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ABSTRACT

This dissertation sets out to provide the necessary evidence that there is a logical connection between a person’s engagement in sport and the formation and development of his or her character and also to indicate what role sport can play in moral education of those, in particular children, who play it. The main aim of this study is to show that an initiation into the practice of sport entails not only the mastery of physical skills but also the cultivation of moral character. To achieve this aim, the following three objectives will be addressed: 1) to demonstrate that the learning of sport entails the acquisition and development of a particular species of practical knowledge; 2) to show that the logic of acquiring practical knowledge through participation in sport, games or physical education activities is similar to the logic of acquiring a moral habit and skill in moral reasoning which are two necessary conditions for moral education; and 3) to argue that sport, when properly understood and taught as a socially constituted practice that has its own integrity governed and characterized by its rules and ethos, provides an important context and resource that is logically applied to the process of moral education, that is, of acquiring moral habits and skill in moral reasoning. In short, with a focus on the analysis of moral education this study attempts to provide a compelling argument that sport can play an significant role in the moral growth of young people.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

I had planned to join one of my friends at a restaurant for a late lunch on the first Sunday of February. When we entered the restaurant, a waiter stopped us and said “We are closing; it’s a big day.” I stepped back and looked at the post attached to the front door saying, “We are closing Super early Super Bowl Sunday.” I, as a foreign student who did not follow the American religion -- American football, asked a waiter why it was necessary to close at 2pm. He answered, “It is a business mistake to stay open today. We want to avoid the business lull that comes when customers are glued to the television while their teams are on the field.” During my years in the United States, it did not take me long to realize that the Super Bowl is a national event; the game and its ancillary festivities constitute Super Bowl Sunday. Over the years it has become the most-watched U.S. television broadcast of the year, and has become likened to a de facto U.S. national holiday.

Sports play a significant role in the lives of many Americans and, indeed, of many people around the world. People seem almost fixated on physical prowess, on athletes’ remarkable feats, and on the drama of the sport games. There are millions of people willing to spend time and money in order to watch sporting events in person and on
television. The 2006 FIFA World Cup was aired in a total 43,600 broadcasts across 214 countries and it had a total cumulative television audience of 26.29 billion – 24.2 billion in-home and 2.1 billion out-of-home viewers (FIFA, 2006). Through 16 days of coverage, 211 million viewers have watched the 2008 Beijing Olympics on NBC Universal’s broadcast network and cable channels, according to Nielsen Media Research (Nielsen Business Media, 2008). In the United States, there are many people that watch sports almost religiously. Millions watch not only National Football League (NFL), Major League Baseball (MLB), National Basketball Association (NBA), National Hockey League (NHL), and the college football bowl games, but also games leading up to these, as well as regular season events. Sports television is available on multiple channels, twenty-four hours a day, while whole sections of the newspaper focus on sports.

While millions of people watch sports television, millions of others engage in sports activities of varying levels. In our contemporary society, many individuals value physical health, good looks, youthful attitude, and long life above almost anything else (Kretchmar, 2005). According to Bureau of Labor Statistics, about 70 percent of people who live in the United States participated in sports and exercise activities (including walking and using cardiovascular equipment) on an average day in recent years (n.a., 2008). The leisure industry is the second largest industry in America, producing over $500 billion annually in direct spending (AAHPERD, 2007). According to the Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association, the U.S. sports goods industry is expected to reach $69.6 billion (at wholesale) by the end of 2008 (n.a., 2008). Though the above date is referring to American society, sport crosses national boundaries. Sport, wherever it is engaged in, is an important and pervasive influence in the contemporary world (Arnold,
Despite the significant role of sport in our contemporary society, sport and physical activities are often devalued (Arnold, 1997; Drewe, 2001; Jones & McNamee, 2000; Kirk, 2006; Kretchmar, 2005; Shields & Bredemeier, 1995). There is still an overt prejudice against physically involved activities, in contrast to their unreasonable favor of any scholarly acts. Where productivity and work are highly valued, physical education and sport have an ambiguous status at best, whereas in dualism, mind is more highly regarded than body or thinking than doing (Kretchmar, 2005). There still exists the “dumb jock” stereotype and widespread perception that physical education or university kinesiology programs are not intellectually challenging (Kretchmar, 2005). The value of physical education and other school-based physical activity programs have been questioned in many curricular content debates (Drewe, 2001). In schools across the United States, the time available for physical education has been substantially reduced -- and in some cases completely eliminated -- in response to budgetary concerns and increasing pressures to improve academic test scores (National Association for Sport and Physical Education & American Health Association, 2006).

Physical education is typically justified as a means for students to achieve healthy and fit lifestyles (Drewe, 2001). For example, for nearly 20 years the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE) had been conducting The Shape of the Nation Report every five years to summarize information for the profession and the public regarding the status of physical education in the American educational system. These reports have brought attention to the importance of daily physical education programs for all school age children, stressing that physical education is unique to the
school curriculum as it is the only program that provides students with opportunities to learn motor skills, develop fitness, and possess the knowledge, skills, and confidence to be physically active and healthy for a lifetime (NASPE & AHA, 2006). Grad and Wright (2005) argued that with the increase in obesity nationwide, the benefits gained from physical education activity include: disease prevention, decreased morbidity and premature mortality, and increased mental health and self-esteem. Also, the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAHPERD) has emphasized that physical education class provides students with an individualized, developmentally appropriate, and personally challenging instructional program that will advance the knowledge, confidence, skills, and motivation needed to engage in a lifelong, healthy, active lifestyle (AAHPERD, 2005). In short, the most prominent benefits so often espoused by advocates of physical education have to do with both physical and mental health topics such as improving respect for oneself, self-confidence, social development, self-esteem, lowering stress and other such activities (Drewe, 2001).

I am not denying the above-mentioned values of physical education such as the promotion of healthy lifestyle both physically and mentally, but it should not be overlooked that the same physical and mental health objectives could be realized through other non-physical education programs. For example, students who express themselves with an arts curriculum could see their self-confidence and self-esteem rise (Drewe, 2001). In a similar way, sports curricular such as soccer clubs could give students the opportunity to engage in confidence, physical fitness, and self-esteem building activities. In short, the same benefits could be achieved through different means. Thus, it seems to me that these justificatory arguments are not unique to physical education.
Purpose of the Study

What then makes physical education and sport special and valuable act of educating? It is my assertion in this that it flows from how it facilitates moral education. Some critics claim we are in the throes of “moral crisis,” “moral decline,” “moral vacuum,” or “moral change” in our moral posture (Barrow, 2007; Halstead & Pike, 2006; Mitias, 1992). The social and historical causes of this state of affairs should be examined (Mitias, 1992). Yet, apart from this urgent concern, it is intrinsically important for us to understand the practice or method we can employ in educating our children to become moral: How can we educate our children in moral conduct. Under what conditions can we achieve this aim? I believe that physical education and sport can provide that condition for the moral development of our youth in such a way that they grow in moral autonomy.

What possibility does physical education provide for the development of moral character? Physical education is the subject area in which practical knowledge is more emphasized than any other educational activities in the school curriculum. This alone makes physical education particularly conducive to the process of moral education because moral knowledge, as Aristotle insisted, is practical. It is knowledge by and from praxis (alternative translations: “doing” or “conduct”). Physical education involves the acquisition of a particular form of practical knowledge directed toward practical outcomes. Keeping this distinguishing feature of physical education in my mind, I assert that physical education makes a significant contribution to moral education. Physical education is special in requiring a logical connection between attaining practical knowledge and achieving moral education. Unlike other educational activities, I firmly believe that physical education can provide a rich environment for dealing with moral
issues and developing the student’s moral behavior. Thus, when sport and physical education are viewed as an arena for practicing moral behaviors as well as an important context that is logically linked to the process of moral education, a stronger justification for the inclusion of physical education in the school curriculum can be provided rather than rely on the instrumental arguments concerning health and fitness so often espoused by advocates of physical education (Drewe, 2001).

Therefore, this dissertation is a serious attempt to explore analytically and critically, with an eye on the contemporary social scene, the logical connection between moral education and sport and physical education. The goal of this study is to prove that the practice of sport not only results in the mastery of physical skills but also the cultivation of moral character. To accomplish this goal, the following three objectives will be addressed. The first is to demonstrate that learning sport entails the acquisition and development of a particular type of practical knowledge. Secondly, this study attempts to show that the logic of acquiring practical knowledge through participation in sport, games or physical education activities is similar to the logic of acquiring a moral habit and moral reasoning skill which are two crucial conditions for achieving moral education. The last objective argues that when sport are properly understood, taught as a practice, utilizes integrity, and is governed and characterized by its rules and ethos, it provides an effective practical context in which to logically apply to the process of moral education, that is, of acquiring moral habits and skill in moral reasoning. In short, with a focus on analysis of moral education this study attempts to provide a convincing argument that sport can play a significant part in the moral growth of young people.

Delimitation & Definition of Terms
For the purpose of this study, the following definitions have been included.

**Moral Education**: For millennia the topic of moral education has gotten attention from philosophers of education. The literature surrounding moral education is immense and the scope of this dissertation precludes me from dealing with all of the issues involved in moral education. Thus, I will assume that there is enough agreement that the factors of moral education are *the formation of moral habits* (Aristotle, 2000; Arnold, 2001; Barrow, 2007; Jones, 2005; Noel, 1991; Peters, 1981; Watson, 2008) and *the acquisition of skill in moral reasoning* (Aristotle, 2000; Barrow, 2007; Carr, 1996, 2008; Kohlberg, 1981; Jones & McNamee, 2000, 2003; Peters, 1981; Schneider, 2009). The detailed discussion of what is meant by both moral habit and skill in moral reasoning will be addressed in Chapter 2.

**Physical Education and Sport**: Neither sport nor physical education are simple terms. Due to similarities in, and possible overlap between, some definitions, these terms are used almost interchangeably in much of the literature. However, due to the varying roles of sport and physical education in our society, sports are not always physical education and not all physical education is simply sport (Capel, 2000; Drewe, 2001; Freeman, 2001; Lumpkin, 2002). A stark distinction between sport and physical education is that while sport, particularly elite professional sport, can be played without any educational aims, physical education, as indicated by the title, always has to have an educational aspect of the physical experience as its primary goal (Drewe, 2001; Freeman, 2001).

This does not mean that sport cannot be used as a vehicle for the educational process. Sport does offer a number of valuable educational experiences which are
intrinsic to the act of educating. However, sport is often played for purposes such as the experience of fun or attainment of money (Drewe, 2001). So, some elite professional sports cannot be specifically described as being educational and would be a poor example in that context. For example, drug use, cheating, abuse of athletes and the corrupting power of money all undermine the educational value of sport. However, it is important not to write-off all of the possible manifestations of sport from some elite professional or high competitive sports where winning is deemed of crucial importance (Kirk, 2004). As Kirk (2004) pointed out, “there are various ways of practicing sport, some of which may be more or less socially and educationally desirable than others” (p. 262). Therefore, when we come to consider sport as a major form of physical education, it is important to select the most socially and educationally desirable sport so that it has the potential to contribute positively to the educational process in the physical education.

Throughout this dissertation, I consider sport as the main content of physical education. Although physical education program could, and should, involve more than sport, such as educational gymnastics, fitness training and dance, sport has been considered as the major content for physical education because of the educational values that sport is inherently concerned with. In this study, I shall be primarily concerned with the teaching of sport rather than other contents of physical education. However, most of what I discuss physical education applies to the practice of sport as well. To maintain that sport is important subject matter for physical education, I will (particularly in Chapter 4) provide an account of how sport can be represented in physical education in an educationally valuable form. What the relationship is between sport and physical
education and how they differ from one another will be elaborated upon later in Chapter 4.

**Theoretical Knowledge and Practical Knowledge:** It is well recognized by philosophers (Aristotle, 2000; Carr 1981; Ryle, 1949) that there are two types of knowledge: theoretical knowledge (or propositional knowledge) and practical knowledge. While theoretical knowledge is concerned with knowing facts such as the dates of historical events or the rules of physics or geometry (e.g., knowing the date of John F. Kennedy’s assassination, knowing the chemical composition of salt, and knowing the opposite angles of a parallelogram), practical knowledge “is concerned with certain forms of performative competence,” or knowing how to perform a skill such as driving a car, building furniture or hitting a golf ball with wood clubs (Arnold, 1988, p. 119). Carr (1981) helps identify the distinction between these two types of knowledge. He wrote, “the main difference between theoretical and practical knowledge is that whereas the concern of the former is with the discovery of truths that are adequately supported by reason and confirmed by experience, the latter is concerned with the execution of purpose in action, conducted in a rational manner and confirmed by a reasonable degree of success” (Carr, 1981, p. 60).

In the light of the definition of theoretical knowledge and practical knowledge above, I assert that physical education involves the acquisition of practical knowledge regarding how to perform the varied movements involved in sport and physical education activity along with theoretical knowledge regarding how the constitutive rules, and rules of skill function in a given sport. Such theoretical knowledge would also include the educational experience of learning how one’s body functions in the sport context (i.e.,
knowledge about exercise physiology, biomechanics, etc.). Chapter 4 will revisit theoretical knowledge and practical knowledge involved in sport and physical education.

Background of the Study

In times past, sport was considered as a part of schools’ educational systems for instilling virtues such as honesty, perseverance, hard work, resolution, humility and courage (Fraleigh, 1984; MacIntosh, 1979; Mangan, 1981). There was major support for this ideological commitment in physical education. However, recent more in-depth sociological, historical and philosophical research on school sports has raised serious questions about the validity of these earlier value affirmations (Fraleigh, 1984).

The idea that there is some sort of internal (or more than contingent) connection between the practice of sports, games or other physical activities and the development of qualities of moral character or understanding is an ancient one, finding some support even in the dialogs of Plato, who held that there is a close correspondence between physical and moral fitness. Centuries later, various physical educators and sport philosophers such as Arnold (1997, 1999, 2001), Boxil (2003), Butcher & Schneider (1998), Jones & McNamee (2000, 2003), Meakin (1981), Simon (2003) and Wright (1987) have written about the potential contributions of physical education and sport to moral education. Some moral benefits include the development of positive character attributes; determination is requirement to endure the rigorous demands of sport; commitment to the principles of fair play, including the willing compliance to the agreed upon rules, is also required; a degree of altruism is often necessary in order to achieve team success; and sports even often involve a particularly generous element whereby competitors encourage and applaud one another as they mutually pursue excellence in a
paradoxically competitive, yet cooperative state of play. Of course, the belief in the correlation of sport and moral education is not held by just some philosophers but is widely held throughout our culture (Simon, 2003).

My theoretical background for the claim that sport provides an important resource, which is logically linked to the process of moral education, is based on the following three views about sport as a moral practice. First, sport participation provides youth the experience of a fair and legitimate social structure. As the rules for games may seem fairer than those of society, sport can provide an ideal setting to instilling moral thinking in children (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995).

Second, sport participants and observers alike sometimes employ moral categories to evaluate sport behaviors. Some behaviors in sport are deemed praiseworthy; others evoke moral condemnation. If sport were not considered a moral practice, sport behaviors could not be evaluated morally.

The last view, perhaps most importantly, is that sport is inherently based upon the moral concept of fairness. Sport philosophers often have argued that fairness is essential to sport and game experiences (Arnold, 1997; Drewe, 2001; Fraleigh, 1984; Meakin, 1982; Zeigler, 1984). Peter Arnold has, I think, rendered a great service to the theory of the relationship between sport and education from the moral point of view. Borrowing from Rawls’s (1971) theory of justice, Arnold described, in his Sport, Ethics and Education (1997), fairness as a confluence of freedom and equality, and he pointed out that sport embodies these twin moral principles. Sport embodies freedom due to the free choice to participate. It embodies equality because when choosing to participate, participants agree to abide by a shared set of rules (Arnold, 1997; Jones & McNamee,
Participants have a moral duty to abide by the rules because of their free choice of participation, and moreover “to commit themselves to what the rules are designed to advance: fairness” (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995, p. 174). Therefore, “to intentionally attempt to gain unfair advantage by breaking the rules is not to be in sport at all” (Arnold, 1997, p. 49) because sport is premised on the twin moral principles of freedom and equality. On this account sport can be a productive place for learning these fundamental moral principles as they are both offered and demanded by sport.

On the other hand, other sport philosophers and critics of contemporary sport are often skeptical of the adage that the practice of sport has a direct connection to moral character development. They assert that sport may very well promote values, but there are also negative values being taught such as overemphasis on winning and resulting disrespect of rival players (Coakley, 2004; Eccles, Barber, Stone & Hunt, 2003; Kohn, 1986; Orlick, 1990; Sage, 1998; Simon, 2003). Other offensive forms of behavior include violence, cheating, aggression, abuse of athletes, and drug use (Carr, 1998; Leonard, 1972; Morgan, 1994, 2006a; Ogilvie & Tutko, 1971).

In fact, it might be difficult for some to see sport’s association with morality because some elements of contemporary sport may often seem to be opposite to the familiar moral ideals. Thus, people may doubt if sport can act as a foundation for moral education and may see significant limitations to sport being used in this fashion. For example, it is often asked by participants, fans, and critics how sport such as boxing could epitomize any important moral ideals. Superficially it seems to promote violence. Sports such as boxing and American football are hardly unique in this respect (Russell, 2007).
The relationship between playing sport and the development of a sound moral character has been the subject of intense debate among philosophers and physical educators for a number of years now. Although this topic is important to philosophy and practice, it seems to me that time itself has seen no conclusive resolution to the issue. Russell (2007) argued that this is due to the unique nature of sport, its separation from what we call “real life,” the seemingly arbitrariness of its activities, and oft-reported moral breakdown of its star participants, to name a few obvious reasons. He also maintained that the puzzles about sport’s relation to morality are pressed by the diversity of conduct found within sport, much of which seems morally questionable at best (Russell, 2007).

To deal with these ambiguities over the connection between sport and morality, it is necessary to consider the following questions: What moral values does sport have? What qualities do we expect pupils to learn by participating in sport? Why those qualities are valuable, to what extent do they occur in sport? Can the teaching of sports in school be viewed as having any serious implications for the moral education of students? Furthermore, do morally desirable attributes a student might develop on the playing field transfer to other areas of his or her life? I think that these are extremely difficult though important questions in order to argue for a logical connection between sport and moral education. The discussion in the following chapters, therefore, is an attempt to suggest a response to these and similar questions regarding the moral foundations of sport and of sport’s relation to the development and formation of his or her moral character and, in particular, to suggest what role sport can play in moral education.

Significance of the Study
The perennial question about whether sport can contribute to the moral education of those, in particular children, who play it, has been the subject of continuous debate. As yet, however, there seems to be little conclusive evidence one way or another. Thus, this study attempts to find the necessary evidence that there is a logical connection between engagement in sport and moral education. Most of the existing work regarding sport’s relation to moral education is based largely on the examination of internal or external values of sports to argue that sport is inherently concerned with moral values and can contribute to the development of moral character. But this study attempts to approach the issue in a little different way. With a focus on analysis of moral education, this study attempts to show how closely and logically participation in sport is related to moral education.

Organization of the Study

Can sport contribute to the moral education of a student? Before I make any attempt to analyze this central question of the dissertation I should be clear about the concept of moral education. Therefore, the subsequent chapter provides the foundation for the thesis of this dissertation by explicating what are the qualities or traits one needs to be a moral person. To accomplish this, I interrogate what I mean by moral education by looking at how education philosophers have long grappled with: What constitutes moral education; what does it mean to grow morally; how can this education be best achieved; and how to best be morally educated? When discussing moral education, we discuss the conditions that must be fulfilled in order for someone to become moral. What it takes to help a student become moral is the emphasis in this discussion.

In Chapter 3, I begin my exploration of the intersection between moral education
and engagement in sport by examining how philosophers and physical educators have for many years discussed and argued for the connection between participation in sport, games or other physical activities and the development of moral character. I trace back to foundational documents of western philosophy supporting the idea that there is a logical connection between sport participation and the development of moral character, drawing up how Plato envisioned a close connection between physical education and the education of the soul (moral education). When understanding how sport might contribute to the development of moral character, it seems to me worthwhile to look back at the views of one of the greatest philosophers in the history of human civilization on the subject.

A close look at a study of the appropriate literature concerning the relationship between engagement in sport and the development of moral character suggests that the main arguments on this issue has been based on one or the other of three following familiar concepts: 1) the rules of sport; 2) the ethos of sport (virtues in sport); and 3) sportspersonship (exercise of virtues). Chapter 3 will, therefore, in some detail discuss these three important concepts which have been a main basis for the arguments regarding the positive connection between engagement in sport and moral education by many scholars.

In Chapter 4, I begin my examination of how moral education relates to physical education and sport by articulating what it entails to be physically educated. This first requires a clarification of what I mean by sport and physical education so that my discussion begins from some common basis. Therefore, Chapter 4 provides a brief explanation of the relationship between physical education and sport. It then proceeds to
look closely at the concept of sport from two different points of view: sport as acquisition of “practical knowledge” and sport as a “practice” governed by its rule and ethos.

In this chapter, I look into the teaching of sport and physical education as a distinct component of the educational curriculum with its primary focus on the acquisition of practical knowledge. After examining practical knowledge, including its nature and characteristics, I maintain that the teaching and learning of practical knowledge is what distinguish physical education from more primarily theoretical knowledge components of the educational curriculum, as well as what make physical education a unique and worthwhile component of the school curriculum. Following Arnold’s (1997) notion of “sport as a valued human practice,” I also examine what is meant by sport as a practice and show more explicitly how this differs from sport as an institution. Presenting sport as a practice in values and ethics where morality is intrinsic and essential for serving its purposes, enables me to evaluate sport and provide a means to judge more easily what appropriate conduct in sport is.

