

The Scholarship of Teaching: A review of *Scholé*

David A. Cárdenas
North Carolina State University

Abstract

The scholarship of teaching, first introduced by Boyer (1990), is a systematic method of evaluating teaching which contributes to the advancement of theory and knowledge of pedagogy. Scholé: A Journal of Leisure Studies and Recreation Education's mission is to promote the scholarly approach to learning and teaching in the discipline of leisure studies. The purpose of this study was to evaluate Scholé's contribution to teaching and learning using the scholarship of teaching as a frame of reference. Included are examples of how our profession has contributed to the scholarship of teaching and areas that still need to be addressed.

Keywords: scholarship of teaching, leisure studies, teaching, *Scholé*, evaluation

Introduction

The scholarship of teaching is a relatively new concept that was first formally introduced in 1990 by Ernest Boyer in his publication *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, in conjunction with his work with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and U.S Commissioner of Education. Boyer's major intent with the introduction of the scholarship of teaching was for tenure and promotion standards to acknowledge and reward faculty members for their work in teaching. He argued that there are four areas of scholarship (discovery, integration, application, and teaching) and all four should be valued and accessed in the tenure and promotion process (Hutchings, Babb, & Bjork, 2002). Teaching, as with discovery, integration and application, are all an integral part of fostering the development of academia. Not incorporating teaching in the evaluation of faculty members is as inappropriate as solely evaluating a student on their written abilities but not their critical thinking or problem solving abilities.

The notion of scholarship of teaching has received some criticism. Some faculty members argue that the discipline of education should be responsible for fostering the scholarship of teaching, while other disciplines should concentrate on the intellectual development of their own subject areas (Kreber, 2001). The proponents of the scholarship of teaching respond to this criticism by stating that faculty members have two responsibilities; contributing to the knowledge and discovery of their discipline by conducting research, and through teaching, which contributes to the knowledge and intellectual development of their students (Cambridge, 1999). Because of this dual responsibility it is important that each discipline examine and evaluate its teaching practices, student learning styles, curriculum, course content, faculty development, and

student population characteristics to determine how it has, and can continue to contribute to the scholarship of teaching.

Leisure Studies

The discipline of leisure studies has shown its commitment to the intellectual development of students through the scholarly publication, *Schole: A Journal of Leisure Studies and Recreation Education*, formally known as *SPRE Annual of Education*. The directive of the publication is to “encourage scholarly thinking and inquiry related to teaching techniques, course content, internships, curriculum planning, student competency and other related topics” (The Society of Park and Recreation Educators, 2002, p. ii). *Schole* is an annual publication that has been published since 1986 by The Society of Park and Recreation Educators, a branch of the National Recreation and Park Association.

The purpose of this paper is to examine *Schole* to determine its contribution to the “scholarship of teaching”. Hopefully this will provide some insight into what problems our discipline has posed about teaching and learning and how these problems have been addressed.

The Scholarship of Teaching

The scholarship of teaching as stated above was initially introduced in Boyer’s publication *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. The catalyst for this initiative was the tenure and promotion process. He argued that teaching is scholarly work and should be recognized in the same manner that research is recognized in higher education. Boyer’s publication reinvigorated the need to modify the tenure and promotion process to incorporate and make teaching a more significant component of that process (Shulman, 1999). Since Boyer’s publication the focus of the scholarship of teaching has shifted from the argument of teaching versus research and has focused more on the concept, definition, and delivery of the scholarship of teaching (Hutchings et al. 2002).

The Carnegie Academy of Scholarship for Teaching and Learning defines the scholarship of teaching as “problem posing about an issue of teaching or learning, study on the problem through methods appropriate to disciplinary epistemologies, application of results to practice, communication of results, reflection, and peer review” (Carnegie Teaching Academy, 1998). The process of the scholarship of teaching involves: (a) having a clear goal/objective; (b) requiring ample preparation; (c) incorporating suitable methods to assess; (d) producing significant results and (e) involving reflective review (Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997).

The scholarship of teaching is a structured procedure that consists of many steps. For a teacher’s work to be regarded as scholarship of teaching they must be fully immersed in the theory of teaching and learning of their discipline. He or she must take traditional teaching further than the classroom and document the process, open it up to

critique and review, and share the information (Trigwell, Martin, Benjamin, & Prosser, 2000). The scholarship of teaching is also questioning teaching and systematically inquiring how to improve the learning process of students (Hutchings, & Shulman, 1999).

