supported Agency

The proposed framework also draws on self-determination theory to explain why the quality of participation matters. Students require understandable expectations and meaningful support when making choices. A teacher can explain why a safety rule matters, offer an appropriate choice of challenge, and provide feedback that identifies progress and a next step. Autonomy support operates alongside clear structure; it does not require unrestricted choice or the removal of teacher responsibility (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Reeve, 2006; Standage, Duda, & Ntoumanis, 2005; Vasconcellos et al., 2020).

For character education, this perspective shifts attention from public compliance toward understanding and ownership. Asking students why a fair procedure protects everyone may be more educational than demanding obedience without explanation. Nevertheless, motivation and moral judgement are not interchangeable constructs. Enjoyment, perceived autonomy, and engagement can support participation, but none alone demonstrates honesty, care, or transfer. An evaluation must define these outcomes separately rather than combine them into a single favourable score.

Transfer Beyond the Lesson

Transfer refers to the application of learning in a context different from the original activity. A learner who cooperates in a structured game may not necessarily use the same skill in another classroom, at home, or in an unstructured peer interaction. Life-skills scholarship therefore provides a useful distinction between opportunities embedded in sport and explicit teaching that helps learners recognise, practise, and review application

elsewhere (Bean, Kramers, Forneris, & Camiré, 2018; Camiré, Trudel, & Forneris, 2012; Gordon & Doyle, 2015; Jacobs & Wright, 2018; Jacobs, Lawson, Ivy, & Richards, 2017).

This article treats transfer as a planned instructional concern and an empirical question. Teachers can invite learners to identify another situation requiring the same value, make a small action plan, and revisit that plan later. Such prompts are pedagogical proposals, not evidence that transfer has occurred. Evaluation should seek concrete examples across time and settings and consider alternative explanations, including school-wide practices and other educational experiences.

APPROACH AND SOURCE BOUNDARIES

Documentary Foundation

The supplied Indonesian report, dated November 2025, is the contextual foundation. Its stated partner is PPG Unesa in Surabaya, and its intended beneficiaries include physical education teachers and PPG students. Its programme design comprises coordination, preparation of materials, workshops, teaching simulation, module development, mentoring, and evaluation. The report lists a five-member academic team and two student assistants. These are programme descriptions, not a verified participant sample or evidence of completed delivery.

The documentary reading focused on the programme rationale, intended teaching mechanisms, proposed outputs, and explicit statements about missing evidence. No individual participant records, raw questionnaire responses, interview transcripts, observation datasets, or completed teaching modules were supplied. Document analysis is appropriate for examining the relationship between stated aims and proposed processes, but it cannot reconstruct absent implementation events. The distinction between a document's claims and the evidence underlying those claims guides the interpretation throughout this article (Bowen, 2009).

Narrative Engagement with International Literature

The article uses a targeted narrative synthesis of 60 journal articles to elaborate the framework. Literature was located through title and topic searches and bibliographic checking, including publisher records and Crossref metadata. Themes included responsibility-based pedagogy, cooperative learning, Sport Education, motivation, moral behaviour, life skills, teacher professional learning, and implementation. Bibliographic details were checked against retrievable records. This procedure was undertaken for conceptual development; it was not designed to identify every eligible study or estimate a pooled intervention effect.

Sources were selected for their relevance to a specific conceptual function. Empirical studies illustrate teaching or measurement issues, reviews characterise the wider evidence base, and theoretical articles inform mechanisms and professional learning. Evidence from youth sport and general education is used as adjacent scholarship, with its different setting

acknowledged. The selection has no preregistered protocol, exhaustive database strategy, independent dual screening, formal risk-of-bias scoring, or PRISMA flow diagram. The 60 references therefore constitute a purposive bibliography rather than 60 independently appraised intervention studies.

