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Abstract

Some scholars in kinesiology have advocated for the adoption of the leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship (LDS) construct as a way for the discipline to survive and thrive in the challenging 21st Century university climate. Despite budding interest in LDS, there is a lack of empirical research on the construct and the limited conceptual literature lacks the specificity, practicality, and transformative quality necessary for realistic and fruitful application. This participatory research, informed by the social movement theory of collective action frames, investigated the meaning, need, development, and motivation of LDS in kinesiology by engaging 10 senior scholars from various countries and sub-disciplinary areas of kinesiology who have demonstrated interest/expertise in the construct (considered experts) in an interview-Delphi study. Thematic analysis revealed the experts viewed: (a) the meaning of and need for LDS in kinesiology as a powerful, yet slippery, philosophy focused on ensuring and enhancing the future of the discipline through the pursuit of integrity, and is variously and intentionally embedded in all aspects of all scholars’ work; and (b) the development of and motivation for LDS in kinesiology as requiring dedicated, multifarious, and contextualized development initiatives that are dialogical, narrative-based, and incentivized. Interpretation of the thematic findings through Alvesson’s (2012) organizational culture theory suggests the experts’ vision of and for LDS in kinesiology can be understood as: (a) focused on understanding and critically reflecting upon organizational culture so as to inspire more thoughtful and ethical organizational perspectives; and (b) developed and motivated through cultural change via the everyday reframing of cultural orientations. An appreciation of the individual and holistic connections between the experts’ vision and Alvesson’s theory indicates LDS is sufficiently specific, practical, and transformative for realistic and fruitful application; and well-suited to navigating the fragmenting and depoliticizing challenges of the 21st Century given the enhanced cultural understanding, coordination, and ethical consciousness it stimulates. Ultimately, it can be concluded from this research that the experts’ vision of and for LDS in kinesiology is a theoretically-supported and empirically-evidenced way of meaningfully understanding, acting in, and improving
organization and, as such, indicates investment in the construct holds promise for a vibrant disciplinary future.
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Summary for Lay Audience

Scholars in kinesiology address some of the most pressing and meaningful societal issues related to movement (e.g., health crises and joy of movement, respectively). However, as public funds to universities dwindle, academia has become an increasingly corporatized and competitive environment which presents challenges to the valuable work of scholars in all disciplines. Some scholars have suggested that adoption of the leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship (LDS) construct may be a promising way to survive and thrive in this challenging academic climate and continue their important contributions to society. However, despite enthusiasm for the construct, not enough is known about it and whether it is as promising as described. Therefore, this research investigated what LDS means and how it might be developed by interviewing 10 senior scholars from various countries and sub-disciplinary areas of kinesiology who have demonstrated interest/expertise in the construct (considered experts). The experts described: (a) the meaning of LDS in kinesiology as a philosophy that scholars variously and intentionally embed in all aspects of their work and is focused on ensuring and enhancing the discipline’s future through the pursuit of integrity; and (b) the development of LDS in kinesiology as requiring dedicated, contextualized, and incentivized development initiatives that are focused on dialogue and story-sharing. The experts’ vision of and for LDS in kinesiology can be better understood through Alvesson’s (2012) organizational culture theory as: (a) focused on understanding and critically reflecting upon shared meanings in the discipline so as to inspire more thoughtful and ethical perspectives; and (b) developed through ongoing and subtle renegotiation of meaning such that scholars in kinesiology are convinced to think like stewards. Taken together, these findings suggest that the view of LDS outlined in this research is sufficiently specific, practical, and transformative for realistic and fruitful application; and well-suited to navigating the challenges of the academic climate given the enhanced organizational understanding and ethical consciousness it stimulates. Ultimately, this research outlines a theoretically-supported and evidence-based way of meaningfully understanding, acting in, and improving one’s organization, thereby indicating
investment in LDS holds promise for a vibrant future for scholars in kinesiology and their important societal contributions.
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Chapter 1 – Introduction

In this chapter I introduce my doctoral research which inquired into the promise of the leadership-as-disciplinary construct as a way for the kinesiology discipline to survive and thrive in the 21st Century. The chapter begins with a description of the research context, which is followed by an overview of the research questions and design, and then by an explanation of the significance of the research. Finally, an overview of the dissertation is provided.

Research Context

Academic disciplines are significant constructions in academia that can be understood as reservoirs of ways of knowing which, in dynamic combination with other structural phenomena, can condition behavioural practices, sets of discourses, ways of thinking, procedures, emotional responses and motivations. Together this constellation of factors results in structured dispositions for disciplinary practitioners who, in conjunction with external forces, reshape them in different practice clusters into localised repertoires. While alternative recurrent practices may be in competition within a single discipline, there is common background knowledge about key figures, conflicts and achievements. Disciplines take organisational form, have internal hierarchies and bestow power differentially, conferring advantage and disadvantage. (Trowler, 2014, p. 6-7)

The academic discipline of kinesiology\(^1\) in particular is focused on the study of human movement\(^2\) and encompasses various sub-disciplinary areas including, but not limited to, human anatomy, human physiology, exercise physiology, biomechanics, motor learning

---

\(^1\) There has been debate on an epic scale regarding which name is the most appropriate label for this academic discipline (Lawson, 2007). The name ‘kinesiology’ is now widely accepted in Canada and the United States, having evolved from the previously accepted label (and focus) of ‘physical education’ (Lawson, 2014). Elsewhere, in places such as the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand, variations of the names ‘human movement studies’ and ‘sport studies’ have fairly widespread acceptance as labels for this academic discipline.

\(^2\) There has been vigorous debate about the focus of the academic discipline of kinesiology (Rikli, 2006).
and control, psychology of physical activity, physical education pedagogy, health, adapted physical activity, sociology of sport, sport history, sport management, and sport philosophy (Canadian Council of University Physical Education and Kinesiology Administrators, n.d.). The kinesiology discipline has developed tremendously since what can be considered its formation in the 1960s (Elliot, 2007). The discipline has amassed considerable research achievements, impressive student enrolment, extensive public interest, and, perhaps most importantly, the potential to address many of today’s most pressing and meaningful movement-related matters (e.g., inquiries related to health crises and joy of movement, respectively; Kretchmar, 2014; Thomas, 2014). Despite this, kinesiology is not guaranteed an equally promising future in the academy amidst the many challenges threatening all disciplines in the 21st Century university, such as corporatization and competition for resources and prestige (Brown, 2015). These challenges can compromise the valuable work of scholars within kinesiology (Kirk, 2014). For instance, the influence of corporate funders on research agendas – which has resulted in some instances in a privileging, rather than a balance, of matters of health or life itself (e.g., movement as duty or medicine) over matters of meaning or quality of life (e.g., movement as an end in itself or as play; Kretchmar, 2014; Thomas, 2014) – contradicts the academic values of many scholars within kinesiology and causes them difficult emotional labours (Block, 2016; Kirk, 2014). These pressures may be heightened for doctoral students and those scholars in the pursuit of tenure, as the lack of job security and cultural capital may make it more difficult to resist such pressures (Casey & Fletcher, 2017). As a further example, the need to compete for resources and prestige means scholars within kinesiology must sometimes battle challenges to their cultural and economic authority over human movement against “untrained and uncertified ‘experts’ in fitness and sports” (Thomas, 2014, p. 320), and sometimes even against scholars from other kinesiology sub-disciplines, both of which are counter-productive to academic work and fragment the discipline (Block & Estes, 2011; Lawson, 2014).

For the discipline of kinesiology to survive and thrive in academia amidst this structurally and emotionally challenging climate, it has been argued that a strategic and
conscious investment in leadership that is “tailor-made for the social, political, cultural and economic realities of the 21st Century” (Lawson, 2014, p. 274), and that emphasizes the transformation this requires (rather than simply conservation; Lawson, 2016), is needed. In response, some scholars in kinesiology (e.g., Charles, 2016; Estes & Germain, 2016; Frank, 2016; Kretchmar, 2014; Lawson, 2012, 2014, 2016; Lawson & Kretchmar, 2017; Napper-Owen, 2012; Russell, Gaudreault, & Richards, 2016), drawing upon the work of higher education scholars (e.g., Golde & Walker, 2006; Walker, Golde, Jones, Bueschel, & Hutchings, 2008), have begun to advocate for the adoption of the action- and future-oriented, morally courageous, and collective approach of the leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship (LDS) construct. To explain, the action- and future-oriented nature of LDS, whereby stewards act purposefully to conserve, restore, and transform their discipline for those yet to come (Golde, 2006), is argued to hold promise as a way to address today’s need for disciplines to strategically angle for cultural and economic authority over their core content (Block & Estes, 2011). The morally courageous nature of LDS, whereby stewards are guided by a “sense of purpose larger than oneself…[and] take risks” (Golde, 2006, p. 13) to advocate for the discipline and academic values they believe in, is argued to hold promise as a way to address today’s need for an “ethico-emotive politics” (Zipin, 2010, p. 159) to challenge the depoliticizing pressures of the corporatized university (Block, 2016; Kirk, 2014). Lastly, the collective approach of LDS, which assumes that stewardship is a responsibility of all doctorate holders and that it concerns one’s entire discipline, not just one’s own sub-disciplinary area (Walker et al., 2008), is argued to hold promise as a way to address today’s need to combat fragmentation and work productively with colleagues of different perspectives (Lawson, 2014; Tinning, 2015). In sum, it is not surprising that The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has argued, “we must make the development of ‘stewards of

---

3 As will be discussed in more detail later in this dissertation, emphasis here is on leadership rather than leaders. That is, emphasis is on the activity or function of influencing others rather than on the individuals engaging in that leadership (Heifetz, Linsky, & Grashow, 2009). Such an emphasis allows for a focus on the practice of leadership that is open to all, rather than on the characteristics and qualities of individuals in particular formal roles.
the discipline’ our highest priority and understand that other goals, such as pursuing resources and prestige, are in service of this cause” (Walker, 2006, p. 423). The rationale is that “if we do not take care of our disciplines, we fail as stewards of knowledge generation” (Prewitt, 2005, p. 32), which, in kinesiology’s case, means risking the decline of a discipline so well-positioned to address many of today’s most important movement-related matters (Kretchmar, 2014).

**Research Questions and Overview**

Despite the budding interest in LDS, there is a lack of empirical research on the construct both in general and specific to kinesiology, and the conceptual literature that does exist is argued to lack the specificity, practicality, and transformative quality necessary for realistic and fruitful application (Charles, 2016; Lawson, 2014). For these reasons, this research investigated the specific, practical, and transformation-oriented questions of: (a) what does LDS in kinesiology entail? (b) why is LDS needed in kinesiology? (c) how could LDS in kinesiology be realistically developed? and (d) what would motivate participation in LDS development within kinesiology?

The approach taken to the investigation of these research questions was informed by the ontological and epistemological assumptions of the participatory paradigm that: (a) reality is socially constructed with the purpose of changing the world; and (b) knowledge is the constructed meaning of individuals, for which practicality is of primacy (Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba, 2011). This investigation was further informed by its framing in the social movement theory of collective action frames. Such a theoretical positioning is critical as the field-wide nature of LDS will not occur by chance but instead requires an “organizational intervention…[that is] nothing short of a social movement” (Lawson, 2014, p. 282). The collective action frames theory is intended to engage participants in the active, collaborative, and discursive process of: (a) diagnostic framing: negotiating a common understanding of the problematic conditions in need of change and the corresponding needed behaviours; (b) prognostic framing: generating a unified and practical plan to foster such behaviour; and (c) motivational framing: determining ways to inspire others to engage in the plan (Benford & Snow, 2000). The first two frames mobilize consensus, while the third mobilizes action, “moving people from the balcony to the barricades” (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 615). The methodology
of participatory research, with its “emphasis on research for change and the development of communities” (Tandon, 2005a, p. 37), has been described as “giving life” (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005, p. 597) to social movements. Thus, participatory research was used to ‘give life’ to this social movement theory-informed investigation. More specifically, the participatory method of the interview-Delphi was used to facilitate a structured dialogue between 10 select scholars from various countries and sub-disciplinary areas of kinesiology who could be considered ‘experts’ on the topic of LDS in kinesiology given their scholarship. The aim of this dialogue was to establish: a rich understanding of the meaning of and need for LDS in kinesiology, a detailed plan for the realistic development of LDS amongst scholars in kinesiology, and comprehensive strategies to motivate scholars in kinesiology to participate in such development. The experts’ visions of and for LDS in kinesiology were then thematically analyzed and theoretically interpreted so as to allow for conclusions to be drawn about the construct’s suitability for navigating 21st Century challenges.