The revision of the tenure and promotion process was the catalyst for Boyer's scholarship of teaching, however there are many other reasons for its quest. Those reasons include, but are not limited to: (a) change in population attending higher education institutions; (b) public's need to have higher education be accountable for its teaching; (c) infusion of technology into the classroom; (d) interdisciplinary approach of today's society and (e) education's mission (Hutchings, & Shulman, 1999). The scholarship of teaching is critical for the advancement and viability of education. Through teaching, teachers are able to empower their individual students, but teachers alone can not advance the scholarship of teaching. There needs to be input, support, and reward for the scholarship of teaching by the academic unit/department, institution, and system of education.

Examples of scholarship of teaching

Although the process of scholarship of teaching is structured, the subjects, styles, and delivery methods are not. For example T. Mills Kelly, a professor of history, developed a portfolio document to compare two introductory courses, one that was given in its traditional fashion (books, overheads, videotapes etc.) while the other took advantage of hypermedia (PowerPoint, WorldWideWeb, online course material, etc.). The purpose of the comparison was to determine how hypermedia influenced student learning. The developed portfolio included research on online teaching, materials used in the course, sample work of the students, syllabus, peer and student evaluation, and the impact technology has on the teaching and learning process. After the portfolio was completed it was posted on the Internet to be reviewed by peers. Students in the hypermedia course tended to use course materials more often in projects and papers compared to students in the traditional course (Kelly, 2003).

In another example of scholarship of teaching, Randy Bass, a professor in American Studies, addressed what he called "problems in his teaching". He recognized that he did not know how his students learned and wanted to design his course to fit the learning styles of his students. Bass wanted his students not only to learn the material but also to comprehend the material so that they could fully appreciate and understand the principles of his discipline.

At the beginning of the course, he asked the students a set of questions ranging from what they wanted to learn, what material fostered their learning, what technology they used in the learning process and what learning this particular course material meant to them and their future. The questions allowed him the opportunity to adjust the course to the needs of his students. On the last day of class he gave them the same questions he had given them on the first day of class and asked them to reflect on their experience that semester. He also asked them to provide feedback, such as what had they learned, what

methods had assisted in understanding the course content, in what way they would have changed the delivery of the course, and finally how they would answer the set of questions (their learning process) that were posed at the beginning of the semester now that they had completed the course. Bass then wrote a journal article about his experience and what he had learned about his teaching. From his reflection, and the students and peer responses, Bass adjusted the course to accentuate the learning styles of the students. (Bass, 1999).

The two previous cases are examples of the scholarship of teaching, yet the manner, method, and delivery was different. The following examination of Schole is an attempt to identify alternate approaches to the scholarship of teaching and evaluate the Schole's major contributions.

Methods

To determine *Schole's* contribution to the scholarship of teaching, articles from 1987 to 2002 (volume 2-15) were reviewed. Volume one was not reviewed because it could not be located in time for this study. One hundred and seventeen peer-reviewed articles were included in this study. During the review process each article's keywords, overall objective, and findings were documented. The researcher derived keywords from 1987-1995 and *Schole* provided keywords from 1996-2002. Duplicate keywords were counted and then the keywords were divided into subject areas. Next, the overall objectives of the article and finding were analyzed. General themes were developed from the articles objectives and findings.

No advanced statistics were conducted. Frequencies of the keywords and subject areas were calculated and then general themes were developed from the objectives and finding of each article.

Results

A total of 311 keywords were identified. Duplicate keywords were combined and 161 different subject areas were documented. Some examples of the keywords were; accreditation, evaluation, academic advising, critical thinking, service learning, retention, diversity, course content, portfolio and professional involvement. All 311 keywords were classified into 15 subject areas: administration, course content/development, curriculum development, diversity, evaluation techniques, faculty development, graduate studies, learning styles/strategies, professional development, program development, research, student development, teaching styles/strategies, technology, and other. Teaching styles/strategies (12.9%), learning styles/strategies (12.5%) and curriculum development (11.3%) were the three areas most often addressed, while graduate studies (2.9%), technology (1.6%) and research (1.3%) were the areas that were addressed the least (Table1).