The synthesis moves from programme intentions to proposed mechanisms and corresponding evidence requirements. It does not infer effectiveness by counting positive studies. Nor does it claim that the proposed combination is a previously validated hybrid model. Where responsibility-based teaching, cooperation, and student agency are combined, their compatibility remains a design proposition to be examined during implementation.

Ethical and Reporting Boundaries

This manuscript uses documentary material and published scholarship and reports no newly collected human-participant data. It does not claim that ethical approval or a waiver has been granted. Before submission, the authors should confirm institutional requirements for documentary use and the appropriate statement for the selected journal. Any future classroom evaluation will require procedures appropriate to the involvement of teachers, children, recordings, and school records.

The source's label as a final report is retained as contextual information but does not override its own acknowledgement of missing results. Planned outputs, including an article, intellectual property, news coverage, and a video, cannot be treated as verified achievements without the corresponding records. This reporting boundary is necessary to keep the conceptual contribution assessable on its actual evidence.

PROPOSED PEDAGOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Aligning Values with Movement Tasks

The first design step is constructive alignment among the movement objective, the character objective, the task, and the evidence. Teachers select one or two values rather than attach a long list of virtues to every lesson. Each value is expressed as an action appropriate to the age group and task. For honesty, the action might be accurate self-reporting of a score; for care, it might be checking whether a peer wants assistance before providing it. These examples specify learning opportunities without reducing character to a checklist.

A module should state what the teacher will do to make the action possible. If cooperation is expected, the task must allow and require contributions from different students. If self-direction is expected, students need a bounded decision and sufficient information. If respect is expected, the teacher must model how disagreement can be expressed and repaired. Pedagogical model scholarship supports examining the relationship between learning goals and the organisation of the entire instructional environment (Armour, 2017; Casey, 2014; Haerens, Kirk, Cardon, & De Bourdeaudhuij, 2011).

Journal of Early Childhood Motor Development
ISSN: 3164-3272 (Online)
https://journals.smartmotionedu.id/index.php/jecmd
2026, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 66-84

Table 1. Illustrative Alignment of Character Goals and Learning Opportunities

Value	Task Design	Observable Example	Feedback Focus
Honesty	Student reporting of scores or infringements	Corrects an inaccurate score	Accuracy and reasons for correction
Responsibility	A clear role with rotation	Completes the agreed role and cares for equipment	Commitment and available support
Cooperation	A shared goal requiring individual contributions	Invites a peer to participate and shares opportunities	Who contributes and who is excluded
Respect	Dialogue about rules and disagreement	Listens and challenges a decision constructively	Language, fairness, and repair
Care	Accessible tasks and consent to assistance	Offers appropriate help without taking over	Whether support respects the peer
Self Direction	Bounded choice and a personal task goal	Selects a challenge and reviews progress	Reasoning and adjustments

Note. Author-developed examples for prospective use; no local implementation is claimed.

A Recurring Lesson Sequence

A proposed lesson begins with a short relational check-in and an accessible explanation of the movement and character goals. Students then encounter a structured task with clear safety expectations and opportunities to make appropriate decisions. During activity, the teacher observes specific interactions, interrupts harmful patterns when necessary, and provides feedback connected to the agreed goals. A brief reflection examines an actual decision or difficulty. The lesson closes with a transfer prompt that identifies another setting in which the value could be useful.

For example, a small-sided passing game can use rotating roles and a shared task goal that requires contributions from all group members. Observers record examples of inviting a teammate into play, responding constructively to an error, and acknowledging an infringement. These records describe events rather than rank classmates as good or bad people. A reflection question might ask whose participation improved after the group changed its passing pattern and what the group should try next. The example is an author-developed illustration, not a documented activity from the programme.

The sequence should remain adaptable. A large class, limited equipment, mixed confidence, or a learner requiring an adapted task may change the appropriate group size and role structure. Equitable participation requires teachers to examine whose choices count and whose contributions are visible. School-based moral and social learning also depends on the broader environment, so a single lesson routine cannot carry the entire responsibility for student development (Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, 2011; Fraser-Thomas, Côté, & Deakin, 2005; Holt, Sehn, Spence, Newton, & Ball, 2012; Oliver & Kirk, 2016; Richards, Ivy, Wright, & Jerris, 2019).

