

Physical Education and Sports Pedagogy for Sustainable Development: Understanding the Theoretical Foundations, Pedagogical Frameworks, and Global Implications

Sandip Sinha^{1*}, Dr. Anil Mili²

¹Asst. Professor, School of Physical Education & Sports Science, Arunachal University of Studies, Namsai, Arunachal Pradesh (India). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-7812-9947>

²Associate Professor, Faculty of Physical Education & Sports Science, Rajiv Gandhi University (A Central University), Doimukh (India). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9539-289X>

*Corresponding Author: Sandip Sinha, Asst. Professor, School of Physical Education & Sports Science, Arunachal University of Studies, Namsai, Arunachal Pradesh, India. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-7812-9947>

ABSTRACT

Physical education (PE) and sports pedagogy occupy a strategic position at the intersection of human development, social equity, and environmental stewardship. This paper examines the theoretical and doctrinal dimensions of integrating sustainable development principles into physical education and sports pedagogy, drawing on the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), contemporary pedagogical theories, and empirical scholarship. Through a systematic doctrinal analysis, the study interrogates how PE curricula, teacher-training frameworks, and sports-based interventions can be restructured to advance health literacy, social inclusion, ecological consciousness, and lifelong physical activity. The paper argues that transformative, sustainability-oriented sports pedagogy must move beyond performance-centric models to embrace holistic, rights-based, and ecologically responsive approaches. Findings indicate that interdisciplinary curriculum integration, values-based coaching, community sport ecosystems, and digital pedagogical innovations are critical levers for aligning PE with the 2030 Agenda. Policy recommendations, pedagogical strategies, and implications for future research are discussed.

Keywords: Physical education pedagogy, Sustainable development goals, Curriculum integration, Sport-for-development, Ecological literacy, Health equity, Transformative learning.

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Received: 09 July 2026

Accepted: 24 July 2026

Published: 25 July 2026

Cite this article as:

Sandip Sinha, Dr. Anil Mili, Physical Education and Sports Pedagogy for Sustainable Development: Understanding the Theoretical Foundations, Pedagogical Frameworks, and Global Implications International Journal of Innovative Studies in Humanities and Social Studies, 2026: 2(4); 11-25.

<https://doi.org/10.71123/3067-7319.020402>

Copyright:©2026. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.



Introduction

The relationship between physical education, sport, and human development has been the subject of extensive scholarly inquiry for more than a century. Yet, the emergence of the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (United Nations, 2015) and its 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) has fundamentally reoriented the global conversation about the role of sport in society. Physical education, as a formal institutional vehicle for transmitting bodily, social, and civic knowledge, is increasingly recognised as

a lever for realising sustainable development objectives spanning health equity, gender justice, environmental literacy, and social cohesion (Kidd, 2008; Lyras & Welly Peachey, 2011).

The concept of sports pedagogy defined broadly as the science and art of teaching and coaching sport, physical activity, and movement has itself undergone significant doctrinal evolution. From its roots in military and nationalist physical conditioning regimes of the nineteenth century (Hoberman, 1984), through the humanistic and holistic movements of the mid-

twentieth century (Arnold, 1988), to the contemporary discourse of transformative, rights-based, and ecologically conscious pedagogy, sports pedagogy has continuously mirrored and mediated broader social imperatives (Kirk, 2010). The challenge for scholars, practitioners, and policymakers today is to articulate a coherent, empirically grounded, and normatively robust framework that situates PE and sports pedagogy squarely within the sustainable development paradigm.

The significance of this inquiry cannot be overstated. Globally, over 1.4 billion people are insufficiently physically active, a crisis with profound consequences for chronic disease burden, mental health, and social wellbeing (World Health Organization, 2022). At the same time, the global sport industry generates an estimated USD 500 billion annually, yet its environmental footprint from carbon emissions to resource consumption is rarely subjected to rigorous sustainability scrutiny (Trendafilova & McCullough, 2018). Physical education, as a near-universal feature of national school systems, represents one of the most scalable and democratically accessible institutions for advancing both individual and collective dimensions of sustainable development.

Conceptual Framework and Theoretical Underpinnings

Defining Sustainable Development in the Context of Sport

Sustainable development, as classically formulated by the Brundtland Commission (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987, p. 43), is “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.” This tripartite construct encompassing economic viability, social equity, and ecological integrity has since been elaborated through successive global frameworks, culminating in the 2030 Agenda and its 17 SDGs (UN, 2015). Sport scholars have adapted this framework to argue that sport can be a vehicle for sustainable development insofar as it generates social capital, promotes health behaviours, fosters inclusive communities, and, when practiced sustainably, minimises environmental degradation (Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011; Schulenkorf et al., 2016).

In the context of physical education, sustainable development takes on additional pedagogical meaning. Beyond the environmental dimension, sustainability in PE discourse encompasses the sustainability of active lifestyles across the life course (Sallis et al., 2015), the

sustainability of participatory and equitable sporting cultures (Flintoff & Scraton, 2001), and the sustainability of institutional commitments to quality physical education in the face of curriculum marginalisation (Hardman & Marshall, 2009). Thus, a comprehensive conceptualisation of sustainable development in the PE context must integrate ecological, social, economic, and pedagogical dimensions.

Sports Pedagogy: Doctrinal Foundations

Sports pedagogy, as a formal discipline, draws on multiple intellectual traditions, including philosophy of sport, educational science, exercise science, and developmental psychology (Armour, 2011). Doctrinal analysis in this context involves the systematic examination of foundational principles, normative standards, and authoritative frameworks that govern the theory and practice of teaching sport and physical activity. Key doctrinal sources include national PE curriculum frameworks, international sport governance instruments, UNESCO’s Quality Physical Education (QPE) guidelines, and scholarly consensus as reflected in peer-reviewed literature.

Arnold’s (1988) tripartite taxonomy education in, through, and about movement remains a foundational doctrinal reference. Education in movement emphasises skill acquisition and physical competence; education through movement foregrounds character, social learning, and citizenship; education about movement develops critical understanding of sport’s cultural, historical, and scientific dimensions. This taxonomy is directly relevant to sustainable development, as the through and about dimensions offer the most fertile pedagogical territory for values transmission, critical consciousness, and social transformation (Kirk, 2010).

More recently, Armour (2011) and others have advanced a “pedagogy of sport” that transcends traditional boundaries between formal PE, community sport, and elite performance, arguing for a unified pedagogical science grounded in learner needs, developmental appropriateness, and social justice. This move toward a broader, more inclusive sports pedagogy doctrine is congruent with the ambitions of the SDG framework, which recognises sport as a universal language capable of crossing cultural, economic, and political boundaries (UN, 2015).