TABLE 1

Fifteen keyword subject areas and frequencies

<i>Categories</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Teaching Styles/Strategies	40	12.9%
Learning Styles/Strategies	39	12.5%
Curriculum Development	35	11.3%
Diversity	30	9.6%
Evaluation Techniques	28	9.0%
Course Content/Development	25	8.0%
Professional Development	23	7.4%
Program Development	20	6.4%
Student Development	17	5.5%
Administration	16	5.1%
Faculty Development	12	3.9%
Graduate Studies	9	2.9%
Other	8	2.6%
Technology	5	1.6%
Research	4	1.3%
Total	311	100%

The general themes of the article objectives and findings identified were closely related to the keywords. The design of teaching and learning processes and procedures and the need for curriculum development were the objectives addressed most frequently in the *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* articles. Most of the themes revolved around techniques of teaching to help promote student learning, the importance of incorporating interdisciplinary course content, methods of understanding how students in leisure studies learn, and the need to revise the leisure studies curriculum. Listed below are the general themes of the objectives (Table 2) and of the findings (Table 3). The keywords subject areas, themes of the objectives, and themes of findings provide insight into the topics and focus areas of the peer reviewed articles in *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* and helped to determine if *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* has promoted and contributed to the scholarship of teaching.

Implications and Recommendations

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning and the scholarship of teaching

As the articles were first reviewed, the dedication and passion to students and pedagogy of teaching was apparent. The authors of these articles presented the willingness to share their knowledge and stories with others that were facing many of the same issues. The findings of the *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* articles analyzed indicate that teaching and learning is a priority for our profession and discipline. The findings also indicate that there are a

wide variety of issues that have been addressed within our profession. Over 160 different subject areas were documented in the 117 articles. The two subject areas that were addressed most frequently were teaching and learning styles/strategies. Approximately 75% percent of the articles' main objectives addressed the improvements of teaching, learning, curriculum and course content.

TABLE 2

Themes from the objectives

- Change the department/program curriculum to meet the needs of today's students and profession.
- Develop new teaching styles/strategies so students will be better prepared to meet the challenges of the profession.
- Document past teaching strategies used to help address issues such as diversity, trends, and technology.
- Examine learning styles/strategies such as experiential learning, and cooperative learning.
- Develop courses and course content that will promote problem solving and critical thinking.
- Address the recruitment, retention, and education of minority students and students with disabilities.
- Develop and or incorporate new evaluation methods for teaching and learning.
- Address the need to train both future doctoral students and faculty members to teach more effectively.
- Debate the needs and methods of specialized accreditation.

Using The Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning definition of the scholarship of teaching to evaluate *Schole*, "problem posing about an issue of teaching or learning, study on the problem through methods appropriate to disciplinary epistemologies, application of results to practice, communication of results, reflection, and peer review" (Carnegie Teaching Academy, 1998), the author concluded that *Schole* has contributed to the scholarship of teaching.

Problem posing about an issue of teaching or learning

The questions being posed in *Schole* do fit the needs of our discipline and needs of our students. For example, one of our students' primary responsibilities entering the workforce will be providing services and goods to the public. Many of the challenges they will face involve interacting and understanding human behavior. Our student's will

be responsible for being aware of and respecting the needs, customs, and concerns of clients, customers, co-workers, and supervisors. Providing courses that incorporate active and experiential learning and addressing diversity is critical to the success of our students. Some examples of this in *Scholé* include, Hoge, & Austin (1988), Freysinger, & Bedini (1994), Henderson, (1995) and O'Dell, & Seigenthaler (1998).

TABLE 3

Themes from the findings

- Students benefit intellectually and professionally from structured active and experiential learning.
- Multicultural and diversity training should be incorporated into course content to teach social responsibility.
- A positive relationship should be developed between the academic unit, student and the professional community.
- Teachers should be trained to teach. Too often doctoral students, new faculty members and established faculty members are not prepared for the responsibility of teaching.
- Trends in the workforce and in today's society should be incorporated into the coursework.
- While working within the educational framework, evaluation methods should be reexamined and changed according to the needs of the students.
- A student's development should consist of more than just their intellectual and educational development. The physical and emotional development of a student should also be addressed while incorporated in classroom activities, advising, mentoring and community involvement.
- Sharing personal and professional experiences are effective tools in teaching.