Professional Learning as A Cycle of Enactment

The report proposes workshops and mentoring. The framework strengthens this design by linking each learning activity to a product or decision that can be revisited. Teachers first examine a realistic teaching dilemma and identify the intended value. They then co-design a short module, rehearse a segment, receive focused feedback, enact it in school when feasible, and revise it using evidence. These stages describe a recommended professional learning cycle; the report does not establish that participants completed them.

Professional development literature helps explain why a single presentation is unlikely to provide sufficient evidence of instructional change. Teacher learning involves subject-specific content, opportunities for active engagement, feedback, coherence with practice, and organisational conditions that support use. Collaborative and informal learning can matter, but attendance and favourable reactions should remain distinct from demonstrable changes in teaching (Armour & Yelling, 2007; Desimone, 2009; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001; Guskey, 2002).

Mentoring should therefore focus on instructional decisions. Instead of advising a teacher to improve cooperation generally, a mentor can examine whether each learner has an identifiable contribution, whether role rotation actually occurs, and whether reflection uses evidence from the activity. The next module then documents a specific revision. A professional learning community becomes useful when it preserves this connection between a teaching problem, an attempted response, and evidence informing the next decision.

Programme Logic and Testable Propositions

The proposed logic connects partnership support to teacher learning opportunities, improved instructional design, consistent classroom enactment, and opportunities for student learning. The final link concerns use beyond the original lesson. Each step is conditional. Mentoring may not translate into practice without time or institutional support; an improved module may not be enacted as intended; enacted opportunities may not produce sustained behavioural change.

Journal of Early Childhood Motor Development
ISSN: 3164-3272 (Online)
https://journals.smartmotionedu.id/index.php/jecmd
2026, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 66-84

Four propositions can guide a subsequent feasibility study. First, modules with explicit behavioural indicators should be easier to observe and provide feedback on than modules listing values alone. Second, feedback connected to classroom evidence should support more targeted module revisions. Third, stable opportunities for contribution and reflection should make responsibility-oriented teaching more visible. Fourth, explicit transfer planning should make transfer attempts more identifiable, while leaving their success open to investigation. These propositions are predictions derived from the framework, not findings of the present article.

EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Distinguishing Evidence Levels

Evaluation should begin with delivery and progress toward more demanding claims. Delivery records establish whether activities occurred, who attended, and what support was provided. Teacher learning evidence addresses changes in understanding or pedagogical reasoning. Product evidence addresses module quality. Observation addresses classroom enactment. Student evidence addresses behaviour across repeated opportunities. Transfer evidence addresses use in another context. An indicator at one level cannot substitute for missing evidence at another. Implementation scholarship underscores the need to examine how programmes are delivered when interpreting outcomes (Durlak & DuPre, 2008; Nilsen & Bernhardsson, 2019).

Table 2. Evidence Levels for Prospective Programme Evaluation

Level	Possible Evidence	Permissible Inference	Status in Source
Delivery	Attendance, agenda, session records	Activities occurred as documented	Not verifiable
Teacher Learning	Paired assessments and scenario responses	Change in assessed understanding	No raw data
Module Quality	Versioned modules and shared rubric	Observable improvement in product quality	Products unavailable
Enactment	Repeated observation and teacher logs	Teaching components were enacted	No observation data
Student Behaviour	Repeated contextual observations and reflections	Patterns in the observed situations	No student data
Transfer	Follow-up examples in another setting	Application in documented new situations	Not established

Note. Evidence is cumulative but each level requires its own records. No programme effect can be estimated from the supplied material.