**Significance and Implications**

As the existing literature on LDS has been criticized for being predominately conceptual and lacking a diversity of voices, this research contributes to filling these gaps through its empirical design and engagement of international scholars from many of kinesiology’s sub-disciplinary areas. However, this research has been purposefully designed to contribute more than literature alone. That is, in the event that the findings of this research substantiate the promise of LDS as a way for the kinesiology discipline to survive and thrive in the 21st Century, it is hoped that the detailed and practical nature of the findings, and their framing as a social movement, will allow for their feasible adoption by all scholars in kinesiology and result in the development of stewards across the discipline. Importantly, improvement to the work life of scholars within kinesiology may then function to improve their critical scholarly contributions to society.

The existing literature on LDS has also been criticized for being too generic, thus the discipline-specific nature of this investigation makes another important contribution. That is, the design of this investigation was generated with an appreciation of: (a) the empirical research which indicates that a number of the dispositions that have a direct bearing on leadership (e.g., preferred leadership styles; linguistic preferences;
conceptions of quality; etc.) have a disciplinary component (Deem et al., 2003; Kekale, 1999, 2002); (b) the reality that disciplines are the primary framework through which faculty are recruited, organized, and rewarded; and (c) the argument that taking a generic approach to leadership investigations within academia risks developing insights that may require too much translation to be practically useful in a disciplinary setting and, consequently, may not attract the attention and respect of academics (Blackmore, 2007). It is important to note that although there have been pushes toward interdisciplinarity and movement away from essentialist views of disciplines in recent years, this does not mean that disciplines do not remain one of the most significant features of academic life and leadership (and will likely remain so for the foreseeable future); rather, these trends suggest that disciplines are one of various significant features (Trowler, 2014).

Investigations such as this doctoral research that inquire into leadership within academia with attention to disciplinarity, but that do not take a deterministic nor simplistic view of disciplines, may contribute to making interdisciplinary work, whether in formal leadership teams or in research groups, more successful (Blackmore, 2007).

Finally, it is important to clarify that the aim of this research is not to advance the construct of LDS in kinesiology as yet another type of “adjectival leadership” (Mulford, 2008, p. 38) with an instrumental or aspirational focus that “does not necessarily engage with the messiness of the social world, thereby limiting its contribution to the advancement of scholarship and practice” (Eacott, 2015, p. 90). Rather, the aim is that through “stewardship-focused dialogue” (Lawson & Kretchmar, 2017, p. 196) we can work together to “build and sustain our ‘modest, practical morals,’ counteract suppressive forces of the field, and protect and enable our reflexive, collegial and ethical dispositions” (Alfrey, Enright & Rynne, 2017, p. 18). My view is that the value of this research rests “in the ideas it generates, both those that evoke consensus and those that do not” (Gordon, 1992, p. 28). As Golde (2006) argued in her seminal disciplinary stewardship work, “ideas are powerful incentives for change. Big ideas are more compelling and persuasive than either financial incentives or lists of ‘best practices.’ Academics, perhaps more than the average [individuals], are captivated and moved by important ideas” (p. 8).
Dissertation Overview

The remainder of this dissertation is organized into five chapters. In Chapter Two, a review of the higher education and kinesiology literatures on the construct of LDS is presented. In Chapter Three, the details of the research design are described, including: my positionality as the researcher, the theoretical framing of collective action frames, the participatory research methodology, the interview-Delphi method, the participant sampling and recruitment, the data gathering and analysis, the ethical considerations made, and the trustworthiness measures taken. In Chapter Four, the thematic findings of the research are presented, that is, the experts’ vision of what LDS in kinesiology entails and why it is needed, as well as how to realistically develop LDS in kinesiology and strategies to motivate participation in that development. In Chapter Five, Alvesson’s (2012) organizational culture theory is employed as an interpretive lens through which to discuss the experts’ vision of and for LDS in kinesiology in relation to the aim of the research, that is, whether and how LDS can be interpreted as holding promise as a way for kinesiology to survive and thrive in the 21st Century. Finally, in Chapter Six, I conclude by highlighting the contributions of the research, acknowledging its limitations, considering its implications for practice, and forwarding suggestions for future research directions.
Chapter 2 – Literature Review

This chapter presents a review of literature on the construct of disciplinary stewardship. The review is presented in two major sections. The first section includes a review of the seminal work on disciplinary stewardship in the broader higher education literature, the impact of that work, and the evolution of the construct to date. The second and final section includes a review of how the disciplinary stewardship construct has been applied within the kinesiology literature. This section begins with an overview of the temporality, amount, depth, type, and geographic source of the kinesiology literature on disciplinary stewardship. This overview is followed by a review of how the meaning of, need for, development of, and motivation for disciplinary stewardship (i.e., this dissertation’s research questions/foci) have been portrayed in the kinesiology literature. The chapter closes with a summary of the most important gaps in these literatures and how these gaps are addressed in the design of this doctoral investigation.

Disciplinary Stewardship

This section of the literature review reveals that, in the 20 years since its inception, there has been much interest in the construct of disciplinary stewardship as a way to secure the endangered future of disciplines and academia, originally through interventions focused on doctoral education. In these two decades, writing on the construct has evolved to suggest the need to focus on disciplinary stewardship before and beyond doctoral education and, relatedly, that disciplinary stewards are not just PhD graduates, but graduates of bachelor’s and master’s programs as well. However, important details regarding leadership, development, motivation, and diverse viewpoints of disciplinary stewardship remain unconsidered in the broader higher education literature. These shortcomings leave the construct of disciplinary stewardship less specific, practical, and transformative than possible and necessary for optimal impact.

The Origin of the Disciplinary Stewardship Construct

The construct of disciplinary stewardship was pioneered by Chris Golde and George Walker in the early 2000’s, on behalf of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (referred to hereafter as Carnegie). The construct was originally developed as a normative description of the purpose of doctoral education as a
result of concerns that doctoral programs were not keeping pace with rapid changes to higher education and, as such, the future of disciplines and academia was in jeopardy. As evidence of the failures of doctoral education, Golde and Walker (2006) cited examples such as new PhD graduates who were ill-prepared to perform the duties of a faculty member, underrepresentation of historically marginalized groups in academia, and high percentages of graduate student attrition. Examples of the changes to higher education they cited included increased time-to-career, expanding and blurring disciplinary boundaries, and increasingly entrepreneurial funding structures (Golde & Walker, 2006). Ultimately, Golde and Walker suggested that the practices of doctoral education had become so outmoded that they no longer effectively met their central purpose of:

Educating and preparing those to whom we can entrust the vigor, quality, and integrity of the field. This person is a scholar first and foremost, in the fullest sense of the term—someone who will creatively generate new knowledge, critically conserve valuable and useful ideas, and responsibly transform those understandings through writing, teaching, and application. We call such a person a ‘steward of the discipline.’ (Golde, 2006, p. 5)

This quote can be understood as the initial foundation of the disciplinary stewardship construct. That is, disciplinary stewardship was originally and most basically intended to refer to the notion of scholars who are prepared in doctoral programs that are responsive to the current academic climate and, as such, can be trusted, to generate, conserve, and transform knowledge in particular ways (which will be elaborated on later) that will ensure the vigor, quality, integrity, and ultimately future, of their discipline and academia more generally.

The Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (CID): A Seminal Action Research Project on Disciplinary Stewardship

As representatives of Carnegie, Golde and Walker oversaw a five-year (2001-2006) action research project entitled the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (CID), which can be understood as the seminal work on the topic of disciplinary stewardship. The first task of the CID was to expand the construct of disciplinary stewardship into a preliminary basic framework (detailed in the following section). Next, the CID engaged 84 academic departments in the United States across six disparate disciplines (i.e.,
Chemistry, Education, English, History, Mathematics, and Neuroscience) to consider how their doctoral programs might be restructured to better prepare graduates as disciplinary stewards and to then implement and assess those programmatic changes. One of the main products of the CID was a volume edited by Golde and Walker (2006) entitled, *Envisioning the Future of Doctoral Education: Preparing Stewards of the Discipline*. This volume included 16 discipline-specific essays (i.e., two to three sole-authored essays for each of the six disciplines included) in which leading scholars conceptualized the nature of stewardship in their discipline as well as how they thought it ought to be developed if they could start carte blanche. The volume also included Golde’s introductory chapter on disciplinary stewardship, three overarching commentaries on the essays, and Walker’s summary chapter.

The CID described its work as “an exercise in field building and knowledge building” (Golde, 2006, p. 7). The rationale was that improvements to and securements of the higher education system could be made if conversations (i.e., clarification, debates, etc.) about the system’s purposes and mechanisms were made routine and public rather than implicit and assumed – which they argued leads to lost purposes and contradictory processes (Golde, 2006). Thus, the major aim of the CID and its edited volume was to begin a conversation about disciplinary stewardship, not to provide a definitive answer (Golde, 2006). The CID suggested that if the volume sparked debate then it had done its job in calling into question (and/or affirming) tacit practices in doctoral education (Golde, 2006).

**A Generic Framework for Disciplinary Stewardship**

The expanded description of disciplinary stewardship developed by Golde and Walker (2006), and later provided to the CID departments and essayists, was based on the following three assumptions. First, “the term steward of the discipline should be applied to all doctorate holders” (Golde, 2006, p. 13). It is neither innate nor reserved for those in particular roles, nor those who are exceptional scholars. Instead, disciplinary stewardship is something that can and should be developed, and something that all scholars should aspire to (Golde, 2006). Second, “the formulation of what stewardship means is discipline-specific. What it means to be a steward of chemistry differs from, say, English or mathematics” (Golde, 2006, p. 14). Therefore, Golde and Walker described their
depiction of disciplinary stewardship as generic and intended to be used as a “framework for discipline-specific conversations” (Golde, 2006, p. 14). Third and lastly, Golde and Walker argued that conversations about disciplinary stewardship should be focused on the academic department. They described their assumption that “the key educational community is the academic department—the nexus of the discipline and the institution” (Golde, 2006, p. 8).

As for what it means to be a disciplinary steward, Golde and Walker (2006) described it to be both a set of roles and skills as well as a set of principles which inform a scholar’s professional responsibility for the current and future integrity of their discipline. They described that “the former ensure competence, and the latter provide the moral compass” (Golde, 2006, p. 9). In terms of roles and skills, that of generation, conservation, and transformation were identified. Generation refers to carrying out all aspects of research in a way that meets the standards of rigor, quality, and credibility (Golde, 2006). It also entails that one ensures the quality of others’ scholarly work by partaking in critical reading and assessment of scholarship (Golde, 2006). Conservation denotes the maintenance of “the continuity, stability, and vitality of the field” (Golde, 2006, p. 11). Doing so involves an understanding of the field’s history as well as fundamental ideas and debates so as to be able to: (a) understand the shoulders upon which one stands; (b) appreciate which ideas have outlived their utility; and (c) understand one’s place in the discipline, as well as the discipline’s place in, and contribution to, the broader knowledge landscape. The meaning of transformation is two-fold. One aspect is the responsibility and desire to clearly communicate disciplinary ideas to all audiences – including disciplinary peers, students, and society – using whichever technique is most effective. The other aspect is the commitment to apply disciplinary ideas to solve problems in society, however directly or indirectly.