Study on the problem through methods appropriate to disciplinary epistemologies

For the most part the methods used in *Scholé* are appropriate to the questions being posed. This is evident in the various techniques that were employed addressing the questions posed. Examples of some of the methods included surveys, focus groups, trial-and-error, experimentation, and portfolios. In addition many of the articles were case studies and or reflection on personal experiences, which are important and provide

rich and valuable information. While *Schole* has used the appropriate methods, it is important to keep abreast of new techniques and methods and incorporate them into the evaluation of our teaching and learning.

This research focused on the subject areas, objectives, and findings of the *Schole* and not the methods the researchers were conducting. To fully evaluate the methods a more in-depth analysis should be conducted.

Application of results to practice

Examining previous articles can be one form of assessing the evidence of application. Although it does not illustrate application of results, it can be used as a method to measure the degree in which the concepts and terms are being incorporated into new research. The only accurate method to determine the application of *Schole*'s is to question practitioners. Yet by reviewing all of *Schole*, and comparing earlier articles with subsequent articles, assists in providing some insight into the incorporation of ideas, methods and concepts.

There are many examples of authors in *Schole* incorporating ideas, methods and concepts that had been addressed in previous *Schole* articles. One example of this process is in the Ralston & Ellis (1997) article that addressed service learning. The article outlines the definition and concepts of service learning. Also, the article contains examples of how to incorporate service learning into the curriculum. Since then four articles (at minimum) have been written in *Schole* about service learning and incorporate many of the concepts and ideas that were addressed in the 1997 article.

Communication of results, reflection, and peer review

The communication, reflection, and peer review are evident in the publication of the articles. The authors took the time and effort to conduct the research, document the findings, write the results and allow their peers to review and learn from their teaching practices. Through the communication of *Schole* our discipline has become stronger and has contributed to the scholarship of teaching.

How should we measure the scholarship of teaching?

Based on the definition of the scholarship of teaching it is evident, as a whole, *Schole* has been successful in promoting issues of teaching and learning as well as been an effective tool in communicating new concepts and ideas. Most articles have contributed to the scholarship of teaching. However, the author cannot confidently assert that any one article or specific work is an example of scholarship of teaching. This is not to say there are no examples of scholarship of teaching in *Schole*. It would not be prudent for this author to proclaim work as scholarship of teaching by only reviewing a single article. To label work scholarship of teaching it must be evaluated at multiple levels.

The evaluation of a specific work, with respect to the scholarship of teaching, should consist of some personal contact in the review process as well as involve research in the specific area and program. The personal review could include, but not be limited to reviewing past documents such as portfolios, interviewing the teacher(s), reviewing lectures, participating in class projects, talking with their students, and talking with peers/colleagues. Teaching (especially good teaching) is not only an intellectual, emotional, and social process, it is also a physical endeavor that takes much time, energy, and hard work. The evaluation process should honor that work and should include immersion in the work being evaluated. Often times teaching is solely evaluated by a single artifact such as a journal article or written student evaluation. The written documents should be used as a tool but not the sole tool used for evaluation. The evaluation method should allow the evaluator to be immersed in the teaching. This process takes time and effort and is often an arduous process, but well worth it for our students and discipline. For this reason, not being immersed in the process and not having the personal contact with the specific research articles in *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* the author cannot label any specific work as the scholarship of teaching.

The future of leisure studies and the scholarship of teaching

Our profession has done a commendable job in addressing teaching and learning. Yet, there are still many issues and problems that need to be addressed. One of these issues is the actual concept of scholarship of teaching, which indirectly has been addressed, but should be incorporated into our vocabulary. The works that Boyer, Hutchings, Shulman, Cambridge, The Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, Pew Scholars and others should be reviewed and incorporated in the process of how we view teaching and learning. Also, our faculty may consider the Pew National Fellowship Program for Carnegie Scholars, which is an initiative started by the Carnegie Foundation to advance the profession of teaching and learning. The Pew Scholars program “makes teaching more professional” and they are “trained in the practice of the scholarship of teaching as they engage in research on teaching and learning within their discipline” (Kreber, 2001, p. 152). By involving our scholars in this program, our discipline can gain new and exciting insights in the scholarship of teaching. This encouragement of involvement should not solely rest on the academic department but should be adopted by all units of higher education (college, institution, professional organization, etc).