Teacher Knowledge and Module Quality

If pretests and posttests are used, analysis should retain paired records and report the actual number of complete pairs. Item content should reflect the intended knowledge, including interpretation of classroom scenarios, rather than recall of presentation slides alone. Raw score ranges, central tendency, dispersion, missing responses, and uncertainty should be reported. A single-group change may be informative for feasibility but cannot independently identify programme causation.

Module assessment can examine alignment, task design, accessibility, individual accountability, feedback, reflection, and transfer prompts. Reviewers need shared descriptors and practice applying them. A revised module should be compared with its earlier version using the same criteria. Any locally developed rubric remains a proposed tool until its content and scoring quality are examined; it should not be described as validated merely because it resembles an established instrument.

Classroom Enactment and Student Behaviour

Classroom observation should document both teacher provision and student response. A teacher may offer a meaningful choice that students do not use, or students may cooperate despite weak task structure. Distinguishing these patterns helps explain implementation rather than compressing it into a global success rating. Established responsibility-focused observation and questionnaire research offers starting points, but instruments require appropriate permission, translation, contextual adaptation, and measurement checks before local use (Kavussanu, Stanger, & Boardley, 2013; Li, Wright, Rukavina, & Pickering, 2008; Wright & Craig, 2011).

Behavioural evidence should be collected over several opportunities and interpreted in context. Records may describe how a learner handles a disputed score or how a group distributes responsibility. Student reflection can explain intentions and perceived constraints, while teacher observations provide a complementary view. Agreement between sources strengthens interpretation, but disagreement can reveal an important teaching problem. The objective is educational feedback and credible inference, not permanent labels about students' moral worth.

Transfer and Sustainability

Transfer evidence should identify the value, the new setting, the action attempted, and when it occurred. A learner's intention to help a peer is different from a documented example of doing so. Follow-up questions can explore barriers and revisions. Information from another teacher or a family member may be useful when proportionate and authorised, but additional reporting should not become intrusive surveillance. Life-skills measurement and transfer scholarship reinforce the need to separate skill acquisition, opportunities to apply a skill, and demonstrated application (Cronin & Allen, 2017; Gould & Carson, 2008; Holt et al., 2017; Jacobs, Wright, & Richards, 2022; Mossman, Robertson, Williamson, & Cronin, 2021; Williams, Neil, Cropley, Woodman, & Roberts, 2022).

Sustainability concerns whether teachers continue using and adapting the approach after initial support ends. Useful records include subsequent modules, mentoring contacts, peer observations, and reasons for discontinuation. Maintaining an online discussion group is an enabling condition rather than proof of sustained professional learning. The programme should also examine workload and whether the approach preserves meaningful movement time while improving the quality of social interaction.

DISCUSSION

Contribution to International Physical Education Scholarship

The framework connects character education with the practical work of planning, teaching, and reviewing physical education. Its central contribution is to make the route from an abstract value to an assessable learning opportunity explicit. It combines a responsibility-oriented relational stance, cooperative task structures, supported agency, and reflection while requiring evidence at each link. The programme design from an Indonesian teacher education partnership provides the contextual problem; international literature supplies concepts and design cautions rather than a substitute dataset.

The distinction among character, social skill, responsibility, motivation, and life skill is especially important. These constructs overlap but answer different questions. Sharing equipment may demonstrate cooperation in one task; understanding why equitable access matters involves ethical reasoning; using the same principle in another setting raises a transfer question. An intervention can improve one dimension without establishing all the others. Broad reviews of development through physical education should therefore inform outcome selection without encouraging an undifferentiated claim of holistic improvement.

Implications for Teacher Education Partnerships

University partnerships can contribute through sustained pedagogical support, careful documentation, and access to research-informed discussion. For PPG and school partners, the immediate priority would be to make a small number of modules usable and observable. Student teachers can rehearse how to respond to disagreement, exclusion, and mistakes, while experienced teachers can contribute context-specific knowledge about class management and school routines. Mentors should document how feedback changes the next version of a task.