The Nexus between Physical Education and the SDGs

The United Nations Office on Sport for Development and Peace (UNOSDP, 2016) has formally recognised

sport as an enabler of all 17 SDGs, citing its potential contributions to health, education, gender equality, poverty reduction, environmental sustainability, and peace-building. Physical education, as the institutional expression of sport within the educational system, is particularly well positioned to contribute to SDGs: 3 (Good Health and Well-Being), 4 (Quality Education), 5 (Gender Equality), 10 (Reduced Inequalities), 11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities), and 13 (Climate Action).

Theoretically, this nexus is explicable through several lenses. Human development theory (Sen, 1999) posits that sport and physical education expand human capabilities including physical competence, social belonging, and critical agency that are foundational to sustainable human flourishing. Social capital theory (Putnam, 2000) highlights sport's capacity to generate bonding and bridging social capital, fostering trust, civic engagement, and inter-group cooperation essential for sustainable communities. Critical pedagogy (Freire, 1970) provides a normative framework for sports pedagogy that challenges oppressive structures, develops conscientisation, and empowers marginalised communities to participate in the transformation of their social conditions.

Literature Review

Historical Evolution of Physical Education Curricula

The historical trajectory of physical education curricula reveals a persistent tension between instrumentalist and humanistic conceptions of the subject. In the nineteenth century, PE was predominantly configured as a tool of nationalist physical conditioning, military preparedness, and social discipline, epitomised by the gymnastics movements of Ling in Sweden, Jahn in Germany, and the public school athleticism of Victorian Britain (Mangan, 1981). The early twentieth century saw the emergence of the New Physical Education movement in the United States, associated with Dewey's progressive education philosophy and Wood and Cassidy's (1927) advocacy for a child-centred, socially integrative approach to PE.

The post- World War-II period witnessed the globalisation of PE as a component of universal education systems, driven by UNESCO's advocacy for physical education as a fundamental human right (UNESCO, 1978). The 1978 UNESCO International Charter of Physical Education and Sport enshrined the principle that "the practice of physical education and sport is a fundamental right for all" (UNESCO, 1978,

p. 1), a doctrinal foundation that resonates powerfully with contemporary sustainable development discourse. Subsequent decades saw increasing scholarly attention to the social determinants of PE participation, including gender, race, socioeconomic status, and disability, opening the door to critical and activist pedagogical traditions (Fernández-Balboa, 1997).

In the twenty-first century, PE curricula have increasingly incorporated health literacy, physical activity promotion, and lifelong activity objectives (Sallis et al., 2015), reflecting recognition of the global physical inactivity epidemic and its links to non-communicable disease (WHO, 2022). More recently, scholars have begun to call for the integration of sustainability and ecological literacy into PE curricula, arguing that the physical education context with its inherent engagement with natural and built environments offers unique opportunities for environmental education (McCullough et al., 2020).

Sport for Development: Global Discourse and Evidence Base

The sport-for-development (SFD) literature has grown substantially since the early 2000s, when organisations such as the UN, the International Olympic Committee (IOC), and numerous NGOs began to formally articulate sport's potential as a tool for achieving development objectives (Kidd, 2008). Coalter's (2007) critical overview identified a persistent "sports plus" versus "plus sport" tension in SFD programming, distinguishing between programmes that use sport as a hook for external development objectives and those that treat sport as intrinsically developmental. This distinction has direct relevance for sports pedagogy, as it implicates questions about the relative priority of physical skill development versus social and civic learning outcomes.

Schulenkorf et al. (2016), in a systematic review of SFD literature, identified social capital, community empowerment, and individual capacity-building as the most consistently evidenced outcomes of well-designed SFD programmes, while cautioning against uncritical assumptions about sport's transformative power. Lyras and Welty Peachey (2011) developed a Sport-for-Development and Peace (SDP) theory grounded in sport sociology, development studies, and peace research, providing multidisciplinary theoretical scaffolding for empirical research and programme design. More recently, Sherry et al. (2017) and others have called for greater methodological rigour in SFD research, including the use of longitudinal designs, mixed methods, and community-based participatory approaches.

The evidence base for PE's contributions to specific SDGs, while growing, remains uneven. Contributions to health outcomes (SDG-3) are the most robustly documented (Janssen & LeBlanc, 2010; Donnelly et al., 2016), while contributions to environmental sustainability (SDG-13) and peaceful societies (SDG-16) remain relatively underexplored empirically, though theoretically compelling (McCullough et al., 2020). This evidence gap represents both a scholarly challenge and an opportunity for future research.

Pedagogical Theories Informing Sustainable PE

Several pedagogical theories have been identified in the literature as particularly relevant to sustainability-oriented sports pedagogy. Constructivist learning theory (Piaget, 1970; Vygotsky, 1978) provides a foundational rationale for learner-centred, inquiry-based approaches in PE that develop not only physical competence but also cognitive understanding, social negotiation, and reflective capacity. Mosston and Ashworth's (2002) Spectrum of Teaching Styles, ranging from command-style direct instruction to learner-initiated discovery and self-teaching, offers a practical pedagogical typology for differentiating instruction in PE contexts.

Hellison's (2011) Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (TPSR) model, developed over four decades of practice in under-resourced urban sport contexts, provides one of the most empirically validated frameworks for using sport to develop values, civic agency, and social responsibility, core aspirations of the sustainable development agenda. The Sport Education Model (Siedentop et al., 2011), with its emphasis on authentic sport experience, student leadership, and inclusive participation, offers a structural approach to PE curriculum design that mirrors the institutional features of sustainable sporting cultures. Cooperative learning (Dyson & Casey, 2012) foregrounds collaborative problem-solving, interdependence, and shared accountability values directly aligned with the collective action imperatives of sustainable development.

Critical and activist pedagogy traditions in PE (Fernández-Balboa, 1997; Tinning, 2010) draw on Freirean (1970) and Gramscian frameworks to interrogate the power dynamics, ideological functions, and social reproductive tendencies of mainstream PE, advocating instead for pedagogy that explicitly challenges inequality, fosters critical consciousness, and empowers students as agents of social change. This tradition has particular relevance for SDG-aligned PE, as it insists that sustainable development is not a technocratic project but a fundamentally political and emancipatory

one. Kirk's (2010) historical and sociological analyses of PE curricula further underscore the importance of understanding the structural constraints—including curriculum policy, teacher education, resource allocation, and cultural norms—that shape what is pedagogically possible within institutional PE.

Research Questions

This paper undertakes that task through a doctrinal and academic research methodology, systematically interrogating the theoretical, pedagogical, and policy dimensions of the intersection between physical education, sports pedagogy, and sustainable development. The paper is guided by four overarching research questions:

1. What are the theoretical and doctrinal foundations that connect sports pedagogy to sustainable development?
2. How do contemporary pedagogical models in physical education support the realisation of specific SDGs?
3. What institutional and policy frameworks currently govern the integration of sustainability into PE and sport?
4. What are the principal challenges and future trajectories for a sustainability-oriented sports pedagogy?