In terms of principles, Golde and Walker (2006) did not specify actual labels, but their descriptions could be summarized through the terms action- and future-oriented, morally courageous, and collective. The principle of being action- and future-oriented is based on the assumption that disciplinary stewards are “entrusted with the care of something valuable on behalf of others” (Golde, 2006, p. 12). In other words, they are “caretakers with a critical eye towards the future” (Golde, 2006, p. 13). Thus, disciplinary
stewardship requires “thinking about the continuing health of the discipline and [acting] to preserve the best of the past for those who will follow” (Golde, 2006, p. 13). Being morally courageous assumes that a sense of purpose should guide action, and that this purpose should be larger than oneself and take as its touchstone the care of the discipline (Golde, 2006). The word care, however, does not suggest the simple maintenance of the discipline as it is, but rather the taking of carefully considered “risks to move the discipline forward” (Golde, 2006, p. 13). Finally, being collective refers to having a broad view or perspective (Golde, 2006). This means one does not simply focus upon the welfare of their own career or their own sub-discipline, but rather on the discipline more broadly (i.e., the sum of the parts), including its connections with other disciplines (Golde, 2006). Table 1 summarizes the generic framework.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic Framework of Disciplinary Stewardship (i.e., the CID)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The need for disciplinary stewardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary stewardship is needed because doctoral programs are not keeping pace with rapid changes to higher education and, as a result, not preparing graduates who can be trusted to ensure the vigor, quality, integrity, and, ultimately, future of their discipline and academia more generally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who disciplinary stewards are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All doctorate holders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scope of disciplinary stewardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meaning of disciplinary stewardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set of roles and skills (for competence), including generation, conservation, and transformation; as well as a set of principles (for moral direction), including being action- and future-oriented, morally courageous, and collective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of disciplinary stewardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In doctoral education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learnings from the CID: The Need to Develop Scholars with Breadth, Consideration of Professional Components, and Accountability to the Public

The CID essayists raised a number of common ideas about how doctoral programs might be restructured to better prepare graduates to be disciplinary stewards who could be entrusted to care for their disciplines. For example, many wrote about the need to: enhance the instructional capacities of doctoral students; address the misalignment between the increasing number of career paths and graduate
programs/university departments; engage doctoral students in conversations about
disciplinary contests and overarching intellectual questions and projects; consider who
the future generation of the discipline will be and what intellectual problems they will
tackle; emphasize the development of professional and scientific ethics and disciplinary
values; as well as emphasize the development of quality, rigorous researchers who can,
for example, ask ‘good’ (i.e., creative, risky, challenging, interdisciplinary) research
questions.

The most prominent themes contained in the essays, however, were related to the
following three priorities for disciplinary stewardship development. One theme was the
need to ensure that doctoral students found a balance between depth in a particular sub-
disciplinary area and breadth of knowledge about the larger disciplinary context
(including other relevant disciplines). Nearly all the essayists underscored the tendency of
academics to be inwardly focused and work independently and the need for increased
emphasis on interdisciplinarity and collaboration. A second theme was the need to
prepare scholars to concern themselves with both their discipline of study as well as their
discipline’s associated professional enterprise(s). The essayists suggested that the barriers
between the concepts of pure and applied work be removed and the importance of
professional and practical knowledge and skills be raised within disciplines. Third, much
attention was paid to the need to develop doctoral students who could become academic
citizens in the world at large. The essayists relayed the importance of communicating
research with the public, engaging with public policy and practice, and generally being
seen to address the needs of society.

A Critical Consideration of the CID: Important Matters Left Unconsidered Limit
the Specificity, Practicality, and Transformative Potential of LDS

What can be taken away from a reading of the CID essays and was recognized to
some degree by the commentators’ chapters, is that the CID left some important matters
about disciplinary stewardship unconsidered and, as a result, placed limits on the
construct’s specificity, practicality, and transformative potential. These unconsidered
matters include: (a) the leadership implications for and of disciplinary stewardship; (b)
the disciplinary stewardship development needed beyond doctoral education, as well as
the motivation needed for such development to happen; and (c) diverse viewpoints on, and potential alternative visions of, disciplinary stewardship.

**Implications for and of Leadership**

It remained largely unconsidered in the CID that realization of the reforms for disciplinary stewardship that were advocated by the essayists would depend, in many cases, upon formal leaders to implement structural changes to academic incentive systems (Prewitt, 2006). That is, incentive structures need to be changed if people are to become motivated to do and, importantly, not be penalized for the types of things the essayists advocate for as acts of disciplinary stewardship (Prewitt, 2006). For example, in regard to the essayists’ call for interdisciplinarity and collaboration, university leaders would need to make changes to tenure and promotion criteria; disciplinary leaders such as journal editors and scholarly association leaders would, respectively, need to make changes to journal aims and scope and awards criteria; and transdisciplinary leaders, such as those who head funding agencies, would need to change competition eligibility criteria. The efforts of formal leaders in this vein could be understood as leadership-for-disciplinary stewardship and were not sufficiently considered in the CID.

At the same time, the important role of informal leadership in disciplinary stewardship was also largely unconsidered in the CID and cannot be understated. Although formal leaders may implement the structural changes needed to foster disciplinary stewardship, it is from faculty and students that ideas about how to reconfigure academic practices in relevant, practical ways must come (Prewitt, 2006). As such, Walker (2006) argued in his concluding CID chapter that the best way to ensure the development of disciplinary stewards was through “a continuous process of iterative, collective reflection” (p. 426, emphasis added). He emphasized that “we need to accept our shared responsibility to engage in the process. And we need to act with strong leadership in an understanding of the need for change” (p. 427). The reality is that “no one is in charge” (Prewitt, 2006, p. 23) of disciplinary stewardship, and therefore the argument becomes that we all must be. Actions in this regard may be considered informal leadership and understood as one aspect of leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship, which was also not adequately considered in the CID. Ultimately, the inattention to leadership
for and as disciplinary stewardship left important details about the construct unknown and limited its practical application.

**Development Beyond Doctoral Education and Matters of Motivation**

Damrosch (2006) pointed out in his commentary chapter that the number of commonalities in the CID essays regarding what to change for the development of disciplinary stewards begged the question: “if everyone knows what needs to be done, why are so few… doing it?” (p. 34). This highlights two important issues not considered by the CID: (a) “it is not enough to rethink the doctorate, we need to rethink the faculty” (Elkana, 2006, p. 91); and (b) it is not enough to think about what needs to change for disciplinary stewardship to occur, but whether change will be welcomed by key stakeholders (e.g., faculty) and, if not, how to motivate desire for such change (Chan, 2006). Walker (2006) acknowledged this limit of the CID in his concluding chapter. He asserted, “none of this [i.e., changes to doctoral education for disciplinary stewardship development] can happen without a profound change in **faculty attitudes and habits**... we need a collective will… and an understanding of the need for change” (Walker, 2006, p. 427). This failure to consider the details of disciplinary stewardship development beyond doctoral education and relevant matters of motivation places considerable limits on the practicality of the construct’s adoption writ large.

**Diverse Viewpoints and Potential Alternative Visions**

Overall, the ideas presented in the CID essays were not radical. That is, most of the ideas suggested in the essays could be addressed through relatively minor changes and, furthermore, none of the essayists questioned the value or existence of their discipline nor suggested major re-organizations of it (Walker, 2006). This conservative viewpoint may have been partially due to the senior and single-nation sample of the scholars who produced it. While the perspectives of senior scholars are absolutely valuable and necessary given their extensive experience, expertise, and power in academic decision-making processes, other perspectives are also needed (Taylor, 2006). That is, the perspectives of undergraduate and graduate students, early career faculty, and non-regular faculty (e.g., post-doctoral fellows, teaching professors) in various countries and at various types of universities could have offered fresh perspectives on disciplinary stewardship that were attune to different pressures, structures, and developments. These
diverse viewpoints were sorely missed in the CID and contributed to the result of a non-transformative vision of disciplinary stewardship. These critical considerations of the CID, as well as the development priorities described in the previous section, are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

*Generic Framework of Disciplinary Stewardship and Learnings from and Critique of the CID*

| The need for disciplinary stewardship | Disciplinary stewardship is needed because doctoral programs are not keeping pace with rapid changes to higher education and, as a result, not preparing graduates who can be trusted to ensure the vigor, quality, integrity, and, ultimately, future of their discipline and academia more generally |
| Who disciplinary stewards are | All doctorate holders |
| The scope of disciplinary stewardship | Academic unit |
| The meaning of disciplinary stewardship | Set of roles and skills (for competence), including generation, conservation, and transformation; as well as a set of principles (for moral direction), including being action- and future-oriented, morally courageous, and collective |
| The development of disciplinary stewardship (i.e., learnings from the CID) | Development happens in doctoral education and focuses on preparing scholars who: have a balance of breadth and depth, are considerate of their discipline’s professional components, and are engaged with and accountable to the public |
| Motivation for disciplinary stewardship development | Essentially unconsidered |
| Critique | The following was unconsidered and left disciplinary stewardship less specific, practical, and transformative than possible and necessary: -implications for and of leadership -development in areas other than doctoral education -motivation for disciplinary stewardship development -diverse viewpoints and alternative visions of disciplinary stewardship |

The Impact and Evolution of the Disciplinary Stewardship Construct

There have been numerous publications and initiatives on or related to disciplinary stewardship that have been published or launched since the CID. Many of these follow-up works have addressed, in a largely conceptual rather than empirical fashion, the directions detailed in the CID’s findings, such as balancing doctoral students’ depth with breadth, expanding the focus of disciplinary stewardship to include the professional aspects associated with one’s discipline, and promoting scholars’ public
engagement and accountability. Like the CID, however, many of these follow-up works largely leave the same important matters unconsidered, such as leadership implications, development beyond doctoral education, motivational matters, and alternative visions of disciplinary stewardship from diverse viewpoints. The result is that – although the construct of disciplinary stewardship appears to have made an impact on many audiences in the form of interest and perceived value since the CID – more specific, practical, and transformative understandings of the construct continue to remain unknown. The following paragraphs summarize and provide examples of the impact of the construct, as well as describe the new understandings of the construct that have evolved over time.

**Impact: Institutional and Disciplinary**

One way to understand the publications and initiatives on disciplinary stewardship that followed the CID is by categorizing them as either institutional or disciplinary in focus. Generally speaking, those works that are ‘institutional’ in focus take up the disciplinary stewardship construct in relation to non-discipline-specific practices within the university setting, with doctoral education and graduate education more broadly being major emphases. These works often take the shape of formal and informal action research projects and are typically described in technical reports.

One prominent example of an institutionally focused disciplinary stewardship project was the *Reframing the PhD for Australia’s Future Universities* project. This three-year nation-wide project focused on thinking differently “about the ‘heart’ of the PhD borrowing from, and extending, the Carnegie Foundation’s idea of ‘stewardship’” (Barrie et al., 2018, p. v). Following interviews and round-table discussions with doctoral students, supervisors, and early career scholars, a final report was produced. The report outlined an argument for reframing the intention behind existing PhD milestones in disciplinary stewardship language. For example, in the early stages of a doctoral program, generation may entail developing an individual learning plan, conservation may entail candidature (e.g., research proposal), and transformation may entail creating a project management plan and budget. The report also presented examples of how the core aspects of a PhD, that is, the research project, supervision, departmental and disciplinary engagement, and skill development, might be altered to include options that “bring stewardship to life” (Barrie et al., 2018, p. 31). For example, in regard to the research
project, the report suggested that the written thesis or dissertation no longer be the sole artefact produced. The report outlined,

To communicate the process and product of the research to different audiences (and to document research influence and engagement), the student may choose to curate an online portfolio that might include a selection of the following: a short video of the research for 3MT competition; a blog describing the process of undertaking the research - key challenges, decision points, moments of change; a Twitter feed documenting the nature and extent of public engagement… (Barrie et al., 2018. p. 22)

Those works inspired by the CID that are ‘disciplinary’ in nature can generally be understood as focused on the application of the disciplinary stewardship construct within a particular discipline, be it inside or outside the university setting. Some of the most substantial discipline-specific dialogues on the construct appear to be ongoing in the disciplines of nursing, archeology, and data science/statistics. While the vast majority of these works take the form of position papers (e.g., Grace, Willis, Roy, and Jones’ [2016] work in nursing; Tractenberg’s [2016] work in statistics), a robust empirical example is Monica Cox’s (2019) book entitled Demystifying the Engineering PhD. Cox interviewed individuals holding engineering PhDs who were working in academia or industry and asked them to describe what the disciplinary stewardship roles of generation, conservation, and transformation meant in the context of their work. Some key findings included that participants viewed generation as beyond the creation of knowledge and involved such academic actions as engaging students in apprenticeships and such industrial actions as commercializing technology and patenting innovations. Furthermore, being sound, rational, and clear were emphasized as important hallmarks of generation in engineering given the need for precision in the discipline. Conservation was the least discussed aspect of disciplinary stewardship amongst Cox’s participants, with industry professionals pointing to their service as advisors for academic engineering departments and academics highlighting their teaching. Finally, transformation was the most discussed aspect of disciplinary stewardship in the study with both engineering academics and industry professionals emphasizing their communication with diverse audiences (e.g., K-
12 students, university students, clients, etc.), and the need to be able to tailor messages appropriately for success.