In Chapter 5, I build on my arguments presented in the previous chapters in an attempt to answer the central questions of this study: how can physical education and sport contribute to the moral growth of young men and women; more concretely, under what conditions is this contribution possible? By demonstrating that the learning of sport and physical education is special in requiring a logical connection between attaining practical knowledge and acquiring moral habit and skill in moral reasoning, I assert that there is a logical connection between engagement in sport and moral education. In short, this chapter argues that sport provides a facilitating resource which is intimately applied to the process of moral education of acquiring moral habits and skill in moral reasoning.
In suggesting that there is a logical connection between participation in sport, games or other physical activities and the cultivation of moral character, I will be faced with the counter-argument that sport participation is not a morally valuable experience to develop moral qualities because sporting contexts have frequently been arenas for immoral behavior rather than moral behavior (Schneider, 2009). Therefore, Chapter 5 lays out and examines the arguments that reject the idea that there is a logical connection between engagement in sport and the moral character development. Critiques of the character-forming potential of sport have generally taken one of three forms: 1) sport is morally neutral; 2) it is doubtful whether moral qualities developed in sport will be transferred to other spheres in life; and 3) sport is morally negative. Thus, I examine three main lines of the negative arguments on sport as a moral character builder. Then I, as a proponent of the positive view regarding sport as a vehicle for the formation of moral character, will attempt to refute each point of negative view by suggesting what can be done about sustaining sport as an important form of the cultivation of moral characters.

Finally, I hope to demonstrate that without the active role of the teacher, moral education in sport and physical education would be left incomplete. Therefore, Chapter 5 addresses the role of the physical education teacher as a physical educator in the sense of facilitating the acquisition of knowledge (both theoretical and practical) in their students, as well as a moral educator in the sense of facilitating moral growth in their students.

The last chapter summarizes the main arguments presented in the previous chapters. By making more explicit what moral education is and how the practice of sport relates to it, the chapter re-emphasizes that despite the absence of much clear-cut supportive empirical evidence, there is a logical connection between a person’s initiation
into sport and physical activity and the formation and development of his or her moral character. Then I will conclude with some suggestions for further research in an effort to promote sport in a morally and educationally justifiable way.

Summary

In closing this introduction chapter, it is important to begin by stating clearly what I do not intend to say in this study. I am not claiming that participation in sport automatically and intrinsically infuses good moral values in its participants. I do maintain, however, participants can form moral habits and learn moral reasoning skill more effectively through sport than through any other activities in our life. Put another way, what is not being maintained in this dissertation is that such moral qualities as justice, courage, honest, generosity, fairness and impartiality are specifically and can only be acquired in and through sport or that they can then automatically be transferred and applied to other spheres of life. What I am illustrating is that if one looks at other forms of educationally acceptable activities, it would be hard to deny my conviction that physical education class can provide a context more conducive to attaining practical knowledge and cultivating moral behaviors than other educational activities in schools can provide. Moreover, when sport is compared to other forms of socially acceptable activities, it becomes hard to escape the claims made by some sport philosophers and physical educationists (Arnold, 1992, 1997, 1999; Kirk, 2006; Maraj, 1965; Schneider, 2009; Siedentop, 2002) that there are few activities or situations in our daily life that demand or teach moral virtues that are commonplace and necessary to partake in sport. I strongly believe, though problems and controversy have arisen in competitive sport, it still provides people with encounters where they can learn and evoke moral values, as the
situations and struggles they face, in which they must balance fairness and sportsmanship with the strong desire to win, reflects real-life conflicts. The primary difference between sport and daily life is that moral experience is concentrated and acutely displayed in sport due to the immediacy of the activity, making it a valuable setting for moral education.
CHAPTER 2: MORAL EDUCATION

Let me return to the central question of this dissertation: Can sport contribute to moral education? This question cannot be answered unless a clear notion of what it is to be morally educated. Thus, it is necessary to explicate what I mean by moral education. Education philosophers have grappled with moral education for ages, culminating in a vast wealth of literature. What constitutes moral education? What does it mean to grow morally? How can this education be best achieved? How do you morally educate children? These are the major questions which have been addressed by philosophers of education. This chapter attempts to provide a clearer picture of the moral education by answering questions such as those posed above in order to proceed to examine how this education relates to sport and physical education.

What Is Morality?

Before exploring moral education, the prerequisite task would be to clarify the difficult concept of morality which will appear frequently throughout this dissertation. Morality can be understood as a sub-class of social norms and values of a group of people (Loland, 2002). Morals are beliefs and ideas which guide a person’s perception of what is acceptable or unacceptable. They can be widely known rules or principles such as the Golden Rule, or specific aspects of character like moral values which enable you to act appropriately in regards to others. That is to say, morals regulate interaction in situations
in which what are considered basic values are at stake. When our morals are viewed as a set, as Schneider (2009) puts it, “they form a morality – a system of norms, values, and rules of action that govern our relationship with other human beings – that guides us when questions of right and wrong arise” (p. 4). Loland (2002) articulates such systems by stating that “they prescribe how we should act so as to do good to others, how significant goods and burdens should be allocated, and how people should relate to one another in matters of promises and contracts. Breaking moral norms leads to internal sanctions such as guilt, and/or external sanctions such as blame” (p. 18).

Rachels (2007) also helps us understand morality by providing the “minimum conception” of morality. He argues it is a core that every moral theory should accept at least as a starting point: “morality is, at the very least, the effort to guide one’s conduct by reason – that is, to do what there are the best reasons for doing – while giving equal weight to the interests of each individual who will be affected by what one does” (Rachels, 2007, p. 14).

It would be beneficial if I could provide a simple, uncontroversial definition of what morality is, but that is impossible. Unfortunately, it seems to me, there is no single definition of morality shared by all social scientists, much less all philosophers. Any definition I offer would offend someone, as there are many rival theories (which will be discussed in the following section), each with a competing concept of what it means to live morally. Moreover, morality itself is a social construction that has been differently constructed in different times and places. Various cultures have always differed about what is right and wrong and these perspectives change over time as people and their ideas about the world change. This should make us cautious in dealing with morality, but it
need not paralyze us.

A careful study of the history of morals would reveal that the basic stock of moral values has remained relatively stable (Mitias, 1992). An objective and critical look at civilization would show a constant list of virtues that encompass moral living (Barrow, 2007). Despite cultural differences in each corner of the globe, I believe, there is a general consensus on the basics of morality. Our understanding and views of morality do not seem to have basically changed since the time of Aristotle (Mitias, 1992). We now hold that the content of morality is composed of moral values such as honesty, courage, generosity, truthfulness, justice, friendship, and integrity (Arnold, 1997; Mitias, 1992; Peters, 1981). Although the complete list of morality may vary from one society and time to another, at the roots of morality we see a stable set of moral values through the long length of the history of the civilized world (Mitias, 1992).

Moral Theory

Rokeach (1973) offers a compelling definition of what it means to say that a person has a value and a value system.

A value is an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence. A value system is an enduring organization of beliefs concerning preferable modes of conduct or end-states of existence along a continuum of relative importance” (Rokeach, 1973, p. 5).

Generally, a value implies an important content of something we desire which provides us with deep satisfaction once attained. A person or act is normally considered moral if that person or act demonstrates at least one of the values established in society as moral (Mitias, 1992). These moral values are at the root of moral rules or principles. An example of such a rule is, “Don’t cheat!” We can consider it a rule because it implicitly
expresses moral values such as fairness and honest, but it also acts as the basis of moral
decision. Imagine two students taking a test in class: one has his answer sheet exposed
accidentally, in plain view of the neighboring student. The other student is faced with a
moral dilemma. Should he look at the other student’s answer sheet — a clearly immoral
act — or should he turn away, and do his own work? By choosing to not cheat, the student
has upheld the values of this moral rule: fairness, honesty, and integrity.

Throughout our everyday lives we make choices based on morality. These choices
are shaped by established and accepted moral principles. A person with moral character
knows how to act morally. He or she will act justly and generously in stable human
situations as well as situations which are unparalleled or those faced for the first time in
life. In such situations in which a person asks themselves, “What ought I to do?” they are
attempting to access and deal with a problem (Mitias, 1992). In order to solve this
problem, the person needs to make a choice and implement the chosen option. However,
making a decision involves navigating a complex and sometime perplexing set of
dynamics (Mitias, 1992).

We encounter a unique moral situation in which we have to make a decision. To
make a morally right (or better) decision, we should learn how to apply a moral rule in
the situation. Consider, for instance, the following abortion case. Although it is an
extreme case, it will help you understand the dynamics of moral situation and what
constitutes moral situation.

A teenage girl named Rachel is a rape victim, attacked by someone known by the
family. She decides not to reveal the incident, but soon after her horrible ordeal she learns
that she has become pregnant. Rachel is psychologically devastated by this attack. She
reflects on her condition thoughtfully and considers ending the life of her baby. Is there a moral justification for her decision?

This decision is very convoluted with many details and various points to take into consideration. Rachel has to consider her family, baby, and the morally deprived father of the baby. She also has to consider and weight the moral dynamics of the possible outcomes resulting from her decision. Should she end the developing life inside her? This baby will be a constant reminder of a heinous incident. Also, the father of the baby takes no responsibility for his actions and will not contribute in raising the baby. This becomes a moral dilemma. Should an innocent human life be terminated or should the moral rule thou shall not kill be followed? A normal person who is rational and sane would know of this dictate and of other moral dictates that uphold societies. This knowledge is theoretical, but the question which Rachel faces is how to apply the moral rule in her situation?

As I have just mentioned, this situation is unique because it involves a particular individual in a unique dilemma. The moral rule thou shall not kill does not take into consideration the tragic details of this concrete situation causing conflicting moral rules. The rule is a general statement that applies to all human situations in which life is at stake, such as euthanasia or capital punishment (Barrow, 2007; Mitias, 1992). If this happens, how should Rachel resolve this conflict? This decision comes down to translating the context of the general moral rule into concrete moral judgment. I believe that this translation can be made through Aristotle’s classification of moral knowledge as “practical knowledge” because it is meant to produce a particular course of action (Mitias, 1992). This raise the central question of moral education: How do we foster this type of
knowledge and understanding in children?

Meakin (1982) describes moral education as follows:

Implicit in moral education, as I conceive of it, is the aim of fostering in pupils that degree of knowledge and understanding and that degree of emotional development which are necessary conditions of their coming to think critically for themselves on moral issues and of their making rational moral judgements which they translate into appropriate intentional action (p. 65)

As Meakin (1982) points out, implicit in the concept of moral education is the notion that moral rules and behavior patterns can have a rationale. It shows that there is some basis for making moral judgments. In seeking a basis for moral judgments, many educators have turned to moral theories to reason out the morally right action in particular instances.

Many moral reasoning theories have developed over time. Noted ethical theorists based their theories on what they concluded were the most important factors in deciding whether an action was ethically acceptable or unacceptable. Theories of moral philosophy can be divided into three categories: 1) Deontological moral theory, 2) Consequentialism, and 3) Teleological moral theory.

Deontological Moral Theory

Moral principles are statements prescribing or proscribing particular types of action. The most famous version of deontological moral theory is the one put forth by one of the greatest figures in modern thought, Immanuel Kant who believed that moral principles are absolute. He argued, to take one example, that lying is never right, no matter what the circumstances. He expresses the categorical imperative in these terms: “Act only according to that maxim by which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law” (Kant, 1960, p. 182). According to Kant (1960), we should only
act upon moral principles that we would want universalized. The Golden Rule, “Do unto others as you would have them do onto you,” echoes Kant discussion about only doing things that are good for you as well as others: actions that you have as general law. Referring to such an imperative as categorical, Kant believed that one has a duty to follow a particular maxim unconditionally, regardless of particular consequences he or she wants in a given situation (Kant, 1960; Sullivan, 1994). Kant believes that following such maxims will lead you to act morally.

Simply stated, Kant’s principle of unconditional duty to a truth assumed to be self-evident would lead a person to be moral and rational (Stewart, 2009). However, one problem deontologists face is that even universalized principles can conflict in certain situations. In such situations, we need a way to evaluate and weigh out which of the conflicting principle to follow (Stewart, 2009). As a typical example, picture yourself as a German citizen in World War II. You live by the principle “Never harm a fellow human,” and so you permit a Jewish family to hide in your basement. The German soldiers bang on your door asking if you are harboring Jews in your houses. Suddenly, the previously mentioned principle (and thus the lives of the Jews you hide) is jeopardized by a second principle you have lived by: “Never tell a lie.” You must pick between these two guiding principle and determine if the lives of other human outweigh telling the truth.

As we can see from the above example, sometimes principles will conflict. In other words, when one principle is followed, sometimes another cannot be followed. But, a moral stance that absolutely excludes both is illogical. Of course, this inconsistency could be prevented if at least one of these rules is believed not absolute (Rachels, 2007). However, it is unlikely this course of action will be accessible whenever there is a
conflict. Fundamentally it is also hard to understand why some serious moral rules should be inviolable if others are not (Rachels, 2007).

Consequentialism

Moral theories which insist that the consequences of actions are the main factor in choosing which action is right in a specific circumstance are consequentialist moral theories. The major type of consequentialist theory is utilitarianism, a theory proposed by David Hume (1711-1776) but given definitive formulation by philosopher John Stuart Mill (1806-1873) and his predecessor, Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832). Bentham argued that morality is not about pleasing God, nor is it about being faithful to abstract rules. Morality is about making the world as happy as possible (Wringe, 2006). Utilitarianism states that when you are faced with a moral decision, you should choose the act that will bring the greatest amount of happiness to the greatest number of people. Where deontological theories are concerned with the “means” of moral decision making, consequentialist theories are more concerned with the “end” (Drewe, 2001). In other words, in consequentialist theories, actions are judged according to how they affect oneself or others, rather than on the principles or values upon which the actions are based. To help better understand utilitarian approach to moral judgments, consider the following euthanasia example provided from Robert Veatch’s (1977) book, Case Studies in Medical Ethics.

Skin cancer had riddled the tortured body of Matthew Donnelly. A physicist, he had done research for the past thirty years on the use of X-rays. He had lost part of his jaw, his upper lip, his nose, and his left hand. Growths had been removed from his right arm and two fingers from his right hand. He was left blind, slowly deteriorating, and in agony of body and soul. The pain was constant; at its worst, he could be seen lying in bed with teeth clenched and beads of perspiration standing out on his forehead. Nothing could be done except continued surgery and analgesia. The physicians estimated that he had about a year to live. Mr. Donnelly
had three younger brothers ranging in age from 52 to 36. The youngest, Harold, was the one to whom he had always felt closest. When he pleaded for relief, the other brothers put him off, saying the doctors were doing all they could. To Harold the pleas were more explicit. For the past two months they had been repeated and unmistakable. Mr. Donnelly wanted to die. Harold removed a .30-caliber pistol from his dresser drawer. He wandered through the town the rest of the afternoon and early evening, having drinks at local bars. He walked toward the hospital, arriving during the evening visiting hours. He claimed that he could remember nothing else, including how his brother was shot and killed. The brothers testified against him in the trial (Veatch, 1977, p. 328).

This true story naturally arises the question of whether Harold did wrong. On one hand, Harold loved his brother, and could not stand to watch him suffer. Moreover, Matthew had begged Harold to end his suffering by killing him. All this argues for a lenient judgment. On the other hand, Harold intentionally killed an innocent person, an act which is always viewed according to the dominant moral tradition in our society as immoral (Rachels, 2007).

By using the Matthew Harold’s example, Rachels (2007) explained a different approach Utilitarianism takes. Utilitarianism would have us weigh all options presented to Harold Donnelly searching for the best end result. In order words, what action would lead to the greatest amount of satisfaction for all who are involved? If the youngest brother allows Matthew to live, he might live for another year, in pain, blind, and mutilated, but how much pain and unhappiness would this cause? Matthew made it plain that he was completely unhappy in his condition, and preferred death to living another year in such a condition. Therefore, utilitarians weighed the options and concluded that euthanasia would be morally just by preventing prolonged suffering (Rachels, 2007).

It could be called to attention here that utilitarianism structures ‘the good’ in terms of happiness, satisfaction, or pleasure, and it is questionable whether this is the best
way to depict goodness (Schneider, 2009). Returning to the above euthanasia case, most religious people would not condone or agree that it was morally justifiable for Harold to kill his brother. The United States was founded on Christian values which are still very influential in today’s culture. Christianity considers killing a mortal sin regardless of reason (Barrow, 2007; Stewart, 2009). If someone commits murder in America the assailant will be arrested, charged and punished as Harold Donnelly was (Rachels, 2007). Thus, this reasoning is not grounded in strong moral reasoning, and its primary weakness is that it simply does not make sense to determine right and wrong in this manner since it involves breaking a rule. Hence, to strengthen the consequentialist viewpoint, we will need to consider other ways to conceptualize ‘the good’ (Wringe, 2006).

**Teleological Moral Theory**

Teleological moral theory differs from deontological and consequentialist moral theories because it focuses on being, being a certain type of person while the latter two theories focus on doing -- either based on responsibility or the consequence of an action (Drew, 2001). What are the moral values that a good person should possess? This is the question that a teleological moral theorist would ask. *Telos* is an ancient Greek word meaning ‘purpose.’ Teleological ethical theorists require that you consider your purpose as a human being. By defining one’s purpose, an understanding about what it is to be a good human being and determining the moral values that make up a morally good person can result (Schneider, 2009).

The major type of teleological moral theory would be that of virtue theory which has its roots in the work of Aristotle. In his *Nicomachean Ethics* (ca. 325 B.C.), the main questions are about character. Aristotle begins by asking “What is the good of man?” and
he contended that happiness is the ultimate good for human beings, and that “happiness is a certain kind of activity of the soul in accordance with complete virtue” (Aristotle, 2000, p. 20). Therefore, in order to understand morality, we must grasp what characterizes someone as a virtuous person. Aristotle, focusing on particulars, describes such virtues as courage, self-control, generosity, honest, friendship, and truthfulness. While this view of moral theory is often associated with Aristotle, many other ancient thinkers such as Socrates and Plato contemplated morality (or ethics) by asking the same question: what traits of character make one a good person? This resulted in the virtues as the main topic of their discussion (MacIntyre, 1984; Rachels, 2007; Stewart, 2009).

Teleological moral theory asks that individuals cultivate values which include justice, truthfulness, fairness, honest, compassion, and respect their lives. These values should be then used when deciding what is right and wrong in their conduct and action. Aristotle believed moral values are habits of action cultivated through practice. Human beings, therefore, acquire happiness, their highest good, or *telos*, through this cultivation of virtues (Aristotle, 2000).

As we have seen thus far, moral theories of Kantianism and Utilitarianism that highlight right action are incomplete because they do not include the question of character (Rachels, 2007). Teleological moral theory seems to correct this problem by making character most relevant. But it also risks being incomplete in the opposite way (Rachels, 2007). Moral problems ask the question what we ought to do in a given moral situation. However, teleological moral theory does not offer clear answers to moral problems about what we should do when we encounter moral situations (Halstead & Pike, 2006; Rachels, 2007; Stewart, 2009).
The fundamental flaw of virtue theory is that it is incomplete (Rachels, 2007; Stewart, 2009). The flaw resides in the question, “what is virtue?” Is it honesty? Honesty seems like a typical virtue, yet look at it from another perspective. Many people are honest because of social and religious teaching and pressures originating during childhood. However, if someone is not taught to be honest via these social and religious pressures, how do you measure and add up “what is dishonesty?” Is it lying to gain an upper hand when trying to obtain a desired result? You can call that dishonesty or being honesty to your self-preservation. Either way it is hard to understand honesty if it is not in someone’s disposition to follow the rules of virtue (Rachels, 2007).

In addition, it is not clear perhaps how virtue theory could apply to cases of moral conflict (Goodman & Lesnick, 2004; Wringe, 2006; Rachels, 2007). For example, imagine you are a happily married man, waiting for your wife to prepare for an evening out. She comes in wearing a dress that is clearly too small for her, bunching up in many places. She asks precisely the question you feared she might ask, “Does this dress make me look fat?” Put on the spot, you can either tell her the truth, kindly but honestly suggesting she try on something else, though this could potentially ruin the evening. Or you could lie and tell her she looks beautiful. There are reasons for and against choosing either of the virtues of honesty or kindness. So which should you do? The admonition to act virtuously does not, by itself, offer much help. It only leaves you wondering which virtue takes precedence. From this example, it becomes clear that we need more general guidance to resolve this conflict, more than virtue theory might be able to offer us (Rachels, 2007).
So far I have summarized, albeit briefly, three theories of moral philosophy that identify different elements as being the most important in helping individuals make moral decisions and act morally: deontological, consequentialist, and teleological moral theories. In order for us to make moral decisions, we need to have some underlying moral theory to apply to ethical dilemmas to reason out the morally right action in particular instances. That is to say, the resolution of a moral issue can be interpreted from one or the others of these three perspectives. As we have seen, however, each theory has some limitation to understanding of what we ought to do in unique moral situations. Using only one theory limits the judgment needed to make the right moral decision (Carr, 1996; Noddings, 1995). Thus, it is critical to evaluate all moral theories when decisions involving moral issues are to be made in order to give those issues the most comprehensive consideration possible. This provides important information for the teacher about how she or he has to create a facilitating environment in which his or her students can develop their skill in moral reasoning and moral disposition (Drewe, 2001).

What Constitutes Moral Education?

What is the content of moral education? This question has been the subject of intense debate among philosophers of education for a number of years now (Goodman & Lesnick, 2004; Halstead & Pike, 2006; Hamm, 1977; Peters, 1981; Sher, 1982). Moral education is an activity of “building moral character.” The notion that the cultivation of moral character is the main task of moral education has been approved by a multitude of philosophers on education during the past years (Barrow, 2007; Carr, 2008; Goodman & Lesnick, 2004; Mitias, 1992; Peters, 1981; Sichel, 1988; Watson, 2008). In this section, following Mitias (1992), I argue that the factors of this activity are the formation of moral

In what follows, I explicate what I mean by moral habit and examine how to instill moral habit in the growing child. The second part of my discussion is devoted to what I mean by skill in moral reasoning, exploring how we can make a decision in a concrete moral situation.

*Moral Habit*

What does it mean to grow morally? In order to truly be moral, one must have a definite conception of morality. This goes beyond the basic definition to include the knowledge and practice of how to make someone become moral. Suppose we hold, with Aristotle, that a virtue is a trait of character manifested in habitual action. The “habitual” is important. For example, the virtue of honesty is not possessed by someone who only occasionally tells the truth or only when it is to his or her own advantage (Rachels, 2007). An honest individual will be uninfluenced and truthful no matter the outcome; her actions spring from a firm and unchangeable character (Aristotle, 2003). Then, it could follow that moral education is a process in which we instill moral habit in the growing child.