Methodology

This paper employs a doctrinal research methodology, supplemented by an integrative literature review. Doctrinal research, as defined by Hutchinson (1999) and contextualised in the educational sciences by Westerman (2006), involves the systematic analysis of authoritative texts, principles, and normative frameworks to develop, interpret, and critique the conceptual architecture of a field of inquiry. In the context of this paper, primary doctrinal sources include UNESCO policy instruments, UN resolutions and reports, national PE curriculum frameworks (including those of Australia, Finland, South Africa, and the United States), IOC governance documents, and WHO physical activity guidelines. These sources were subjected to thematic and normative analysis, with particular attention to the discursive construction of sustainability, health, equity, and pedagogy.

The integrative literature review, following Torraco's (2005) methodological framework, synthesised peer-reviewed empirical studies, theoretical papers, and systematic reviews published between 1970 and 2024

in leading journals including the Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, Sport, Education and Society, the European Physical Education Review, the Journal of Sport for Development, and the International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology. Databases searched included ERIC, SPORTDiscus, PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science, using search terms including; physical education pedagogy, sustainable development goals, sport for development, health education, social inclusion, environmental education, and teacher professional development.

The doctrinal analysis proceeded through three iterative phases: mapping the normative landscape identifying key instruments, actors, and discourses; critical interrogation assessing coherence, gaps, and tensions within and between doctrinal sources; and synthetic reconstruction proposing an integrated doctrinal framework for sustainability-oriented sports pedagogy. This approach is consistent with legal and policy doctrinal methods adapted for educational research (Hutchinson & Duncan, 2012) and with the interpretive tradition in sport pedagogy scholarship (Armour, 2011).

Physical Education as a Vehicle for Sustainable Development

Health and Well-being (SDG-3)

SDG-3 calls for the promotion of healthy lives and well-being for all at all ages. Physical education is among the most direct institutional mechanisms for achieving this goal, given its potential to establish physically active habits, health literacy, and psychosocial wellbeing in children and young people. The WHO (2020) Physical Activity Guidelines recommend that children aged 5–17 engage in at least 60 minutes of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity daily, a target that quality PE programming can substantially support, particularly for children from disadvantaged backgrounds who have limited access to non-school physical activity opportunities.

The evidence linking PE participation to health outcomes is substantial. Donnelly et al. (2016), in a comprehensive review, documented that school-based physical activity interventions improve cardiovascular fitness, musculoskeletal health, metabolic health, cognitive function, and mental wellbeing. Janssen and LeBlanc (2010) similarly found robust associations between physical activity and health outcomes in children, with dose-response relationships indicating that more is better. Critically, however, the quality of PE instruction—not merely its quantity—is determinative

of health outcomes, underscoring the importance of pedagogical excellence (McKenzie & Lounsbury, 2013).

Mental health benefits of PE are increasingly recognised as a critical dimension of SDG-3's wellbeing mandate. Biddle et al. (2019) reviewed evidence for associations between physical activity, sedentary behaviour, and mental health in children and adolescents, finding consistent positive associations between PA and reduced symptoms of depression and anxiety, as well as improved self-esteem and cognitive functioning. The COVID-19 pandemic further highlighted PE's mental health function, as school closures and reduced physical activity contributed to significant deterioration in children's mental health globally (Viner et al., 2022), demonstrating the fragility of health gains when PE is deprioritised.

Quality Education and Lifelong Learning (SDG-4)

SDG-4 commits to ensuring inclusive and equitable quality education and promoting lifelong learning opportunities for all. Physical education contributes to this goal through multiple pathways. First, quality PE develops physical literacy defined as the motivation, confidence, physical competence, knowledge, and understanding to value and take responsibility for engagement in physical activities for life (Whitehead, 2010, p. 5) which is foundational to a lifetime of health-enhancing physical activity. Physical literacy, like print literacy and numeracy, is increasingly recognised as a fundamental educational entitlement and a prerequisite for full participation in a physically active society.

Second, PE contributes to cognitive development and academic achievement, supporting the educational quality dimension of SDG-4. Fedewa and Ahn (2011), in a meta-analysis, found that school-based physical activity interventions had significant positive effects on children's academic achievement, with effect sizes comparable to or exceeding many academic interventions. The neurobiological mechanisms underlying this relationship include enhanced cerebral blood flow, improved executive function, and reduced stress-related cortisol levels associated with physical activity (Hillman et al., 2008). These findings provide a powerful evidence-based argument for the inclusion of quality PE within the school curriculum, including in contexts where PE is often marginalised in favour of academic subjects.

Third, the lifelong learning dimension of SDG-4 finds expression in PE's mandate to develop self-directed,

autonomous learners capable of maintaining physical activity across the life course. The Self-Determination Theory (SDT) of Deci and Ryan (1985), extensively applied in PE research, posits that intrinsic motivation for physical activity, the most durable and health-promoting form is fostered when teaching practices support students' psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Pedagogical approaches that prioritise student voice, choice, and meaningful engagement are thus both theoretically and empirically justified as strategies for promoting lifelong physical activity, directly serving SDG 4's lifelong learning ambitions (Ntoumanis et al., 2020).

Gender Equality in Sport (SDG-5)

SDG-5 targets the achievement of gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls. Gender has been one of the most extensively analysed structural determinants of physical education participation and experience, with decades of feminist sport scholarship documenting the ways in which PE has historically reproduced hegemonic masculinity, marginalised girls' embodied experiences, and privileged competitive, performance-oriented sport over more diverse forms of physical activity (Flintoff & Scraton, 2001; Wright, 1996).

Contemporary research continues to document gender disparities in PE participation and physical activity more broadly. The WHO (2022) reports that globally, adolescent girls are less likely to meet physical activity guidelines than boys, with sociocultural barriers including safety concerns, lack of female role models, body image pressures, and gender-restrictive sport cultures identified as key determinants. These disparities are compounded at the intersections of gender, race, and socioeconomic status, with girls from low-income and minority backgrounds facing the greatest participation barriers (Flintoff et al., 2008).

Pedagogically, addressing gender equity in PE requires both structural and cultural transformation. Enright and O'Sullivan (2010) documented the power of student-centred, participatory curriculum design in engaging previously disaffected teenage girls in PE, demonstrating that when students have genuine agency over the content and process of their physical education, participation and engagement improve dramatically. The Sport Education Model (Siedentop et al., 2011) has been shown to improve girls' participation and leadership in PE contexts, as its team-based, season-long structure creates opportunities for sustained engagement, skill development, and social belonging that are often absent

in more individualistic or competitive PE formats. Gender-transformative sports pedagogy thus requires attention to both the hidden curriculum of gender norms in sport and the explicit pedagogical strategies through which equity can be actively promoted.