A staged approach offers a more defensible basis for expansion. An initial feasibility phase would examine participation, burden, acceptability, observation procedures, and whether the planned teaching components can be enacted. A subsequent pilot could examine change using repeated measures and appropriate comparisons. Only after sufficient evidence of delivery and measurement quality should a larger study test sustained outcomes. This sequence also helps avoid investing in extensive materials before teachers have established that they work in their settings.

Inclusion and Contextual Adaptation

Character education can reproduce inequity if desirable behaviour is defined around the preferences of confident students or teachers without examining who can participate. For example, public leadership should not be the only recognised expression of responsibility. Careful preparation, quiet assistance, and fair equipment management can also contribute. Teachers should recognise different forms of contribution while retaining clear expectations against harmful conduct.

Adaptation to Indonesian PJOK should preserve the intended mechanism while adjusting task language, examples, equipment, and support. The framework does not establish that imported models have identical meanings or effects across contexts. Teachers and learners should help examine whether behavioural indicators are understandable and fair. Accessibility, safety, and respectful feedback are design requirements whose local enactment must be observed, rather than assumed from a module's wording.

Limitations

The principal limitation is the absence of verified programme implementation and outcome data. No conclusion can be drawn about participant numbers, knowledge gains, teaching improvement, student development, or transfer. The documentary foundation is one university programme report, and its needs statements were not independently checked. The proposed framework therefore has conceptual and practical relevance but no demonstrated local effectiveness.

The narrative literature selection is purposive and vulnerable to omission and interpretive bias. Studies differ in educational level, duration, setting, outcomes, and design quality. Youth sport findings cannot be transferred directly to compulsory physical education, and general professional development research may not capture all subject-specific conditions. Bibliographic checking confirms reference identity and metadata; it is not a formal appraisal of every study's validity. The framework's combined components, illustrative lesson sequence, and evaluation matrices require prospective testing.

CONCLUSION

Integrating character education into physical education requires explicit relationships among values, movement tasks, teacher actions, reflection, and evidence. The proposed framework translates the intentions of an Indonesian university community engagement programme into a cycle of professional learning and classroom design. Responsibility-oriented teaching, structured cooperation, meaningful student choices, and transfer prompts offer complementary resources for that work.

The supplied report supports analysis of programme intentions but does not establish completed delivery or effectiveness. The appropriate next step is a documented feasibility study that examines module quality, classroom enactment, measurement procedures, and the practicality of follow-up. Claims about improved character or sustained transfer should follow evidence from repeated observations and suitably designed evaluation. The

framework offers a basis for that work while keeping intended educational benefits separate from demonstrated outcomes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The source identifies PPG Universitas Negeri Surabaya as the intended programme partner. Acknowledgement wording and permissions should be confirmed before submission.

FUNDING STATEMENT

The source identifies a university non-state-budget community engagement scheme. The authors must confirm the formal funder name, award number, and required wording before journal submission.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

An author declaration is required before submission; no declaration has been inferred from the report.

ETHICS AND CONSENT

No new participant data are reported. The authors must confirm applicable institutional and journal requirements for use of the programme document. Future empirical evaluation requires an appropriate ethics and consent process.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The conceptual analysis is based on the supplied programme report and the cited literature. No participant-level dataset was available for this manuscript.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

All five names follow the source report. Authorship eligibility, order, name spelling, individual contributions, and final approval must be confirmed by the authors before submission.