Cultivating moral habits are necessary for moral growth (Aristotle, 2000; Barrow, 2007; Mitias, 1992; Noel, 1991; Watson, 2008; Wringe, 2006). In other words, by moral habits I mean moral qualities or moral virtues that people use in every aspect of their life. Impartiality, generosity, courage, honesty, fairness, friendship, compassion and justice
are moral virtues which are cherished and respected in society (Peters, 1981). When these qualities are used together they become the traits of one’s moral character (Barrow, 2007; Mitias, 1992). Then, how can we acquire these qualities? An answer could be found in Aristotle’s dictum that we become virtuous by performing virtuous acts. In other words, these qualities are acquired by doing. Aristotle wrote: “Virtues, however, we acquire by first exercising them. The same is true with skills, since what we need to learn before doing, we learn by doing; for example, we become builders by building, and lyre-players by playing the lyre. So too we become just by doing just actions, temperate by temperate actions, and courageous by courageous action” (Aristotle, 2000, p. 23).

The following passage calls into question: Why must a child practice courage in order to attain it? The repeated action of the child turns this quality, and other positive qualities, into habit.

Moral goodness, on the other hand, is the result of habit, from which it has actually got its name, being a slight modification of the world *ethos*. This fact makes it obvious that none of the moral virtues is engendered in us by nature, since nothing that is what it is by nature can be made to behave differently by habituation. For instance, a stone, which has a natural tendency downwards, cannot be habituated to rise, however often you try to train it by throwing it into the air; nor can you train fire to burn downwards; nor can anything else that has any other natural tendency be trained to depart from it. The moral virtues, then, are engendered in us neither by nor contrary to nature; we are constituted by nature to receive them, but their full development in us is due to habit (Aristotle, 2003, p. 31)

In order words, when a child performs the same virtuous act in several similar situations, when future situations that require the same act arise, the child will feel inclined to act accordingly. The term *ethike* (habit) is partly defined as “possessing” (Mitias, 1992). Children, through the practice of courage, can develop, or possess, a tendency to act courageously in a certain way. Through this training of the mind, the *dynamis* (capacity)
for courage will become realized in the behavior and habit (*energeia*) of the child (Aristotle, 2003). Terms that describe the relationship between habit and psyche, such as “instill, inculcate, implant, acculturate, or habituate” (Mitias, 1992, p. 8) illustrate the idea of a response becoming rooted in a child, and then so the habit formed cannot be lost (Mitias, 1992; Noel, 1991; Peters, 1981; Sichel, 1988; Watson, 2008).

Critics might view this perspective of moral education as “moral indoctrination” or “moral training” (Sher, 1982). If this moral training can ingrain specific behavior patterns which cannot be erased in the mind of a child, then it may be possible to use techniques to bring about on demand whatever moral conduct is chosen (Mitias, 1992). In other words, as Meakin (1982) puts it, moral training, in the contrast to moral education, suggests the “more limited aim of drilling pupils in a code of moral rules and concomitant behavior patterns, with scant or no regard for their rationale...in the hope, or even expectation, that they will hold to them unshakably and live by them” (p. 65). However, when Aristotle’s conception of habit is interpreted in this way it runs in direct contrast to his vision of the moral person in two ways (Aristotle, 2000; Mitias, 1992).

First, for Aristotle, habit is not passive, blindly happening when needed (Aristotle, 2003; Mitias, 1992; Noel, 1991; Verbeke, 1990). Possessing a moral quality is equal to possessing an active readiness to act in a certain way (Aristotle, 2000; Dewey, 1930; Mitias, 1992; Noel, 1991; Peters, 1981; Sichel, 1988). Since a habit is an established custom or practice repeated over time, a person knows what to expect and how to perform under a specific situation. That is to say, a skill has been acquired because he or she has developed technical, psychological, and cognitive skills necessary to perform acceptably when a new situation presents itself (Dewey, 1930). Dewey has illuminated
the aspect of habit better than any other philosopher in the twentieth century. He argued that “the essence of habit is an acquired predisposition to ways or modes of response, not to particular acts except as, under special conditions, these express a way of behaving” (Dewey, 1930, p. 42). Habit, according to Dewey (1930), means “a special sensitiveness or accessibility to certain classes of stimuli, standing predilections and aversions, rather than bare recurrence of specific acts. It means will” (p. 42).

However, a critique may question if habit is the best way to nurture moral qualities in young children. Do habits just lead to a predetermined automatic response or does it lead to a cognitive understanding of situations where a response will be based on strong moral values? If habits do lead to a well thought out moral response we should emphasize doing as a way to build moral character through practice (Dewey, 1930; Mitias, 1992; Peters, 1981).

Second, besides being affective, the moral habit is, for Aristotle, cognitive (Aristotle, 2003; Mitias, 1992). In other words, adopting a habit means an understanding of the principle behind the action and also how to perform it (Aristotle, 2000). Insofar as it is a disposition a habit is a kind of attitude (Mitias, 1992). An attitude, according to Eagley & Himmelfarb (1978) is disposition or tendency to make evaluative judgments concerning objects or events. Mitias (1992) pointed out that an attitude is always directed toward an object and is characterized by its level of passion (strong, weak, positive, negative, etc.). As McGuire (1985) states that attitudes relate an “object of thought” to a “dimension of judgment,” one’s attitude entails a sense of value and a definite expectation. Similarly, one cannot have a habit in general, but a particular habit, that is, a particular tendency to act or respond in a certain way.
In short, as Aristotle noted in his *Nicomachean Ethics*, “moral excellence comes about as a result of habit” (Aristotle, 2003, p. 31). Individuals display strong moral character after they have developed habits of action which are the learned and then practiced basics of moral values. What then can be concluded from what has been said about moral habit is this: to possess a habit is tantamount to learning a principle; learning the logical structure of types of situation where type is comprised of certain components and expectations in various situations; develop a skill of how to analyze such situations; furthermore, acquiring a skill to make a particular decision on the basis of the principle learned (Mitias, 1992). The point of moral education is to assist the young in mastering general principle, not to make moral decisions for them. When these principles become moral habits they become moral rules within the soul of the child (Mitias, 1992; Peters, 1981; Watson, 2008).

*Skill in Moral Reasoning*

Moral reasoning is “a decision-making process that requires individuals to use criteria such as moral values, moral principles, and/or the anticipated moral consequences to determine whether a particular action is right or wrong, or whether we have a moral obligation to act in a particular manner toward others” (Schneider, 2009, p. 5). To further discuss skill in moral reasoning (the other factor of moral education), let us start with the following example.

Jackie is participating in a soccer game. She and a player on an opposing team are going for the ball at the same time. They collide and Jackie gets up right away, while the other is wincing in pain and grabbing her ankle. She thinks about running to the open ball to try and give her team an advantage. Instead she stops and helps the other player back
up and congratulates her on her hustle. Jackie has acted morally, has she not? What if what went through her mind was this: “That idiot just ran into me and tried to take me out of the game! Serves her right hurting herself, she deserves it. Hmm….should I help her up? There are college scouts at the game. They like good sportsmanship and fair hard play. If I do I will look that much more appealing and could get a scholarship to school. It looks like the ball is going to roll out of bounds anyway.” If Jackie’s thought process where something like that it would seem her moral character was compromised. It is apparent she twisted her situation and her outer moral image to serve her and make her stock go up. Her logic highlighted a self perpetuating reason underling her actions of sportsmanship and compassion.

The above example indicates that automatically reacting to a situation out of moral habit does not make the action truly moral. Cognitive evaluation is needed. That is why Aristotle added “choice” as another important requirement for moral actions to transpire.

actions done in accordance with virtues are done in a just or temperate way not merely by having some quality of their own, but rather if the agent acts in a certain state, namely, first, with knowledge, secondly, from rational choice, and rational choice of the actions for their own sake, and, thirdly, from a firm and unshakeable character (Aristotle, 2000, pp. 27-28).

Consequently, Aristotle used two elements to define virtue. The first is a virtuous disposition and second is choice (Aristotle, 2000; Mitias, 1992). In other words, the action must come from a moral character, a character that is both firm and stable, and be in line with a moral principle (Verbeke, 1990). Along with having a virtuous disposition, the person must be able to assume responsibility for her action and be able to say, “The action is mine” (Mitias, 1992). She must choose to make this claim and in doing so give
reality and action to her sense of value which arises from her moral deliberation or will (Mitias, 1992).

Moreover, ownership of a moral disposition and eagerness to act on the pertinent moral rule does not impose a moral decision in a concrete moral situation (Barrow, 2007; Carr, 1996, 2008; Mitias, 1992; Peters, 1981). Thus, skill is urgently needed to make a decision (Mitias, 1992). Consider once again the abortion example. Imagine Rachel in the midst of her decision-making process. Using moral reflection will not help her find answers by means of the moral rule, for it is solely a general dictate: Do not kill. This dictate does not comment on specific situations such as war, capital punishment, or euthanasia (Mitias, 1992). When Rachel consults her moral feeling for help she discovers a general belief toward life. Neither the rule nor the belief provides her with a decision. How is she to reach a decision that exemplifies the moral rule yet expresses her disposition? Or, in other words, how is she to translate the general content of the rule into a particular decision?

Rachel should be proficient in moral reasoning and judgments to succeed in this translation. Making a moral judgment does not use rational analysis such as is used in mathematics or science (Mitias, 1992). Rather the model of moral reasoning is an activity of exploration, starting with the moral situation and then generating the moral question, or problem (Hare, 1964; Jones & McNamee, 2000; Peters, 1981). A moral situation consists of specifics which raise moral question. This includes “the problem which a person faces; the moral rules which are relevant to the problem; the people who are affected, directly or indirectly, by the problem; the impact of the possible course of action upon the person, or the possible legal, financial, or social consequences which might
follow if a certain course of action were adopted” (Mitias, 1992, p. 13). Making a choice on these matters is tantamount to making a moral judgment.

Returning to the abortion case in order to illustrate the dynamics of the moral situation, the first question is, what are the basic facts that make up Rachel’s moral situation? What constitutes the situation is that Rachel is seriously scarred emotionally. She is an innocent victim in a horrendous attack. If her baby is born it would be a constant reminder of the violation against her. Thus she faces the question of death: Is it morally justifiable to put an end to the baby’s life voluntarily? But this question is caused by a number of factors. These include: 1) Rachel’s deteriorating health as the emotional scars may cause her body so much stress that she is at high risk for a miscarriage anyway; 2) her young age and the consciousness that her future with a baby will be extremely difficult; 3) the unavailability of help from others; 4) fearing that no one will understand her; 5) her feeling that she would become a burden on society if she were to go on welfare after being kicked from the house by unsympathetic parents.

Next, Rachel’s baby will be a special individual, too. He or she could be full of ideas, feeling, values, habits, desires, and interests. The baby will be a member of society who may contribute in many ways and in a number of roles someday. The baby will have the capacity to possess definite capacities that are moral, social, political, and professional and also learn how to act with these capacities.

Furthermore, Rachel herself has a family, big or small, that she may or may not be close to. She could be rich or poor. She has, in short, definite connections to her social environment. Rachel’s psychological treatment, if she were to pursue it, might be causally related to the treatment of other victims facing similar situations: to what extent
will her decision affect the treatment of other victims? Besides these factors, there are others that might affect Rachel’s decision.

I mention the preceding facts to give you an idea of the dynamics, complexity and bewilderment of the moral situation. It is vital to understand that a moral judgment cannot be reached by just considering one’s moral feeling (Mitias, 1992). As in any important decision the facts must be thoroughly examined. I believe that this is why Aristotle described a moral decision as a deliberative judgment. It is the skill of moral reasoning when one articulates the right moral judgment in a given moral situation. “This reasoning”, wrote Mitias (1992), “is a reflective, critical activity; it does not ‘deduce’ the judgment directly from the moral value without regard for the facts of the moral situation, but articulates the judgment on the basis of a rational survey and evaluation of these facts” (p. 14).

Therefore, a rational investigation of the facts which make up the structure of moral situation must be done in order to make right judgment about what to do in the given situation (Peters, 1981). Several requirements must be met in this systematic inquiry: the moral decision and moral rule should conform to each other; the person’s decision should precisely represent his or her moral feeling; and the decision should do not harm (Kohlberg, 1981; Mitias, 1992; Peters, 1981). The point of moral deliberation is that the agent has to decide and choose the alternative courses of action which exemplifies the essential dictate of the moral rule (Mitias, 1992). In other words, the person’s decision has to expresses his or her moral feeling and comfort to the dictate of the moral rule at the same time.
Consider the following example. A high school tennis player, Matt is participating in his important tennis match whose result has significant impact on whether or not he can receive scholarship funds when he enters a college. In a very close match, the referee mistakenly calls a ball “out” which causes his opponent to lose a match, and he knows that decision is wrong. He is now in a situation in which he asks himself “Should I protest the decision in favor of my opponent, or should I feign ignorance about the referee’s incorrect line call? That is to say, Matt’s personal desire conflicts with the dictate of the moral rule: Be honest, be fair! Is his drive to win stronger than his will to abide by the moral rules of the game even he knows the call to be false? His desire to act oblivious to the mistake is there, but can he overcome this desire and act in a moral manner? Judging from my own experience and the readings of philosophers like Plato, Aristotle, and Dewey I firmly believe that it is possible for him to overcome his desire and make moral judgment.

To sum up, good moral reasoning is the ability to evaluate a problem, taking into consideration both conceptual and factual elements (Mitias, 1992; Sichel, 1988). That is to say, skillful moral reasoning involves the conceptual understanding of the moral rule relevant to the moral situation in order to resolve the problem without infringing the dictate of the rule (Mitias, 1992; Sichel, 1988). It also requires the understanding of the facts comprising the structure of moral situation. We may not teach moral conduct directly to our youth, but I do believe that we can teach them to be conscious of the moral goodness of their own unique character and conduct combined with a feeling of obligation to do right or good.
The discussion of this chapter was intended to provide an overall idea of moral education so that I can proceed to examine how the process of this education is applied to the learning of sport and physical education. To close this chapter, let me raise a fundamental question of moral education: can we teach someone how to be a moral person? My answer is “No.” We may not be able to teach anyone how to be a moral person, but I aver that we can teach a person the conditions which are indispensable for becoming a moral person. As discussed in this chapter, moral habits and skill in moral reasoning are the conditions for moral growth of a person. Then it should follow that educators should provide these necessary conditions for their students to grow morally. My basis for claiming that sport contributes to moral education is in line with this argument, which can be only hinted here (This will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5). Although involvement in sport and physical education may not automatically and intrinsically infuse good moral habits and moral reasoning skill in its participants, participants may acquire this twofold development through sport and physical education more effectively than any other activities in our life. I believe that sport can be utilized as a useful vehicle to facilitate the moral reasoning skills and the formation of moral habits which I believe is the central goal of moral education.
CHAPTER 3: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

“Sport builds character.” This reassuring belief is firmly entrenched in popular opinion and still has a strong influence over people today (Reid, 2007; Schneider, 2009). Rudd (2005) argued that when a participant is credited with character, the word character denotes a multitude of moral and social values such as teamwork, loyalty, self-sacrifice, perseverance, work ethic, and mental toughness. Philosophers and physical educators have long discussed and debated the relationship between the practice of sport and the development of moral character. By surveying the extensive sport ethics literature, this chapter examines how, and on what grounds, philosophers and physical educators have for many years argued for the clear connection between participation in sport, games or other physical activities and the development of moral character.

Plato’s View of Physical Education as a Moral Character Builder

In surveying the sport ethics literature regarding the idea that there is a clear connection between sport participation and the development of moral character, I trace back to foundational documents of western philosophy supporting the sports-builds-character belief: the ancient Greeks such as Plato saw a close connection between physical education and the education of the soul (moral education). When understanding how sport and physical education might contribute to the development of moral character, it seems to me worthwhile to look back at the views of one of the greatest philosophers in
the history of human civilization on the subject. Plato believed that physical education is a means to fulfill educational objectives toward an individual’s moral character, intellect, and understanding of his or her role in a civilized society (Hyland, 1990; Osterhoudt, 1991; Plato, 2006; Reid, 2002, 2007). Even if his idealistic hopes of the future may seem far removed from today’s reality, understanding the similarities as well as differences of the use of sport for moral education in past and the present practice might allow us to realize the ideas of how sport and physical education is concerned with not only physical fitness but also the development of moral character (Reid, 2007). Therefore, I start this chapter by explaining and evaluating the views of physical education as developed by Plato.

Terminology: Metaphysics, Ontology, and Dualism

It will be beneficial if I define commonly used philosophical terms and concepts which will appear frequently throughout this section so that my discussion begins from some common basis. Therefore, I begin with a brief definition of the concept of metaphysics, ontology, and dualism, respectively. Metaphysics is a division of philosophy that seeks to discover the essence of fact and to distinguish between the real and the unreal (Osterhoudt, 1991). For thousands of years, philosophers, scientists, and theologians have wrestled with metaphysical issues involving the fundamental character of reality vis-à-vis the form of reality, the content of reality, and the relation of form and content (Osterhoudt, 1991).

The study of these issues has developed into a branch of metaphysics called ontology, which concerns the fundamental character of humanity and of human existence in terms of the nature of the self and the relation of mind and body (Osterhoudt, 1991).
Understanding the arguments within this branch, such as senses versus the mind and ideas versus the physical, tangible world, is key to understanding the Western world. In relation to sport, ontology studies topics such as dualism (mind/body separation), embodiment (mind/body integration) and the influence of these concepts on how the body and its activity are regarded (Thomas, 1983). These studies concern questions and examinations related to the nature of sport and human movement and their potential use for expression, harmony, and communication with self and others (Thomas, 1983).

The last concept I will define here is dualism. In order to appreciate Plato, one of the earliest dualists and perhaps apply his insight to contemporary sport and physical education, it is necessary to revisit his metaphysical dualism which is the philosophical division of human existence into two components: mind and body. The dualistic approach to the issue of existence (ontology), whether a human is essentially a spirit or a body, was classically explained by Plato in *Phaedo* (Fairs, 1968). Two of the greatest philosophers of all time, Socrates (c. 470-399 B.C.) and Plato (c. 428-348 B.C.) formulated philosophical views of the body based on metaphysical dualism and their thoughts decisively influenced the face of modern physical education (Fairs, 1968; Hyland, 1990; Reid, 2007; Thomas, 1983). A being’s separation into mind and body is the concept of dualism, a key idea in metaphysical thought and remains popular today (Charles, 1994; Fairs, 1968).

This bipartite division of reality can help explain today’s philosophy toward sport, physical education, and play. I believe that the mind-body relationship is important to physical educators because how we teach and what we value are determined by our own
position about this relationship. Kleinman (1972) helps identify what is being referred to here. He writes that:

for the theorists in physical education, the questions concerning body and mind have always posed a distinct problem. Is mindful activity separate and distinct from physical activity? Is it the responsibility of the physical educator to develop minds as well as bodies? Are bodies subservient to minds? It becomes obvious that the familiarity with the problems of metaphysics will enable the physical educator to establish better grounds for his beliefs about his own discipline (Kleinman, 1972, p. 322).

Many of the attitudes our society has toward physical education and sport originated from attitudes surrounding the worth of the body and its activities in contrast to the worth of the mind and its activities (Thomas, 1983). The metaphysical arguments about the nature and relationship between mind and body have been going on for centuries and have impacted education and attitudes that dictate behavior linked to physical activity (Thomas, 1983). Although the intricacies of the mind-body relationship debate is interesting to the philosopher, this section will focus on the main ideas representing the metaphysical dualism developed by Plato and how he influenced current attitudes and practices of sport and physical education.

Therefore, in what follows, I examine the relationship of mind and body from Plato’s philosophical perspectives and its impact on the status of today’s physical education. Then, I will elucidate a close connection between physical education and the education of the soul/mind (moral education) by delving into his views of physical education.

*Plato’s View of Physical Education*

Although Plato was greatly influenced by his teacher Socrates, Plato took it upon himself to build the genuinely comprehensive system of philosophy (Johnson & Reed,
To explain human existence, Plato used the concept of dualism which divides us into a bodily existence and a spiritual/mental existence.

In *Phaedo*, Plato demonstrates his belief that truth and knowledge as determined by the mind and soul are more realistically represented than those determined by the physical world, which cannot be trusted, because the body may betray the mind. Although *Phaedo* describes a negative philosophical view of the body and of physical education, it is not Plato’s only position on this subject (Mechikoff & Estes, 2006). Plato may be the origin of the belief that physical education acts as moral education (Hyland, 1990; Reid, 2007), and this suggestion can be supported by the discussion of *gymnastikê* as education for the guardians in *Republic*. In *Republic*, he suggests the two crucial elements in a fine education: “*mousikê*” (usually translated music and poetry) and “*gymnastikê*” (the rough equivalent of physical education). Ironically, these two pursuits are normally peripheral in today’s modern educational system. They are considered the least of importance and often first eliminated during times of fiscal uncertainty (Hyland, 1990). Nevertheless, Plato strikingly places gymnastics at the core of education.

So we would quite rightly claim that he who best combines gymnastic with music and applies them in most fitting measure to his soul is most perfectly musical and attuned, far more so than one who merely brings into unison the strings of lyre (Plato, 2006, p. 103).

One might expect Plato to follow the dualistic approach above, using music to train the soul and gymnastics to train the body, but such is not the case as Plato describes below.

But it seems god has given the two arts of music and gymnastic to mankind, I would claim, not for soul and body except incidentally, but for the spirited and the philosophical elements of the soul, in order that they may be fitted to each other by being properly stretched and relaxed (Plato, 2006, p. 103).
Plato insists that *gymnastikê*, or for our convenience physical education, educates the whole person, properly focusing on improving the person, not one entity of the person, namely the body. This can only be so if the soul and body are so intimately intertwined that neither can part from the other. I believe, on this view, the education basis of physical education is not to develop only our physique, but to develop our selves. Perhaps contemporary educators should abandon the current scheme of decreased importance of physical education by continuing the dualistic assumptions, and instead consider the deep connection of soul and body and alter the role of sport and physical education to include not only the physical aspect, but also its intimacy with the soul (Hyland, 1990).