Reduced Inequalities and Social Inclusion (SDG-10)

SDG-10 seeks to reduce inequality within and among countries. Sport and physical education have a complex and ambivalent relationship with social inequality. On one hand, sport is frequently celebrated as a meritocratic arena in which talent and effort transcend social class, race, and background, what Coalter (2007) termed the "sports mythology" of social mobility through sport. On the other hand, critical scholars have documented the ways in which sport and PE reproduce and legitimise social hierarchies, privilege dominant group bodies and movement cultures, and exclude or marginalise those who do not conform to normative standards of athleticism (Evans, 2004).

A sustainability-oriented sports pedagogy committed to SDG-10 must engage critically with these dynamics. Bailey et al. (2009), in a systematic review, found evidence for physical education's contributions to social inclusion for children with disabilities, from minority ethnic backgrounds, and from disadvantaged socioeconomic contexts, but cautioned that these outcomes are contingent on pedagogical quality, structural support, and cultural sensitivity. Adapted physical education, inclusive sport programming, and Paralympic sport development represent important institutional expressions of SDG-10 commitments within the PE domain (Haegele & Hodge, 2016).

Community sport, as a bridge between formal PE and broader civic life, also represents a critical institutional site for advancing social inclusion. Coalter's (2007) concept of "sport plus" programmes—which use sport as an entry point for broader social development interventions including mentoring, education, and employment support—has particular relevance for marginalised youth populations. The evidence for such programmes' effectiveness in reducing inequality and promoting social mobility, while mixed, suggests that well-designed, adequately resourced, and pedagogically sophisticated sport-based social inclusion programmes can deliver meaningful outcomes (Sherry et al., 2017).

Sustainable Cities and Communities (SDG-11)

SDG-11 aims to make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable. Physical education and community sport contribute to this goal

through their roles in creating accessible, safe, and inclusive public spaces for physical activity; fostering social cohesion and community identity; and promoting active transportation and physically active urban lifestyles. The built environment is a critical determinant of physical activity, with access to parks, sports facilities, footpaths, and cycle lanes strongly associated with population-level physical activity (Sallis et al., 2016).

Sports pedagogy that incorporates outdoor and environmental education dimensions—including adventure education, orienteering, urban exploration, and environmental stewardship activities can serve as a bridge between PE and sustainable urban development objectives. McCullough et al. (2020) argued that PE educators have a professional and civic responsibility to model and advocate for physically active, environmentally sustainable urban lifestyles, integrating active commuting, outdoor physical activity, and nature-based learning into their pedagogical repertoire. Schools as community sport hubs serving multiple community constituencies across the day, week, and year—represent a particularly promising institutional model for maximising the social and physical capital value of sport infrastructure within sustainable urban frameworks.

Climate Action and Ecological Literacy (SDG-13)

SDG-13 calls for urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts. The relationship between sport and environmental sustainability is complex and underexplored in the PE literature. The global sport industry's environmental footprint including energy consumption, water use, waste generation, and carbon emissions from travel is substantial and growing (Trendafilova & McCullough, 2018). However, sport also has demonstrated capacity to mobilise public awareness, behaviour change, and civic action around environmental issues, through initiatives such as the IOC's sustainability agenda, the UN Environment Programme's sport and environment programme, and numerous grassroots sport-for-environment initiatives.

Physical education, with its inherent engagement with the body, natural environments, and physical landscapes, represents a particularly rich context for ecological literacy education defined as the capacity to understand and engage critically with ecological systems and human impacts upon them (Orr, 1992). Outdoor and adventure education, long-established sub-disciplines of PE, have developed extensive pedagogical traditions for using natural environments as both context and content for learning, including environmental stewardship,

ecological literacy, and sustainable outdoor recreation practices (Beames & Brown, 2016). Integrating these traditions into mainstream PE curricula represents a significant opportunity to advance SDG-13 objectives through sport and physical education.

Pedagogical Frameworks for Sustainable Sports Education

Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (TPSR)

Don Hellison's Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (TPSR) model, developed and refined over four decades of practice (Hellison, 2011), is widely regarded as the most empirically validated framework for using sport and physical education to develop values, civic agency, and social responsibility in young people. The TPSR framework is organised around five levels of responsibility: Level 0 (Irresponsibility), Level 1 (Self-control and Respect), Level 2 (Participation and Effort), Level 3 (Self-direction), and Level 4 (Caring and Leadership), with the explicit aim of transferring these values from the gym to the broader community. This transfer goal directly aligns TPSR with the social and civic dimensions of sustainable development.

Empirical research on TPSR has documented significant positive outcomes including improved self-efficacy, conflict resolution skills, pro-social behaviour, and academic engagement (Gordon, 2009; Martinek & Hellison, 2009). Walsh et al. (2010) found that students in TPSR-based PE programmes demonstrated greater levels of personal and social responsibility compared to control groups, with sustained effects over time. Critically, TPSR has been most extensively developed and tested in under-resourced urban contexts, demonstrating its particular relevance for SDG 10 (reduced inequalities) and SDG 16 (peace, justice, and strong institutions) objectives. Adaptations of TPSR for diverse international contexts—including post-conflict settings, refugee communities, and rural development contexts—further demonstrate its pedagogical flexibility and cross-cultural applicability (Escarti et al., 2010).

Sport Education Model

The Sport Education Model (SEM), developed by Siedentop (1994) and subsequently elaborated by Siedentop et al. (2011), is a curriculum and instruction model designed to provide authentic, educationally rich sport experiences within the school PE context. The SEM is characterised by six key features: seasons (extended units of instruction), affiliation (students as team members throughout the season), formal competition,

culminating events, record keeping, and festivity. These features replicate the institutional structure of community sport, providing students with a richer, more contextualised, and more socially embedded sport experience than traditional PE units typically afford.

Research on the SEM has documented positive outcomes including increased physical activity levels, improved sport competence, enhanced social inclusion, and greater student enthusiasm and engagement (Hastie et al., 2011). Crucially for sustainability objectives, the SEM's emphasis on student leadership through roles such as team captain, coach, referee, and statistician develops civic and organisational competences directly relevant to community sport leadership and active citizenship. The model's inclusive design, which distributes leadership roles and competitive success across diverse student subgroups, also supports SDG-10's equity objectives, and MacPhail et al. (2008) demonstrated that the SEM can be an effective vehicle for developing cooperation, fair play, and inclusive sporting cultures, particularly when teachers adopt facilitative, student-centred pedagogical approaches.