REFERENCES

Armour, K. M. (2017). Pedagogical cases: A new translational mechanism to bridge theory/research practice gaps in youth physical activity education (PAE). *Kinesiology Review*, *6*(1), 42–50. https://doi.org/10.1123/kr.2016-0037

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

Bailey, R. (2006). Physical education and sport in schools: A review of benefits and outcomes. *Journal of School Health*, *76*(8), 397–401. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-1561.2006.00132.x

Bailey, R., Armour, K., Kirk, D., Jess, M., Pickup, I., Sandford, R., & BERA Physical Education and Sport P (2009). The educational benefits claimed for physical education and school sport: An academic review. *Research Papers in Education*, *24*(1), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671520701809817

Baptista, C., Corte-Real, N., Regueiras, L., Seo, G., Hemphill, M., Pereira, A., ... Fonseca, A. (2020). Teaching personal and social responsibility after school: A systematic review. *Cuadernos de Psicología del Deporte*, *20*(2), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.6018/cpd.346851

Bean, C., Kramers, S., Forneris, T., & Camiré, M. (2018). The implicit/explicit continuum of life skills development and transfer. *Quest*, *70*(4), 456–470. https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2018.1451348

Bjørke, L., & Mordal Moen, K. (2020). Cooperative learning in physical education: A study of students' learning journey over 24 lessons. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, *25*(6), 600–612. https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2020.1761955

Boke, H., Aygun, Y., Tufekci, S., Yagin, F. H., Canpolat, B., Norman, G., ... Ardigò, L. P. (2025). Effects of cooperative learning on students' learning outcomes in physical education: A meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *16*, 1508808. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1508808

Bores-García, D., Hortigüela-Alcalá, D., Fernandez-Rio, F. J., González-Calvo, G., & Barba-Martín, R. (2021). Research on cooperative learning in physical education: Systematic review of the last five years. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, *92*(1), 146–155. https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2020.1719276

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

Bredemeier, B. J., & Shields, D. L. (1984). Divergence in moral reasoning about sport and everyday life. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, *1*(4), 348–357. https://doi.org/10.1123/ssj.1.4.348

Camiré, M., Trudel, P., & Forneris, T. (2012). Coaching and transferring life skills: Philosophies and strategies used by model high school coaches. *The Sport Psychologist*, *26*(2), 243–260. https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.26.2.243

Casey, A. (2014). Models-based practice: Great white hope or white elephant? *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, *19*(1), 18–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2012.726977

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

Cecchini, J. A., Montero, J., Alonso, A., Izquierdo, M., & Contreras, O. (2007). Effects of personal and social responsibility on fair play in sports and self-control in school-aged youths. *European Journal of Sport Science*, *7*(4), 203–211. https://doi.org/10.1080/17461390701718497

Cronin, L. D., & Allen, J. (2017). Development and initial validation of the life skills scale for sport. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *28*, 105–119. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2016.11.001

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11*(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli1104_01

Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher*, *38*(3), 181–199. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x08331140

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

Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development*, *82*(1), 405–432. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x

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. (2002). The implementation of cooperative learning in an elementary physical education program. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, *22*(1), 69–85. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.22.1.69

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

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

Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, *38*(4), 915–945. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312038004915

Gordon, B. (2020). An alternative conceptualization of the teaching personal and social responsibility model. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, *91*(7), 8–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2020.1781719

Gordon, B., & Doyle, S. (2015). Teaching personal and social responsibility and transfer of learning: Opportunities and challenges for teachers and coaches. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, *34*(1), 152–161. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2013-0184

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

Guskey, T. R. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. *Teachers and Teaching*, *8*(3), 381–391. https://doi.org/10.1080/135406002100000512

Haerens, L., Kirk, D., Cardon, G., & De Bourdeaudhuij, I. (2011). Toward the development of a pedagogical model for health-based physical education. *Quest*, *63*(3), 321–338. https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2011.10483684

Hastie, P. A., & Buchanan, A. M. (2000). Teaching responsibility through Sport Education: Prospects of a coalition. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, *71*(1), 25–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2000.10608877

Hastie, P. A., de Ojeda, D. M., & Luquin, A. C. (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

Hellion, 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

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

Holt, N. L., Sehn, Z. L., Spence, J. C., Newton, A. S., & Ball, G. D. C. (2012). Physical education and sport programs at an inner city school: Exploring possibilities for positive youth development. *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy*, *17*(1), 97–113. https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2010.548062

