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I am privileged and delighted to have been invited to react to Daryl Siedentop's 1998 McCloy Lecture to the Research Consortium (Siedentop, 2002). I think it appropriate to honor Daryl Siedentop's contributions to sport pedagogy over the years with the review of his scholarship and what it has contributed to the field of sport pedagogy. His commitment and contributions to the intellectual development of our field deserves no less. Daryl's publications on effective teaching over 30 years have been prolific and wielded a major influence on the sport pedagogy community. His sustained line of research/writing on teaching effectiveness is well known and respected among sport pedagogy colleagues around the world.

My critique of Siedentop's McCloy Lecture is divided into three sections. First, I react to sections of the presentation offering points of agreement and disagreement along with some context for the ideas Daryl shared. Next, I address aspects of "effective teaching research" that I see as missing from or less evident in Daryl's work. No one researcher is expected to cover all aspects of a specific field, yet I speculate on why strands of the teaching effectiveness research are absent from his opus magnum. Finally, I comment on Daryl's overall contributions to the literature on effective teaching in physical education.

It is important at the outset to say some things about myself so that you may better understand or interpret my remarks. I have never been comfortable with the biographical expectation of scholarly writing, as I find it somewhat gratuitous. Yet I am convinced that to know me (to the degree that you can, given what I share) is to understand a little about why I react to Daryl's work as I do. Hopefully—and this is my real intention—sharing some of my scholarly and professional experiences with Daryl will provide some deeper appreciation for the theoretical roots of and particular influences on Daryl's intellectual ideas and the significance of his research contributions to sport pedagogy.

I completed a descriptive analytic study of student teacher effectiveness and student behavior in secondary school physical education for my master's thesis (O'Sullivan, 1985). It was part of a larger data set of teacher effectiveness studies at the University of Victoria in Canada led by Bruce Howe and my master's advisor, John Jackson (Howe & Jackson, 1985). The video-bank of physical education lessons we collected was our equivalent of the "What is going on in the gym" data

Mary O'Sullivan is with the College of Education, The Ohio State University, 149A Arps Hall, 1945 North High St., Columbus, OH 43210.
bank of physical education lessons from Teachers College, Columbia University (Anderson & Barrette, 1978). I used Academic Learning Time in Physical Education (ALT-PE) to analyze the physical education lessons of student teachers. During a visit to our school, Daryl invited me to begin doctoral studies at Ohio State under his guidance. Debbie Birdwell and Mike Metzler had just finished dissertations with Daryl involving the design and testing of ALT-PE (Birdwell, 1980; Metzler, 1980). Thus in the early 1980s I became involved in systematic observation studies of teaching and used ALT-PE as a data collection instrument as part of a staff development intervention with secondary physical education teachers for my doctoral dissertation (O'Sullivan, 1983).

I returned to Ohio State in 1986 as an assistant professor and over the next 15 years worked with Daryl in varying capacities. We have been longtime colleagues and friends. He has also been a mentor and my dean, and I was his school director for a time. I have seen his work up close as we have worked together and independently, and talked about physical education, education, and research. While I continue to value descriptive and intervention studies of teaching and learning and behavioral perspectives on teaching and teacher education, my growth as a scholar has embraced aspects of interpretivism, feminism, and critical pedagogy in approaching studies of teaching, teacher education, educational policy, and curriculum change. I brought those experiences to bear (and probably more) as I reacted to Daryl's McCloy Lecture for this monograph.

An Overview of Teacher Effectiveness Research

Daryl noted two goals for his McCloy Lecture titled “In Search of Effective Teaching: What We Have Learned From Teachers and Students”: to provide an overview of the field of teacher effectiveness research and to describe the ecological approach to teacher effectiveness research conducted with several of his doctoral students. What you read in the first part of Daryl's presentation is really not so much an overview of teacher effectiveness research (a difficult task at best and impossible to tackle in a 50-minute speech). Rather, it is an interesting description of Daryl's ideas on and assumptions about teaching research and what it takes to do good teacher effectiveness research in the field.

In the manuscript he defined teaching research as “the study of particularistic settings... that have unique, defining characteristics. It is fundamentally important to understand that subject-matter work in school classes occurs in groups and over long periods of time” (p. 428). He viewed teaching as work and as a performance that involves teachers and their students working together for long periods of time. He believed that studying what teachers and students do in the complexities of real class settings is at the center of understanding that work. There are several assumptions about teaching research embedded in his summary. What I have attempted to do in this section of the paper is to summarize each assumption as a statement of principle Daryl adheres to and follow it with an interpretation of that principle.