Cooperative Learning in Physical Education

Cooperative learning (CL), a well-established pedagogical approach in general education, has been extensively adapted for PE contexts by Dyson and Casey (2012) and others. CL in PE involves structured group activities in which students work together toward shared physical and cognitive learning goals, with individual accountability, positive interdependence, face-to-face promotive interaction, interpersonal skill development, and group processing as core structural features. These features make CL particularly well suited to the collaborative, interdependent, and collectively responsible norms that underpin sustainable development.

Meta-analytic evidence consistently supports the effectiveness of cooperative learning for promoting both cognitive achievement and prosocial outcomes across educational levels (Johnson & Johnson, 2009), and PE-specific research has documented positive effects on physical skill development, social behaviour, and motivation (Casey & Goodyear, 2015). From a sustainable development perspective, CL in PE is significant for its capacity to model and practise the collaborative problem-solving, shared responsibility, and collective agency that are essential for addressing complex sustainability challenges. The explicit social skill development dimension of CL, including communication, conflict resolution, decision-making

and leadership maps directly onto the civic competences required for active participation in sustainable communities (Dyson & Casey, 2012).

Activist Approaches and Critical Pedagogy

Activist approaches to physical education, developed by Enright and O'Sullivan (2010, 2013) and informed by critical and feminist pedagogical traditions (Freire, 1970; hooks, 1994), represent the most explicitly political dimension of sustainable sports pedagogy. These approaches position students, particularly those from marginalised communities as agents of curriculum design, challenging the traditional authority structure of PE and developing students' capacity for critical analysis, advocacy, and social change. Activist PE projects have engaged young people in identifying, analysing, and challenging unjust structures and practices in their PE and sport experiences, including gender discrimination, body normativity, compulsory able-bodiedness, and racial marginalisation.

The relevance of activist approaches for sustainable development is grounded in the recognition that sustainability is not merely a technical challenge but a political one, requiring the development of critically conscious, socially engaged citizens capable of challenging unsustainable systems and advocating for just alternatives. Tinning's (2010) concept of "modest pedagogy" offers a realistic and context-sensitive framework for critical PE practice, acknowledging the structural constraints facing PE teachers while insisting on the ethical imperative of working toward more equitable, socially just, and ecologically responsible physical education. Digital and media literacy components of critical PE pedagogy—developing students' capacity to critically analyse sport media, advertising, and consumption cultures—are increasingly recognised as essential dimensions of sustainability-oriented sports education in the twenty-first century (Thorpe & Rinehart, 2010).

Teacher Education And Professional Development

The transformation of physical education toward sustainable development objectives is ultimately contingent on the quality and orientation of PE teacher education and continuing professional development. Teacher educators occupy a critical gatekeeping function in determining what knowledge, values, skills, and pedagogical dispositions enter the profession (Armour, 2014). Yet, research consistently documents a significant theory-practice gap in PE teacher education,

with student teachers frequently reverting to traditional, performance-centred, and socially conservative PE practices upon entering schools, regardless of the transformative aims articulated in teacher education programmes (Kirk, 2010).

Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) identified a set of evidence-based principles for effective teacher education, including a strong theoretical foundation, extensive clinical practice, close school-university partnerships, and ongoing induction and mentoring support. Applied to PE teacher education for sustainable development, these principles suggest the need for curriculum content explicitly addressing sustainability, social justice, ecological literacy, and critical pedagogy, alongside practicum experiences in diverse community sport and outdoor education contexts. Armour and Yelling (2004) demonstrated that PE teachers' professional development is most effective when it is ongoing, collaborative, practice-embedded, and responsive to teachers' context-specific needs principles that should inform the design of sustainability-focused PE professional development programmes.

Several models for sustainability-oriented PE teacher education have been proposed and piloted. UNESCO's Quality Physical Education (QPE) framework (UNESCO, 2015) provides a comprehensive set of guidelines for PE teacher education emphasising equity, inclusion, health literacy, and lifelong physical activity values closely aligned with the SDG agenda. The International Physical Literacy Association's (IPLA) teacher education standards similarly embed sustainability-aligned objectives within a coherent framework of physical literacy development. At the institutional level, universities and teacher education colleges that explicitly integrate sustainability across their curricula, adopting a "whole institution" approach to sustainable development (Sterling, 2001), provide a broader enabling environment for transformative PE teacher education.

Digital technologies and open educational resources represent an increasingly important dimension of PE teacher education for sustainable development, both as vehicles for professional learning and as subject matter for critical digital literacy development. Online communities of practice, video analysis platforms, and digital portfolio systems create new possibilities for teacher collaboration, reflective practice, and cross-cultural learning that can support the dissemination of sustainability-oriented pedagogical innovations across geographic and institutional boundaries (Armour & Makopoulou, 2012). However, the digital divide—

unequal access to technology and digital literacy must itself be recognised as a sustainability issue in teacher education, requiring deliberate attention to equity of access and culturally responsive digital pedagogy (Selwyn, 2016).

The preparation of PE teachers for ecological literacy and environmental education dimensions of sustainable PE represents a notable gap in current teacher education provision. McCullough et al. (2020) surveyed PE teacher education programmes in the United States and found minimal integration of environmental sustainability content, despite PE's inherent connections to natural environments through outdoor education, adventure education, and ecologically situated physical activity. Filling this gap requires deliberate curriculum reform in PE teacher education, informed by interdisciplinary collaboration with environmental education, outdoor education, and sustainability studies scholars and practitioners.

Policy, Governance, and Institutional Frameworks

The integration of sustainable development into physical education and sports pedagogy is not solely a matter of pedagogical innovation; it requires enabling policy environments, adequate resource allocation, and coherent institutional frameworks at local, national, and international levels. Hardman and Marshall (2009), in a landmark global survey of PE provision, documented widespread marginalisation of PE within school curricula, characterised by insufficient curriculum time, inadequately trained teachers, poor facilities, and low institutional status. This structural marginalisation represents a fundamental obstacle to realising PE's potential as a vehicle for sustainable development.

At the international level, the UNESCO International Charter of Physical Education, Physical Activity and Sport (UNESCO, 2015), the revised and updated version of the 1978 Charter provides the most comprehensive doctrinal framework for global PE governance, articulating state obligations in relation to PE provision, teacher training, facility development, and research. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (UN, 2015) and its SDGs, while not explicitly addressing PE, have been interpreted by UNESCO and UNOSDP as establishing a framework within which sport and PE contributions to sustainable development should be recognised and supported. The Kazan Action Plan (UNESCO, 2017), adopted at the World Conference on Physical Education, Physical Activity and Sport, provides a more specific operational framework for

PE policy development, identifying priority areas including quality, equity, inclusion, teacher training, and research.