Jacobs, J. M., Lawson, M., Ivy, V. N., & Richards, K. A. R. (2017). Enhancing the transfer of life skills from sport-based youth development programs to school, family, and community settings. *Journal of Amateur Sport*, *3*(3), 20–43. https://doi.org/10.17161/jas.v3i3.6514

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

Jacobs, J. M., Wright, P. M., & Richards, K. A. R. (2022). Students' perceptions of learning life skills through the teaching personal and social responsibility model: An exploratory study. *Frontiers in Sports and Active Living*, *4*, 898738. https://doi.org/10.3389/fspor.2022.898738

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., & Ntoumanis, N. (2003). Participation in sport and moral functioning: Does ego orientation mediate their relationship? *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *25*(4), 501–518. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.25.4.501

Kavussanu, M., Stanger, N., & Boardley, I. D. (2013). The prosocial and antisocial behaviour in sport scale: Further evidence for construct validity and reliability. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *31*(11), 1208–1221. https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2013.775473

Li, W., Wright, P. M., Rukavina, P. B., & Pickering, M. (2008). Measuring students' perceptions of personal and social responsibility and the relationship to intrinsic motivation in urban physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, *27*(2), 167–178. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.27.2.167

Mossman, G. J., Robertson, C., Williamson, B., & Cronin, L. (2021). Development and initial validation of the life skills scale for sport – transfer scale (LSSS-TS). *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *54*, 101906. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2021.101906

Nilsen, P., & Bernhardsson, S. (2019). Context matters in implementation science: A scoping review of determinant frameworks that describe contextual determinants for implementation outcomes. *BMC Health Services Research*, *19*(1), 189. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-019-4015-3

Oliver, K. L., & Kirk, D. (2016). Towards an activist approach to research and advocacy for girls and physical education. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, *21*(3), 313–327. https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2014.895803

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

Opstoel, K., Prins, F., Jacobs, F., Haerens, L., van Tartwijk, J., & De Martelaer, K. (2022). Physical education teachers' perceptions and operationalisations of personal and social development goals in primary education. *European Physical Education Review*, *28*(4), 968–984. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336x221102300

Pascual, C., Escartí, A., Llopis, R., Gutíerrez, 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

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

Reeve, J. (2006). Teachers as facilitators: What autonomy-supportive teachers do and why their students benefit. *The Elementary School Journal*, *106*(3), 225–236. https://doi.org/10.1086/501484

Richards, K. A. R., Ivy, V. N., Wright, P. M., & Jerris, E. (2019). Combining the skill themes approach with teaching personal and social responsibility to teach social and emotional learning in elementary physical education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, *90*(3), 35–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2018.1559665

Sánchez-Miguel, P. A., Álvarez-Sánchez, J. L., Hortigüela-Alcalá, D., Pérez-Pueyo, A., & Tapia-Serrano, M. A. (2025). The effect of the teaching personal and social responsibility model on personal and social responsibility in physical education: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Quest*, *77*(2), 237–266. https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2024.2443937

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

Standage, M., Duda, J. L., & Ntoumanis, N. (2005). A test of self-determination theory in school physical education. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *75*(3), 411–433. https://doi.org/10.1348/000709904x22359

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

Williams, C., Neil, R., Cropley, B., Woodman, T., & Roberts, R. (2022). A systematic review of sport-based life skills programs for young people: The quality of design and evaluation methods. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *34*(2), 409–435. https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2020.1792583

Wright, P. M., & Craig, M. W. (2011). Tool for assessing responsibility-based education (TARE): Instrument development, content validity, and inter-rater reliability. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science*, *15*(3), 204–219. https://doi.org/10.1080/1091367x.2011.590084

Zach, S., Shoval, E., & Shulruf, B. (2023). Cooperative learning in physical education lessons - literature review. *Frontiers in Education*, *8*, 1273423. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1273423