1. **Data collection is the foundation of all good research.** Daryl has always been intrigued with research method and the importance of good data collection protocols. Several pages of his manuscript are devoted to the methodological issues of teaching research and how these were addressed in the series of ecological
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studies he conducted or collaborated on at Ohio State. This is perhaps one of his greatest contributions to the teaching effectiveness research in physical education, and a hallmark of his graduate students’ research skills. The findings are only as good as the quality of the data that you collect. Good studies are dependent on good data.

2. What teachers do in classrooms is more important to our understanding of teaching than what teachers say about their teaching. When I came to know him first, I believe that Daryl mistrusted what teachers had to say about their teaching as a quality data source. He did not believe teachers intentionally lied about what they were doing or wanted to do with children. Rather, he believed that watching what they did and how they interacted with students was a much better indicator of their teaching. He believed that what teachers said they wanted to do in the teaching learning process was less useful to our understanding of effective teaching than what they actually did with children. He clearly articulated his mistrust of psychometrics (one strategy to get at teacher views of teaching) at a Big Ten Body of Knowledge Symposium. He noted that “what has happened over time had been the reintroduction into science albeit by different names, of a whole class of explanatory variables whose origins are philosophical and religious rather than empirical” (Siedentop, 1983c, p. 13).

I think there were serious limitations to this approach to teaching research, especially as we tried to design intervention programs to support long-term professional development programs with teachers. By this I mean that we need to understand what it is teachers understand and believe about teaching (the distinction is important) if we are to assist them in their professional growth as educators. They are the key players in their own professional development, and to assist them we need to not only understand their practice but also why they behave as they do and what they see as the important goals for their program and the students they teach. Daryl’s work in the 1990s demonstrated attention to this aspect of teaching research, and in some important ways.

3. Psychomotor objectives are the primary objectives of physical education. Low inference systematic observation systems were designed by Daryl and his students with the assumption that motor performance was the primary, if not the only, outcome of a physical education lesson (more specifically the target of their descriptive and intervention studies). This is not to say that Daryl viewed other objectives as illegitimate. The central foci of physical education teaching and learning for him were the qualitative and consistent opportunities for student performance of physically active motor responses in a supportive educational climate.

His own personal involvement in physical activity has always been about the quality of the performance. Though I did not know him during the early years of his career, playing or coaching baseball and basketball was about performance. Golf has never been a walk on the fairway for Daryl: sport for him is about playing and playing well. Running marathons was in large measure about time and speed, not just participating or finishing. Playing badminton with undergraduates during university activity classes was competitive for him as he took pride in challenging students to games and used the challenge to motivate them.

He has focused most of his teaching research on how to best to help all students develop competence in some physical activity so they would participate regularly in those aspects of our culture he found so enjoyable. Little of his schol-
arship has focused on the nonpsychomotor objectives of physical education. He did not focus on how (or if) low inference observation systems might inform the knowledge base of how to effectively teach to these affective objectives. Although his introduction of Sport Education to the national and international debate on curriculum allowed for the validity of other educational objectives, his primary commitment has been to motor performance goals for physical education.

4. **What students do in class determines what they learn.** In the late 1970s, much of the scholarly efforts in our field to study teaching (scholars such as John Cheffers and Bill Anderson, to name two) were focused on what teachers did with and to students (Anderson & Barrette, 1978). Daryl shifted the teacher effectiveness research to focus on what students were doing in the gymnasium. It was a critical shift of focus. The development and adaptations of ALT-PE by Daryl and his doctoral students made substantive and significant intellectual contributions to the study of teaching.

These included the design of two kinds of low-inference data collection systems that provided specific information about student behavior in the teaching/learning of physical education. The first were time-based systems that looked at how teachers and students spent time in class. The most well known of these systems was ALT-PE (Metzler, 1980; Siedentop, Tousignant, & Parker, 1982). The second were response based systems that looked at student opportunities to respond (OTRs) to performing specific motor tasks which were then assessed qualitatively (correct form and/or function of a variety of sport skills). The measurement tactics behind these data collection instruments were very much influenced by his readings of and commitment to applied behavior analysis.