At the national level, PE curriculum policy frameworks vary significantly in the extent to which they incorporate sustainability-aligned objectives. Analysis of national PE curricula in selected countries reveals a spectrum of approaches. Australia's *Shape of the Australian Curriculum: Health and Physical Education* (Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2022) explicitly integrates health literacy, social-emotional learning, and critical inquiry as core dimensions of PE, alongside movement skill development an approach broadly congruent with SDG objectives. Finland's *National Core Curriculum for Physical Education* (Finnish National Board of Education, 2016) similarly emphasises values education, student agency, and lifelong physical activity within a social-ecological framework.

South Africa's *Physical Education curriculum* (Department of Basic Education, 2011), developed in the post-apartheid context, explicitly situates PE within a social justice and human rights framework, making direct connections between sport, citizenship, and transformation—a particularly clear doctrinal articulation of PE's sustainable development potential. By contrast, many national PE curricula remain primarily focused on sport skill acquisition and physical fitness testing, with limited integration of social, civic and ecological sustainability objectives (Hardman & Marshall, 2009). This curricular conservatism reflects the influence of sport science and performance-oriented physical culture on PE's institutional identity, as well as political and professional resistance to broadening PE's mandated purposes.

Sport governance organisations, including the IOC, FIFA, and national sport federations, increasingly articulate sustainability commitments through sustainability strategies, environmental management frameworks, and social responsibility programmes. The IOC's *Olympic Agenda 2020+5* (IOC, 2021) includes sustainability as a core strategic priority, encompassing environmental sustainability, human rights, gender equality, and social inclusion—dimensions directly aligned with the SDG framework. However, critical scholars have questioned the depth and sincerity of sport governance organisations' sustainability commitments, noting persistent gaps between rhetorical aspiration and institutional practice (Trendafilova & McCullough, 2018). Genuinely sustainable sport governance requires

not merely technical environmental management but fundamental rethinking of growth-oriented, commercially driven sport development models.

Challenges and Critiques

Despite the compelling theoretical and empirical case for integrating sustainable development into physical education and sports pedagogy, significant challenges and critiques must be acknowledged. First, the risk of instrumentalisation looms large: when PE is configured primarily as a vehicle for sustainable development objectives external to the subject itself health outcomes, social cohesion, environmental citizenship it may undermine PE's intrinsic educational value and professional identity, reducing the subject to a means to external ends (Kirk, 2010). Sustainable sports pedagogy must maintain the intrinsic value of physical competence, embodied enjoyment, and sport culture alongside its broader developmental aspirations.

Second, the evidence base for many proposed PE-sustainability linkages remains thin or methodologically limited. While the association between quality PE and health outcomes is well established (Donnelly et al., 2016), the evidence for PE's contributions to environmental literacy, social capital, and civic agency is more mixed and methodologically contested (Coalter, 2007; Sherry et al., 2017). Overstating the case for PE's transformative potential risks credibility damage when programmes fail to deliver promised outcomes, and diverts attention from the structural and policy determinants of sustainable development that are beyond PE's sphere of influence.

Third, the global heterogeneity of PE provision contexts ranging from well-resourced suburban schools in high-income countries to chronically under-resourced rural schools in low-income countries, means that a single sustainability-oriented PE framework cannot be universally applied without context-sensitive adaptation. The risk of pedagogical imperialism the uncritical export of pedagogical models developed in high-income, anglophone contexts to diverse global settings is a genuine concern in the SFD literature (Darnell & Hayhurst, 2011). Sustainability-oriented sports pedagogy must be culturally responsive, locally contextualised, and developed in genuine partnership with communities rather than imposed from above.

Fourth, the political economy of school sport including commercial sponsorship, elite sport pipeline pressures, and media-driven performance cultures creates structural incentives that frequently push against equity, inclusion, and sustainability objectives. Physical

education occupies a contested institutional space in which competing interests government health policy, commercial sport, elite athlete development, parental expectation, and professional PE identity all vie for influence over curriculum content and pedagogical practice (Evans, 2014). Navigating these competing pressures requires not only pedagogical skill but political acumen and institutional advocacy capacity that are rarely developed in PE teacher education.

Recommendations and Future Directions

On the basis of the foregoing doctrinal analysis and literature review, this paper advances the following recommendations for scholars, practitioners, policymakers, and sport governance organisations committed to advancing physical education and sports pedagogy for sustainable development.

Curriculum Reform

National PE curriculum frameworks should be revised to explicitly integrate sustainable development objectives, including health literacy, social justice, ecological literacy, and active citizenship, as mandated learning outcomes alongside physical competence and movement skill development. This reform should draw on UNESCO's QPE framework and the Kazan Action Plan as doctrinal reference points, while allowing for national and cultural contextualisation. Interdisciplinary curriculum integration connecting PE with science, social studies, health education, and environmental education should be incentivised and structurally supported through timetabling, assessment reform, and teacher collaboration time.

Teacher Education Reform

PE teacher education programmes should incorporate explicit content on sustainable development, including environmental literacy, social justice, critical pedagogy, and SDG-aligned pedagogical models such as TPSR, Sport Education, and cooperative learning. Practicum placements should be diversified to include community sport, outdoor education, and SFD programme contexts, alongside traditional school PE settings. Continuing professional development for practicing PE teachers should be systematically resourced, school-embedded, and responsive to teachers' sustainability-related professional learning needs.

Research Investment

Funding bodies, universities, and sport governance organisations should invest in rigorous, longitudinal, mixed-methods research on PE's contributions to sustainable development outcomes, with particular

attention to under-evidenced SDG domains including environmental literacy (SDG 13), reduced inequalities (SDG 10), and peaceful societies (SDG 16). Community-based participatory research approaches, co-designed with young people, communities, and practitioners, should be prioritised to ensure research relevance, ethical integrity, and knowledge translation.

Policy and Governance

Governments should legislate minimum standards for PE provision including curriculum time, teacher qualification, and facility standards—as a component of their educational human rights obligations and SDG commitments. International sport governance organisations should adopt binding sustainability criteria for sport event bidding, facility development, and programme funding, and should require sustainability literacy as a core competence for sport administrators and coaches. Public-private partnerships in sport should be governed by social and environmental sustainability conditions that align commercial sport investment with SDG objectives.

Digital Innovation

The integration of digital technologies including wearable activity monitors, virtual physical activity platforms, gamification, and social media into PE pedagogy should be pursued with deliberate attention to equity of access, digital literacy, and critical engagement with commercial digital sport cultures. Digital tools should serve pedagogical objectives grounded in physical literacy, social connection, and ecological awareness, rather than driving further datafication of children's physical activity or reinforcing consumerist sport cultures. Open-access digital resources for sustainability-oriented PE should be developed and disseminated through international networks of PE scholars and practitioners.