Our profession should also incorporate new and innovated teaching methods. Much has already been done but a few avenues have not been explored. One specific area that has not directly been addressed in *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* is the concept of inquiry-based learning. Inquiry “involves searching for significant questions and figuring out how to explore those questions from many perspectives” (Short, Schroeder, Laird, Kauffman, Ferguson, & Crawford, 1996, p. 9). The process of inquiry-based learning begins with the gathering of information from all means possible including the teacher, students, outside class experiences, written materials, human senses, etc. The next step is to ask questions about information that has been gathered, not necessarily to derive the correct answer,

but to understand the issues and derive applicable meaning. The purpose of inquiry based learning is not to answer questions but to stimulate ideas, broaden perspectives, and ask more questions.

Another issue that has not been addressed in *Schole* is the effectiveness of team-teaching, both with multiple faculty members and with faculty members and professionals in the field. Team teaching with professionals gives the students both an academic and practical perspective to the course and course content. Faculty members can incorporate the academic theory, while the professionals can contribute current events and trends to the class. Team teaching not only gives students multiple perspectives and added insight, but also provides teachers with added support and resources. This has been an effective teaching tool in the past, but needs further research.

Also, there are areas that have been addressed in *Schole*, which either need to be revisited or expanded. For example a few articles address the issue of whether technology is an important tool and how to implement software and hardware. However technology is changing at a rapid rate and our students more than ever will need to be technology savvy (not just computer savvy). Areas that should be researched include equipment (Geographic Positioning Systems [GPS] and Personal Digital Assistances [PDAs]), methods used to analyze data (SPSS, Amos and SAS), and teaching/learning methods (PowerPoint, WebAssign, and distance learning). There is so much technology in our society that researching the use of it in leisure studies could be its own discipline.

Another issue that *Schole* addressed that should be expanded is how to assess teaching and how to assess student learning. The topic of learning outcomes and teaching outcomes should be investigated. How is it that we really know that our students are grasping the concepts? Does a written document, an oral presentation, reference letter from a community member, or nationwide tests indicate students have mastered the needed skills? Is a formal lecture, small group discussion, web-based, or capstone course the most effective manner to teach? Each program (travel and tourism, therapeutic recreation, sport management, park planning, recreation economics, etc.) should know what methods of instruction are conducive to their student learning.

The area of faculty development should also be explored further. Specifically, what steps should be taken to groom future faculty members for an appointment in higher education? Kanter, in 1992, wrote that doctoral students are given very little exposure and training to teaching, yet it is one of their major job responsibilities. What has been done to correct those issues? Also, how are future faculty members prepared to advise students, adjust for students with disabilities, and manage a classroom? Before we can expect scholarship of teaching we must teach the scholar.

Limitations

There are a few limitations to this investigation. The first is that it was subjective to the author's thoughts on teaching and learning. Others may and probably do view the

purpose and process of teaching and learning differently. In addition, this was not a true content analysis, which would have been a systematic look at the text, however the analysis was a general review of the *Schole's* keywords, objectives and findings.

Another limitation is only peer reviewed articles were used for this study. Invited papers and book reviews were reviewed but did not document or analyzed. However while skimming them it was apparent that they also contributed to the scholarship of teaching. In the future the invited papers and book reviews should be reviewed and analyzed. In addition to not reviewing the other articles in *Schole*, the author did not document or analyze any other articles or journals in other disciplines about teaching and learning for this study. This would have allowed the author the opportunity to compare and contrast between disciplines, and provide other examples of scholarship of teaching.

Conclusion

Through *Schole* leisure studies faculty explore the manner in which we approach teaching and student learning. Students and the development of students is a priority in the profession, which is evident in the work that has been published. Our profession not only needs to continue its endeavors, but now should take this a step further and continually contribute to the discipline's scholarship of teaching. The need to pursue the scholarship of teaching is evident, not just in our discipline or in higher education, but throughout the entire education system. This should be our mission, as educators, and it should be viewed as our "Hippocratic Oath". Although idealistic and possibly naïve, what should our mission be, if not to foster and enhance learning for the betterment of our students and society?