5. **Learning about teaching must be done in classrooms with real teachers and students.** Daryl was a key advocate of studying teaching behavior in real time where it occurred: in the gymnasium and playgrounds of urban, suburban, and rural schools with real teachers in real classrooms. He and his colleagues used the findings to inform the pedagogy courses they were teaching to prospective physical education teachers in their teacher education programs. He almost single-handedly helped to shift the norms of pedagogy research from what had been a dominant focus on motor learning research conducted primarily in university laboratories with undergraduate student populations taking physical activity classes in university Basic Instruction Programs, to observing teachers and their students in school gymnasiums.

6. **Useful theories of teaching are those that are inductively derived from observations of what teachers and students do.** I am not sure I understand or can present Daryl’s intellectual position on this principle. As a student of his, I was encouraged to study instructional and curriculum theories of contemporary education scholars. Yet his writings suggested little tolerance for theories of teaching that developed from philosophical assumptions about the nature of teaching or the role of schooling in society.

What I have never been able to reconcile about Daryl’s views is how one might prosecute (i.e., support) a theory of teaching for physical education that was not immediately evident in the beliefs and teaching behaviors of practicing teachers. His view seems to me to limit efforts toward curriculum change to incremental steps rather than systemic reform, even though I know he has argued in the past for systemic reform of teacher education programs. This principle seems to require
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that legitimate theories of teaching must be observable in schools. Yet, this seems to limit our thinking to what is doable under current circumstances, not what might be desirable if we could establish the appropriate climate and/or structural support for alternative ideas.

7. Teaching is bounded by time and space and can be understood as a discrete place. Daryl was criticized early in his career for a lack of appreciation for context in understanding what and why teachers and students operate as they do in classrooms. In his McCloy Lecture, he clarified his appreciation (which is greater than he is credited with) of the cultural and ecological context of the school (if not the community) and how they impact what has been done and could be done in physical education by teachers and students. This position comes out best in his writings on physical activity as a public health issue and the relationships between activity, educational status, and income levels.

Ecological Teacher Effectiveness in PETE

The second part of the McCloy Lecture summarizes the ecological studies Daryl and his students pursued at Ohio State during the 1990s. It is interesting to note the space devoted to describing the methodologies used in this series of ecological studies. This is instructive as another example of Daryl’s commitment to method as the foundation of good research. It is worth noting here what he lists as the methodological advances of this particular approach to teaching effectiveness research. It was during this period that I witnessed a small part of Daryl’s evolution as a scholar. The shift to the ecological model required a different set of data collection tools, and Daryl took many of these new data collection techniques on board and made them his own. He did not just borrow from the general classroom literature, though he was incredibly adept at doing this. In many cases he adapted and revised (i.e., improved) them for use in physical education environments. In this next section, I list these methodological approaches and Daryl’s involvement with them over time.

1. Ethnographic methods as a research tool. Daryl’s use of ethnographic research was a gradual one that began in the late 1970s and initially was influenced by Berliner and the BTES work (see Tikunoff, Berliner, & Rist 1975). Two doctoral students (Tousignant and Alexander) sought to describe the events of the classroom with measurement tactics more sophisticated than academic learning time (ALT-PE had been a focus of most dissertations to that point). They went about these descriptions of instructional systems and tasks in very different ways. Alexander (1983a, 1983b) studied students’ responses to managerial and instructional tasks and the impact on student engagement using a behavior analysis lens (Johnston & Pennypacker, 1980). Tousignant gathered field notes to describe the task systems in secondary physical education lessons at a local high school (Tousignant & Siedentop, 1983). It is interesting to note that neither of these first entrees into task systems research using behavioral (Alexander) and ethnographic research (Tousignant) methods included teacher interviews as primary data collection sources. This changed over time with Daryl and his students using all the ethnographic tools available to them to gain an understanding of the ecology of the gymnasium (see Lund, 1992; Romar, 1995).
2. **Teachers' knowledge as a key variable.** Daryl was committed to the importance of content knowledge in the preparation of quality teachers, but his early research on teacher effectiveness did not focus on this aspect of the teaching learning process. Daryl was influenced by Shulman's (1986) work on pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) as it related to his interest in the instructional tasks that teachers delivered to their students. This resulted in several studies by a number of Ohio State doctoral students on teachers' content knowledge and the relationship of teacher knowledge to the quality of learning tasks in physical education classes (Doutis, 1998; Romar, 1995). Amade-Escot's (2000) recent description of the relationship between the pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) scholarship in North America and the didactics ideas and research in Europe is very instructive on what it means to know one's content in physical education.