Conclusion

This paper has argued that physical education and sports pedagogy occupy a strategic and under-utilised position within the global sustainable development enterprise. Through doctrinal analysis and integrative literature review, it has demonstrated that PE's contributions to health and wellbeing (SDG-3), quality education (SDG-4), gender equality (SDG-5), reduced inequalities (SDG-10), sustainable cities (SDG-11), and climate action (SDG-13) are theoretically coherent, empirically grounded, and practically realisable given the right pedagogical models, policy frameworks, and professional capacities. The TPSR model, Sport Education Model, cooperative learning, and activist

pedagogical approaches have been identified as the most robustly evidenced and SDG-aligned frameworks for PE curriculum design and instruction.

At the same time, the paper has acknowledged significant challenges: the risk of PE instrumentalisation, evidence base limitations, the global heterogeneity of PE contexts, and the structural political economy of school sport. Addressing these challenges requires intellectual honesty, methodological rigour, cross-cultural sensitivity, and sustained political commitment from scholars, practitioners, policymakers, and sport governance organisations. Sustainability-oriented sports pedagogy must be simultaneously ambitious and humble ambitious in its vision of PE as a site of transformative individual and social development, humble in its recognition that PE alone cannot solve the systemic crises of planetary sustainability and human inequality.

The 2030 Agenda represents both an opportunity and an obligation for the PE profession. As global citizens who inhabit bodies in shared ecological and social spaces, children and young people deserve a physical education that prepares them not only to move well and live healthily, but to understand, value, and act on behalf of the sustainable world they will inherit. Realising this vision requires the collective intellectual, political, and pedagogical commitment of all who share responsibility for the future of physical education and sport.

References

5. Armour, K. M. (2011). *Sport pedagogy: An introduction for teaching and coaching*. Prentice Hall.
6. Armour, K. M. (2014). New directions for research in physical education and sport: Pedagogical cases. In K. M. Armour (Ed.), *Pedagogical cases in physical education and youth sport* (pp. 1–11). Routledge.
7. Armour, K. M., & Makopoulou, K. (2012). Great expectations: Teacher learning in a national professional development programme. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(3), 336–346. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.10.003>
8. Armour, K. M., & Yelling, M. (2004). Continuing professional development for experienced physical education teachers: Towards effective provision. *Sport, Education and Society*, 9(1), 95–114. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1357332042000175836>
9. Arnold, P. J. (1988). *Education, movement and the curriculum*. Falmer Press.
10. Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2022). *Australian curriculum: Health and physical education*. ACARA. <https://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au>
11. Bailey, R., Armour, K., Kirk, D., Jess, M., Pickup, I., Sandford, R., & BERA Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy Special Interest Group. (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>
12. Beames, S., & Brown, M. (2016). *Adventurous learning: A pedagogy for a changing world*. Routledge.
13. Biddle, S. J. H., Ciaccioni, S., Thomas, G., & Vergeer, I. (2019). Physical activity and mental health in children and adolescents: An updated review of reviews and an analysis of causality. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 42, 146–155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2018.08.011>
14. 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>
15. Coalter, F. (2007). *A wider social role for sport: Who's keeping the score?* Routledge.
16. Darnell, S. C., & Hayhurst, L. M. C. (2011). Sport for decolonization: Exploring a new praxis of sport for development. *Progress in Development Studies*, 11(3), 183–196. <https://doi.org/10.1177/146499341001100301>
17. Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.
18. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Plenum.
19. Department of Basic Education. (2011). *Curriculum and assessment policy statement: Life orientation grades R–3*. DBE.
20. Donnelly, J. E., Hillman, C. H., Castelli, D., Etnier, J. L., Lee, S., Tomporowski, P., Lambourne, K., & Szabo-Reed, A. N. (2016). Physical activity, fitness, cognitive function, and academic achievement in children: A systematic review. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 48(6), 1197–1222. <https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0000000000000901>
21. Dyson, B., & Casey, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Cooperative learning in physical education: A research-based approach*. Routledge.
22. Enright, E., & O'Sullivan, M. (2010). 'Can I do it in my pyjamas?' Negotiating a physical education curriculum with teenage girls. *European Physical Education Review*, 16(3), 203–222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14440071.2010.500000>

- org/10.1177/1356336X10382967
23. Enright, E., & O'Sullivan, M. (2013). Producing different knowledge and producing knowledge differently: Rethinking physical education research and practice through participatory visual methods. *Sport, Education and Society*, 18(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2012.662820>
24. Escartí, A., Pascual, C., Gutiérrez, M., Marín, D., Martínez Taboada, C., & Wright, P. M. (2010). Applying the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility model program in Spanish schools, contexts, and results. *RICYDE: Revista Internacional de Ciencias del Deporte*, 6(18), 1–14.
25. Evans, J. (2004). Making a difference? Education and 'ability' in physical education. *European Physical Education Review*, 10(1), 95–108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X04042158>
26. Evans, J. (2014). Ideological gymnastics: Educational reform and physical education. In K. Green & A. Smith (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of physical education pedagogies* (pp. 27–39). Routledge.
27. Fedewa, A. L., & Ahn, S. (2011). The effects of physical activity and physical fitness on children's achievement and cognitive outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 82(3), 521–535. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2011.10599785>
28. Fernández-Balboa, J. M. (Ed.). (1997). *Critical postmodernism in human movement, physical education, and sport*. State University of New York Press.
29. Finnish National Board of Education. (2016). *National core curriculum for basic education 2014*. Opetushallitus.
30. Flintoff, A., & Scraton, S. (2001). Stepping into active leisure? Young women's perceptions of active lifestyles and their experiences of school physical education. *Sport, Education and Society*, 6(1), 5–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713696043>
31. Flintoff, A., Fitzgerald, H., & Scraton, S. (2008). The challenges of intersectionality: Researching race, gender and sexuality in physical education. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 18(2), 73–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09620210802351300>
32. Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.
33. Gordon, B. (2009). Merging teaching personal and social responsibility with sport education: A marriage made in heaven or hell? *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 28(2), 105–118. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.28.2.105>
34. Haegele, J. A., & Hodge, S. (2016). Disability discourse: Overview and critiques of the medical and social models. *Quest*, 68(2), 193–206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2016.1143682>
35. Hardman, K., & Marshall, J. (2009). *Second world-wide survey of school physical education: Final report*. International Council of Sport Science and Physical Education.
36. Hastie, P. A., de Ojeda, D. M., & Luquin, A. C. (2011). A review of research on sport education: 2004 to the present. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 16(2), 103–132. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2010.535202>
37. Hellison, D. (2011). *Teaching personal and social responsibility through physical activity* (3rd ed.). Human Kinetics.
38. Hillman, C. H., Erickson, K. I., & Kramer, A. F. (2008). Be smart, exercise your heart: Exercise effects on brain and cognition. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 9(1), 58–65. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2298>
39. Hoberman, J. (1984). *Sport and political ideology*. University of Texas Press.
40. hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. Routledge.
41. Hutchinson, T. (1999). *Researching and writing in law*. LBC Information Services.
42. Hutchinson, T., & Duncan, N. (2012). Defining and describing what we do: Doctrinal legal research. *Deakin Law Review*, 17(1), 83–119.
43. International Olympic Committee. (2021). *Olympic agenda 2020+5: 15 recommendations*. IOC. <https://olympics.com/ioc/olympic-agenda-2020-plus-5>
44. Janssen, I., & LeBlanc, A. G. (2010). Systematic review of the health benefits of physical activity and fitness in school-aged children and youth. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 7, Article 40. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1479-5868-7-40>
45. Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2009). An educational psychology success story: Social interdependence theory and cooperative learning. *Educational Researcher*, 38(5), 365–379. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09339057>
46. Kidd, B. (2008). A new social movement: Sport for development and peace. *Sport in Society*, 11(4), 370–380. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17430430802019268>
47. Kirk, D. (2010). *Physical education futures*. Routledge.
48. Lyras, A., & Welty Peachey, J. (2011). Integrating sport-for-development theory and praxis. *Sport*