Platonically speaking, physical education cultivates *arête*. Unlike translations such as virtue and character, the Greek term *aretê* is not specifically moral (Reid, 2007). It can refer to the excellence of anything, and human *aretê* implies moral excellence. In Plato’s thinking, *arête* in the soul resulted in moral and happy humans, which was, for him, the objective of education. Plato certainly believed that physical education helps develop *arête*.

Plato’s appreciation of sport’s character-building potential begins with his personal experience as an athlete; as a wrestler, he used wrestling analogies to explain his philosophical ideas (Reid, 2002, 2007). With Plato’s beliefs that the soul or *psychê* is the source of bodily movement and that *aretê* is the health of the soul (Reid, 2007), it seems that Plato views moral education as training for the soul. We should accordingly ask: How does this training for the soul work? In *Republic*, Socrates describes *aretê* by drawing an analogy between the just soul and the just city. The soul, according to Reid’s
analysis, is divided into three distinct parts: “the rational or wisdom-loving part, the spirited or honor-loving part, and the appetitive or pleasure-loving part” (Reid, 2007, p. 162). These divisions reflect society, which could be divided into the philosophers/rulers, guardians, and artisans (Reid, 2007). The city and man are made good by properly ordering these three aspects. This means that a virtuous and happy individual must have control over both spirit and appetite, but simultaneously not rule over the other parts of the soul and perform their functions.

Gymnastikē would be required to unite all three elements of the soul, in order for the Republic’s educational program to follow Socrates’ suggestion. Book IV describes arête as the working together of the three aspects of soul:

The just man does not allow any element in himself to do what properly belongs to another, nor the kinds in his soul to meddle and interfere with each other; on contrary, he sets in good order what is really akin and achieves self-governance. He introduces beauty and order and becomes a friend to himself, bringing the three elements into attunement as though they were literally the three defining terms of a musical scale, bottom, top, and mean; and if there are other terms in between, he binds them all together and becomes, from many, completely one (Plato, 2006, p. 144).

Socrates states that harmony leads to just actions and maintenance of justice in an individual’s soul. The term aretē is used in Republic in the same way as character is used in physical education literature; both emphasize moral values and self control (Arnold, 1994; Hyland, 1990; Reid, 2007; Rudd, 2005; Thomas, 1983).

In short, the goal of gymnastikē in Republic is to benefit the psychē (mind/soul), not the body, by cultivating the arête. In fact, Plato prescribes physical activity for the bodies of his guardians to improve their souls. Physical education helps harmonize the psychē, develop the necessary moral strength and prepare it for the rigors of philosophy.
Plato, Physical education and Moral Education

Physical education was always a matter of primary concern to the ancient Greeks (Miller, 2004). Aristotle, Plato’s best pupil, also supports the Plato’s view that physical education serves the educational objectives of personal virtue, intellectual achievement, and political harmony (Chryssafis, 1930; Mechikoff & Estes, 2006; Miller, 2004; Osterhoudt, 1991; Verbeke, 1990). Aristotle, in his *Politics* (1998) Book VIII, argues that physical education provides for the natural, harmonious, and symmetrical development of men filled with vigorous strength and high intellect. According to Aristotle, physical well-being is essential to mental health. The balance between bodily and mental training must be maintained. Physical exercise causes joy and happiness that in turn heals the soul.

Both Plato and Aristotle hold that reality divides into two realms, the physical and intellect/soul. I think that this division of reality into two parts is very important for physical educators because this concept can be used to explain many of the attitudes and behaviors we have in the twenty-first century regarding physical education and sports. Plato’s philosophy on dualism and physical education still profoundly influence today’s physical education in particular and education in general (Fairs, 1968; Hyland, 1990; Reid, 2007). Contemporary physical education professionals may look back to Plato’s *Republic* to articulate or defend the mission of physical education in the schools. Plato blends academics with athletics. For Plato, harmony of the soul might be a way to describe virtue, and he believed that athletic activities harmonize different parts of the soul. This idea stemmed from the foundation of Plato’s psychology and theory of moral education. This construction is supported by relevant evidence from *Republic* and other
Platonic texts (Reid, 2007). Plato illustrates how educators can use physical education to stimulate integrity, academic achievement, moral character, and public service (Reid, 2007). Physical education, on his view, plays a significant role in moral education.

Arguments for Sport as a Moral Character Builder

Various philosophers of sport and physical education (Arnold, 1984, 1994, 1997, 1999, 2001; Butcher & Schneider, 1998; Carr, 1979; Drewe, 2001, 2003; Jones & McNamee, 2000, 2003; Meakin, 1981, 1982; Simon, 2003; Russell, 2007; Suits, 2007; Wright, 1987) have written about the potential contribution of physical education and sport to the development of moral character. A close look at a study of the appropriate literature concerning the relationship between participation in sport and the development of moral character suggests that the main arguments on this issue, as far as I can see, appear to be based on one or the other of three following familiar concepts: 1) the rules of sport; 2) the ethos of sport (virtues in sport); and 3) sportspersonship (exercise of virtues). This section will, therefore, look into these three important concepts to see how philosophers and physical educators have for many years argued for the close connection between participation in sport, games or other physical activities and the development of moral character.

The Role of the Rules

First of all, the connection between rules and morality has received some attention in the philosophy of sport literature. Many sport philosophers and physical educators (Arnold, 1997; Boxil, 2003; Drewe, 2001; Jones & McNamee, 2003; Simon, 2003; Suits, 2005, 2007) have proven the moral education potential of physical education and sport by arguing that following rules in sport requires a moral commitment. That is to say, as
Arnold (1997) puts it nicely, “contestants agree that, both logically and morally, there is only one way to play the game fairly – and that is by the rules” (p. 76).

This line of arguments is one of most prominent accounts of sport which is called “formalism” (Butcher & Schneider, 1998; D’Agostino, 1995; Morgan, 1995; Russell, 1999; Simon, 2003, 2007). Formalism is “the view that what counts as a sport, as a move in sport, and as winning a sport is derived from the formal structure, particularly constitutive rules which define the sport” (Morgan, 2007, p. 4). To further understand formalist view of sport, it is necessary to examine the nature of the rules and how they are related to moral values in the first place.

According to Suits (2005, 2007), sport philosophers frequently hold that sports is a category of games. He defined a game: “playing a game is the voluntary attempt to overcome unnecessary obstacles” (Suits, 2005, p. 55). People use conventional logic in their everyday activities, meaning that they use the most direct and efficient approach to overcoming obstacles (Schneider, 2009). During games or sports, however, inefficient environments are created using unnecessary obstacles forcing players to use alternative logic. In other words, they have to use their skills to overcome their competitors (Schneider, 2009).

In the 110m high hurdle event in track and field, for example, obstacles in the form of lightweight plastic 42 inch tall hurdles are placed along a track 10m apart for the purpose of separating the achievement levels of the athletes. Runners must leap over the hurdles, clearing them without losing their speed or balance. The athletes achieving the best time will overcome the obstacles (the hurdles), clearing them quickly and in stride while the others hitting the hurdles or knocking them over will have slower times. They
will be considered less able and ranked lower in terms of talent evaluation. Since sports are considered a category of games, which were defined above by Suits as a voluntary attempt to overcome unnecessary obstacles, sports must then require a different type of thinking than we normally engage in our everyday activities (Schneider, 2009). Morgan (1994) refers to this different type of thinking as “gratuitous logic” (p. 3).

For Suits (2005), gratuitous logic requires players to voluntarily accept rules that establish particular challenges by forcing players to use less efficient means for achieving their particular goal. In other words, the means necessary to create a game are restrictive, complicating the task enough to make the goal challenging. “The rules of a game are, in effect, proscriptions of certain means useful in achieving pre-lusory goals” (Suits, 2007, p. 11). Suits (2007) calls these rules “constitutive rules” because they constitute or define the game, instructing players what to do within the limits of the rules. To put it another way, constitutive rules establish the skills and strategies that may be used while participating in a game. Torres (2000) also noted that constitutive rules are rules that “impose strict restrictions on specific actions and procedures that participants of the game may engage in while trying to attain the prelusory goal” (p. 82). Games must be formally constituted before they can be regulated. According to Kretchmar (2005), constitutive rules designate game objectives and the way in which they may or may not be pursued.

For instance, golf is a game of strict rule play. The goal of the game is to strike the ball into the hole with fewer strokes than their opponents. To accomplish this goal, golfers need to accept the rules of golf that require them to overcome intentionally placed obstacles in their paths by utilizing specialized skills and game strategies. Thus, “participant acceptance of the rules of the sport makes the sport itself possible; unless
participants accept and play by the rules with a strong measure of consistency, the game cannot be played” (Schneider, 2009, p. 59).

Arnold (1997) elaborates on this formalist point of view by suggesting that both the idea and practice of sport are concerned with fairness. Borrowing from Rawls’s (1971) theory of justice, Arnold (1997) describes fairness as a merging of freedom and equality. He believes that sport embodies these two moral principles. Equality and freedom are characteristic of any team sport. Players have to abide by rules that govern play but are free to choose to participate or quit. Players who choose to participate knowingly have the moral duty to abide by the rules and commit themselves to what the rules are designed to uphold: fairness. Since sport is based on freedom and equality sport ceases to exist if players deliberately cheat. The result is worse than bad sport; it is no sport at all (Arnold, 1997).

A sporting competition is, according to Butcher and Schneider (1998), a test of skill within the parameters prescribed by the rules. When athletes enter a contest, they agree to an unspoken contract to use their skills in ways the rules allow (Butcher & Schneider, 1998). This tacit agreement to compete binds the athlete to the self imposed conditions of fairness, honesty, and the athlete’s role in accepting the rules of his or her sport. Therefore, cheating, inequity and unfairness would be wrong, resulting in a broken agreement (Butcher & Schneider, 1998). This approach does not permit the athlete to see the rules or officials as being imposed against the athlete’s interest and will. Rules define the contest, and in entering the contest, athletes agree to test their skill within the limit of the rules (Butcher & Schneider, 1998).
Schneider (2009) also argues for the formalist view of sport by suggesting that constitutive rules are necessary in order to equalize competition (e.g., weight classifications in boxing and wrestling). He maintains that the standardization of constitutive rules for each sport allows for comparisons of skills and accomplishments between players within a sport (Schneider, 2009). Drug-taking in sport can be an example to support the point made by Schneider regarding constitutive rules as equalizing competitions. If a player takes illegal performance-enhancing substances, he or she has broken a rule that was implemented to ensure that achievements in a sport could be compared on equal grounds. That is to say, when the constitutive rules that are agreed to by those affiliated with the game are no longer followed or are broken, meaningful and accurate comparisons can no longer be made (Schneider, 2009).

What emerges from this brief discussion about the role of the rules of the game is that playing sport with rules creates moral issues for players. Rules are not just put into place to function as a hindrance in the game. They create a moral obligation which players have to uphold at all times which in turn affects their moral character. The rules are universal because they apply uniformly to all participants of the game in the same situation (Arnold, 1997). In other words, the rules apply to all those involved in the activities with the ability to perform the types of actions included or excluded by the rules. Like moral law, the rules of sport do not allow exceptions to be made. They apply to all who participate with no exceptions. Every participant should understand that they are obligated to follow and act in accordance with the rules (Arnold, 1997; Butcher & Schneider, 1998; Schneider, 2009).
The standard of impartiality stresses that the rules do not favor one party over another. By doing so, the rules are applied in a disinterested way to the participants. In this way, fairness and justice are maintained (Arnold, 1997). While most sports have officials who impartially enforce the rules of sports upon the players, players themselves are expected to abide by the rules without breaking them to give their team an unfair advantage. The principle of impartiality maintains a rejection of self-interest. Rather, a common interest of sport is, as Arnold (1997) puts it, “the pursuit of a valued form of life, which has its own values and standards, in a rule-bound and morally acceptable manner” (p. 28).

To summarize, according to the formalist view of sport, it is from these simple rules that we can divine the goals of sport and draw moral conclusions regarding sport itself. Formalists such as Bernard Suits (2005, 2007), believe that “the logical incompatibility thesis” is connected with moral judgments. This thesis states that it is not possible to win if the rules of the game are broken. Cheating by players causes their play to be deficient since they were not playing by the game’s specific rules (Suits, 2005, 2007). Therefore, they were not playing the game at all. Cheating also leaves the player morally lax. The point of sport is to conduct yourself morally without breaking any governing rules. Thus, cheating violates the moral obligations as well as the basic point of how sport should be conducted.

However, it is argued that the rule-based conception of sport does not take into account the variety of sport as played and practiced. That is to say, there is dissatisfaction towards the formalists theory based on how their theory has ignored the underlying and socially accepted conventions which apply to the varying sports being analyzed (Arnold,
These conventions are referred to as the “ethos of the game” which is another important basis for moral account of sport which I now turn to.

The Ethos of Sport

Before discussing the ethos of sport, consider the Simon’s (2007) example of “clubless Josie,” who arrives at a championship golf match without her clubs because the airline lost them. Suppose that Josie is your main competitor and you have a duplicate set of clubs almost identical to Josie’s. The question thus arises: Should you lend Josie your clubs so you can proceed with your decisive match? If you think you should lend Josie your clubs, why? Respect for rules does not help because you break no rule in declining to lend Josie your clubs.

Sports are not simply defined by their rules. Lehman (1981) argued the context of the game should be taken into account along with the rules of the game in order to make judgments of unfairness. D’Agostino (1995) also pointed out that due to the fact sports are socially constructed, each one has its own ethos which has varying customs and social norms which determine how the game is to be played. This line of arguments has something to do with what Simon (2003, 2007) calls “conventionalism.” Unlike formalism, “conventionalist view of sport seeks moral inspiration and guidance not from internal elements of sport itself, specifically its main rules, but from larger society, which they then import to handle normative issues that develop in sport” (Morgan, 2007, p. 5).

Arnold (1997) argues that because a rule is applied universally and impartially this does not necessarily make it moral and thinking all rules of sport are based on moral is very irrational. As far as the rules are concerned, however, the manner in which
participants should conduct themselves is based upon commonly accepted moral
injunctions such as: don’t cause pain, don’t disable, don’t deceive, don’t cheat, keep your
promise, do your duty (Arnold, 1997). “What is at the heart of these injunctions,” wrote
Arnold (1997), “is a respect for the participant as a person to whom consideration should
be shown, not only as a person, but because the ethos of sport as a practice demand it” (p.
28). Arnold (1997) emphasizes that one attribute of being initiated into sport is to conduct
oneself in a moral way and in keeping with its moral ethos, the ideals and virtues in
which it is rooted. That is to say, it is maintained that the practice of sport, in keeping
with its moral ethos, demands that its participants should be fair, courageous, honest,
friendly, beneficent, and caring (Arnold, 1997). Returning to the Josie’s example,
therefore, you should lend Josie your clubs to keep with the ethos of sport: fairness,
friendship and beneficence (Lumpkin, Stoll & Beller, 1994). This is the basic stock of
moral values, the notion that one ought, generally, to be caring, beneficent, and nice to
people: that is, treat others how you would like to be treated.

Butcher and Schneider (1998) argue that in the sport context, contests are defined
by a combination of constitutive rules and ethos. As stated earlier, athletes entering a
match form a tacit contract to compete and test their training and skills in the ways
permitted by the game concerned (Butcher & Schneider, 1998). Butcher and Schneider
(1998) insist that the game’s ethos be taken as the content of the contract between the
competitors. Therefore, this argument ultimately becomes similar to the formalist view of
sport, with the added benefit of emphasizing the athlete’s role in accepting and living up
to his or her part of the further agreement: the ethos of the game. Regarding the Josie
example, Butcher and Schneider (1998) argues that although no constitutive rules were
broken by declining to lend Josie your clubs, your agreement includes playing fairly and therefore, the agreement of fair play says you should lend her your clubs.

Schneider (2009) also agrees with Butcher and Schneider (1998) by arguing that excellence in sport is not solely based on victory and successfully executed skills. It is necessary to uphold certain values and conventions. Put another way, beyond wining and skill execution, excellence in sport requires the practice of the moral ethos of sport such as respect, compassion, fairness, generosity, and kindness. He maintains that an athlete must adhere to the “written rules” that govern and characterize his or her sport as well as the “unwritten rules” of sport (the ethos of sport) in which he or she has agreed to participate. When you win a contest or score points, you must do so using skills that are acceptable under both written rules and unwritten rules of sport. By doing so, you show respect for the sport and the opponent, and also displaying both moral and performance excellence (Schneider, 2009).

Arnold (1997) argues that although sport is characterized by the skills, excellence, and achievement of the players, sport is also a moral practice in which its ethos is inseparably connected to the virtues of its participants. According to Arnold (1997), an initiation into the practice of sport invokes responsibility for behaving morally and abiding by a know ethos. Acting any other way is to become morally condemned (Arnold, 1997).

As for the Josie example again, you are in a unique position because you are her opponent in a contest. While fair play dictates that you must let her play with equal opportunity, there is no compulsion to be nice to her by lending her your clubs. However, in the light of what has been suggested so far, it can be argued that the practice of sport
creates a moral community. This community urges its members to conduct themselves in an exceptional manner so that the internal goals and the standards of excellences can be pursued in an honest and reasonable way (Arnold, 1997). If a practice such as sport is to be preserved, MacIntyre (1984) argues, virtues are required. In sport, acting virtuously involves participants conducting themselves in a moral way and in keeping with the ethos of sport, that is, its values, standards and best traditions (Arnold, 1997). MacIntyre (1984) describes a clear assessment of what a virtue is and of its importance to a practice of sport. He wrote: “A virtue is an acquired human quality the possession and exercise of which tends to enable us to achieve those goals which are internal to practice and lack of which effectively prevents us from achieving any such goals” (p. 191).

Therefore, a virtue is an important part of a practice and is an integral part of its ethos (Arnold, 1997). To put it differently, “a virtue is an admired human quality which is not only conducive to the good life of man but is indispensable to those pursuits which are worthwhile” (Arnold, 1997, p. 29). The basic understanding and notion of virtue is based on its relation to a desirable quality and aspect of life. Virtues are those actions which are meritorious or praiseworthy not only in terms of how the practice is conducted, but also in terms of how one performs them (Arnold, 1997). Thus, acts of sportspersonship are a credit to sport as well as to the person who possesses them. I finally turn to the concept of sportspersonship which has been a basis of arguments for sport’s relation to moral development.

The Concept of Sportspersonship

Ethical issues are concerned with what is right or wrong, good or bad, fair or unfair, responsible or irresponsible, obligatory or permissible, praiseworthy or
blameworthy. Ethics defines what is good for the individuals and for society and establishes the nature of duties that people owe themselves and one other. Therefore, it is a normative form of inquiry rather than a descriptive one. “It is concerned less with how human beings do act (though this is often the source of moral probing and even contempt) than with how they ought to act -- a (moral) prescription of their action” (Morgan & Meier, 1995, p. 141). In the light of this brief definition of ethics, two very vital questions should be taken into consideration for ethical issues in relation to sport. How should players act toward each other while engaged in competition? What is the proper behavior for individuals and the entire sporting community as they strive for athletic perfection? In short, what behaviors aid to the success of a morally just and admirable athlete? To answer these questions, many philosophers (Arnold, 1995, 1997; Drewe, 2003; Feezell, 2007; Keating, 2007) have turned to the notion of sportsmanship: What is sportsmanship? What is considered proper conduct and improper conduct by sportsmanship?

Drewe (2003) defines sportsmanship from a practical orientation by stating “the minimum condition for someone to be considered a good sportsperson would have to be someone who played fairly: that is, someone who followed the rules of the game” (p. 128). Willingness to follow the constitutive rules is often considered the manifestation of moral character in sport. However, this is not the stopping point for moral education in sport. One must also consider the question of sportspersonship. Sportspersonship goes beyond an appreciation of the rules. It instead concerns commendatory acts done in sport without obligation that enrich the sport and make it a worthwhile practice (Arnold, 1997). It is for this reason, it is sometimes said, that sport without sportsmanship would seem a
barren organized physical activity (Arnold, 1997). Its rule would remain but it would be an empty shell without its ethos, values and traditions (Arnold, 1995).

Many definitions of sportsmanship have surfaced over the years, several fall into what Shields, and Bredemeier (1995) categorized as “a bag of virtues,” that is, an aggregate of different values. In other words, sportsmanship is concerned with the practice of such virtues as friendliness, generosity, and compassion in the conduct of sport (Arnold, 1997). Even if some values are stressed more than others occasionally, such as fairness, justice, kindness, compassion and honesty, “a bag of virtues” approach of sportspersonship would call for all values to be emphasized, excluding none (Schneider, 2009). Clifford and Feezell (1997) present sportsmanship in a light that gives respect to other teams, opponents, officials, coaches, teammates and the rules of the game. Due to a new age of passionately obsessive fans, it seems they should be added to the list also (Schneider, 2009). Arnold (1995, 1997) also views sportsmanship as being acts of cooperation that support conviviality and social harmony. He said, “it not only acts as a social lubricant but brings about a mutual trust and respect among sportsmen and sportswomen” (Arnold, 1997, p. 78).

James Keating’s classic essay, “Sportsmanship as a Moral Category” asked about the nature and proper scope of sportsmanship. He characterizes the central meaning of sportsmanship as the virtue of generosity. He concluded:

The goal of genuine sport must be the principal determinant of the conduct and attitudes proper to sporting activity. Since its goal is pleasant diversion – the immediate joy to be derived in the activity itself – the pivotal or essential virtue in sportsmanship is generosity. All the other moral qualities that may also be in evidence are colored by this spirit of generosity (Keating, 2007, p. 150).
The point of generosity as a manifestation of sportspersonship is that it is not mandatory, but given of one’s own free will as a sign of trust and goodwill (Arnold, 1995). As Keating (2007) pointed out, it also illustrates the manner in which sport should be performed.

In this sense, Arnold (1995) proposed the altruistic view of sportsmanship which can be seen as an aspect of moral education. This altruistic view of sportspersonship is concerned with the codes of conduct towards the well being of other people. According to this altruistic view, rules are less important, but it is focused on beneficence, sympathy, compassion, and difficulties of others (Arnold, 1995). That is to say, sportsmanship is an act which is altruistic, deserving of praise, but not compulsory. No one is required to show good sportsmanship, but if he or she does the action is acclaimed. An example here might be when a cyclist stops, at their own expense, to help a wrecked cyclist during a race. The point is that such acts stem from a desire to help or provide consolation for one athlete at the disappointment of another (Arnold, 1995).