*Evolution: Expanding Disciplinary Stewardship Development to Before and Beyond Doctoral Education and Including Non-Academic Practitioners as Disciplinary Stewards*

The various CID-inspired works published over the past two decades have evolved the construct of disciplinary stewardship in two primary ways. First, the development of disciplinary stewardship is increasingly presented as not solely taking place within doctoral programs but also within formal and informal education before and beyond the doctorate. Second, disciplinary stewards are increasingly argued to not only be PhD-trained scholars but also bachelor- or masters-trained professionals. To explain, a review of the CID-inspired works over the years suggests that while disciplinary stewardship might be most comprehensively and explicitly developed in doctoral education and practiced in traditional academic roles, it can also be developed in other forms of education and practiced in non-traditional academic roles as well as non-academic professional roles. The idea is that many professionals engage in versions of generation, conservation, and transformation activities that advance and sustain their disciplines without necessarily having pursued doctoral education or having stayed in academia following doctoral education if pursued. A key explanation for these evolutions of the disciplinary stewardship construct is that only a small percentage of individuals pursue doctoral work in the first place, and the majority of those who do pursue a PhD leave academia upon graduation to work outside of traditional academic roles. Thus, if the principal disciplinary stewardship aim of gaining public trust to secure a discipline’s future is left only to doctoral graduates, and particularly those graduates who remain in academia, achieving this aim is unlikely. As such, the construct of disciplinary stewardship can be understood as having evolved to be less concerned with qualification or setting, and more concerned with professional purpose and commitment. Therefore, the argument has become that disciplinary stewardship should be an explicit goal of not just doctoral education, but also undergraduate, master’s, and professional education, as well as ongoing professional development across one’s career.
Recently, an authorship team that included seminal disciplinary stewardship author Golde herself, incorporated these two evolutions of the disciplinary stewardship construct into a Mastery Rubric. In this Mastery Rubric, Rios, Golde, and Tractenberg (2019) provide performance level descriptors of disciplinary stewardship knowledge, skills, and abilities demonstrated at various stages of development. The three components of the Mastery Rubric will be described in the following paragraphs.

First, in terms of the knowledge, skills, and abilities of disciplinary stewardship, Rios et al. (2019) outlined the following eight items:

1. requisite knowledge/situational awareness;
2. create and/or generate new methods/new knowledge;
3. critically evaluate extant or emerging ideas;
4. conserve ideas (or not, if deemed rejectable and non-conservation is justified);
5. responsibly write (disciplinary scholarship);
6. responsibly teach/mentor/model (formally and informally);
7. responsibly apply the knowledge and principles of the discipline;
8. responsibly communicate (outside of scholarly venues). (p. 13-14)

The last seven of these items were essentially derived from the original generic framework of disciplinary stewardship depicted in the CID, albeit with subtle changes to be inclusive of those individuals and activities outside of academia. The first item (i.e., requisite knowledge/situational awareness), however, was added because it had become clear to Rios et al. (2019) over the time the construct has been applied that “knowing when to exhibit which aspect of stewardship itself, [is] something that [needs] to be taught and practiced explicitly” (Rios et al., 2019, p. 14).

Second, in terms of a developmental trajectory, Rios et al. (2019) adopted the European guild structure of novice, apprentice, journeyman, and master stages. They described novices as those just beginning to engage with the discipline. These individuals are focused on their individual pursuit of acquiring disciplinary content knowledge and are not yet able to recognize that there are ramifications that extend beyond them if they fail to act as stewards. While these stages are not tied to particular time frames, a novice could, they suggested, be an undergraduate student in the mid- or late-stages of their degree or an early-stage graduate student. Apprentices were described as actively engaged in the study of the discipline and starting to do so at an independent level, such
as an advanced-stage graduate student. These individuals show a greater degree of reflexivity and awareness of their limitations than novices. Rios et al. suggested apprenticeship is the longest period of a disciplinary steward’s formation. At the stage of journeyman, one is considered a steward according to Rios et al. These are independent scholars or practitioners such as doctoral students, researchers inside or outside academia who do or do not have PhDs, and baccalaureate holders engaged in independent professional practice. A journeyman’s disciplinary and/or professional engagement was described as “uniformly stewardly” (p. 17), and they recognize their lesser developed stewardship capacities and seek development opportunities accordingly. Finally, a master was described as one who is able to diagnose and remedy the deficiencies in the stewardship knowledge, skills, and abilities of those individuals at earlier stages. In other words, a master is one who can develop stewards. However, Rios et al. do not provide detail of that development beyond their suggestion that masters do this through some form of active intervention in the development of individuals at earlier stages, and not just through modeling.

Third, and finally, in their development of performance level descriptors, Rios et al. (2019) mapped their identified disciplinary stewardship knowledge, skills, and abilities onto Bloom’s taxonometric cognitive ability levels of: (1) understand, (2) summarize, (3) apply, (4) analyze/predict, (5) evaluate, and (6) synthesize. They suggested that, generally speaking, novices fulfill the knowledge, skills, and abilities of disciplinary stewardship at Bloom’s levels one and two: understanding and summary levels. Apprentices do so up to and including levels three and four: application and analysis levels. Journeymen function up to levels five and six: evaluation and synthesis. Masters, however, fulfill the knowledge, skills, and abilities of disciplinary stewardship at all the aforementioned levels and are also able to identify the mechanisms by which improvement in these levels can be fostered by those less expert in the discipline.

The final product of the Mastery Rubric is outlined in a three-page table in Rios et al.’s (2019) paper and is beyond the scope of summarizing here, but a single excerpt reads as follows. For item one of the identified knowledge, skills, and abilities of disciplinary stewardship, that is, requisite knowledge/situational awareness, the performance level description for ‘master’ is: “Exercises professional practice standards
and recognizes situations in which stewardship should be modeled and/or applied with respect to themselves and others, and to interactions within and outside of the profession or discipline” (Rios, Golde, & Tractenberg, 2019, p. 22). The authors recommended the idea of disciplinary stewardship portfolios, akin to a professor’s teaching portfolio, in which individuals evidence their achievement at a particular level on the rubric.

Unfortunately, Rios et al. did not offer detail on how the knowledge, skills, and abilities of disciplinary stewardship may be developed at all, let alone to these performance levels (that is, apart from suggesting that masters simply know how to provide development), nor do they address matters of motivation for such development. The evolution of the disciplinary stewardship construct that was reviewed in this section is summarized in Table 3 alongside the original framework for comparison.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original and Evolved Generic Frameworks of Disciplinary Stewardship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generic Framework of Disciplinary Stewardship (i.e., the CID)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need for disciplinary stewardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who disciplinary stewards are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary stewardship is needed as a way to gain public trust and, as a result, secure the future of disciplines and academia more generally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded from generic framework to include not only all doctorate holders but also non-academic practitioners with bachelor and master’s degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scope of disciplinary stewardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded from generic framework to include not only the academic unit but also practitioner workplaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meaning of disciplinary stewardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded from generic framework to include not only the previously identified roles, skills, and principles (slightly modified to be inclusive of non-academic work), but also the awareness to know when to exhibit which role, skill, and principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of disciplinary stewardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded from generic framework to include not only doctoral education but postsecondary education prior to doctoral programs and professional development throughout a scholar’s or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|...
and are engaged with and accountable to the public professional’s career. Development is described as advancing through the stages of novice, apprentice, journeyman, and master. At each stage an individual can fulfill the knowledge, skills, and abilities of a disciplinary steward to increasingly complex performance levels. Masters are described as individuals who can develop disciplinary stewardship in those who are in earlier stages.

**Motivation for disciplinary stewardship development**

Essentially unconsidered

Critique

The following was unconsidered and left disciplinary stewardship less specific, practical, and transformative than possible and necessary:

- implications for and of leadership
- development in areas other than doctoral education
- motivation for disciplinary stewardship development
- diverse viewpoints and alternative visions of disciplinary stewardship

Largely leaves the same previously identified matters unconsidered (i.e., leadership, development, motivation, and diverse viewpoints), meaning more specific, practical, and transformative understandings of the construct remain unknown.

**Section Summary**

The literature reviewed in the chapter thus far has revealed that, over the past 20 years, there has been considerable interest in the construct of disciplinary stewardship as a way to secure the future of disciplines and academia more generally. The original generic framework of the construct, forwarded by Carnegie, focused on improving doctoral education such that graduates would be prepared to generate, conserve, and transform knowledge in their academic unit in ways that would ensure the current and future vigor, quality and integrity of their disciplines. While the CID, the seminal work on the topic, highlighted important priorities about how to move the construct of disciplinary stewardship forward, including developing PhD graduates who have a balance of breadth and depth, are considerate of their discipline’s professional components, and are engaged with and accountable to the public, it also left important matters unconsidered. These unconsidered matters include the leadership implications of and for disciplinary stewardship, development beyond doctoral education, the motivation for disciplinary stewardship development, and diverse viewpoints on and alternative
visions of the construct, all of which limit its specificity, practicality, and transformative potential. Although writing on the construct has evolved in the years since the CID to recognize the need for disciplinary stewardship before and beyond doctoral education and, relatedly, that disciplinary stewards are not just faculty members who are PhD-trained, but also non-academic professionals who have been prepared in bachelors and research-intensive or professional graduate programs, the other important matters left unconsidered by the CID largely remain so.

**Disciplinary Stewardship in Kinesiology**

This second and final section of the chapter presents a review of the kinesiology literature on disciplinary stewardship, the themes of which largely mirror the broader higher education literature on the construct. That is, although the construct of disciplinary stewardship appears to be an established and growing interest in the kinesiology literature over the past 10 years, this literature is mostly superficial, conceptual, and American-authored and focused. Furthermore, this literature can be understood as less specific, practical, and transformative than desired as: (a) the meaning of and need for disciplinary stewardship is unclear due to a lack of specificity and consensus; (b) the development of disciplinary stewardship is limited in consideration, and what exists is neither detailed nor transformative; and (c) consideration of the motivation for disciplinary stewardship development is essentially non-existent.

**An Overview of the Kinesiology Literature on Disciplinary Stewardship:**
**Temporality, Amount, Depth, Type, and Geographical Source**

Like the broader higher education literature previously described, an overview of the kinesiology literature on or related to disciplinary stewardship reveals a seemingly growing interest in the construct but also critical gaps that limit its potential. The following details about the temporality, amount, depth, type, and source of the literature demonstrate this. Between 2011 and 2012, approximately six years after the 2006 publication of the CID volume on disciplinary stewardship, the construct began to be used and advocated for in the broad kinesiology literature (i.e., literature intended for audiences across the sub-disciplines of kinesiology, e.g., Boyce, 2012; Lawson, 2012; Napper-Owen, 2012; Twietmeyer, 2012), as well as in the literature of one of the kinesiology sub-disciplines (i.e., the physical education sub-discipline, e.g., Parker et al.,
2011 and Ward et al., 2011). In the nearly 10 years since the introduction of disciplinary stewardship to the kinesiology literature(s), the construct has been increasingly, although not overwhelmingly, utilized (i.e., approximately 35 works as of late 2019 with two in 2011, four in 2012, four in 2014, two in 2015, 10 in 2016, two in 2017, five in 2018, and six in 2019). These kinesiology works have employed the construct of disciplinary stewardship to varying degrees of depth, however. That is, the vast majority of these works have invoked the construct in an incidental or peripheral way (i.e., in passing, without definition or explanation; e.g., Cardinal, 2019; Charles, 2016; DiGiacinto et al., 2019; Feingold & Estes, 2016; Fischman, 2014; Hersman, 2018; Knudson, 2016; Lambdin, 2016; Lawson, 2012; MacPhail & Schaefer, 2019; Richards & Graber, 2019; Richards, 2015; Russell, 2014; Stylianou et al., 2017; Templin et al., 2019; Twietmeyer, 2012, 2015, 2018; Ward et al., 2011), a small number have applied the construct in some detail (i.e., multiple mentions, some definition or explanation; e.g., Hochstetler, 2018; Lawson & Kretchmar, 2017; Lorusso & Richards, 2018; Parker et al., 2011; Napper-Owen, 2012; Russell et al., 2016), and fewer still are expressly about disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology in entirety. Key examples of kinesiology works that take disciplinary stewardship as the main focus include: Lawson’s (2014) *Quest*-published National Association for Kinesiology in Higher Education (NAKHE) lecture about disciplinary stewardship as an important leadership investment for the future of kinesiology; Lawson’s (2016) *Quest*-published NAKHE lecture about the need for transformative and boundary-bridging disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology; Frank’s (2016) *Quest*-published NAKHE lecture on understanding the essence and impact of disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology as about ‘sweating the small stuff’; and Estes and Germain’s (2016) article in the *Quest* special issue on the future of kinesiology in higher education about kinesiology’s scholarly associations as disciplinary stewards of the future. These four works are representative of the previously mentioned kinesiology literature that incidentally invoke disciplinary stewardship, as well as the broader higher education literature reviewed in the previous section, in two key ways: type and geographic source. First, in terms of type, virtually all of the kinesiology literature invoking the construct of disciplinary stewardship is conceptual rather than empirical in nature. Furthermore, in those few works that include empirical data, the construct of
disciplinary stewardship was not the phenomenon under investigation. Second, in terms of geographic source, the construct of disciplinary stewardship has been nearly exclusively addressed in American kinesiology forums (such as NAKHE and *Quest*), by American-based scholars, and in relation to the American higher education system and kinesiology context (which, of course, differs from other national contexts in important ways).