- Management Review, 14(4), 311–326. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2011.05.006>
49. MacPhail, A., Kirk, D., & Kinchin, G. (2004). Sport education: Promoting team affiliation through physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 23(2), 106–122.
50. Mangan, J. A. (1981). *Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian public school: The emergence and consolidation of an educational ideology*. Cambridge University Press.
51. Martinek, T., & Hellison, D. (2009). *Youth leadership in sport and physical education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
52. McCullough, B. P., Orr, M., & Watanabe, N. M. (2020). Measuring externalities: The imperative next step to sustainability assessment in sport. *Journal of Sport Management*, 34(5), 393–402. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2019-0254>
53. McKenzie, T. L., & Lounsbery, M. A. F. (2013). Physical education teacher effectiveness in a public health context. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 84(4), 419–430. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2013.844025>
54. Mosston, M., & Ashworth, S. (2002). *Teaching physical education* (5th ed.). Benjamin Cummings.
55. Ntoumanis, N., Ng, J. Y. Y., Prestwich, A., Quested, E., Hancox, J. E., Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C., Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M., Lonsdale, C., & Williams, G. C. (2020). A meta-analysis of self-determination theory-informed intervention studies in the health domain: Effects on motivation, health behavior, physical, and psychological health. *Health Psychology Review*, 15(2), 214–244. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17437199.2020.1718529>
56. Orr, D. W. (1992). *Ecological literacy: Education and the transition to a postmodern world*. State University of New York Press.
57. Piaget, J. (1970). *Structuralism*. Basic Books.
58. Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon & Schuster.
59. Sallis, J. F., Bull, F., Guthold, R., Heath, G. W., Inoue, S., Kelly, P., Oyeyemi, A. L., Perez, L. G., Richards, J., & Hallal, P. C. (2016). Progress in physical activity over the Olympic quadrennium. *The Lancet*, 388(10051), 1325–1336. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(16\)30581-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)30581-5)
60. Sallis, J. F., McKenzie, T. L., Beets, M. W., Beighle, A., Erwin, H., & Lee, S. (2012). Physical education's role in public health: Steps forward and backward over 20 years and HOPE for the future. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 83(2), 125–135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2012.10599842>
61. Schulenkorf, N., Sherry, E., & Rowe, K. (2016). Sport for development: An integrated literature review. *Journal of Sport Management*, 30(1), 22–39. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2014-0263>
62. Selwyn, N. (2016). *Education and technology: Key issues and debates* (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.
63. Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.
64. Sherry, E., Schulenkorf, N., & Phillips, P. (Eds.). (2016). *Managing sport development: An international approach*. Routledge.
65. Sherry, E., Schulenkorf, N., Seal, E., Nicholson, M., & Hoyer, R. (2017). Sport-for-development research 1990–2015: A review of the literature and trajectories for future research. *European Journal for Sport and Society*, 14(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16138171.2017.1294284>
66. Siedentop, D. (1994). Sport education: Quality PE through positive sport experiences. *Human Kinetics*.
67. Siedentop, D., Hastie, P. A., & van der Mars, H. (2011). *Complete guide to sport education* (2nd ed.). Human Kinetics.
68. Sterling, S. (2001). *Sustainable education: Re-visioning learning and change*. Green Books.
69. Thorpe, H., & Rinehart, R. (2010). Alternative sport and affect: Non-representational theory examined. *Sport in Society*, 13(7–8), 1268–1291. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17430431003780278>
70. Tinning, R. (2010). *Pedagogy and human movement: Theory, practice, research*. Routledge.
71. Torraco, R. J. (2005). Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. *Human Resource Development Review*, 4(3), 356–367. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484305278283>
72. Trendafilova, S., & McCullough, B. P. (2018). Environmental sustainability research in sport management: Where we have been and where we need to go. *Sport Management Review*, 21(2), 220–229. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2017.08.004>
73. UNESCO. (1978). *International charter of physical education and sport*. UNESCO.
74. UNESCO. (2015). *Quality physical education: Guidelines for policy makers*. UNESCO.
75. UNESCO. (2017). *Kazan action plan*. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000252725>
76. United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. United Nations.

77. United Nations Office on Sport for Development and Peace. (2016). Sport as an enabler of sustainable development. UNOSDP. <https://www.un.org/sport/content/why-sport/sport-and-sustainable-development-goals>
78. Viner, R., Russell, S., Saulle, R., Croker, H., Stansfield, C., Packer, J., Nicholls, D., Goddings, A.-L., Bonell, C., Hudson, L., Hope, S., Ward, J., Schwalbe, N., Morgan, A., & Minozzi, S. (2022). Impacts of school closures on physical and mental health of children and young people: A systematic review. *BMJ Open*, 12(2), Article e048480. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2021-048480>
79. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
80. Walsh, D. S., Veri, M. J., & Willard, J. J. (2015). Effects of TPSR-based physical education on student responsibility: A review of literature 2003–2014. *Agora for Physical Education and Sport*, 17(2), 164–188.
81. Westerman, W. (2006). Doctrinal research: It's not what you think. *Legal Education Review*, 16(1–2), 181–200.
82. Whitehead, M. (Ed.). (2010). *Physical literacy: Throughout the lifecourse*. Routledge.
83. Wood, T. D., & Cassidy, R. F. (1927). *The new physical education*. Macmillan.
84. World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our common future (the Brundtland Report)*. Oxford University Press.
85. World Health Organization. (2020). *WHO guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour*. WHO.
86. World Health Organization. (2022). *Global status report on physical activity 2022*. WHO.
87. Wright, J. (1996). The construction of complementarity in physical education. *Gender and Education*, 8(1), 61–79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540259660040>