In this section, I have examined in some detail three important concepts that have been a basis when arguing for the relationship between participation in sport and moral development. The following quotation provides a useful summary:

What sport emphasizes so clearly by its nature and proper example is that human goals must be accomplished by overcoming obstacles with the use of permissible means that themselves satisfy requirements of respect for person and, also, respect for the integrity of the institution or practice in which those means are exercised. This is of course a fundamental moral lesson, perhaps the fundamental moral lesson, and it may be the deep moral lesson of sport…Sport, at least in this abstract and general sense, can be a moral mirror for how we are to live elsewhere (Russell, 2007, p. 63).
As explored in this chapter, sport is a special human activity in which its rules, moral ethos and acts of sportspersonship all play a significant role in determining what is morally acceptable and unacceptable behavior. In other words, rules, moral ethos, and sportsmanship are the defining concepts which are needed to understand the logical connection between engagement in sport and the cultivation of moral character. Properly understanding sport from these three concepts clarifies how sport should be practiced to play a role in moral education.
CHAPTER 4: SPORT

The preceding Chapter 2 was intended to examine what it means to be morally educated. To examine how moral education relates to physical education and sport, I will now articulate what is entailed in becoming physically educated. This first requires a clarification of what I mean by sport and physical education so that my discussion begins from some common basis. Due to the varying roles, sports are not always physical education and not all physical education is simply sport (Capel, 2000; Drewe, 2001; Freeman, 2001; Lumpkin, 2002). Therefore, this chapter begins with a brief explanation of the relationship between physical education and sport. It then proceeds to look closely at the concept of sport from two different points of view: sport as acquisition of “practical knowledge” and sport as a “practice” governed by its rule and ethos.

Sport and Physical education

Neither “sport” nor “physical education” are simple terms. There are many characterizations and descriptions of physical education and sport. Nevertheless, due to the lack of delineation of physical education and sport by the physical education profession, the general public views sport and physical education as one and the same (Capel, 2000; Freeman, 2001). However, physical Education and sport are not synonymous. Although physical education and sport have similarities and commonalities,
many scholars on the subject have concluded that they are not the same. (Capel, 2000; Freeman, 2001; Lumpkin, 2002).

In order to discuss the relationship between physical education and sport, it will be useful to start with a brief definition of play and consider its relationship to sport and physical education. It is now commonly agreed that ‘play’ refers to “an activity that is pursued voluntarily for its own sake” (Arnold, 1997, p. 13). That is to say, play is essentially activity used as amusement. Play is a physical or non-physical activity that is not competition based. Play is not necessarily sport or physical education, even though fundamentals of play can be found in both (Freeman, 2001).

Sport is an organized form of play which has two necessary elements: physicality and competition. Although some sports are less physical than others, for example, golf as opposed to American football, and activities such as white water rafting and rock climbing are viewed as sport even without obvious opposing competitors, I will postulate that there needs to be some degree of physicality and competition for an activity to be a sport (Drewe, 2001). One cannot separate competition from sport, as it is fundamental to sport’s nature. Sport activity is primarily competitive. Without the competitive element, it is nothing more than play or recreation. Though play can at times be sport, it cannot be the other way around (Freeman, 2001).

Physical education has elements of both play and sport, but it is an unbalanced mixture of the two (Freeman, 2001). As its title indicates, physical education is an educational process with a grander purpose than simply playing or competing in a sporting event. Through physical prowess and activity it “educates” its participants (Freeman, 2001). Play can be a relaxation and source of amusement without any
education goal. Likewise, sport can be played without any educational aim. In other words, both play and sport can be purely educational, purely recreational or any mixture of the two. Physical education, on the other hand, always has to have an educational aspect of the physical experience as its main goal (Freeman, 2001). This is a stark distinction between sport and physical education.

However, as I mentioned above, it should not be overlooked that sport also can be used as a very useful vehicle for the educational process. What I want to point out here and come back to later in this chapter, is that sport does have an important value which is intrinsic to the act of educating. Education is all about the development of rationality and acquiring theoretical and practical knowledge (Hirst, 1974; Peters, 1966). This development is essential to the education process. In this sense, sport can serve fundamental educational objectives; that is, the acquisition of both theoretical and practical knowledge which is intrinsic to what it means to be educated (this will be more discussed in the following section of this chapter).

Because sport can offer a number of valuable educational experiences, physical education curriculum designers have pushed to have a sport education model added. “Despite debates about the potential of sport to be miseducative, we continue to promote sport education because of its educative potential in a number of areas of learning and also because of the cultural significance of sport” (Alexander, Taggart & Luckmann, 1988, p. 21). Moreover, the sport context can provide a forum within which young people can experience success and satisfaction (Capel, 2000). They can feel successful through physical mastery of a new sport, team camaraderie, winning, physical improvement and sense of worth (Coakely, 2004). Sport has advantages that motivate participation that
physical education curriculums lack (Coakely, 2004). Thus, sport can make a significant contribution to education in general and physical education in particular. Although physical education program could, and should, involve more than sport, such as educational gymnastics, fitness training, dance or informal games, sport has been considered as the major content for physical education because of the educational values that sport is inherently concerned with.

Despite their interrelationship in their educational aspects, differences between physical education and sport also should not be ignored because just as physical education programs involve more than sport, sport programs are not solely educational (Drewe, 2001). There are contexts where sport is more concerned with instrumental functions, that is, the experience of fun as in recreational sport, or the acquisition of money, as in professional sport (Drewe, 2001). I must admit that the elite professional sport, what some experts have called “commodification of sport,” where such external goals as money, power, status and fame are deemed of crucial importance, cannot be solely identified as being educational. I am not suggesting that recreational or professional sport is inferior to sport played for the educational function of acquiring both practical and theoretical knowledge. What I am suggesting here, however, is that sport can take on a different function. That is to say, sport can be played for different values and play a different role in our contemporary society. These different functions of sport clarify the educational or non-educational emphasis in sport.

What should be clear about sport in relation to education is the fact that although sport can, and often is, played for more external goals such as money, fun, power and status, sport can be played in a way that is not directly tied to those external goals but is
concerned with its own goals, conduct and welfare for the benefit of all who participate in it. When considering sport as an important content of physical education, the need for clarity regarding the complex form of sport that should be reproduced in schools becomes very clear (Kirk, 2006). In order for sport to contribute positively to the educational process in physical education, sports must be selected for the potential they hold for education (Capel, 2000). Therefore, in what follows, I will provide an account of how sport needs to be understood and conducted in order for sport to be represented in physical education in an educationally valuable form.

What Does It Mean to Be Physically Educated?

Before looking into what it means to be physically educated, it will first be useful to examine the notion of education. Despite other concerns that arise, education still focuses on the development of knowledge and understanding (Hirst, 1974; Peters, 1966). How teaching is conducted morally is an idea that is equally important. Put another way, the acquisition of knowledge by morally acceptable procedures is at the core of what education means (Peters, 1966).

Ideally the end of one’s educational mission will have intrinsic value along with any instrumental value that they might have. That is, as Arnold (1991) put it nicely, “the activities or subjects comprising education must have sufficient intrinsic values in terms of knowledge and understanding to make them worthwhile, pursued for their own sake and not solely for some reason external to them” (p. 67). What philosophers such as Dewey (1916), Carr (1981) and Peters (1966) recognize is that the value of education is not limited to its status as a means. This notion is captured in etymology of the word philosophy, ‘love of wisdom’ or ‘love of knowledge.’ In this sense, education is best
characterized as comprising intrinsically valuable activities and procedures (Arnold, 1991).

Emerging from what has been briefly explained about the notion of education is that aims in education involve helping students acquire the knowledge and understanding that are not only instrumentally worthwhile but also intrinsically valuable (Arnold, 1991; Dewey, 1916; Drewe, 2001; Hirst, 1974; Peters, 1966). Therefore, a compelling justification for sport and physical education as an educational activity should stem from the intrinsic value of the knowledge and comprehension developed through educational processes.

If we pursue the activities associated with physical education (games, gymnastics, track and field, dance, etc.) only for their instrumental values (e.g., staying physically fit, strengthening social interaction and moral behaviors through physical education), then we effectively neglect what is arguably the most important feature of their educational value; that is their intrinsic value. In doing so we would recognize the external or instrumental values of physical education, but only in a limited sense, and not to its full capacity as both an instrumentally valuable educational tool and an intrinsically valuable educational function. In other words, to claim that physical activities are educationally valuable, it must be demonstrated that they are in and of themselves valuable and that they are not subject to the extrinsic or instrumental values contingently associated with them (Arnold, 1991). This raises the central question of this section: what are the intrinsic values of physical education that make it worth passing on to students? It is to the question of what sorts of knowledge and understanding are intrinsic to physical education activities that I now turn.
It is well recognized by philosophers that there are two types of knowledge: theoretical or propositional knowledge and practical knowledge. It was Aristotle who originally pointed out the distinction between theoretical and practical reasoning (Aristotle, 2000). To discuss these two type of knowledge, it will be beneficial if I begin with a distinction between “knowing that” and “knowing how” made by Ryle:

There are certain parallelisms between knowing how and knowing that, as well as certain divergences. We speak of learning how to play an instrument as well as of learning that something is the case; of finding out how to prune trees as well as of finding out that the Romans had a camp in a certain place; of forgetting how to tie a reef-knot as well of forgetting that the German for ‘knife’ is ‘Messer.’ We can wonder how as well as wonder whether (Ryle, 1949, p. 28).

Ryle (1949) underlined the point that both “knowing that” and “knowing how” are expressions of human rationality. He argued that whereas knowing-that is a function of human theorizing, knowing-how is an expression of rational practice. It could be argued, therefore, that while theoretical knowledge is concerned with knowing facts such as the dates of historical events or the rules of physics or geometry (e.g., knowing the date of John F. Kennedy’s assassination, knowing the chemical composition of salt, and knowing the opposite angles of a parallelogram), practical knowledge deals with certain forms of performative competence, or knowing how to perform a skill such as driving a car, building furniture or hitting a golf ball with wood clubs (Arnold, 1988). Carr (1981) helps identify the distinction between these two types of knowledge. He writes that:

The main difference between theoretical and practical knowledge is that whereas the concern of the former is with the discovery of truths that are adequately supported by reason and confirmed by experience, the latter is concerned with the execution of purpose in action, conducted in a rational manner and confirmed by a reasonable degree of success (p. 60).
In the light of what has been said about the notion of education above, I think that the values of knowledge (theory) and skill (practice) involved in physical education activities are best seen as being concerned with education because they are intrinsically involved with the study of physical education and the successful participation in it. That is to say, physical education involves the acquisition of practical knowledge regarding how to perform the varied movements involved in sports along with theoretical knowledge regarding how the constitutive rules, and rules of skill function in a given sport. Such theoretical knowledge would also include the educational experience of learning how one’s body functions in the sport context (i.e., knowledge about exercise physiology, biomechanics, etc.).

To facilitate discussion about educational values intrinsic to sport and physical education, I will be effectively equating skill with “how to” knowing, and knowledge with “factual” or “theoretical” knowing. To put another way, skill is to be understood in terms of practical knowledge, and knowledge is to be understood in terms of theoretical or factual knowledge concerning human movement in the form of sport, dance, and physical activities.

*Theoretical Knowledge: Knowing-that*

I believe that one of the main aims in physical education would be to help students acquire practical knowledge, that is, “knowing how” to perform various movement skills. However, I would be remiss not to examine an area of theoretical knowledge involved in physical education. Physical education clearly involves skill, but in some contexts it also involves knowledge, such as knowledge of the constitutive rules involved, the rules of skill, rules of etiquette (both formal and informal), an
understanding of the necessary and proper use of equipment, etc. Biomechanical comprehension would also fall into this category, such as knowledge concerning the effects of exercise, knowledge concerning injury prevention and care, knowledge of the integrated use of body systems, etc. (Martens, 1986).

Obviously, theoretical knowledge in physical education is important. Otherwise, what is presented verbally or in text would not be rational or informative (Arnold, 1991). A teacher must be fully aware of techniques and concepts associated with their discipline before he or she can apply such information. For example, a physical education teacher needs to have knowledge about biomechanical concepts and principle so that students can be taught that in skills such as track starts, swimming starts, and base running, placing the line of gravity toward the edge closest to the desired direct of movement is the most efficient method for creating a faster start. Without the proper knowledge and comprehension of relevant theory, a teacher cannot help students fully become physically educated. Therefore, the theories and facts that make up theoretical knowledge is an essential part of the physical education curriculum, as it establishes a solid foundation of understanding and information where research and study can advance (Arnold, 1998, 1991). However, the true meaning of being physical educated cannot be fully comprehended unless theoretical knowledge is used or applied in an educational way to deal with the issues that come with teaching and learning sport, dance and physical education activities (Arnold, 1998, 1991).

*Practical Knowledge (Skill): Knowing-how*

Having argued that theoretical knowledge is of central importance as an aspect of physical education and as a part of what it is to be physically educated, following Arnold
(1988, 1991, 1997), I now want to maintain that learning of skills involved in sport and physical education, that is, learning of practical knowledge, or “knowing how,” is more crucial feature resident in sport and physical education. That is, the acquisition of practical knowledge through sport and physical education is a unique and important value which provides a compelling reason for the inclusion of physical education in the educational system. It is my belief that the acquisition of practical knowledge in physical education is the distinguishing factor from more primarily theoretical knowledge components of the educational curriculum such as science, history, and mathematics.

To clarify the meaning of practical knowledge in relation to physical education, it is necessary to examine what it means to learn skill. Arnold (1988, 1991) suggested that skill be understood as a certain form of practical knowledge by arguing that skills are exemplifications of practical reasoning in terms of knowing how to do something competently to certain minimum standards. Ryle also elaborates on what it means to “know how” by suggesting that knowing how involves not only performing an operation correctly or successfully, but also applying criteria in performing critically.

A person’s performance is described as careful or skillful, if in his operations he is ready to detect and correct lapses, to repeat and improve upon successes, to profit from the examples of others and so forth. He applies criteria in performing critically, that is, in trying to get things right. This point is commonly expressed in the vernacular by saying that an action exhibits intelligence, if, and only if, the agent is thinking what he is doing while he is doing it, and thinking in such a manner that he would not do the action so well if he were not thinking what he is doing (Ryle, 1949, p. 29).

Therefore, it could be argued that learning a skill in sport and physical education involves more than drill or repeating a behavior pattern (Arnold, 1991). Instead, it involves thoughtful and intelligent practice. In a sport like tennis, for example,
skillfulness, at the highest level, is not so much recognized by the ability to make various shots (forehand, backhand, volley, overhead smash, lob, etc.), though these acquired techniques remain important, as by an ability to utilize these techniques intelligently both to enhance his/her own strengths and exploit his/her opponent's weakness (Arnold, 1991). For another example, soccer is a game in which there is a constant changing environment. It requires a mastery of basic skills which is utilized and skillfully applied to the unpredictable circumstances of the game as it evolves (Arnold, 1991). When we speak of a skillful player, it means that he or she not only masters certain basic moves but also is able to perceive what needs to be done at a given moment and direct imagination and energy toward its achievement (Arnold, 1991). In short, skill is concerned with practice, action and intentionally doing, not just theory, belief, or speculation with which theoretical knowledge is concerned (Arnold, 1988, 1991; Wright, 2000).

Admitting that physical education entails both theoretical knowledge and practical knowledge (skill) I maintain that, in so far as the two can be characterized separately, the latter should take priority. This is, I believe, because theoretical knowledge per se has no utility. An action must be performed for something to be changed or improved upon. Action without knowledge is blind, just as knowledge without action is powerless (Arnold, 1991). In other words, theoretical knowledge is useless unless a person has the ability to apply this knowledge in practical situations (Arnold, 1991). What needs to be understood is that knowledge and intelligence is proven and demonstrated by actualizing that knowledge through action. A person may know how to swim, but the knowledge is exercised when the person does it.
This line of argument is supported by Aristotle who believed that putting in the mind of the child a heap of ideas just about knowledge such as moral values, moral rules, moral theories which he or she can remember cannot make the child a virtuous person. He writes in his *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book II: “Virtues, however, we acquire by first exercising them. The same is true with skills, since what we need to learn before doing, we learn by doing; for example, we become builders by building, and lyre-players by playing the lyre. So too we become just by doing just actions, temperate by temperate actions, and courageous by courageous action” (Aristotle, 2000, p.23). This is why he emphasized knowledge by and from *praxis* (alternative translations: “doing,” or “conduct”).

Furthermore, although theoretical knowledge is important in education, on its own it cannot make a true educated person. As Arnold (1998, 1991) and Martin (1994) pointed out, putting emphasis only upon the cognitive and intellectual provides, at best, an ideal of an educated mind not an educated person. This is, I believe, why Plato and Aristotle put great emphasis on physical education as a crucial element in education. They both believed that physical education is a means to fulfill ultimate educational objectives. They insisted that *gymnastikê* (sport or physical education) should be taught in order to harmonize the entire person with their soul (this was discussed in some detail in Chapter 2). Without practice, they believed, theory would be left meaningless and valueless.

To close this section, I have examined theoretical knowledge and practical knowledge (skill) involved in physical education which I believe are two critical features of physical education inherently concerned with the act of educating. In other words, I
have argued that physical education involves the teaching and the acquisition of practical knowledge, that is, “know how” to perform various movement skills, as well as theoretical knowledge, that is, knowledge of the constitutive rules of games, rules of etiquette, an understanding of the use of equipment, and knowledge of related fields such as exercise physiology and biomechanics. Although both theoretical and practical knowledge are important aspects of physical education, I believe that insofar as physical education is concerned with the teaching and learning of sport and physical activities, the emphasis should be with practical knowledge, or the knowledge of how to in the form of skills, the essence of physical education. I think that the teaching and learning of practical knowledge is what distinguish physical education from more primarily theoretical knowledge components of the educational curriculum, as well as what make physical education a unique and worthwhile component of the school curriculum.

The Notion of Sport as a Practice

Sport is not an easy term to define. When you look at a dictionary, you may find sports described as “a physical activity that is governed by a set of rules or customs and often engaged in competitively” (Merriam-Webster). However, such a lexical definition is not enough to fully account for the concept of sport. A fundamental and clearly relevant source for normative ethic for sport is a definitive conception of what sport ought to be.

Sport is a complex cultural convention. It neither parallels the rest of society nor is it completely disconnected from it (Jones & McNamee, 2003). As of late it has become trendy for sport philosophers and educationists to think of sports in a non analytical fashion as activities to which criteria such as being rule-governed, play, and
competitiveness apply (Jones & McNamee, 2003). Conceptually, sport has evolved for many philosophers and educationists of sport (Arnold, 1997; Burke, 1997; Butcher and Schneider, 1998; Feezell, 2004; Gibson, 1993; Jones & McNamee, 2003; McNamee, 1995; Siedentop, 1998) to be seen in grand social and historical developments. Recently, in analyzing the concept of sport, the works of McIntyre (1984) have led many scholars to believe that “practice” epitomizes the elemental foundation of sport (Arnold, 1997; Jones & McNamee, 2003; Kirk, 2006; Siedentop, 1998, 2002).

MacIntyre (1984) in *After Virtue* provided a compelling definition of the word “practice.” He wrote:

> By a ‘practice’ I am going to mean any coherent and complex form of socially established co-operative human activity through which goods internal to that form of activity are realized in the course of trying to achieve those standards of excellence which are appropriate to and partially definitive of that form of activity, with the result that human powers to achieve excellence, and the human conceptions of the ends and goods involved, are systematically extended (p. 187).

Based on the MacIntyre’s conception of practice, Arnold (1997) offered compelling arguments for understanding sport as a “valued human practice.” He said, “Like farming, physics, engineering or architecture, sport is a practice because it is a peculiarly human activity in which values internal to that activity are discovered and realized in the course of trying to achieve the standards of excellence that characterize it” (Arnold, 1997, p. 14).

MacIntyre (1984) distinguished internal goods from external goods. Internal goods are the beneficial results of the particular practice. External goods which are exemplified with money and fame, however, are sought through various means. McNamee (1995), following MacIntyre, differentiated between ‘a practice’ and ‘an institution’ arguing that while a practice is a unique rule-governed endeavor because it is
exemplified by the internal goals, principals and values it is comprised of, an institution is required to be concerned with outsider factors like financial gain, power, promotional endeavors, and social issues.

Arnold (1997) built on McNamee’s distinction between a practice and an institution by elaborating upon what the relationship is between ‘sport as a practice’ and ‘sport as an institution’ and how the two terms differ from one another. He argued that while practice of sport is centered on its goals, the conduct and well-being of those who participate in it, sport as an institution is a bureaucratic business model run by large scale organizations (Arnold, 1997). It is concerned with publication, regulation, administration and packaging of the sport to be sold for profit (Arnold, 1997). Arnold (1997) stresses that sport is or should be inheritably universal in regards to its demands and expectations as a human practice, though the institution of sport is subjected to external political, economic, and social factors that contextualize how sport is practiced.

What I want to emphasize here is that even though economic and social circumstances are different from one culture or society to another, this is not representational of how sport should be understood and how it should be conducted (Arnold, 1997). As Arnold (1997) pointed out, it should be clear that the ethical basis for sport is just as universal as the concepts and skills that accompany it. The moral values in sport do not waiver from context to context. Instead, they are prescriptive and universal. In other words, sport is “a form of moral objectivism which holds that certain types of value and conduct such as fairness have universal validity” (Arnold, 1997, p. 5). All participants are required to abide by the innate moral qualities necessary to partake in the practice of sport. These moral qualities should be emphatically upheld with the same
rigorous dedication that is used when learning to play the game, or honing physical skills.

When viewing sport in this manner it can be seen universally as a moral enterprise (Arnold, 1997).

Another feature central to the understanding of the concept of practice is that being engaged in a practice means standing in a particular relationship to the practice itself and to other practitioners. MacIntyre (1984) said:

A practice involves standards of excellence and obedience to rules as well as the achievement of goods. To enter into a practice is to accept the authority of those standards and the inadequacy of my own performance as judged by them. It is to subject my own attitudes, choices, preferences and tastes to the standards which currently partially define the practice (p. 190).