In sum, this overview of the kinesiology literature on or related to disciplinary stewardship has revealed that it is largely superficial, conceptual, and American in nature and, as such, the construct’s potential is, at present, considerably limited. In the next section, the kinesiology literature on and related to disciplinary stewardship is reviewed in more detail to reveal how the construct’s meaning, need, development, and motivation have been written about in this discipline.

**A Review of Disciplinary Stewardship in the Kinesiology Literature: Meaning, Need, Development, and Motivation**

A review of the kinesiology literature on or related to disciplinary stewardship provides few clear answers to questions about the meaning of, need for, development of, and motivation for the construct. In terms of the meaning of and need for disciplinary stewardship, this review reveals there is a lack of specificity and consensus on these two matters in the kinesiology literature which leaves them unclear. Furthermore, this review also reveals that the development of disciplinary stewardship has not been considered by many scholars within kinesiology, and the few considerations that do exist are neither detailed nor transformative. Finally, it is also revealed in this review that there has been virtually zero consideration of the motivation for disciplinary stewardship development in the kinesiology literature.

**Depictions of the Meaning of Disciplinary Stewardship within the Kinesiology Literature: Unclear**

Despite the aforementioned growing use of the construct of disciplinary stewardship in the kinesiology literature, there is not a great deal of clarity in this literature as to what the construct means in this particular discipline (i.e., the purpose, activities, and scope of disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology and the persons involved). The following subsections describe that this lack of clarity stems from the realities that:
(a) much of the kinesiology literature that invokes disciplinary stewardship lacks an explanation or definition of the construct’s meaning; (b) the small number of kinesiology works that do offer explanations or definitions of disciplinary stewardship’s meaning do not extend the generic framework nor provide discipline-specific details; and (c) those few kinesiology works that do provide extensions of the generic framework and/or discipline-specific details offer some varied and even contrasting perspectives of the construct’s meaning.

**Lacking Explanation and Definition.** One reason the meaning of disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology is unclear is that many of the kinesiology articles that invoke the construct do not offer an explanation or definition and, often times, do not even provide a citation for further reference (e.g., Cardinal, 2019; Charles, 2016; Culp, 2016; Feingold & Estes, 2016; Fischman, 2014; Richards, 2015; Stylianou et al., 2017). Instead, the reader must infer the construct’s meaning given how it is used, and sometimes there is limited detail from which to go on. For example, in her lecture on ‘Mentoring: A convenience or convergence,’ Hersman (2018) referred to “stewards of our profession and not simply faculty members” (p. 140), with no further explanation. In this case, one can gather that she sees some distinctions between scholars who are ‘just’ faculty members and those who are disciplinary stewards, but the nature of that difference is not made clear. What muddies an understanding of the meaning of disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology further is that many of these works infer different meanings.

**Lacking Extensions to and Discipline-Specific Details of the Generic Framework.** Another reason the meaning of disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology is unclear is because many of the kinesiology works that offer basic explanations or definitions of the construct do not extend the generic framework nor provide discipline-specific details. That is, most of these works cite but do not expand much, if at all, on Golde and Walker’s/the CID’s (2006) intentionally generic depiction of disciplinary stewardship (e.g., Lorusso & Richards, 2018; Parker et al., 2011; Napper-Owen, 2012; Russell, 2014; Russell et al., 2016; Ward et al., 2011). Some other kinesiology works offering basic explanations or definitions of the construct do not cite the CID and instead cite, but again do not extend, kinesiology author Lawson’s (2014, 2016) works which draw on the CID (e.g., Hochstetler, 2018; Knudson, 2016; Lawson & Kretchmar, 2017;
MacPhail & Schaefer, 2019; Richards & Graber, 2019; Russell et al., 2016; Templin et al., 2019). All of this to say that many of the kinesiology works that offer some substantive explanation of disciplinary stewardship simply restate, whether in direct quotations or paraphrased language, the generic framework notion that the meaning of disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology is about faculty members being caretakers of quality in the discipline, often exclusive of professional components, and only a few of those works continue on to include the detail that disciplinary stewardship entails a set of roles and skills (i.e., generation, conservation, transformation) as well as a set of principles (i.e., action- and future-oriented, morally courageous and collective). The result is that a kinesiology-specific understanding of disciplinary stewardship is not made clear in any of these works.

The Few Extensions to and Discipline-Specific Details of the Generic Framework are Varied. Although there are some kinesiology works that offer extensions to and discipline-specific details of the generic framework, the picture of what disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology means remains unclear because these works offer varied or contrasting depictions. What follows is a description of the three main conceptualizations of the meaning of disciplinary stewardship from the kinesiology literature that extend the generic framework and/or offer discipline-specific details. These three conceptualizations largely originate from the four previously identified kinesiology works that take disciplinary stewardship as their primary focus (although are supported in part by the various kinesiology works that invoke the construct in a peripheral way): Lawson (2014, 2016), Frank (2016), and Estes and Germain (2016). These three conceptualizations include depictions of disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology as: (a) faculty members’ collective leadership both within and beyond the academic unit that is transformative and boundary-bridging by focusing on ethics, values, moral imperatives, and social responsibilities; (b) about a scholar’s beliefs and carried out in everyday tasks within their academic unit, the effectiveness of which is dependent upon the quality of their relationships; and (c) a virtue of a PhD-trained scholar’s character and carried out as academic service to the discipline conducted outside of one’s paid institutional duties.

Disciplinary Stewardship in Kinesiology as Faculty Members’ Collective Leadership Within and Beyond the Academic Unit that is Transformative and
Boundary-Bridging by Focusing on Ethics, Values, Moral Imperatives, and Social Responsibilities. This conceptualization of the meaning of disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology constitutes a major extension to the generic framework as it considers the construct’s relationship to leadership explicitly. Leadership, as previously mentioned, was identified in 2006 by the CID as in need of future consideration but was not adequately addressed in the years since. This extension is based primarily on Lawson’s (2014, 2016) work. In his 2014 NAKHE lecture he not only acknowledged the importance of leadership-for-disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology, that is, the need to invest in the development of formal academic leaders in kinesiology who support disciplinary stewardship, but more importantly emphasized the need to focus on leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship, that is, the notion that all scholars in kinesiology are responsible for disciplinary stewardship as a form of distributed, collective leadership. This notion of disciplinary stewardship as the collective responsibility of all scholars in kinesiology has since been supported by Hochstetler (2018). The notion of disciplinary stewardship as a form or act of leadership has also been alluded to by other scholars in kinesiology including Charles (2016), Knudson (2016), and Lawson and Kretchmar (2017).

Another way in which Lawson extended the generic framework was by pushing back on the CID’s emphasis on the academic unit as the primary focus of disciplinary stewardship to instead include and emphasize focus beyond the unit. He offered the distinction of stewarding the home organizational unit and stewarding the discipline and suggested that “you can have one… without the other… [but] both are needed, and together they necessitate a major reorientation for many faculty” (2014, p. 278). Lawson’s emphasis on disciplinary stewardship action beyond the unit is reflected in the historical examples of disciplinary stewardship he identified. He highlighted instances of scholars in kinesiology who have authored persuasive position papers about disciplinary issues. These included the landmark work of Henry (1964) who seminally argued for an academic discipline (rather than professional field) of physical education in higher education, and Newell (1990a, 1990b, 1990c) who rather famously argued for the label ‘kinesiology’ to become the name for the study of human movement in higher education (previously referred to as physical education). Lawson explained that the authors of these
special, pivotal publications…[are] stewards of the discipline. Their sometimes passionate debates on the name, scope, and missions for the discipline follow suit. Regardless of the authors’ and proponents’ preferences, they were stewarding the discipline when they acted as academic citizens when they offered to chart its course into the future. Sometimes conserving kinesiology, sometimes restoring it, and at other times transforming it, their scholarship has been a form of leadership in service of the discipline. (p. 285)

In line with his emphasis on disciplinary stewardship as going beyond the unit to the larger discipline, Lawson (2014) provided some contemporary kinesiology-specific priorities for disciplinary stewards. One such priority was the need to not “view today’s sub-disciplinary organization and structure and kinesiology’s overall disciplinary organization as ‘as good as it gets,’” (p. 282) and instead to restore holism and to innovate, that is, to “reconfigure relationships among the sub-disciplines, and envision as well as create entirely new sub-disciplinary specializations” (p. 282). The particular priority of disciplinary holism, especially via maintenance of the place of the humanities in kinesiology, has also been tagged as a needed contemporary action of disciplinary stewards in kinesiology by scholars such as Twietmeyer (2012) who has argued it be a “necessary” (p. 235) priority.

A further extension to the generic framework is detailed in Lawson’s subsequent (2016) NAKHE lecture. In this follow-up analysis he argued that, within the dominant generic framework of disciplinary stewardship, the notion of caretaking is depicted as primarily maintenance- or preservation-oriented. Lawson advocated instead for an alternative and contrasting framework of disciplinary stewardship in which caretaking is more reform- and transformation-oriented. He began this argument by describing that it is incumbent upon disciplinary stewards to analyze and be responsive to the contextual realities in which they find themselves in order for their discipline to survive and thrive. As such, Lawson contended that while a maintenance-oriented version of disciplinary stewardship caretaking – which, in kinesiology’s case could translate to preserving and improving the existing sub-disciplinary organizational structure – may have been appropriate in the 20th Century university context in which prestige was the predominant priority and thus isolation for differentiation purposes was accepted, this is no longer the
case in the 21st Century. Instead, Lawson argued that, in this new century, accountability for societal impact has overcome prestige as the predominant academic priority and therefore an anti-isolationist approach that evidences societal connectivity is required. He suggested, therefore, that disciplinary stewards of kinesiology must re-evaluate the discipline’s inherited sub-disciplinary structure and make changes as needed to the boundaries between sub-disciplines, with neighboring disciplines, and to society, such that interdisciplinary research, teaching, and outreach may become more possible. Despite Lawson’s advocacy for disciplinary stewardship work at all the discipline’s many boundaries, it is the singular boundary of kinesiology and society that other scholars in kinesiology writing about disciplinary stewardship have focused on, specifically as it relates to the responsibility to explain and promote kinesiology’s societal relevance and contributions (e.g., Charles, 2016; Hochstetler, 2018; Lorusso & Richards, 2018).

MacPhail and Schaefer (2019) take Lawson’s broader view, however, and suggest disciplinary stewardship caretaking involves attending to and transforming, as needed, kinesiology’s many boundaries.

As a final extension, Lawson (2016) also provided insight into the type of reflection that disciplinary stewards of kinesiology need to engage in if they are to pursue a transformative version of disciplinary stewardship that is responsive to the need to be accountable for kinesiology’s societal impact. He suggested there are “consequential questions for stewards and their acts of stewardship [for example]: (a) Toward what ends? (b) In whose interests? (c) What are the likely consequences of eliminating Kinesiology or some of its sub-disciplines?” (p. 104). Lawson and Kretchmar (2017) expanded upon the type of reflection Lawson had previously described by calling it “stewardship-oriented dialogue… [which] requires a return to first order questions regarding purposes, ethics, values, moral imperatives, and social responsibilities” (p. 195). They suggest that such dialogue will “provide important priorities and opportunities for disciplinary stewards committed to renewing kinesiology, safeguarding its future, and serving future students and society’s members” (Lawson & Kretchmar, 2017, p. 199).