3. **Unit of analysis should be the task.** Doyle's (1979) notion of tasks as a set of operations for achieving an instructional goal resonated with Daryl. His work with advisees on describing and understanding the nature of instructional tasks for student learning has been one of the few micro-analyses of the teaching learning environment. Since then several pedagogy scholars have studied instructional tasks. Judy Rink (1999) and Daryl were early advocates of this approach. Judy had been a doctoral student of Daryl's and Jack Hough (instructional theorist) in the 1970s, and I think there was a mutual recognition of the significance of tasks as the engine of the teaching learning process.

4. **Student understandings of what they were learning.** This was not a major focus of Daryl's work, in large part because of his distrust of the available data collection systems at the time (stimulated recall, interview, paper and pencil tests). In time, through the work of his colleagues and their doctoral students on student voices, he came to appreciate that what students thought about what they did and why they did it were valuable pieces of the effective teaching puzzle (Dyson, 1995; Graham, 1995).

5. **Teacher beliefs as a component of quality teaching.** Niki Tsangaridou, Daryl, and I studied exemplary teachers and how reflections of their teaching practice influenced what they did with their pupils in subsequent lessons (Tsangaridou, 1994; Tsangaridou & Siedentop, 1995). We built on the work of Don Schon (1983) in his book "The Reflective Practitioner" and Van Manen's (1977) categorization of teachers' reflective thoughts. This was one of a series of studies through which Daryl and his students sought to inform themselves of what it was that teachers knew and believed was important in understanding the teaching learning process. Much work has been one in this area in recent years that addresses curriculum orientations and teacher beliefs (Ennis, 1994; Howarth, 2000; Rovegno & Bandhauer, 1997; Tsangaridou & O'Sullivan, 1994).

***

Daryl clarified several of his assumptions about the ecological approach to teaching research in his McClay Lecture. These were that (a) school classrooms involve two primary task systems: the managerial and instructional task systems; (b) the most immediate task of teaching is establishing and maintaining order (i.e., the managerial task system); and (c) learning goals are pursued by covering a curriculum. The ecological research conducted by Daryl and his students at OSU
provided an important knowledge base on effective teaching. The key findings have been the following:

1. Management systems are paramount to a quality teaching environment.
2. Management is often gained at the expense of the instructional system.
3. The real tasks in the gymnasium develop over time via student negotiation. The actual tasks should not be understood as those initially stated tasks by the teacher outlining the activity to be completed. Rather the actual tasks, as determined from student and teacher negotiation, or from student modifications without teacher interference, define the tasks and thus what is learned.
4. Task negotiations are mostly verbal in classrooms and quite different from physical education settings, where students modify tasks and wait to see if the teacher notices the modifications. Some students are skilled negotiators of classroom work.
5. Levels of ambiguity and risk impact the levels of student engagement.
6. Accountability (often in the form of class supervision) drives the learning. If there is no accountability, there is no task. In the absence of accountability, the work that occurs is largely a function of students' inherent interests in the activity.
7. Students are mostly held accountable for effort, not performance, and this is even more so for girls than for boys.
8. Teachers tend to reflect on their behavior but are not very reflective of student outcomes.

Daryl's work with his students has contributed to a greater understanding of the management and instructional task systems of various physical education environments. He believed that understanding the interrelated nature of the two task systems was a key goal of the ecological analysis. While the social task system was initially highlighted in dissertations by Tousignant (Tousignant & Siedentop, 1983) and later by Griffin (Griffin, Siedentop, & Tannehill, 1998), Daryl never attended to it as a critical aspect to understanding life in classrooms. I suspect this was in part because the early teaching research (Berliner and Doyle's work) did not foreground this aspect of the classroom ecology. Yet, serious attention needs to be given to understanding how the social system impacts upon and is in turn impacted by the instructional and management systems. This has been done recently (see Peter Hastie's [2000] research on the ecological analysis of Sport Education from the managerial, social, and instructional perspectives).