That is to say, once a person is committed to a practice he or she will be required to live up to the authority of the highest standard of that practice to the best of their abilities. It does not make a difference if it is on a field of play, or in the classrooms of academia. In sport, as in other realms of practice, “the standards that apply are those that are objective, not subjective or emotional, and relate to its intrinsic goals and purposes rather than to those that are extrinsic” (Arnold, 1997, p. 14). As MacIntyre (1984) said in the latter part of the above quotation, a practitioner’s preferences, tastes, attitudes, and choices are somewhat framed by the practice. Put another way, keeping every practice true to itself and uncorrupted by external influences or pressures requires a special relationship between the participants particularly whether there is mutual admiration or opposition in competition (Arnold, 1997; Butcher & Schneider, 1998; MacIntyre, 1984). A practice, according to Arnold (1997), will lead to corruption and dishonesty and fall victim to the unprincipled and the unscrupulous if the participants in the practice do not hold reverence for one another in protecting the same values within their pursuits.
Therefore, such virtues as fairness, courage, hard work, trust and honesty are vital to safeguard the integrity of practices, so that participants in practices pursue the internal goods and promote high standards of excellence that characterize them. According to MacIntyre (1984), virtues are not only necessary components of practices but also a helpful means of identifying them. In other words, the paradox is that the development of certain virtues such as fairness, honesty, courage, and generosity, is not only a necessary condition but also a consequence of proper participation in the practices. In such an account, it could be argued that the practice of sport is an arena where human, morals, and characters are tested (McFee, 2000; Parry, 1988). In the arena sport provides, one tests oneself and one’s competitors to find the limitations and excellence in the chase for the end of the game.

I believe that sport can only be properly conducted, especially from the moral point of view, if it is adequately understood. Only with an understanding of its rules and of the underlying principles that guide the participants’ behavior can sport be conducted “morally.” Various philosophers of sport and physical education (Arnold, 1997; Aspin 1975; Boxill 2003; Fraleigh 1984; Kretchmar 2005; and Meakin, 1982) have recognized this point. In this regard, I believe that Arnold’s assertion that sport is a valued human practice which has its own integrity governed and characterized by its rules and ethos helps us to identify how sports participants ought and ought not to act in ethically right ways, resulting in guides for ethical actions. Moreover, it is only when sport is understood in this way that sport’s relation to moral issue becomes fully understandable and intelligible (Arnold, 1997).

Having delineated the concept of sport as a practice, it is necessary to dig a little
deeper to understand two important elements that both underlies and constitutes sport as a
practice – rules of sport and ethos of sport – so that I can proceed to examine how
participation in sport is intimately connected to moral issues.

*Sport as Ethical Rule Following*

As discussed in the preceding chapter, many sport philosophers and physical
educators (Arnold, 1997; Boxil, 2003; Drewe, 2001; Jones & McNamee, 2003; Simon,
2003, 2004; Suits, 2005, 2007) have argued that there is some sort of internal connection
between rules and morality because the necessity of following rules in order to play
games requires a moral commitment. I want to reiterate the role of rules in sport here, for
without it, sport cannot be properly understood as a valued practice and cannot be
properly conducted morally. It is from the understanding of sport as ethical rule following
that we can draw certain moral conclusions regarding engagement in sport.

Suits’ classic essay, “The Elements of Sport (2007)”, attempts to elucidate the
necessary and sufficient conditions of sport. He elaborates on what elements in an
activity all need to be present to be able to call that activity “sport” in confidence. Suits
argued that all sports are particular types of games (Suits, 2005, 2007). A game is
considered sport when physical skill is required. The game must also have strong
foundation. According to Suits (2007), games are comprised of specific goals such as
hitting a ball into the hole in golf, placing a ball through the hoop in basketball, or
advancing a ball into the opposing team’s end zone in football. Unlike other everyday
activities such as vacuuming, writing book or doing the dishes, a game requires a player
to achieve a specific goal in a specific way.

The rules employed are meant to be a hindrance making the game harder. The
primary role the rules play is in the prescription of allowable means: “The rules of a game are, in effect, proscriptions of certain means useful in achieving pre-lusory goals” (Suits, 2007, p. 11). These rules are referred to “constitutive rules” (Suits, 2005, 2007). They are definitive of the game and place limitations on what players can and cannot do. Given the central definitive nature of rules, Suits maintained that “to break a constitutive rule is to fail to play the game at all” (Suits, 2007, p. 12). Therefore, Suits’s idea of playing games involves a volunteer trying to obtain a certain goal while following prescriptive rules that limit the legitimate means for its achievement. Thus, certain moral implications are a result of playing games.

To participate in the game arouses an implied obligation to follow its rules (Arnold, 1997; Boxil, 2003; Butcher & Schneider, 1998; Drewe, 2001; Morgan, 1995; Russell, 1999; Suits, 2005, 2007). Rules are the guiding force behind sport that creates equality among the participants in it. Therefore, to break the rules is to change the balance of the game. This violates the principle of equality and fairness for all the competitors given in the quest for a fair victory. Furthermore, the decision to play equates to a promise to all other participants to abide by the rules of the sport (Jones & McNamee, 2003). Breaking the rule is tantamount to violating a moral principle. In other words, one is breaking a promise, which is morally inappropriate. On this account it can be argued that sport provides an excellent forum for the exercise of moral principle (Jones & McNamee, 2003).

Moreover, the rules of sport are inherently based upon the moral concepts of justice and equality (Arnold, 1997). Thus, if sport incorporated a rule which created an unfair balance between competitors it would be in opposition to the very nature of sport.
itself. For instance, if in a baseball game one team, by rules, is allowed four strikes before receiving an out compared to the other team’s three strikes, the first team has more opportunities to score. Thus, it violates the concept of equality. In bowling if one competitor, by rules, is allowed 3 turns per frame while other competitors only receive two turns to hit the pins, there is an imbalance in justice. From such examples it is easy to see that most sports rules attempt to adhere to justice and equality (Arnold, 1997; Boxill, 2003; Drewe, 2001).

*Ethos of Sport*

Without ethos of sport, the understanding of sport as a practice, especially from moral point of view, would be left incomplete. Sport as a practice is also governed by an ethos reflective of high ideals and cherished traditions (Arnold, 1997; Butcher & Schneider, 1998; D’Agostino, 1995; Keating, 2007; Lumpkin, Stoll & Beller, 1994; Schneider, 2009). As discussed in Chapter 3, one attribute of participating in sport is to behave morally and in keeping with the ethos of sport: its values, standards and best traditions of the practice (Arnold, 1997). In a very close tennis match, for example, a bad call made by a referee which affects the outcome of the game are sometime questioned by an opponent who becomes advantaged by the wrong decision. This is an example of the best ideals and traditions of the sport.

Though there are clear cases where these ideals, conventions and best traditions are ignored and neglected, when it does happen it is viewed negatively and evokes moral condemnation. This is because there do exist fundamental ideals and traditions. Thus, evidence that sport is a moral practice comes from the fact that participants and observers alike sometimes employ moral categories to evaluate sport behavior. In our society, acts
of sportsmanship, fair play, beneficent behaviors are recognized and commended, but poor sportsmanship, unfairness, cheating, disrespecting others, and unacceptable behaviors in some sporting contests are criticized and denounced as unbecoming to the morality of sport (Russell, 2007). If sports were not moral practice how could they be assessed with moral values to praise or denigrate the behaviors of players?

It could be argued, therefore, that sport is a moral practice in which its inherent ethos is inseparably linked to the exercise of virtues of its participants (Arnold, 1997). That is to say, when a person is initiated into sport it will be done in such a way that he or she will be demanded to behave morally and adhere to the known ethos in sport. It is maintained that sport as an ideal practice when taking into consideration moral ethos requires the participants in it to “be fair, courageous, determined, and as well as friendly, beneficent, and caring” (Arnold, 1997, p. 29).

Schneider (2009) also argued that achieving excellence in sport calls for not only effective skill execution, but also practicing moral ethos of sport such as honesty, fairness, respect, generosity and kindness. He maintains that sport participants must adhere to the written rules and the unwritten rules of sport (the ethos of sport) in which he or she has agreed to participate (Schneider, 2009). In this sense, Graham McFee (2000) supports Schneider’s point by making the distinction between the actual rules and the “spirit” of the rules. His usage of the term “spoiling” shows how he believed the spirit of the rules were morally degraded. He wrote: “I use the term ‘spoiling’ to roughly characterize approximately behaviour that, while not contrary to the rules of a game/sport, is nonetheless not how one ought to play it, for ‘participating in the
game/match’ should mean participating in ways that respect one’s opponents, showing due regard for them” (pp. 172-73).

Therefore, sport participants who properly understand the ethos of sport know that pursuing the excellence of the sport itself requires exercise of the virtues of courage, honesty, and justice to facilitate that excellence (Arnold, 1997). At times acting in accord with such virtues results in reducing a competitor’s opportunity to win but maintains the integrity of the sport itself, a result which is positive for all. When sport is played with integrity of practice and participants in it see one another with esteem, the competition becomes a friendly exchange and nurtures desirable qualities in human relationship (Arnold, 1997).

To close this chapter, in explicating sport as a practice in terms of its rules and of the underlying moral ethos that guide the participants’ behavior, I could argue that it is an inherently moral practice. Teaching sport as a moral practice then becomes an excellent method of teaching moral virtues which are required for retaining the integrity of the practice. In order for sport to make a contribution to moral education of the students who play it, sport in schools should not be focused as a vehicle for something external to itself such as economic benefit, prestige, and entertainment. Attention should be paid to its moral ethos, finest conventions, and virtues in which it is rooted.

What I am arguing is that sport should be understood as a practice which is comprised of the rules, ethos, and exercise of virtues. They are what make sport such a special moral practice to its individual participants. The Kantian deontology and Aristotelian teleology in moral theory discussed in Chapter 2 seems to provide the most apposite perspectives for this understanding. As Arnold (1997) pointed out, the
deontology described how fundamental principals such as universality and impartiality are related to duty, commitment, and fairness. The teleology provides a reasoned account of the development of the individual who needs to obtain virtues such as generosity, courage, compassion, justice, and integrity to have fulfillment as a person (Arnold, 1997). These virtues are refined and practiced for sake of the individual and society as a whole. Acts of sportspersonship, it has been suggested, are good example of this teleological perspective. Sportspersonship is not required directly by the rules of sport, but it is the aspect of sport that makes its ethos great. When sport is played with such admirable quality of virtue as fairness, respect for opponents and generosity, ethos of sport as a practice is at its full display (Arnold, 1997).

Moreover, sport as a valued practice is a view that is aligned with the notion of education discussed in the preceding section. In fact, the two are compatible. As Arnold (1997) puts it nicely, “when sport is pursued for its own internal goals in the form of skills, tactics, strategies and standards in a moral way for their own sake, it is in and of itself educative” (p. 8). The understanding of the rules of sport, ethical principles upon which they are based, and necessary moral qualities makes sport a worthwhile endeavor. When these qualities are put forth in life and utilized it becomes an educative situation (Arnold, 1997).

What emerges from what has been discussed in this chapter is that if sport is to have a strong foot hold in the educational curriculum and be justified in educational terms, rather than in terms of “schooling” about fitness and health, it should be understood as a practice (Arnold, 1991, 1997; Kirk, 2006; Siedentop, 2002). In other words, if sport is pursued for the purposes external to itself, it can be more appropriately
labeled a “schooling objectives” rather than an “educational objectives” (Arnold, 1991). The purpose of schooling such as promotion of healthy life style both physically and mentally also provide a reasoned account of why sport should be taught in school, but it should be regarded as its beneficial outcome instead of its objective (Arnold, 1991; Drewe, 2001; Siedentop, 2002). Only by teaching students sport in a way they appreciate its skills as well as the intrinsic values of sport such as moral ethos, standards and best traditions, its unique value can be upheld. Moreover, this can validate and justify teaching of sport in schools as part of a well rounded educational curriculum.
CHAPTER 5: THE ROLE OF MORAL EDUCATION IN SPORT

In the preceding two chapters, I explicated what I mean by both moral education and sport. In Chapter 2, I examined some of the main issues involved in moral education. I argued that moral education is an activity of building moral character which refers to the interpenetration of moral habits along with the degree of one’s skill in moral reasoning. In other words, two necessary factors of moral education are the formation of moral habits and the learning of skill in moral reasoning. Then, in Chapter 4, I examined what it means to be physically educated. I based this examination on attaining practical knowledge, and analyzing the notion of sport as a valued practice. Now, Chapter 5 puts together arguments discussed in those two chapters and attempts to answer the following central question of this dissertation: How can physical education and sport contribute to the moral growth of the youth; more particularly, under what conditions is this contribution possible?

I assert in this chapter that there is a logical connection between engagement in sport and moral education. I argue that the logic of acquiring practical knowledge in sports is similar to the logic of acquiring a moral habit and skill in moral reasoning. Thus, sport provides an important resource that is effectively applied to the process of moral education. Also, I point out that when sport is properly understood as a particular type of human practice that has its own integrity governed and characterized by its rules and
ethos, sport can play the significant role in the formation and cultivation of moral character. In short, I argue that sport provides an important context for the practicing of moral behavior. What is practiced can then intimately be applied to the process of moral education. This is the process of acquiring moral habits and skill in moral reasoning.

Without the active role of the teacher, moral education in sport would be left incomplete. Therefore, another question that will be addressed is, what can the teacher of sport reasonably do in order to promote moral education? The role of the physical education teacher will be discussed later in this chapter.

The Logical Connection between Moral Education and Sport

In our daily lives, we constantly make moral decisions based on established and recognized moral principles. Our awareness of these principles and how we employ them and live up to them make up what is called moral knowledge (Barrow, 2007). This sort of knowledge, as I argued in Chapter 2, is by no means theoretical; “it does not consist in putting in the mind of the child a heap of ideas about moral values, moral rules, moral theories, or the significance of morality in human life which he or she can remember or on which he or she can give a lecture or write an essay” (Mitias, 1992, p. 6). This sort of knowledge is, as Aristotle said, practical: it is knowledge by and from praxis (alternative translations: “doing,” “conduct”); it is a sort of practical wisdom. It is, moreover, a skill, a “know-how” (Mitias, 1992, p. 6). I believe that Aristotle characterized moral knowledge as practical knowledge, mainly because it is intended to bring about a certain course of action.

A normal human being who is in mastery of her rational and moral sense would possess knowledge of the moral rules that are upheld in society, such as “don’t cheat,
don’t lie, don’t harm, etc” (Mitias, 1992). This sort of knowledge is theoretical, but the question which is important to this dissertation is how to apply this theoretical knowledge in a specific moral situation? Put another way, how can our children acquire practical skills in translating the content of moral rules into a concrete moral decision in such a way that the decision is correct and done in accordance with the meaning of the rule? What does it take to acquire and cultivate this practical knowledge (skill or “know how”) in the young?

To answer these questions, let us return to what I discussed in the preceding chapter. In Chapter 4, briefly speaking, I argued that physical education involves the teaching and the acquisition of practical knowledge or the “know how” to perform various movement skills. The theoretical knowledge of physical education and sport is the knowledge of the constitutive rules, rules of skill (i.e., strategy), rules of etiquette (both formal and informal), an understanding of the necessary and proper use of equipment, etc. Although all of this knowledge is an important part of what it is to be physically educated (Drewe, 2001), the emphasis should be on practical knowledge. Thus, I pointed out that the principle concern of physical education is clearly practical knowledge or knowing “how to” in the form of skill.

My basis for claiming that physical education involves the acquisition of practical knowledge was on the concept of skill. That is to say, I argued that those skills which are enhanced through engagement in sports or physical education activities illustrate the practicality of obtaining certain minimum standards. As Arnold (1991) pointed out, the skills employed to teach sport are not mindless drills or learned patterns of behavior that students blindly follow. Rather, “it implies thoughtful action and an exemplification of
intelligent practice, which in turn involves rule-following procedures and a monitoring by the agent as she or he performs, with the idea of mastery in mind” (Arnold, 1991, p. 73). In short, skill is a particular form of practical knowledge (Arnold, 1988, 1991; Wright, 2000).

For example, tennis, a sport that is played with high fluidity and skillfulness involving a ball, is not recognized for the particular skills that are used in play such as forehand, backhand, volley, overhead smash, or lob. Instead, what is appreciated in this sport is how the players intelligently use these techniques during the progress of the game, though the skills themselves remain important. In other words, in tennis, as is true in other sports or games with the constantly changing tide of advantage between the players throughout the game, it is not enough for a player to have complete mastery of the skills of the game. The player must also make good decisions on when and how to employ these skills to gain the advantage (Arnold, 1991; Wright, 2000). A skillful player not only has certain basic skill sets but has also the ability to perceive what needs to be done at a given moment and to react and execute complex motions in response to unpredictable situations (Arnold, 1991).

In the light of what has been maintained about engagement in sport based on the acquisition of practical skill, I now want to suggest that there is a logical resemblance between the process of attaining practical knowledge (skill) in sport and the process of acquiring moral character. I argued in Chapter 2 that a necessary condition for moral growth is the cultivation of moral habits (Aristotle, 2003; Barrow, 2007; Mitias, 1992; Noel, 1991; Watson, 2008; Wringe, 2006). As Aristotle (2003) noted in Book II, Chapter 1, of *Nicomachean Ethics*, “moral or ethical virtue is the product of habit (ethos)” (p. 71).
By “moral habit” I mean moral quality or moral virtue. Moral qualities, as Aristotle insisted, are acquired by doing, and by performing the same sort of act in similar situations again and again. This creates a disposition to perform this type of act. If a similar situation arises in the future the person will now feel inclined to act accordingly. In short, to possess a moral quality is to possess an active readiness to act in a certain way (Mitias, 1992).

As an individual learns and practices moral values, they are preparing themselves for situations in which they will have to evoke the same response, thus, cultivating or developing habits that illustrate a strong moral character (Arnold, 1997; Carr, 1991, 2003, 2008; Watson, 2008). In this sense, participants in sport must constantly decide what to do and how to act in a split second. If the moral quality of honesty has been consistently instilled in the participants by their parents, teachers, and coaches throughout their life, it is probable they will practice honesty in sporting situations (Schneider, 2009). In fact, the moral quality of honesty might even become reflexive; in other words, honesty becomes a habit of action. When a person is consistently faced with situations that call for honesty, the person is less likely to hesitate. Instead, he or she will simply react honestly, as the situation call for the moral value of honesty to be applied (Aristotle, 2003; Jones, 2005; Schneider, 2009). This means that the person can learn the ability to expeditiously recognize when it is appropriate to apply the moral value of honesty, justice and courage. In other words, the person can learn moral knowledge; the person can acquire the practical knowledge (skill) for right moral judgments by practicing moral behaviors. This point is most significant for my present purposes as I shall argue that sport can provide
the student with an effective and practical context for learning and practicing moral values so that they acquire moral habits.

The process to make good moral decisions must be practiced until it becomes second nature for the decision maker; as Aristotle insisted, until he or she possesses a stable and firm moral character. The repetition of an experience is practically useful because it can form a framework; that is to say, facing an experience or action continually helps a child better understand the value of the action and develop skills to better perform the action subsequently (Dewey, 1930). After repeatedly applying an approach grounded in moral values to various moral situations, a person with practiced decision-making experience will act efficiently and quickly when presented with similar moral situations. Habits of good action, as Aristotle contended, can be established through practice. Continued and repeated practice is a source of moral knowledge (Mitias, 1992; Peters, 1981; Watson, 2008). In this sense of what has been maintained, I assert that the physical education class (teaching sport or games) provides a unique context for the practicing of moral behaviors and eventually for the acquisition of moral habit. I aver that it is more effective and conducive to this acquisition than the contexts provided by any other subjects and activities schools can offer.

To illustrate my claims thus far that sport provides a useful context for moral education, let me take and expand the Mitias’ (1992) example of Peter growing up in a typical family which wants to teach him how to be courageous. Day to day, Peter faces new and challenging situations, so how will his parents prepare him to be courageous when facing pressure to not be? If you were Peter’s parents, how would you teach him to be courageous? Will you give him lectures about the value of courage? Or, will you make
him read books or watch movies on how to grow in courage? They might work for Peter; he might understand your lectures, the books, or the movies you have assigned him to read and watch. However, they alone will not develop him into a courageous individual.

As I pointed out in the preceding chapter, theoretical knowledge is the type of rationality concerned with knowing that something is the case in a factual way (Arnold, 1988; Carr, 1981; Ryle, 1949; Wright, 2000). Since it is organized and structured it clearly establishes what we should believe. However, alone it does not provide us with the rational intellect for purpose of action. Practical knowledge, on the other hand, is the type of rationality concerned primarily with knowing how to do something successfully (Arnold, 1988; Carr, 1981; Ryle, 1949; Wright, 2000). It helps us to discover the best way to proceed in order to accomplish what is envisaged. In short, theoretical knowledge pertains to the discovery of truth which is confirmed by reason and experience while practical knowledge deals with rational action with the purpose to achieve success (Carr, 1981). In my opinion the best plan for the parents to help Peter acquire practical knowledge is by having Peter undergo certain experiences that reveal to him the value of courage.

What I want to argue is that sport and physical education provides an excellent and effective arena for the practicing of moral behavior such as courageous acts and eventually for the acquisition of moral habit (the quality of courage), so that if a similar situation which calls for courageous action arises in the future he or she will feel inclined to act accordingly. What I want to point out more particularly is that the logic of learning how to acquire a moral habit (moral character) is similar to the logic of learning how to acquire a practical skill (knowledge) by participating in sports. If I were Peter’s parents, I
would have Peter participate in sport involving courageous acts so that he can perform an act of courage and discover for himself what it means to act courageously in the midst of learning the sport.

Returning to the Mitias’s (1992) Peter example, let us assume that his parents teach Peter to be courageous by taking him to the pool to teach him how to swim. However, Peter is, for some reason, afraid to get in the water and the sight of the water is enough to make him fear taking his first plunge into the water. Now several things come into play in Peter’s learning situation. He must learn to swim, he must learn courage to overcome his fear of the water, and he has to continue positive relationships with his parents and friends in the social atmosphere of the pool. Peter’s mannerisms and actions are integral parts of this whole learning situation, so how should his parents help him overcome his fear of the water and perform an act of courage to swim?