Disciplinary Stewardship in Kinesiology as about a Scholar’s Beliefs and as Carried out in Everyday Tasks Within Their Academic Unit, the Effectiveness of Which is Dependent Upon the Quality of Their Relationships. This conceptualization of
the meaning of disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology extends the generic framework as it asserts, in a way that the existing literature on the construct does not, that disciplinary stewardship is rooted in a scholar’s beliefs and thus impacts every professional decision a scholar makes. In other words, this extension suggests that disciplinary stewardship is “in the small stuff of what people do in their [professional] lives” (Frank, 2016, p. 119). This extension is based primarily in Frank’s (2016) NAKHE lecture, however, an emphasis on beliefs as the root of disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology has also been argued by others such as Charles and Charles (2016) who speak of disciplinary stewardship as about “putting philosophy first” (p. 374). Connected to Frank’s assertion about the everyday, belief-driven nature of disciplinary stewardship, is her further extension that the establishment of “honest relationships” (p. 119) with students, colleagues, programs, and units is “at the heart of good stewardship” (p. 122). She has explained that honest relationships are essential to disciplinary stewardship because only a “superficial level of engagement and care” (p. 127) is possible without understanding and trust. Quality relationships have since also been highlighted as part of disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology by Hersman (2018) and Knudson (2018), although primarily in the context of colleagues mentoring one another.

Beyond the aforementioned extensions, Frank (2016) also filled in the generic framework through her provision of some brief discipline-specific examples of disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology. She informally collected these examples via the self-report of a small number of NAKHE members. These examples included: an early career scholar diversifying the undergraduate curriculum he instructed to reflect a more global view; a senior scholar’s many years of leading scholarship on health and fitness; a doctoral advisor’s mentorship of graduate students from minority backgrounds; a department chair’s support of junior faculty; a program director taking on the administrative burden regarding licensure on behalf of others; and executive members of a scholarly association championing gender equity. Frank also reviewed how the namesake of her invited memorial lecture, physical education pioneer Delphine Hanna, was an example of a disciplinary steward given that she “developed the discipline into something better than what it was when she entered it” (p. 122). Examples of Hanna’s efforts include developing the first physical education degree program for women,
advancing gender equity in the purposes and pursuits of movement, mentoring individuals who would go on to become prominent physical education leaders themselves, vastly improving and expanding the gymnasium facilities at her university, and ultimately earning the first full professorship in physical education awarded to a woman.

What can be understood from Frank’s (2016) offering of kinesiology-specific examples of disciplinary stewardship is that her view of the construct’s scope differs from some of the previously reviewed literature in important ways and, in doing so, blurs a clear understanding of the construct. First, Frank’s examples depict the scope of disciplinary stewardship as focused more singularly on the academic unit than on a balance between the unit and the larger discipline and society as Lawson (2014, 2016) and the evolved framework have depicted. Second, Frank’s examples reflect a more maintenance- or preservationist-oriented view of disciplinary stewardship than the transformative version Lawson (2016) advocated for.

Disciplinary Stewardship in Kinesiology as a Virtue of a PhD-Trained Scholar’s Character and Carried Out as Academic Service to the Discipline Outside One’s Paid Institutional Duties. This third and final conceptualization of the meaning of disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology offers extensions which stem primarily from Estes and Germain’s (2016) work. Their central argument is that a disciplinary steward of kinesiology is one who has advanced a “life well-lived” (p. 10) as a scholar, and that one’s “way of living as a scholar” (p. 8) is determined by their character. To explain what they meant by character, Estes and Germain drew on the works of scholars who otherwise do not appear in the general or kinesiology-specific disciplinary stewardship literature. For example, they highlighted American education scholar Ernest Boyer’s (1990) view of a scholar’s character as depending on the three virtues, or dispositions, of integrity, perseverance, and courage. Estes and Germain suggested that disciplinary stewardship, which they described as “the careful and responsible management of something entrusted to one’s care” (p. 6), be considered the fourth virtue of a scholar’s character. By depicting disciplinary stewardship as part of a scholar’s character, Estes and Germain placed emphasis on a scholar’s way of being in the discipline, or their ontology, rather than on their disciplinary knowledge, or their epistemology. In this way,
Estes and Germain’s views have some parallels with Frank’s (2016) views that disciplinary stewardship is about a scholar’s beliefs and what they do in their professional life (although important differences with Frank’s views regarding the scope of disciplinary stewardship are highlighted in the following section).

Another important extension of the generic framework provided by Estes and Germain (2016) is their portrayal of the duties of a disciplinary steward of kinesiology, or what a disciplinary steward of kinesiology does. They draw on Scottish philosopher Allistair MacIntyre’s (1980) notions of “institutions” and “practices” (p. 194) to, respectively, make a distinction between what happens in the name of kinesiology in universities and what happens in the name of kinesiology in the discipline beyond universities. This aspect of their argument is similar to Lawson (2014) in that they distinguish between a scholar’s actions in these two realms. However, their view differs from Lawson’s view that disciplinary stewardship should happen within both of these spaces. Instead, they argue that duties paid by the university cannot be considered disciplinary stewardship as they primarily serve and benefit the vitality of the university-based components of kinesiology, or the ‘institution’ of kinesiology, and not the broader discipline or ‘practice’ of kinesiology. This suggests that the majority of the examples of disciplinary stewardship listed by Frank (2016), which largely took place within the academic unit, would not be considered disciplinary stewardship actions by Estes and Germain. In contrast, they argue duties beyond one’s institutional paid work, such as editorial work, presiding over academic societies, publishing important works, and so forth, primarily serves and benefits the vitality of the discipline or ‘practice’ of kinesiology, and, as such, can be considered disciplinary stewardship. This depiction of disciplinary stewardship as, essentially, academic service to the discipline and conducted outside of the university has also been forwarded (albeit less extensively) by others in kinesiology such as Napper-Owen (2012) and Cardinal (2019).

As a final extension, Estes and Germain (2016) make a distinction between who they believe can and cannot be considered a disciplinary steward of kinesiology. Specifically, they distinguish between those who are masters-prepared professionals and are employed as instructors in kinesiology units, for example, and those who are PhD-trained faculty members. They suggest that because the former are neither employed nor
trained to advance the discipline’s body of knowledge via research and, instead, are primarily employed and trained to serve the institution via instruction, they are “not qualified to be a steward of the discipline” (p. 11) by virtue of the duties of their position and their training. This distinction between those who are PhD graduates and those who are not has been raised by other scholars in kinesiology in relation to disciplinary stewardship, although in a contrasting way. Examples include Boyce (2012) and Gill, Brown, and Reifsteck (2014), who, in their articles on the EdD degree in kinesiology, draw on other Carnegie work (i.e., not the CID) to suggest that graduates of these professionally-oriented doctoral programs are “stewards of practice” (Boyce, 2012, p. 25) or individuals who contribute to “stewardship of the profession” (Gill et al., 2014, p. 223). Thus, Estes and Germain’s views sit in stark contrast to the work of Boyce and Gill et al., as well as the evolved framework, as these sources suggest that non-PhD prepared professionals are also to be considered disciplinary stewards.

Depictions of the Need for Disciplinary Stewardship within the Kinesiology Literature: Unclear

Much like the situation regarding the meaning of disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology, the need for disciplinary stewardship is also unclear in the kinesiology literature. To explain, much of the kinesiology literature that invokes disciplinary stewardship either: (a) does not offer an explanation of its need at all (e.g., Stylianou et al., 2017; Twietmeyer, 2012, 2015); or (b) makes a vague assertion that it is needed to improve the quality of the discipline in some way which would, by extension, secure the discipline’s survival (e.g., Cardinal, 2019; Charles, 2016; DiGiacinto et al., 2019; Fischmann, 2019; Frank, 2016; Knudson, 2016; Lorusso & Richards, 2018; MacPhail & Schaefer, 2019; Richards, 2015; Richards & Graber 2019; Templin et al., 2019). Furthermore, in the few instances in which the need for disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology has been articulated with more specificity, the arguments offered do not provide much consensus when considered together. That is, while they all suggest disciplinary stewardship is needed as a response to contemporary academic issues for disciplinary survival, they focus on different issues and advocate different versions of the construct accordingly. For example, as mentioned in the previous section on the meaning of disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology, in 2014 Lawson described that disciplinary
stewardship was needed to respond to academia’s high-stakes expectations regarding prestige. As such, Lawson suggested that a version of disciplinary stewardship that improved the existing sub-disciplinary version of the discipline, and thereby elevated the discipline’s quality and stature, was appropriate. As a further example, in 2016 Lawson’s analysis evolved to suggest that disciplinary stewardship was needed to respond to the new chief academic expectation of accountability, which he argued had surpassed the expectation of prestige in terms of priority. He argued this new expectation required a different version of disciplinary stewardship, one that re-evaluated the inherited discipline and its various boundaries and re-organized it in ways that promoted societal connectivity as needed. As a final example, Estes and Germain (2016) argued, somewhat similarly to Lawson (2016) and the evolved generic framework, that disciplinary stewardship was needed to respond to the public’s loss of trust in institutions of higher education. Given this view, Estes and Germain suggested that the most appropriate version of disciplinary stewardship was one that focused on the professional character of scholars in kinesiology such that public trust could be enhanced. It is important to note that all of this diverges from the CID and its generic framework, which presented disciplinary stewardship as needed in response to outdated, suboptimal doctoral education that was subsequently jeopardizing disciplines and academia more broadly. It must be noted, however, that there are a very small number of kinesiology works about or related to disciplinary stewardship that do connect the need for the construct to suboptimal doctoral education, and most of these works are specific to the kinesiology sub-discipline of physical education; e.g., Napper-Owen, 2012; Parker et al., 2011; Russell et al., 2016; Ward et al., 2011. All things considered, the need for disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology is not clearly defined in the literature.

Depictions of the Development of Disciplinary Stewardship within the Kinesiology Literature: Limited in Number and neither Detailed nor Transformative

Most of the kinesiology literature about or related to disciplinary stewardship does not address how those within the discipline might be developed into disciplinary stewards. While there are a few kinesiology works which explicitly acknowledge that becoming a disciplinary steward is not automatic (e.g., via graduation from doctoral education or otherwise), cannot be assumed, and thus must be actively developed (Estes
& Germain, 2016; Lawson, 2014; Napper-Owen, 2012), only a small set of kinesiology literature provides consideration of how disciplinary stewardship might actually be developed, and this literature is not particularly specific nor transformative in nature. Although these few existing considerations of the development of disciplinary stewardship do not include much in the way of specific development strategies, they do contain general comments about: (a) potential sites for disciplinary stewardship development, such as doctoral education, education before and beyond doctoral programs, and scholarly associations; and (b) the needed style of development. All of this is reviewed in the following paragraphs.