Boyer in 1990 introduced the idea of scholarship of teaching so that teaching would be recognized and rewarded. The focus of his message of rewarding and acknowledging teaching should not be lost. Teachers should be rewarded for the work they do; even as hard as it is to evaluate it is worth the effort on many levels.

Proponents of the scholarship of teaching have stated that the scholarship of teaching goes beyond the classroom walls and the traditional sense of teaching, and even beyond excellent teaching. Excellent teachers should be commended for their efforts, but then they should be encouraged to make their teaching recognized as scholarship of teaching. Encourage those teachers to question themselves, conduct research on their methods of delivery, get advice and constructive criticism, and share the knowledge they have learned. It should be a goal of education to eventually equate excellent teaching to the scholarship of teaching.

References

- Bass, R. (1999, February). The scholarship of teaching: What's the problem? *Inventio*, 1, (1) Retrieved June 19, 2003 from <http://www.doiit.gmu.edu/Archives/feb98/rbass.htm>
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Carnegie Academy of Scholarship for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Retrieved June 19, 2003, from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning. <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/CASTL/>
- Carnegie Teaching Academy (1998). *Campus programs*. AAHE & The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Cambridge, B. (1999). The scholarship of teaching and learning: Questions and Answers from the field: *AAHE Bulletin*, 52(3), 7-10.
- Freysinger, V. J., & Bedini, L. A. (1994). Teaching for empowerment. *Scholar: A Journal of Leisure Studies and Recreation Education*, 9, 1-13.
- Glassick, C., Huber, M., & Maeroff, G. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation on the professoriate*. San Francisco, C.A: Jossey-Bass.
- Henderson, K.A. (1995). Leisure in a diverse society: Designing a course. *Scholar: A Journal of Leisure Studies and Recreation Education*, 10, 1-15.
- Hoge, G. W., & Austin, D. R. (1988). Altering attitudes toward serving persons with disabilities in a special recreation course. *Scholar: A Journal of Leisure Studies and Recreation Education*, 2, 30-36.
- Hutchings, P., Babb, M., & Bjork, C. (2002). *The scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education: An annotated bibliography*. Retrieved June 19, 2003, from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning. <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/elibrary/docs/bibliography.htm>
- Hutchings, P., & Shulman, L. S. (1999). The scholarship of teaching: New elaborations, new developments. *Change*, 31, (5). 11-15.
- Kanters, M.A. (1992). Teaching the professor to teach. *Scholar: A Journal of Leisure Studies and Recreation Education*, 7, 55-64.
- Kelly, T. M. Western civilization: *A course portfolio*. Retrieved June 19, 2003, from American Association of Higher Education, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching <http://www.theaha.org/teaching/aahe/Kelly/Pew/Portfolio/welcome.htm>

Kreber, C. (2001). Conceptualization the scholarship of teaching and identifying unresolved issues: The framework for this volume. In C. Kreber (Ed.) *Revisiting scholarship: Perspectives on the scholarship of teaching, new directions for teaching and learning*. San Francisco, C.A: Jossey-Bass.

O'Dell, I., & Siegenthaler, K. L. (1998). Family life experiences: Discovering the meaning of leisure concepts with active learning strategies. *Scholar: A Journal of Leisure Studies and Recreation Education*, 13, 21-32.

Ralston, L., & Ellis, G. (1997). Service-learning: Connecting practical experience with classroom, *Scholar: A Journal of Leisure Studies and Recreation Education*, 12, 13-22.

Short, K. S., Schroeder, J., Laird, L., Kauffman, G., Ferguson, M. J., & Crawford, K. M. (1996). *Learning together through inquiry: From Columbus to integrated curriculum*. York, M.I: Stenhouse Publisher.

Shulman, L. S. (1999). Taking learning seriously. *Change*, 31(4), 11-17.

The Society of Park and Recreation Educators. (2002). The Society of Park and Recreation Educators, *Scholar: A Journal of Leisure Studies and Recreation Education*, 14, ii.

Trigwell, K., Martin, E., Benjamin, J., & Prosser, M. (2000). Scholarship of teaching: A model. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 19(2), 155-168.