As Mitias (1992) describes, the parents may show Peter how the other young children are swimming and how they are in no danger. To further show that the water is safe, his mother or father may get in the water and move around showing him that there is nothing to be afraid of. If Peter is still unconvinced, his mother or father may stand in the water at the pool’s edge to show they will help him and protect him. This will create a feeling of security so that Peter might feel comfortable enough to jump in the water.

Now envision Peter in the process of conquering his fear of water. Seeing the other kids and his parents in the water gradually convinces him that the water will not hurt him and he thinks about jumping in, but he is still a little unsure. As his parents keep encouraging him, Peter gets a feeling of security and thinks that his parents would not let anything bad happen to him. In time he is able to jump in and eventually he even gets
comfortable enough to jump in and swim on his own. What happens when Peter underwent this learning experience of swimming is that he saw for himself, in action, how to be courageous and act accordingly in the course of the experience. That is to say, when this experience is repeatedly practiced under the right conditions, Peter learns how to swim and what it means to swim. As Mitias (1992) points out, he obtains this knowledge and skill through practice and repetition. In order words, by doing a type of action again and again the repetition creates a tendency where he expects to achieve success. This practice can be called “habituation” (Aristotle, 2003), for once Peter learns how to perform an act of courage he will then do it through habit (Aristotle, 2003; Arnold, 2001; Mitias, 1992; Noel, 1991). This habit acts as a principle for organizing his action on the basis of past successes, and thus, as Peter may use his habit of courageousness in different situations which calls for courageous actions (Dewey, 1930; Mitias, 1992). In such situations, I believe that he can be guided the way he was guided when he took his swimming lessons.

However, a critic may ask a question: Is this singular event, if successful, sufficient to make Peter a courageous person? Mitias (1992) answers to this question, “not really.” That is to say, all that can really be said is that Peter began to develop an inclination to be courageous and the idea of when it was acceptable to be afraid (Mitias, 1992). At first he was afraid of the water but he learned that water should not be feared after he managed to float on his own. So far his attitude is directed at one action and the knowledge he acquired seems somewhat non-universal. But the knowledge he learned can be applied to any situation which requires courageous actions.
What can be argued from the Peter example about the formation of moral character (courage) through participating in sport (swimming)? It is this: 1) Peter learned general knowledge -- “he learned the logical structure of a type of situation, the type which arouses fear and which consists of certain components and creates certain expectation” (Mitias, 1992, p. 12); 2) he also acquired a skill in distinguishing the sort of object which can be the source of justifiable fear, how to analyze such situations, and how to make a particular decision using this general knowledge; 3) he formed a habit -- he acquired a particular tendency to act or respond in a certain way. In short, possessing a moral habit, it has been suggested, is tantamount to possessing moral knowledge. As I stated earlier, this sort of knowledge is practical, not theoretical; it is a skill or a “know-how.” Acquired moral knowledge becomes essential component of the psyche (Mitias, 1992). The goal of moral education should assist the young in mastering general principles, not conveying moral decisions. Accordingly, we should believe that a moral habit results in the internalization of a moral rule in the soul of the child (Mitias, 1992; Noel, 1991; Peters, 1981; Sichel, 1988; Watson, 2008). In this sense, sport provides an excellent and effective context for the child to practice moral qualities, learn general knowledge, attain practical skills and form moral habits accordingly.

However, a critic still might not be convinced by my points and counter-argue that a moral quality (courage) cannot be attained just by practicing one type of action (swimming) which the child is made to perform repeatedly; that is, it is difficult to say the child will automatically act in the same way again because future situations will be different, at least to some extent, from the earlier ones. For example, the conditions for swimming constantly change when it is done on rivers, oceans, lakes (Mitias, 1992).
other words, a critic would maintain that possession of an active readiness in a certain way does not necessarily entail a moral decision in a concrete moral situation. However, this is why I added another important ingredient for moral education: skill in moral reasoning (this was discussed in detail in Chapter 2). Therefore, the skill to articulate the right moral judgment for a given situation is necessarily needed because acquiring moral knowledge is, as Flanagan (1996) puts it, “primarily a process of learning how: how to recognize a wide variety of complex situations and how to respond to them appropriately” (p. 124).

As I emphasized at the beginning of this chapter, skills developed through engagement in sports or physical education activities are exemplifications of practical reasoning in terms of knowing how to do something competently (Arnold, 1991). Ryle (1949) also agreed with this point by elaborating on what it means to “know how.” He suggested that know-how (skill) involves not only performing an operation correctly or successfully, but also applying criteria in performing critically. That is to say, learning a skill involves more than drill or repeating a behavior pattern. Instead, it involves thought, intelligent practice, and monitoring (Arnold, 1991). Thus, what I want to argue is that what Peter learned is not a mindless swimming drill or a specifically learned pattern of behavior. Rather, it implies thoughtful action and an exemplification of intelligent practice. In other words, what Peter learned is not only a skill in performing swimming drills successfully but also a skill in distinguishing a source of justifiable fear, how to analyze the situation, and how to apply his analysis critically in making a particular decision. In short, in the end Peter acquired a skill in reasoning; he acquired the necessary psychological and cognitive skill to perform under new situations because he knows what
to expect and how to behave (Kohlberg, 1976). To express the same point differently, Peter acquired practical knowledge to articulate the right judgment based on a rational survey and evaluation of the situation. From this evaluation he perform an act of courage satisfactorily when he is called upon to do so (Mitias, 1992).

But a critic may wonder whether learning sports can really enable the students to acquire a skill to articulate the right moral judgment in a given moral circumstance; furthermore, whether sport can instill moral habits in the growing child? What students seem to do when they participate in sports is mostly learn something about how to play the games. True, I think sport cannot instill moral habits directly into the student’s characters. It is not being suggested that moral qualities such as courage, honesty, justice, generosity, fairness and impartiality can only be acquired via sport and then utilized in other aspects of life. That would surely be a naïve and unfounded view of the relationship between sport and the development of moral character (Arnold, 1997; Carr, 1998).

Morality of every society in the civilized world consists of definite moral values. Since morality itself is a social construction, moral values may vary in scope and depth of meaning from one society to another and from one period to another. However, despite the variations, I believe that most rational people would agree on the fundamental conditions that are necessary for human individuality: definite moral values such as justice, fairness, impartiality, freedom, and respect for persons (Peters, 1981). Thus, what should perhaps be maintained is that sport, when seen and taught as a particular type of human practice that has its own integrity governed and characterized by its rules and ethos, provides an ethically based context of endeavor in which such definite moral qualities as those named above are not only encouraged but also practiced in keeping
with its best traditions (Arnold, 1992, 1997, 1999; Kirk, 2006; MacIntyre, 1984; Morgan, 2006b; Siedentop, 2002). Certainly, acts of fairness, impartiality, justice, honesty, compassion and generosity and magnanimity on the sports field are not only universally recognized to be sportspersonlike but also morally applauded (Arnold, 1997). While there are no known empirical studies that can be used to argue that sport or the sports field is the best training forum or method for learning or cultivating moral qualities, it is within reason to suggest that sport provides an unusually good nurturing environment for the practice and the display of moral qualities (Arnold, 1997). These qualities can then be used and appreciated in real life circumstances outside the arena of sport.

However, a critic might raise a further question: does the teaching of sport in schools have more serious implications than any other curriculum area for the moral cultivation of students? Again, I admit that it would not be logical to make an absolute judgment without indisputable proof that there is a necessary connection between engagement in sport and moral development. But if one looks at other forms of educationally acceptable activities it would be hard to deny my conviction that there are not many educational activities in schools which can provide a context more conducive to the acquiring of practical knowledge or practical skill of reasoning than the context provided by physical education activities. Moreover, if one looks at other forms of socially acceptable activities, it would be hard to escape the claims made by some sport philosophers and physical educationists (Arnold, 1992, 1997, 1999; Kirk, 2006; Maraj, 1965; Schneider, 2009; Siedentop, 2002) there are few situations which demand the same desirable qualities as those that are called upon in sport. Perhaps nowhere else in our daily life are the opportunities of practicing moral virtues offered more than in sport.
In this section, I have discussed the logical connection between acquiring a moral character and acquiring a skill (or practical knowledge) in sport in order to show how the learning of sport is related to the possibility of moral education. The point of moral education should be to aid the development of young people into mature adults who display good virtues such as honesty and reject such vices as selfishness (Jones, 2005). That is to say, moral education is about helping students to be a morally autonomous being so that they can act in accordance with moral values which are recognized and upheld in society when they are confronted with moral situations. Therefore, if the central goal of this education is moral growth of a student, and if this growth requires the development of moral habit and skill in moral reasoning, then it is obviously the educator’s responsibility to provide a facilitating environment for this twofold development. I believe that sport can play a most significant role in providing these necessary conditions for achieving moral education. In what senses can sport perform this task more effectively than any other activities can do? There are at least two answers to this question.

The first is, as has been discussed thus far, that moral knowledge is practical knowledge mainly because it is intended to bring about a certain course of action. Perhaps nowhere else in the school curriculum is practical knowledge highlighted more than in the teaching of sport and physical education. Keeping this distinctive feature in mind, I have demonstrated that there is a logical similarity between the acquisition of practical knowledge in sport and the acquiring of moral knowledge. To this extent, it can be argued that the learning of sport is commensurate with the cultivating of moral
character. Thus, it does not seem at all unreasonable to suggest that sport provides an unusually good resource that is applied to the process of moral education.

The second answer is that the concept of sport as a practice, it has been argued, is inherently concerned with moral values; sport is replete with opportunities to learn moral values. Moreover, moral character in sport and in other spheres of life is much the same. They share moral qualities such as fairness, impartiality, honesty, generosity, justice, compassion, loyalty, courage, and resolution. Because sport is a moral practice that has integrity governed and characterized by virtue of the underlying principles, rules and ethos, it provides an ethically based context for the participants to practice moral values and cultivate them. Therefore, a person’s moral character is cultivated in sport when his or her actions are directed by his or her understanding of the rules and the ethical principles upon which those rules are based (Arnold, 1997).

What must not be put forth is the idea that because sport is an intrinsically moral activity, participants in sport invariably act morally. Obviously this is not always the case. However, that does not undermine the conceptual point that is being put forth here. It does not diminish its implication for the teaching of sport in school either. The teaching of sport is a valuable and special form of education because it provides an unusually useful context for the student to acquire both theoretical and practical knowledge as well as to allow them to practice moral behaviors and cultivate moral characters. Put it another way, an initiation into sport entails not only the mastery of physical skills but also the acquisition of moral education.

To close this section, what then can be concluded from what has been said about moral knowledge, practical knowledge, the practice of sport, and moral education? First,
sport, at least in so far as it entails the acquisition of knowledge (both theoretical and practical), is a valuable act of educating. Second, there is a logical similarity between attaining practical knowledge in sport and acquiring moral knowledge. Finally, the teaching of sport provides an important resource that is intimately applied to the process of moral education of acquiring moral habit and developing skill in moral reasoning. The teaching of sport in school, therefore, can and should be justified as a valuable subject that assists the students towards a morally autonomous being, whether on or off the games field, in the sense of helping students not only to possess moral characters but also to choose to be loyal to them.

Arguments against Sport as a Moral Character Builder

As examined in Chapter 3, the idea that sports help build moral character is an ancient one, reaching back at least as far as the philosophical writing of Plato. Centuries later, the existentialist philosopher Camus mentioned in his book, *Resistance, Rebellion and Death* “sport, from which I learned all I know about ethics” (Camus, 1969, p. 242). Of course, the belief that sport can and should be a form of moral education is not one that is limited to some philosophers and physical educators. It is a widely held concept throughout our culture (Simon, 2003). However, the questions about the alleged relationship of sport to moral education can be raised from a variety of angles. This is clear from the extensive literature of sport and physical education surrounding the possible connection between sport and morality (Carr, 1998).

Those who argue against the idea that there is the connection between sport participation and the character development have valid arguments of their own. For example, the oft-cited article by Ogilvie and Tutko (1971) is titled, “Sport: If You Want
to Build Character, Try Something Else.” Shields and Bredemeier (1995) in their book *Character Development and Physical Activity* noted that sport’s reputation as a strong builder of positive character and teacher of positive values is not clearly evidenced in the literature. Coakley (2004) also pointed out that research on the relationship between participation in sport and character development shows that not all participants develop positive character from their sport experiences.

Due to repeated examples of athlete misbehavior and widespread disagreement over just what character is and how it can be measured, many critics of contemporary sport are often skeptical of the adage that the practice of sport has a direct connection to moral character development (Reid, 2007). Critics points out that although sport may provide a valuable experience for the student to enhance values, the negative values such as an overemphasis on winning and consequent disrespect of opponents, are also taught (Coakley, 2004; Eccles, Barber, Stone & Hunt, 2003; Kohn, 1986; Orlick, 1990; Sage, 1998; Simon, 2003). Bill Morgan (1994) arouses our attention on the abuse or degradation of the contemporary sport, saying that “the signs of the degradation of sport are all around us. The mania for winning, the widespread cheating, the economic and political trivialization of sport, the thirst for crude sensationalism and eccentric spectacle, the manipulation by the mass media, the cult of athletic stars and celebrity, and the mindless bureaucratization are just some of the ominous signs” (p. 1).

Therefore, in suggesting that there is a logical connection between participation in sport, games or other physical activities and the development of moral character, I will have to deal with the counter-argument that sport participation is not an educationally valuable experience to form or cultivate moral qualities. This section lays out and
examines the arguments that reject the idea that there is a logical connection between engagement in sport and the moral character development. Critiques of the character-forming potential of sport have generally taken one of three forms: 1) sport is morally neutral; 2) it is doubtful whether moral qualities developed in sport will be transferred to other areas in life; and 3) sport is morally negative. Thus, I examine three main lines of the negative arguments on sport as a moral character builder then I, as a proponent of the positive view regarding sport as a vehicle for the formation of moral character, attempt to defend each point of negative view by suggesting what can be done about sustaining sport as an important form of the development of moral characters.

The Neutral View

First of all, some argue that sport is neither a vehicle for moral education nor a facilitator of antisocial behavior; sport is just morally neutral (Arnold, 1997; Carr, 1998; Peters, 1966; Shields & Bredemeier, 1995). In other words, it cannot be clearly shown that sport exhibits either positive or negative moral significance. Therefore, sport activities are taken from wider moral concerns and sport is neutral from a moral educational point of view for all intents and purposes (Carr, 1998; Peters, 1966). This view originates from the mindset that sport is just a form of play (Arnold, 1997). Because sport is only a game which is separate, none-serious, discontinuous with the life business, what goes on in sport, from the moral point of view, is insignificant and thus is not to be compared to life’s concerns (Arnold, 1997).

Although this view of correlation between sport and morality is not to be overlooked, I think that this neutralist view is the weakest of the three arguments that reject the connection between sport and morality. Is sport really discontinuous with the
business of life in our contemporary society? Just because sport is a form of play or game which is fun, enjoyable and entertaining, does this make sport morally neutral? Sport is, as has been suggested in this dissertation, a socially constituted practice. I believe that it is part of human culture; it is a distinctly human activity in which people often invest considerable emotional and temporal resources; and these resources are quite “real.” Thus, Arnold (1984) pointed out that sport, just like numerous other practices, is a vehicle for self-expression and self-fulfillment. It is therefore to be taken seriously from a moral viewpoint. Moreover, it is important to note that sport processes, from a sociological perspective, resemble closely those in other arenas of life. This is essential when weighing the educational potential which sport can provide. Sport certainly epitomizes positive (or negative) cultural values and provides opportunities for moral reflection and action. Therefore, I think that this neutralist view is derived from an inadequate understanding of sport and a premature assimilation of it into the realm of play (Arnold, 1997).

The Problem of Moral Transfer

Other people acknowledge that sport may encourage the development of desirable attributes, but they question whether these attributes transcend the sport context (Meakin, 1981, 1982, 1990; Shields & Bredemeier, 1995). For example, as a quarterback Sam may learn to be a leader and cooperate with his teammates but that does not necessarily mean he will be a leader and more cooperative with people in his place of work. In other words, they might grant that students might develop moral qualities such as courage, honest, tolerance, cooperation, and fairness in sport and physical education, but doubt whether they will be transferred to other areas of students’ life (Meakin, 1981). Therefore, the
critical question concerning the relationship of sport to moral education is not just about whether moral characters can be cultivated in sport but about whether such moral characters cultivated in sport can become transferred elsewhere. However, it is important to note that this question is not restricted to moral education in sport but to moral education in general. That is to say, doubt concerning moral transfer can apply to other than the activities constitutive of sport and physical education (Meakin, 1981).

If I am to heed my own experience and the testimony of major philosophers from Plato to Aristotle to Dewey, I can say that such moral transfer is possible and without it, speaking of moral education would be meaningless. My firm belief is that students who have reached a level of cognitive development where they have the ability to generalize their moral sense will be able to transfer moral knowledge acquired through sport participation to other similar contexts. As I have suggested in the preceding section, sport entails not only the learning of certain basic skill sets, but also the acquiring of the ability to perceive what needs to be done at a given moment and to react and execute complex motions in response to unpredictable situations (Arnold, 1991). Put it another way, sport provides participants with contexts in which they can learn the psychological and cognitive skill to recognize a wide variety of complex situations. Then they can articulate the right judgment based on a rational evaluation of the situation and perform an act satisfactorily when a new situation comes up.

Moreover, sport does provide people with encounters where they can learn and evoke moral values, as the situations and struggles they face reflect real-life conflicts. Of course, there are obvious differences between sport and other activities in life, but there are many areas of overlap between them. The main difference between sport and
everyday life is that moral experience is concentrated and acutely displayed in sport. If students can be taught and motivated to act in a certain way and shown how to cope with differing circumstances through sport and physical education activities, there seems to be no reason for them to not be motivated to behave this way in similar situations of non sports affiliated life. It is not, of course, being suggested that moral transfer of motivation occurs spontaneously; rather, it depends profoundly on the teacher (Arnold, 2001; Carr, 2001, 2003, 2008; Jones, 2005; Meakin, 1981). Thus, it must be realized that “what doubt about the possibility of moral transfer ultimately queries is whether teachers in school can make any conscious contribution at all to their pupils’ moral education” (Meakin, 1981, p. 252). The role of the teacher regarding the issue of transfer will be discussed in the following section of this chapter.

The Negative View

Finally, some critics suggest that sport does not build moral character at all. Rather, they believe that it has an adverse effect and only teaches negative values and poor morality (Bailey, 1975; Carr, 1998; Ogilvie & Tutko, 1971). They cite violent examples of some sports in their elite or professional form like NBA player Ron Artest who charged into the stands to fight a fan or Dennis Rodman who kicked a camera man in the groin for no reason. Major League Baseball is known for its inordinate amount of illegal steroid usage over the past few decades. These are all clear example of an ethos that defies moral norms. In other words, sport has been receiving poor press involving illegal and banned performance-enhancing substances, steroids usage, gang and organized crime associations, rape and even dog fighting accusations which have done nothing but add fuel to the fire for the argument against sport as a moral character
builder. Proponents have claimed that competition itself leads to immoral behaviors (Orlick, 1990) and antisocial behavior (Kohn, 1986) such as disrespect for opponents, dominance, assertiveness and non-sociability (Ogilvie & Tutko, 1971). Coakley (2004) said that special status given to athletes limits their moral growth. Leonard (1972) quips, “If competitive sports build character, it is character fit for a criminal” (p. 77). Sage (1988) also argued that sport reflects negative values present in the broader culture.

This third line of the negative view of sport as a moral character builder mainly comes from the findings of empirical studies, which more often focus on professional or high competitive sport where winning is considered of most importance (Arnold, 1997). For example, research cited by Shields and Bredemeier (1995) found no strong relationship between elite competitive sport and the development of moral behavior. Such studies appear to show that not only does cheating and foul play occur, but that negative traits such as dominance, aggression and assertiveness must be possessed to be successful (Coakley, 2004; Eccles, Barber, Stone & Hunt, 2003; Ogilvie & Tutko, 1971; Shields & Bredemeier, 1995; Weiss & Bredemeier, 1986). The findings of these studies are made more apparent both on television and in the newspapers when coverage is given to big match events (Arnold, 1997).

Though I am a proponent of the positive view about sport as a moral character builder, I do admit that there are many pitfalls associated with some sports in their elite or professional form. Even though there are pitfalls in some elite or professional sports it is not necessary to place them in total disregard. It is true some professional sports are associated with unsavory behaviors. However, this does not mean children need to be shielded or stopped from playing these sports. There is a Korean maxim which says “if
there are three persons, including me, the other two persons must be moral exemplars for me.” This maxim stresses that we are able to learn from both a bad exemplar and a good exemplar. We learn from a good example when a person gives us an opportunity to imitate his or her good behaviors. We are also able to learn from a bad example when a person gives us an opportunity to reflect on immoral behaviors. Similarly, as Meakin (1982) pointed out, the well awareness of the sport’s ethos can provide an educational opportunity. I believe that children can learn to distinguish between “what is” and “what should be.” That is to say, they can learn from a bad exemplar when a bad sport gives them an opportunity to reflect on negative values. Therefore, partaking in sport will actually help children develop and determine the difference in right and wrong. Children will learn to take responsibility for their actions and how to strive for what is right (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995). Though immoral action can certainly be found in some sports, this does not have to be. I believe that participants can develop a sense of responsibility for their actions and follow the virtues that are demanded in their sport (Arnold, 1997; Shields & Bredemeier, 1995).

To summarize, I have discussed the arguments that reject the relationship of sport to the cultivation of moral character and attempted to defend each point of negative view. The negative argument on sport as an important form of moral education has generally taken one of three forms: the morally neutral view, the problem of transfer, and the morally negative view. Such arguments against the relationship between sport participation and the development of moral character cannot be disregarded. Nonetheless they should not be taken as total representations of the way sport is constructed in general (Arnold, 1997).
When sport seems to have lost its potential to reflect or teach about moral values, “we should be concerned that its basic example has been lost on its practitioners and that sport has been misused or corrupted by some of its participants or by broader elements of society, or by an entire culture” (Russell, 2007, p. 64). At the heart of all sports are virtues, ethics, and interpersonal concerns. If sport is to remain a worthwhile element in our lives, it must be practiced in accordance with its ideals and best tradition (Arnold, 1997). There must be an emphasis on moral values for sports-related people. Regardless of the problems brought about from contemporary high competitive sport, there is no lack of opportunities in sport to encounter, learn, and act on moral values. I firmly believe that if properly utilized, sport can be conducted to teach certain moral values more effectively than other activities in which children become involved. What I want to point out is that although involvement in sport does not automatically infuse good moral character in its participants, participants can learn moral character more effectively through sport than through other activities in our life. Therefore, sport-related people such as players, coaches, athletic directors, and even fans must focus their efforts on using sport as a road to fostering moral values which sport is intrinsically concerned with. Sport as a foundation for moral education should start from this point.