Like the CID’s generic framework, some of the kinesiology literature that addresses disciplinary stewardship development has focused on doctoral education (e.g., Lorusso & Richards, 2018; Napper-Owen, 2012; Parker et al., 2011; Russell, 2015). The arguments in this set of kinesiology literature bear similarities to the themes from the CID’s essays. In essence, these kinesiology works suggest that disciplinary stewardship is instilled via various socialization processes during the doctoral degree. Examples of such socialization processes described to contribute to disciplinary stewardship are provided by Napper-Owen (2012) who has listed: quality, committed mentorship relationships between doctoral students and their faculty mentors/advisors/supervisors; preparing doctoral students for all the roles they will fulfill as faculty members, that is, not merely research but also teaching and service; engaging students in collaborative and interdisciplinary projects; and helping students to understand issues of governance by encouraging their participation in university and/or professional service efforts. Parker et al. (2011) have also written about disciplinary stewardship development in doctoral education, although their work is specific to the physical education sub-discipline in the United States. For their part, Parker and colleagues contended that a core knowledge base within physical education doctoral education must exist if disciplinary stewards are to be developed in these programs. A final example of kinesiology authors writing about disciplinary stewardship development in doctoral education include Lorusso and Richards (2018), who argue for a doctoral curriculum that has “an explicit emphasis on morals” (p. 17).
In contrast, other kinesiology literature is more reflective of the evolved framework and has argued that disciplinary stewardship development should happen before doctoral education (Charles, 2016) as well as throughout scholars’ careers (Estes & Germain, 2016; Lawson, 2014). For example, writing about disciplinary stewardship development in undergraduate education, Charles (2016) has called for a curriculum that delivers values education in every kinesiology course (not only those courses philosophical in nature). He wrote of “a future-oriented curriculum that is premised upon the examination and explication of carefully selected and monitored values” (p. 1). He acknowledged, however, “the quandary facing us is which values to select and how to effectively base a curriculum on them” (p. 1). Writing about disciplinary stewardship development beyond doctoral education, Estes and Germain (2016) argued the PhD is only where development “begins” (p. 8). They explained that,

this way of living of a scholar [i.e., disciplinary stewardship] needs to be discussed continually… throughout the lifespan of the faculty from ‘birth,’ or introduction into the discipline, and finally through retirement or when the scholar leaves the field. In so doing the faculty becomes acculturated into the discipline, sensitive to its needs and aware of the trends and issues that both nourish and threaten the discipline. The faculty then takes a leadership role within the discipline. (p. 8)

The last sentence in this quote is reflective of Estes and Germain’s other views that, like the evolved framework, there are various stages of disciplinary stewardship development. Instead of the developmental stage-dependent labels of novice, apprentice, journeyman, and master used by Rios et al. (2019), Estes and Germain outlined the career stage-dependent labels of doctoral student, junior faculty, mid-level faculty, and senior faculty. They argued some senior faculty might deserve “designation or use of the word steward in acknowledgement of the life well lived by the scholar” (p. 10). Furthermore, they argued that it is these select senior faculty, like Rios et al.’s ‘masters’, who are the ones who develop future disciplinary stewards (although the nature of that development is not made clear). This view of senior scholars as the developers of disciplinary stewards has also been alluded to by some scholars in kinesiology, specifically Frank (2016) and Knudson (2016).
Regarding where career-spanning disciplinary stewardship development might occur, Lawson (2014) highlighted both academic units and cross-disciplinary scholarly associations as key sites. Estes and Germain (2016), however, have argued that only the latter are realistic sites. They explained that disciplinary stewardship development will not occur in the institution where the scholar works because he or she will be occupied with the daily duties of a faculty – teaching, research, and service. It is likely that the scholar will be most engaged in stewardship activities when he or she is meeting with other scholars interested in the discipline itself [i.e., within scholarly associations]. (p. 8)

As for what disciplinary stewardship development within scholarly associations might entail, Estes and Germain have written in general terms about these associations as places where the discussion and reinforcement of scholarly virtues can take place.

Regardless of when and where disciplinary stewardship development happens, Lawson (2016) has argued that different styles/forms of development will lead to different types of disciplinary stewards. His argument about development is in line with his view of disciplinary stewardship as taking two forms, that is the dominant preservationist form and alternative transformative forms. He asserted,

Readers seeking a narrower perspective on stewards and stewardship—with the aim of preserving and strengthening the inherited version of Kinesiology—can focus on four basic priorities. Following Golde (2006), they can examine and improve doctoral programs, enhancing them with special curricular experiences designed to prepare stewards. At the same time, readers can make plans for preparing, supporting, and rewarding current faculty members, especially tenured and senior ones, for their respective roles and responsibilities as stewards and collective acts of stewardship, extending to their roles as mentors for newly hired colleagues who learned about stewardship in their doctoral programs. The third priority involves the preparation and support of deans, directors, and department chairs whose support is critical to all plans for stewards and stewardship. The roles and responsibilities of scholarly and professional associations are the fourth priority. (p. 113)
If, however, the desire is to prepare transformative disciplinary stewards of kinesiology, scholars in this discipline will need to return to the drawing board to generate more innovative/radical development plans.

**Depictions of the Motivation for Disciplinary Stewardship Development within the Kinesiology Literature: Essentially Non-Existent**

Of the four areas covered by this review (i.e., meaning, need, development, and motivation), motivation for disciplinary stewardship development has been the component least addressed in the kinesiology literature. This is consistent with the broader higher education literature reviewed in the previous section of the chapter. In the rare instances in which motivation for disciplinary stewardship has been considered in the kinesiology literature, it has been in relation to the need for and challenges of such motivation. While no specific strategies for motivating disciplinary stewardship development in kinesiology have been offered, Lawson (2014, 2016) has offered a potential way forward. All of this is reviewed in the following paragraphs.

In terms of the need to motivate participation in disciplinary stewardship development within kinesiology, evidence can be seen in Stylianou et al.’s (2017) investigation into the research training experiences of doctoral students and early career academics in the sub-discipline of physical education. The findings of this investigation revealed that participating individuals did not consider themselves to be disciplinary stewards nor did they consider themselves to be responsible for disciplinary stewardship actions (i.e., actions to secure the future of the discipline despite prominent threats to this sub-disciplinary area). The need to motivate participation in disciplinary stewardship is furthered evidenced by Frank (2016), who has argued that the “failure in [the] execution [of disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology] may be attributed to the fact that [disciplinary stewardship] may be overwhelming and choosing not to accept our responsibilities to stewardship is often without consequence” (p. 123).

In terms of the challenges of motivating disciplinary stewardship development in kinesiology, Lawson (2014, 2016) has raised important reflections. He has stated:

Deans, directors, and department chairs cannot force faculty members to become stewards of their discipline, nor can they require doctoral program faculty to emphasize this career orientation in their respective doctoral seminars. In the
same vein, leaders of professional and scholarly associations cannot strong arm their members in support of the disciplinary stewardship agenda. What then, can persons in formal leadership positions do to endorse, launch, advance, and sustain this agenda? The literature is curiously silent on this important, practical question. It also is silent on another one. Is disciplinary stewardship at odds with faculty members’ careers, peer governed communities of practice, and their specialized scholarly/professional associations? (2014, p. 282)

While Lawson did not offer a particular solution to the challenge of motivation for disciplinary stewardship development in kinesiology, he did offer a path forward. He has argued, “With field-wide disciplinary stewardship as the desired outcome, nothing short of a social movement is needed” (2014, p. 282). In this vein, he has recommended the social movement research of Benford and Snow (2000), particularly their theory of collective action frames. Application of this theory suggests that not only should the what and why of disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology be determined (i.e., what is disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology and why it is needed?), but also the matters of how and how best (i.e., how can disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology be developed and how can scholars in kinesiology be persuaded to commit to such development?). This social movement theory also emphasizes that consideration of motivation must involve careful attention to language. Therefore, Lawson (2014) has suggested that questions such as the following must be considered: “what is the main message needed to recruit, engage, and sustain the commitments of disciplinary stewards?… How can leaders craft a field-wide agenda that is simultaneously local, national, and international in ways that matter?” (p. 284-285). Lawson (2014) has made it clear that no universal answers to the question of how to motivate participation in disciplinary stewardship development do or could exist, as contexts matter and constantly change. He has also made it clear, however, that this does not mean that the matter of motivation should not be considered and that tailored and/or transferrable solutions cannot be generated. Lawson has also argued that any proposal for the motivation of disciplinary stewardship development in kinesiology must address the vested interests of faculty members if it is to be successful, particularly the profound influences of individuals’ career self-interest and their sub-disciplinary frame. He argued that future considerations of how to motivate scholars in kinesiology to
participate in disciplinary stewardship development must address the challenges of: (a) how to persuade scholars in kinesiology to appreciate the symbiotic relationship between the health of the kinesiology discipline and the health of their careers; and (b) what it will “take to organize and mobilize kinesiology’s sub-disciplinary tribes with their respective cultural traditions, convincing members that they must actively steward the whole in tandem to their respective sub-disciplinary parts” (Lawson, 2016, p. 113).

**Section Summary**

The literature reviewed in the second and final half of this chapter suggests that the construct of disciplinary stewardship appears to be a burgeoning interest in the kinesiology literature over the past 10 years. A review of this kinesiology literature also reveals, however, that it is largely superficial, conceptual, and American-authored and -focused, as well as that important aspects of the construct are either unclear or unconsidered. Specifically, the meaning of and need for disciplinary stewardship is unclear in the kinesiology literature due to the provision of either limited detail beyond the generic framework or contrasting details. Furthermore, the development and motivation of disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology is unknown as these matters have by-and-large not been addressed. The number of matters unaddressed and the limited detail offered beyond the generic frameworks makes it clear that the construct needs to be engaged with more deeply by more scholars in kinesiology so that it is fleshed out in discipline-specific terms as the CID intended. The contrasting details raised, although few in number, highlight the items to be prioritized in the debate moving forward, these include: the particular academic issues disciplinary stewardship is needed to respond to and how transformative a version of the construct they require within this particular discipline; the companion questions of who can be considered a disciplinary steward of kinesiology (i.e., bachelor, masters, and/or research-intensive or professional doctoral program graduates) and the scope of their stewardship (i.e., inside or outside the academic unit, or both); the notion of leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship; and the use of social movement research and theory as a framework for disciplinary stewardship motivation in kinesiology. The review of kinesiology literature on disciplinary stewardship that is presented in this chapter is summarized in Table 4 alongside the original and generic frameworks for comparison.
### Table 4

**Original and Evolved Generic Frameworks and a Review of Disciplinary Stewardship in Kinesiology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The need for disciplinary stewardship</th>
<th>Generic Framework of Disciplinary Stewardship (i.e., the CID)</th>
<th>Evolved Generic Framework of Disciplinary Stewardship</th>
<th>Disciplinary Stewardship in Kinesiology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary stewardship is needed because doctoral programs are not keeping pace with rapid changes to higher education and, as a result, not preparing graduates who can be trusted to ensure the vigor, quality, integrity, and, ultimately, future of their discipline and academia more generally</td>
<td>Disciplinary stewardship is needed as a way to gain public trust and, as a result, secure the future of disciplines and academia more generally</td>
<td>Unclear as the need is either: (a) not indicated; (b) vaguely described as some type of disciplinary improvement that would by extension secure the future; or (c) described as in response to various contemporary academic issues (e.g., prestige, accountability, loss of public trust), all of which require different forms of disciplinary stewardship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who disciplinary stewards are</td>
<td>All doctorate holders</td>
<td>Expanded from generic framework to include not only all doctorate holders but also non-academic practitioners with bachelor and masters degrees</td>
<td>Unclear as descriptions vary. Such varied examples include: all faculty members; senior scholars; PhD-trained faculty only and not masters prepared instructors; and EdD graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scope of disciplinary stewardship</td>
<td>Academic unit</td>
<td>Expanded from generic framework to include not only the academic department but also practitioner workplaces</td>
<td>Unclear as descriptions contrast. Some portray disciplinary stewardship as: within the academic unit only; beyond the academic unit only; and both within and beyond the academic unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meaning of disciplinary stewardship</td>
<td>Set of roles and skills (for competence), including generation, conservation, and transformation; as well as a set of principles (for moral direction), including being action- and future-oriented, morally courageous, and collective</td>
<td>Expanded from generic framework to include not only the previously identified roles, skills, and principles (slightly modified to be inclusive of non-academic practitioners), but also the awareness to know when to exhibit which role, skill, and principle</td>
<td>Unclear as the meaning is either: (a) not provided; (b) lacking extensions to and discipline-specific details of generic framework; or (c) contrasts with other extensions to and discipline-specific details of generic framework. The three major (often contrasting) conceptualizations include disciplinary stewardship as: (a) faculty members’ collective leadership both within and beyond the academic unit that is transformative and boundary-bridging by focusing on ethics, values, moral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The development of disciplinary stewardship

Development happens in doctoral education and focuses on preparing scholars who: have a balance of breadth and depth, are considerate of their discipline’s professional components, and are engaged with and accountable to the public.

Expanded from generic framework to include not only doctoral education but postsecondary education prior to doctoral programs and professional development throughout a scholar’s or professional’s career. Development is described as advancing through the stages of novice, apprentice, journeyman, and master. At each stage an individual can fulfill the knowledge, skills, and abilities of a disciplinary steward to increasingly complex performance levels. Masters are described as individuals who can develop disciplinary stewardship in those who are in earlier stages.