The nature of the physical education environment, particularly as we come to understand the social determinants of physical activity (Sallis, Prochaska, & Taylor, 2000), can lead to the development of better strategies for engaging students in learning. Research on students' cognitive processes by Lee and her colleagues at LSU (Lee, 2001) has been another important contribution to our understanding of this aspect of the teaching and learning environment.

Siedentop's Contributions to Conceptual Advances in PETE

In the McCloy Lecture, Daryl summarizes the teaching effectiveness research of the 1980s into three categories: (a) Process Product Research; (b) Process-Pro-
cess Research; and (c) Mediating Process Research. The first provided a profile of effective teaching across different subject areas and different physical education contexts. Daryl correctly noted that because the PETE scholarly community did not have access to large grants, they were limited to the study of small-scale instructional units better known as experimental teaching units (ETUs). There were problems with assessing outcomes of these units (i.e., valid measures of performance/learning) which may explain why this line of research never became a major focus for Siedentop. Some ETU studies were completed at OSU under his direction (Dugas, 1984). Equally thorny at the time were the theoretical and methodological problems about what were appropriate instructional outcomes and how they might be measured. Twenty years later, we are beginning to see sustained commitments to this research topic (Mitchell, Griffin, & Oslin, 1994; Richard, Godbout, Tousignant, & Grehaigne, 1999).

Daryl's early teaching effectiveness research used the “process-process” paradigm (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974). What Daryl and his colleagues did was to describe with increasing sophistication what teachers and students did in the name of teaching and learning in a variety of physical education contexts. Daryl's reading of Jacob Kounin (1970) and Walter Doyle's (1979) work left a huge impression on him and they became required readings for all his students in the 1980s. Daryl bought these into the ecological paradigm as part of a larger set of studies that recognized the duo-directional influences of teacher and student behaviors in the teaching learning environment. More recent work has focused on students' cognition as mediating process variables (Lee, 2001; Solmon & Lee, 1996), though Daryl's work remained closely aligned with teacher and student behaviors.

Daryl's research with his students and his colleagues on effective teaching has made several contributions to the field. I will limit my remarks to two main contributions. First, Daryl was a major contributor to the methodological advances on the teaching effectiveness research. These included (a) the development of strong and robust teaching/learning variables; (b) better sampling strategies for observation and analysis of teaching variables; (c) better interobserver agreement protocols; and (d) attention to the importance of content validity. As early as 1983, in a JTPE monograph of Academic Learning Time in Physical Education, Daryl called attention to the need for content-specific studies of physical education teaching. His students had studied volleyball and soccer but found that existing observation systems were not sophisticated enough to sort out relationships between what students did in class and what they learned (Siedentop, 1983a). More recent and sustained effort on this topic is evident (see the 2001 JTPE monograph edited by Griffin and Placek).

For many years Daryl was intrigued by the challenges of developing measurement strategies to study teaching. He commented in this lecture that "The advances in teaching research methodologies have paralleled those in our sister disciplines, perhaps because early teacher effectiveness research methodologies tended to reflect natural sciences traditions" (p. 430). I believe Daryl developed these particular methods to study teaching in large part because of his commitment to the natural sciences and his theoretical roots in applied behavior analysis that he adopted in the 1970s.

Examples of this contribution are his relatively simple-to-use low-inference observation instruments and the development of discrete variables to the study of
teaching in the gymnasium. These have been some of his more important contribu-
tions to the teaching literature. This focus on low-inference systematic observa-
tion systems for physical education influenced the nature and focus of teaching supervision nationwide. The textbooks on supervision by Metzler (1989) and Randall (1992) show some strong influences from Daryl’s early work on effective teaching and teaching supervision (Siedentop, 1981).

Daryl was also quite sympathetic to Locke’s (1990) views on the limits of motor learning to contribute to the body of work on effective teaching. Daryl did not adhere to the theories or research methods of motor learning research but followed what he terms an “anthropological approach” within education. I think that his theorizing about teacher effectiveness research was driven initially by his readings of Berliner, an educational psychologist, and his work with the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study (Berliner, 1979). He was also highly influenced, as were his students of the time, by the measurements and tactics of applied behavior analysis (Johnston & Pennypacker, 1980; Sidman, 1960) as tools for studying teaching. He believed these tools were superior to the “time on task” tools used in the BTES and other classroom teaching research of the time. It was these theoretical and methodological roots, not the disciplines of motor learning and physiology, that shaped his ideas on data collection methodologies and low-inference observations of teachers and students in classrooms.