The Role of the Teacher

Although we accept that moral education is desirable and possible, there are still important issues to consider about moral education. Who is responsible? Who decides what values are to be promoted and what values are to be abjured, particularly in a controversial case? Whose morals are to be taught, promoted, or expressed? Put it another way, although we accept the account of the logical connection between
engagement in sport and moral education discussed above, we will be faced with a
further question, one which is less easy to answer: should a physical education teacher be
a moral educator? If so, how should she teach physical education and sport to help
facilitate the moral development of her students?

Before suggesting a response to these questions, let us consider the following
situation in physical education. Imagine a student, I will call him David, participating in
physical education class. The PE teacher put together lesson plans to teach a game of
soccer and she divided the class into two teams. Before the start of the soccer game, the
teacher planned to have students go through fitness training and conditioning. Through
the class, she intended to teach the students that they are a team and that their actions
affect the others. She begins with stretches, having them partner up and assist each other.
After the stretches will come long-distance running. David is a little out of shape and is
breathing heavily but he is able to keep up so far. After a short break, the teacher has the
students form lines where they will do five sets of ten repetitions, or reps, of various
exercises such as crunches, sit ups, and pushups. David is able to keep up for the first two
sets, but in the middle of the third set, he finds himself unable to do all ten reps. He
finishes seven at the moment the rest of his teammates finish ten. He tries to do the last
three before the start of the next set, but he finds the others watching him. His desire to
impress and not cause himself embarrassment tempts David to act as though he finished
the ten reps at the same time as his teammates, underestimating the teacher’s ability to
notice his count among the other students.

Now imagine David has made the choice to be dishonest and do only seven reps. He
gets away with it for the rest of the exercise and the conditioning agenda moves on to
pushups. Again he finds that he cannot do the full ten reps as his teammates, so he cheats again. He hears the teacher warn no one in particular that if any student has not finished all ten reps, to finish them after each set. David ignores the warning because he thinks he can hide his deception and he has resigned to the fact that he cannot keep up. By the fourth set of pushups, David is deft at hiding his inability. For him, he has succeeded in not making himself stand out or embarrass himself among his peers. But the teacher has caught on to his dishonesty. The other students finish their ten reps, while David finishes seven and stops. The teacher waits but sees David has no intention of finishing ten reps. She then asks David directly if he has finished ten. David could lie with his words like he has been doing with his actions, but the situation and pressure forces him to tell the truth to the teacher, in front of all the peers, that he did not finish all of the reps. The teacher then announces to the entire team that they are to do extra sets in David’s honor. David is now seeing that his action of being dishonest and deceptive affects the whole team. The message to David is clear. He must perform with the team if he wants to join them. He still cannot do the ten reps as quickly as the other students, but he finishes the full ten and the other players wait for him to finish before continuing onto the next set or exercise.

Though I do not argue that teachers in physical education are better moral educators than teachers in other curriculum areas, I do believe that physical education teachers, by its very nature of subject, have more opportunities to play a role in fostering positive moral behavior than do teachers in other subject areas. As for the David example, when David undergoes this difficult experience, he will know, in action, how he should act in an honest way; he will know in general what is expected of him and how he should behave in certain circumstances. The physical education teacher can provide a unique
arena in which David learns, through his physical education experience, how to be part of a team, how to be co-operative with his teammates and what it means to be honest with his abilities, his peers, and his teacher. Therefore, by engaging in sport games, fitness training, educational gymnastics and dance the students could learn through the guidance of the teacher, to become courageous, honest, tolerant of one another, to be patient and to be cooperative (Wright, 1987).

I am not suggesting that other curriculum areas cannot involve students learning moral qualities such as cooperation, honesty and courage. However, I believe that the fundamental thrust of teaching sport and physical education is moral. Therefore, physical education teachers automatically instill moral habits to some extent just by keeping order and proper sportsmanship while teaching. Teachers in general may not be obligated to instill moral habits in their student’s characters, but physical education teachers are obligated to do this for basic student safety. We do not want cheaters and fisticuffs because of spoiled sport students. All teachers need to be fair with students regardless of the subject they teach. However, it is absolutely vital that physical education teachers create an impartial and even environment when placing students on teams (Drewe, 2001). As philosopher John Rawls (1971) stated, the first virtue found in sport is fairness, just as truth is fundamental in systems of thought. If so, educators of sport are wholly involved in teaching fairness. A major aim of all who involved in sport should be to encourage action consistent with developed appreciation of the fundamentals of fairness (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995).

How, then, should the physical education teacher teach sport to cultivate a moral faculty in the souls of the students? By taking the logical connection between moral
education and sport seriously, physical education teachers should create a facilitating environment for the cultivating of positive moral qualities. Put it another way, it is the responsibility of the teacher to teach the student not only the constitutive rules of sport that govern and characterize that activity but also how to play with fairness and respect to all participants, teammates and opponents (Arnold, 2001).

However, Theodoulides (2003) discovered that teachers sometimes condone unsporting or unfair actions if it results in a win. “In particular, during extra curricular activities teachers are more accepting, and in some cases teach, rule breaking and gamesmanship believing it to be ‘all part of the game’” (Theodoulides, 2003, p. 141). Obviously, it is the dominant values of professional sport that children follow when playing sport (Jones, 2005). The behavior and action of those involved, namely, coaches, players, parent, and spectators will reflect the ethos of professional sports (Jones, 2005). In professional baseball, for example, arguing with umpires or pitchers intentionally hitting batters are commonly seen yet unappealing features of the ethos of the sport.

In this respect, it is important for the PE teacher to realize that a morally sound ethos is crucial for the moral development of his or her students, and its creation and promotion is the responsibility of the physical education teacher and the physical education lesson (Jones, 2005). The ethos of sport that the PE teachers create provides the framework for their students to act and interact (Jones, 2005). The teachers must use their position to exemplify and proclaim the moral ethos, the ideals and virtues in which sport is rooted. Acts of “cheating, dangerous play, or unacceptable behavior should not be condoned but condemned because they offend the rules of the activity and its spirit; conversely, acts of consideration or sportspersonship, although not required by the rules,
should be recognized and commended as in keeping with sport as a valued practice” (Arnold, 2001, p. 145). Therefore, the teacher should act as guardian, guide and mentor in order to implement not only the rules, skills techniques, tactics and strategies but also the ethical principles upon which they are based (Arnold, 1997, 2001). In order to preserve the best traditions and conventions of sport, the teacher must care for sport as a practice, and thus provide a way for the students to understand what is involved in the practice of sport and how it should be conducted (Arnold, 2001; Kirk, 2006; Siedentop, 2002).

Of course nurturing moral character is undoubtedly a difficult task. However, if the acquisition of knowledge (both theoretical and practical) by morally acceptable procedures is at the heart of what education means (Arnold, 1991; Drewe, 2001; Peters, 1965), the teachers as an educator should in whatever they do seek to help their students be educated in a morally defensible way and furthermore help them stand on their own as a people. If sport is to be a moral practice where participants can gain moral habits and learn moral reasoning skill, the physical education teacher must demonstrate the relationship between these qualities and their PE lesson. The physical education teacher, as Jones (2005) puts it nicely, “must be fully committed in both words and action to a healthy ethos and must be inclusive where often they are elitists and exclusive. They must embody fairness, compassion, understanding, even-handedness, care and trust. They must display, encourage, and reward good behavior and discourage bad behavior” (p. 146).

To sum up, “a good teacher is not just the technically efficient deliverer of certain curricular goods. He or she is the kind of person who is looked up to by virtue of possessing certain admirable qualities of character upon which it is appropriate to model
our lives” (Carr, 1991, p. 258). It is unlikely that teachers would be able to help their student to cultivate moral qualities in sport and physical education unless teachers are fully committed to the moral qualities themselves. This is, of course, a difficult task, but I think that it is not an impossible one to achieve. If moral education in sport is concerned with cultivating such moral qualities as honesty, courage, compassion, generosity and impartiality and upholding what is fair and just and in the interest of all, the physical education teacher must create the right kind of ethos and provide a facilitating environment in which those moral qualities could be demonstrated to the pupils under their care as well as in which good moral behaviors are practiced and encouraged and bad behaviors are discouraged. What is important is that physical education teachers present their subject matter in a far considerate way, thus showing their passion for the value of their subject (Arnold, 2001; Jones, 2005).

Moral education is complex and difficult. This complex and difficult subject needs to be implemented by a person with proper moral values (Jones, 2005). It is crucial for successfully educating students morally. This person should demonstrate the right sort of values, care about the students, and use good judgment (Jones, 2005). If the teacher was prepared to see her role as a moral educator, as well as a teacher of physical education, then I strongly believe that she could provide the necessary conditions which are crucial for students’ growth in moral character.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

The purpose of this dissertation was to subject the relationship between engagement in sport and the development of moral character to rational and philosophical examination to see if sport can contribute to moral education. Because this examination included a number of related topics, I will summarize the main argument and how it is linked to the other topics discussed in this dissertation. I will then conclude with suggestions for further research in an effort to promote sport in a morally and educationally justifiable way.

The main argument proposed in this dissertation was to show the logical connection between a person’s participation in sport and physical education and the development of his or her moral character. I attempted to approach this issue with a focus on analysis of moral education in order to demonstrate how effectively and logically participation in sport can be applied to the process of moral education. Thus, it was necessary to first interrogate what I mean by moral education by making clear what is entailed in becoming morally educated.

Moral education is an activity of “building moral character.” The notion that the development of moral character is the foremost task of moral education has been accepted by a number of philosophers on education during the past years (Barrow, 2007; Carr, 2008; Goodman & Lesnick, 2004; Mitias, 1992; Peters, 1981; Sichel, 1988;
The main question was raised accordingly: What does it mean to cultivate moral character? To answer this question, I examined two important factors that constitute moral education: the formation of moral habit and the learning of skill in moral reasoning.

First, the necessary condition for moral education is the formation of moral habits. I argued that moral education is a process in which we instill moral habit in the growing child. Many philosophers (Aristotle, 2000; Dewey, 1930; Noel, 1991; Peters, 1981; Sichel, 1988) agreed on the idea that to possess moral habits is tantamount to possessing moral virtues or moral qualities which are cherished and practiced in society. This called for the following question: how can a person acquire a moral quality? The “how” of this question was the “how” of the formation of moral habit. The answer was that moral qualities, as Aristotle insisted, are ingrained upon a person’s psyche by repeating the same actions in varying yet similar situations until the person is predisposed to react in a morally just way. In short, to possess a moral quality is to possess a moral habit (Aristotle, 2000). A habit a person formed functions as a principle for organizing his or her action on the basis of past successes. It is important to note that Dewey (1930) argued when someone acquires a habit he or she really acquires the necessary psychological and cognitive skill to perform under new situations because he knows what to expect and how to behave. In other words, since a habit is an established custom or practice repeated over time, a person knows what to expect and how to perform in a given circumstance.

The formation of moral habit alone is not a sufficient condition for moral education. More precisely, the possession of moral disposition and inclination to act in a certain way on the basis of a moral habit does not, in and by itself, compel an moral
decision in a given moral situation (Barrow, 2007; Carr, 1996, 2008; Peters, 1981). No two moral situations are exactly alike due to various factors that compound and create perplexing unique situations. That is why experience and skill are invaluable in deciphering and reacting to these complex moral situations correctly. Therefore, another necessary condition for moral education was the learning of skill in moral reasoning: skill in how to articulate the right moral judgment in a given moral situation (Mitias, 1992).

A moral judgment cannot simply be made by consulting a moral disposition or moral habit, but rather one has to rationally investigate the moral situations to determine what should be done (Mitias, 1992; Peters, 1981). In other words, the skill in moral reasoning is needed when one articulates the right moral judgment in a given moral circumstance. A good moral reasoning skill is when a person can understand a problem from different vantage points of two types of relation: in the first type of relation, it is necessary to understand the moral obligations and rules pertinent to the situation; the second relations requires an understanding of the facts of the moral situations as well as knowledge of the various conditions where the moral act will occur (Mitias, 1992).

In short, what it means to be morally educated is: 1) to form a moral habit; and 2) to learn the skill to recognize a wide variety of complex situations and how to appropriately respond to them. Put another way, if the central goal of moral education is moral growth, this growth requires the cultivation of moral habit and skill in moral reasoning. Therefore, the two central questions I discussed in this dissertation were: “Can” sport play a role in the formation of a moral habit and the acquisition of a good moral reasoning skill for the students? If so, “how” can sport foster this twofold development of the students?
What is especially important about the notion of moral education is that although we may not be able to teach someone how to be a moral person, we can teach a person the conditions which are indispensable for becoming a moral person. As discussed in Chapter 2 of this dissertation, moral habits and skill in moral reasoning are two necessary conditions for moral growth of a person. Then it should follow that educators should provide these necessary conditions for growth of students in moral character. My basis for claiming that sport contributes to moral education is that sport provides a facilitating context for participants to achieve these two necessary conditions for moral education. Accordingly, it was my next task to articulate what sport is and what is entailed in becoming physically educated in order to proceed to demonstrate my claim that sport can provide the method by which the students acquire a moral character.

I argued that the teaching and learning sport and physical education activities involves both practical knowledge and theoretical knowledge. Practical knowledge is the knowing of how to perform various movement skills. Theoretical knowledge involves all aspects of constitutive rules, including strategy, etiquette (both formal and informal), equipment usage, and a proper understanding of biomechanical of the human body. Although all of this theoretical knowledge is an important part of what it is to be physically educated (Drewe, 2001), I pointed out that the principle concern of sport and physical education is clearly practical knowledge of “how to” perform skillfully. To clarify the meaning of practical knowledge in relation to sport and physical education, therefore, it was necessary to examine what it means to learn a skill. I argued that learning a skill involves more than drill or repeating a behavior pattern (Arnold, 1991). Instead, it involves thoughtful and intelligent practice. Ryle (1949) suggested that skill
involves setting and achieving an operation with strict criteria in critical situation. This is as important if not more so than just performing an operation successfully. It shows that skill in sport is an excellent example of doing something well by using proficient practical knowledge based on minimum criteria (Arnold, 1991). My main point was that the acquisition of practical knowledge in sport is a significant value which provides a logical connection between engagement in sport and the process of moral education.

With this argument regarding practical knowledge involved in sport, I looked into the connection between the learning of sport and the acquisition of moral knowledge. To examine this connection, it is important to note what I mean by moral knowledge. Moral knowledge is not just memorizing certain moral values. It is the understanding of why these values are morally correct, how we use them, and why they are justifiable in our daily lives. I argued that this knowledge is by no means theoretical. This sort of knowledge is, as Aristotle said, practical: it is knowledge by and from praxis (alternative translations: “doing,” “conduct”) primarily because it is intended to bring about a certain course of action (Aristotle, 2000; Mitias, 1992). Furthermore, I argued that it is sort of a skill. Consequently, moral education is not about teaching the students countless ideas regarding moral rules, values and theories to “know,” or “remember” in their mind. However, it is about teaching them when it is appropriate to act in certain ways and when it is not in concrete human situations in which they asks “what ought I to do.” In other words, moral education is about teaching the students practical knowledge so that they can act wisely and virtuously when they are confronted with moral situations. From this interpretation of moral knowledge, I attempted to demonstrate through the example that the acquisition of practical knowledge in sport is commensurate with the acquisition of
moral knowledge. To this extent, I asserted that sport is special in requiring a logical connection between learning practical knowledge in sport and attaining moral knowledge. In other words, sport provides an important resource which is logically applied to the acquisition of moral knowledge.

To deal with the relationship between sport and moral education, it was also necessary to provide a well-delineated and understood picture of what sport is and what it entails, especially from the moral point of view. Following Arnold’s (1997) notion of sport as a valued human practice, I examined the concept of sport as a “practice” because I believe that this view of sport as a practice, as distinct from its institutionalization, provides such a picture.

I believe that sport is a valued practice because “it is a peculiarly human activity in which values internal to that activity are discovered and realized in the course of trying to achieve the standards of excellence that characterize it” (Arnold, 1997, p. 14). When sport is pursued for its own sake, players abide by the rules, and sportsmanship is shown, sports transcend a game and become a morally just and honorable aspect of life. It is a human practice where individuals are tested (Arnold, 1997). I also suggested that as in other practices such as art, architecture, and law, morality in sport is as important as participants’ skill in maintaining standards of excellence. Competitors are placed in rigorous situations where mental sharpness, physical prowess, and morality are the criteria which competitors are judged. When sport is used by anyone for some sort of political statement or commercial gain, however, it is jeopardizing its future as an honorable human practice. In order to retain sport as a valued practice in our lives and defend sport from external interests which might corrupt or alter its innate goals,
therefore, virtues such as fairness, courage, honesty, generosity, compassion, and respect for others are necessary (Arnold, 1997; MacIntyre, 1984).

Through explicating sport as a valued practice in terms of its rules and of the underlying moral ethos that guide the participants’ behavior, I asserted that sport is an inherently moral practice. Teaching sport as a moral practice in schools generates the virtues required for retaining the integrity of the practice and, in turn, provides a facilitating environment for exercising such virtues as well as cultivating them. In order for sport to make a contribution to moral education of the students who play it, it must be taught as a practice, not as an instrument for something external to itself. The primary emphasis of school sport program should be on the cultivation of players’ morality and integrity, developing morally autonomous men and women.

In explicating what I mean by both moral education and sport, I showed that there is a logical connection between participation in sport and the need for moral education. In other words, I maintained that sport can play a significant role in moral education because it provides an important and effective resource which is intimately applied to the process of moral education: the acquisition of moral habit and the development of skill in moral reasoning.

Although sport has not been empirically tested as to whether it is, in fact, the best training ground for the development of moral character, it is reasonable to propose that sport is an excellent setting for practicing moral behaviors and cultivating moral virtues, as such moral behavior and virtues are admired and encouraged in both sport and other facets of daily life (Arnold, 1997; Russell, 2007). In fact, if one looks at other forms of educationally acceptable activities it would be hard to deny my conviction that there are
not many educational activities in schools other than physical education which provide a useful context more conducive to acquiring practical knowledge which is the arena of moral action. When sport is compared to other forms of socially acceptable activities, it becomes hard to oppose statements from some sport philosophers and physical educationists such as Arnold (1992, 1997, 1999), Kirk (2006), Maraj (1965), Schneider (2009) and Siedentop (2002) that there are few activities or situations in our daily life that demand or teach the virtues that are commonplace and necessary to partake in sport.

It is important to reiterate what I do not intend to say in this dissertation. I am not maintaining that the only way to gain moral qualities such as justice, courage, honest, generosity, fairness and impartiality can only be obtained by partaking in sport. However, what I am maintaining is that sport, when taught as a well governed practice by its rules and ethos, provides a facilitating environment in which such moral qualities are encouraged, practiced and cultivated in keeping with its best traditions and ideals (Arnold, 1992, 1997, 1999; Kirk, 2006; MacIntyre, 2007; Morgan, 2006b; Siedentop, 2002). My main point is that although involvement in sport and physical education may not automatically infuse good moral habits and moral reasoning skill in its participants, participants can achieve this twofold development more effectively through a context that sport and physical education provide than through any other activities in our life.

Without the active role of the teacher, however, moral education in sport would be left incomplete. It is my hope that physical educators realize the importance of their role as teachers of both theoretical and practical knowledge. It is also important they be moral educators by providing a nurturing environment for their students to practice moral virtues and to achieve moral education through sport and physical education. This role
includes not only teaching physical skills but also cultivating moral habit and skill in moral reasoning. I believe that educators, especially in this time of what some critics have called “moral crisis,” “moral decline,” or “moral vacuum,” need to be more aggressive in contributing to the moral growth of their students. It is my opinion that all educators, but especially those teaching sport and physical education, can serve this need primarily because they are presenting moral lessons whether they are aware of it or not. With an emphasis on the teaching of critical thinking skill, the exercise of moral virtues, and the cultivation of moral habit, physical education teachers can help students develop into not only physically skilled but also morally autonomous people. It will not take a huge financial investment to bring this goal of moral education through sport and physical education to fruition. It will take dedicated leadership with moral character, ability to inspire, and loyalty to the original ideals of sport and its ethos.

Thus, I conclude my philosophical analysis into the relationship between moral education and participation in sport. This study began with the thesis that there is a strong or logical connection between engagement in sport and the development of moral character. However, this thesis quickly ushered in the topics of the content of moral education, practical knowledge involved in sport and physical education, the notion of sport as practice, the relationship between the process of learning sport and the process of attaining the necessary ingredients for moral education (moral habit and skill in moral reasoning), and the role of the educators in sport and physical education. I hope I have done justice to these topics.

It is likely that there will be much more debate in the following years over the role of sport in the development of moral character. Some researches point to sport as a
negative influence on the development of moral values and behavior with the implication that nothing much can be done about it. Therefore, I think that it is desirable that attempts to reorganize conduct and reasoning is necessary for a proper moral adjustment. Sport as a whole has become economically and commercially driven social events. They players, coaches, fans and administrations are what drive sport and give sport its identity (Schneider, 2009). For sport to produce an increasingly moral education experience all parties will have to get involved. By re-organizing their train of thought, members of the sporting communities can increase character building values of sport and improve its moral condition.

The increasing success of sport at all levels is growing across the globe. There is no end to its appeal or growth even within different global communities. Essential is the understanding that at the base of sport’s popularity and prosperity there must be a firm moral foundation. It is my goal and hope that this study can be a contribution to maintaining and building upon the moral foundation of sport for moral education that is required for sport to retain a place in the educational curriculum as well as to remain a worthwhile element in our lives.
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