Daryl’s attention to the clear specification of teaching variables, thoughtful sampling procedures, and the gathering of reliable data—reliability was a key issue for him—ensured a confidence and credibility in teaching data from the studies on teaching from Ohio State at that time. His development of what in hindsight might be regarded as concise and simple protocols for low-inference observations of teaching: two versions of ALT-PE and Rules, Routine, and Expectations (RRE) were key protocols in the dissemination of low-inference approaches to teaching research in physical education.

A central characteristic of any influential researcher is his or her ability to influence the practice of his/her discipline or field of study. Daryl’s writings have had an enormous influence on the content, scope, and sequence of physical education teacher education programs nationally and internationally. His many scholarly publications and presentations, together with his research-based teaching textbooks (Siedentop, Mand, & Taggart, 1986; Siedentop & Tannehill, 2000), have been highly influential with physical education teacher educators. Daryl used his textbook, Developing Teaching Skills in Physical Education, to disseminate these methodological ideas beyond what was then a small cadre of pedagogy scholars. Chapters on systematic observation in his first and second editions of the book were easy to read and theoretically and empirically well grounded (Siedentop, 1983b). At the time, it was the only textbook to devote substantive space to data collection of teacher and student behavior as part of a preservice teacher’s professional preparation.

Daryl modeled a multilayered approach to dissemination of research methods and findings to scholars and practitioners alike. He did this in three ways. There are several lessons for current pedagogy scholars in understanding this approach to shaping the ideas and practices of research and the practice of physical education in schools and in higher education. First, Daryl and his students published their research findings in research journals to ensure dissemination to the
pedagogy community. Second, Daryl wrote and disseminated the protocols for data collection strategies to encourage replication of research on a topic by this community. Third, he wrote in clear and engaging terms for different audiences to encourage practitioners to engage in research-based practices. This has been a key to their attending to the ideas.

Daryl was brilliant at understanding how best to disseminate his research and scholarship ideas. He was not always successful. I remember one conversation in particular about how disappointed he was when his ideas suggesting a shift in the scope of physical education teachers' work (to better connect community and school physical activity programming) were poorly received by a group of teachers in Ohio. But he continued to seek ways to write and talk about things of concern to teachers. I suspect he would agree that Bobbie, his wife and an outstanding elementary physical education teacher of 30 years, was influential in keeping him informed of the concerns and aspirations of caring physical education teachers.

Concluding Thoughts

The work of sport pedagogy researchers should influence the practice of physical education if we hope to improve the teaching and learning of physical education. Dodds (1999) suggests that commitment to three values is critical to achieving this goal. Daryl's work ethic and prolific writings on teacher effectiveness research, as well as other aspects of sport pedagogy (see other chapters in this monograph), demonstrate a commitment to all three values that are worth articulating here.

The first value is to support the creation of individual and collective opportunities to improve research. One of Daryl's contributions to the teaching effectiveness research has been the extraordinary number of well-trained and productive scholars he has advised, who in turn have contributed in substantial and unique ways to the teaching effectiveness research (see Mitchell, 1997).

The second value is a commitment to a sustained and long-term view of learning to do research. The skills and strategies of doing quality research are learned over a lifetime of practice. Perusal of Daryl Siedentop's writings will leave little doubt about his sustained commitment to several lines of research on teaching, teacher education, and curriculum innovation in physical education. What is also interesting to note is the evolution of his thinking about method as newer strategies of data collection were refined over the last 30 years.

The third value is a commitment to addressing research questions considered of practical and social importance to the practitioners and the scholarly community. While the pedagogy community may not have influenced the majority of school-based practices of physical education, Daryl Siedentop's work on effective teaching research has done as much, if not more than most, to effect positive change in school practice and school curriculum. I suspect that few other accolades would please him more.
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**Note**

1 The McCloy Lecture is the scholarly highlight of annual Research Consortium events at AAHPERD conventions and recognizes leading scholars in physical education/kinesiology. Daryl Seidentop was the first sport pedagogy researcher to give the McCloy Lecture, which he titled “In Search of Effective Teaching: What We Have Learned From Teachers and Students.” Why no sport pedagogy person has been invited to deliver this lecture before 1998 is a story for another time. My thanks to Patt Dodds (1999) for bringing this to my attention.