Motivation for disciplinary stewardship development

Essentially unconsidered

Essentially unconsidered

Essentially unconsidered.

Some acknowledgement of the need for and challenges of motivation, but no strategies offered. Social movement theory and research presented as a suggested path forward.

Critique

The following was unconsidered and left disciplinary stewardship less specific, practical, and transformative than possible and necessary: -implications for and of leadership

Largely leaves the same previously identified matters unconsidered (i.e., leadership, development, motivation, and diverse viewpoints), meaning more specific, practical, and transformative.

Largely leaves the same previously identified matters unconsidered (i.e., leadership, development, motivation, and diverse viewpoints), meaning more specific, practical, and transformative.

Most literature on or related to disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology is neither in-depth nor specific, is predominately conceptual, and is American-authored and -focused. Ultimately, the kinesiology literature offers few clear answers to questions about the

imperatives, and social responsibilities; (b) about a scholar’s beliefs and carried out in everyday tasks within their academic unit, the effectiveness of which is dependent upon the quality of their relationships; and (c) a virtue of a PhD-trained scholar’s character and carried out as academic service to the discipline conducted outside of one’s paid institutional duties.
Chapter Summary

The themes revealed in this chapter’s review of disciplinary stewardship within the broader higher education literature and kinesiology literature suggest a number of priorities for moving the construct forward in ways that would make it more specific, practical, and transformative within kinesiology. These include: (a) the largely conceptual nature of the literature suggests more empirical investigations are needed; (b) the largely American-authored and -focused nature of the literature suggests a variety of international perspectives are needed; (c) the largely generic and non-transformative nature of the depictions of the meaning of (including the scope and persons involved) and need for disciplinary stewardship suggests more discipline-specific details and transformative visions should be pursued; (d) the lack of consideration of disciplinary stewardship development (especially before and beyond doctoral education) and motivation (especially given calls for social movement-informed work) suggest that these aspects need to be considered explicitly; (e) the limited considerations, but critically important implications, of leadership as it relates to disciplinary stewardship, and unanswered calls for leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship in particular, suggests these must be expressly reflected upon; and (f) the lack of citation of one another’s work and contrasting viewpoints suggests scholars in kinesiology should be brought together in dialogue about their views on the topic.

Given this context, I have worked to include all of these items in the design of my doctoral research. The research can be understood, in brief, as an empirical, social movement theory-informed investigation into leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology. The research brought together 10 senior scholars from various countries and kinesiology sub-disciplines to explicitly discuss and negotiate – in the controlled dialogue format of the Delphi method – the meaning of, need for, development of, and motivation
for leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology. The details of this investigation’s design are presented in the following chapter.
Chapter 3 – Methodology

This chapter details the qualitative approach of this doctoral research, my positionality as a researcher in this investigation, the project’s framing in collective action frames theory and participatory research methodology, as well as the details of the research design, including the method, sampling, recruitment, participants, data gathering, and analysis. The chapter closes by describing the ethical considerations made and trustworthiness measures taken.

Qualitative Approach

This investigation took the form of a qualitative inquiry. One hallmark characteristic of qualitative research is a focus on speaking to participants to learn, in their own words, the meanings they hold about the issue under study, “not the meaning that the… writers express in the literature” (Creswell, 2014, p. 234-235). A focus on participants’ meanings is core to this doctoral study as its primary aim was to investigate, through dialogue, what LDS means to some scholars within the kinesiology discipline. Beyond the investigation of meanings, qualitative research seeks to shed light on how a “human phenomenon unfolds as it does... and the effects on those who participate” (Patton, 2015, p. 25), with the result often being stories and insights. This interest in studying ‘how things work’ is reflected in this study’s practical and transformation-oriented focus on how LDS is developed and experienced by scholars in kinesiology, with the product being the sharing of some scholars’ stories and insights regarding LDS.

Another key characteristic of qualitative inquiry is a commitment to developing a “complex picture of the problem or issue under study” (Creswell, 2014, p. 235). The emphasis on complexity was fundamental to the structure of this investigation as perspectives on LDS were gathered from individuals from diverse groups within the discipline, that is from senior faculty in various countries and sub-disciplinary areas of kinesiology. Furthermore, I asked participants to indicate how and why other participants’ perspectives on LDS fit or did not fit with their own. This recognition of the existence of conflict and the importance of contextual differences is a key tenet of qualitative inquiry (Patton, 2015).
The openness, rather than tight prescription, of qualitative inquiry means it is responsive to the reality of the world as it is unfolding for participants, and, as a result, can uncover the unexpected (Patton, 2015). Such openness was vital for this investigation of LDS in kinesiology as it is an area for which little conceptual or empirical research has been conducted. In cases where so little is known about a topic, Patton (2015) has explained that you cannot investigate through “surveys or performance indicators because you don’t know what you don’t know, so you can’t ask questions about it or measure it” (p. 25). Indeed, utilizing the qualitative method of interviewing allowed for the responsive following of the emergent directions in which participants’ comments led (Creswell, 2014).

Reflexivity

In qualitative research, there is a recognition that the researcher’s “personal background, culture, and experiences hold potential for shaping their interpretations… more than merely advancing biases and values… the background of the researcher actually may shape the direction of the study” (Creswell, 2014, p. 235). Therefore, researchers must engage in ongoing reflection of what they know and how they know it so as to help them conduct their work in a more self-aware way. Patton (2002) likens this reflexive process to “a form of sharpening the instruments” (p. 52) of qualitative inquiry. Researchers must also own their position to the research by sharing it with their audience so as to inform readers’ reception of the work (Patton, 2002). Here I share a number of reflections on my connection to this investigation of LDS in kinesiology. Specifically, I reflect on my identity as a certified physical education teacher, a physical education teacher education instructor, and a researcher in the areas of physical education and higher education. I also share how I have come to understand the discipline of kinesiology, higher education contexts, the construct of LDS, and my motivation for doing the work.

My Positionality

I have come to understand the discipline of kinesiology as both an insider and outsider, as well as from both antagonistic and appreciative positions. First, I began to develop my insider perspective as a student in a kinesiology department for my undergraduate and master’s physical education degrees, and also later as an instructor and
research assistant in a kinesiology department. It was during this time inside a kinesiology department that my perspective of kinesiology was not as a useful ‘umbrella’ organizer but rather as something to be understood as opposite and antagonistic to physical education. This was largely due to the fact that, at the time, this department was undergoing a long and contentious name change from ‘physical education and kinesiology’ to ‘kinesiology.’ I am now, and was briefly for my Bachelor of Education degree, located in a faculty of education. While I still contribute to the broader kinesiology discipline through my membership and various service roles to a kinesiology-wide organization (NAKHE), as well as through my scholarship in the physical education sub-discipline, I understand that my academic unit location is perceived to many in kinesiology (and even to some in physical education) as an outsider position. While others may view my interest in studying the kinesiology discipline as odd given my current location and previous tensions, I do not. It is from this ‘outsider’ position that I have come to appreciate kinesiology as serving an important umbrella function, and not as a harbinger to physical education.

Although much of my academic reading and research projects are related to various facets of higher education systems, my understanding of these systems has been influenced by the fact that I have had access to only a few higher education roles. That is, I recognize that my experiences in higher education have been limited to that of an undergraduate and graduate student and part-time/contract employee. This has made me attuned to the particular expectations, pressures, and constraints of these roles, but not necessarily those of the participants in my study who are senior faculty members. Furthermore, I am aware that my perspective of higher education is influenced by the reality that the majority of my higher education experiences have taken place in two medium-sized, public universities in Southwestern Ontario. In contrast, the participants in this study are located in universities of different types (e.g., larger, smaller, private) and in very different geographic locations (e.g., the United States, Europe, Australia, New Zealand). I have, however, made efforts to broaden my perspective and better appreciate the scope of these contexts by securing funding that allowed me to study in a Scottish university for four months and formally visit six academic units of kinesiology within three European countries (England, Ireland, Scotland). While I believe these short
experiences helped me to further understand the particular constraints on academic work and governance in these contexts, they were just that – short. I am aware of the ongoing tension between this project’s international focus, and my Canadian or North American perspective. I do not wish to overstate or generalize my findings about a particular context.

My interest in and perspective on the construct of LDS is both academic and personal. I was alerted to this construct through my master’s thesis investigation into experts’ perspectives on the future of the physical education sub-discipline, the results of which both explicitly and implicitly connected to LDS as an important priority for a desirable future (Lorusso, 2013; Lorusso & Richards, 2018). At the same time, my experiences as a physical education graduate student and employee in an at-times contentious kinesiology unit made me hopeful that the construct has the potential to foster better experiences and outcomes for those in these units – or, at the very least, that discussion on the topic would be productive.

I have come to understand my motivation for undertaking this investigation as primarily due to my concern that declines in the kinesiology discipline would have direct negative implications on physical education at the elementary, secondary, and tertiary levels. As a physical educator, this disturbs me deeply as I believe that children require the formal education provided through physical education to: (a) develop the knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes necessary to lead a healthy active lifestyle in the increasingly sedentary 21st Century context; and (b) reap the holistic benefits that meaningful movement can confer on a person physically, cognitively, and affectively. At the same time, I recognize that this more altruistic motivation is entangled with career self-interest, as the future of the physical education sub-discipline depends upon the future of the kinesiology discipline as a whole (Lawson, 2014).

**Theoretical Framework – Collective Action Frames**

The important discipline-wide nature of LDS will not occur by chance, but rather requires an “organizational intervention” (Lawson, 2014, p. 279) that depends on “collective action...[and is] nothing short of a social movement” (Lawson, 2014, p. 282). Therefore, this investigation of the development of LDS in kinesiology has been positioned in the social movement theory of collective action frames (CAF)—the linking
of which was originally proposed by Lawson (2014, 2016). This social movement framing theory was pioneered by sociologists Benford and Snow (2000), who took their inspiration from the broader, seminal framing work of sociologist Erving Goffman (1974).

In the subsections that follow the concepts of frames and framings are reviewed, as well as how these concepts are operationalized within CAF and applied to this investigation. Furthermore, the need to investigate not only the content of frames, but also the identities, relationships, and processes involved in framing is described and, again, the application to this investigation is detailed.

**Frames and Framings**

In essence, frames can be understood as perceptual models or mechanisms through which an individual comprehends and makes meaningful an uncertain situation (Benford & Snow, 2000; Lawson, 1984; van Hulst & Yanow, 2016). It is important to note that “frames are not static, reified entities but are continuously being constituted, contested, reproduced, transformed, and/or replaced during the course of social movement activity” (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 628). This happens through the interactive and intersubjective actions of sense-making, naming, and storytelling (van Hulst & Yanow, 2016). In brief, these three actions can be understood in the following way:

Sense-making is a situated process to which… actors attend in circumstances that are ambiguous or about which there are uncertainties… Through their use of language… selecting-categorizing-naming and storytelling… [they] draw certain features of an intractable… situation together, thereby both rendering them more coherent and graspable and diverting attention from their ambiguities and uncertainties. (van Hulst & Yanow, 2016, p. 97)

These framing actions do “not occur in a structural or cultural vacuum. Rather, framing processes are affected by a number of elements of the socio-cultural context in which they are embedded” (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 628). This is the case whether actors are able to recognize it or not, as much of this is tacit and unconscious (van Hulst & Yanow, 2016). Examples of such contextual factors include macro-level political opportunity structures, the influence of targeted audiences, and micro-level cultural factors such as
personal and professional socialization, paradigmatic frames of reference, and the metaphors people work and live by (Benford & Snow, 2000; Lawson, 1984). Ultimately, “what gets produced in the framing process is both a model of the world—reflecting prior sense-making—and a model for subsequent action in that world” (van Hulst & Yanow, 2016, p. 98). The idea is that through framing people come to grasp a situation as being of a particular type, such that they can then begin to consider what ought to happen next given what their prior knowledge, values, and experience tells them about these types of situations (van Hulst & Yanow, 2016). A social movement view of framing, and of CAF in particular, is as “action-oriented sets of beliefs and meanings that inspire and legitimate activities and events of a social movement organization” (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 614).

**Framings in CAF**

A premise of CAF theory is that in order for social movements to be successfully formed and maintained a “unity of purpose founded on collective meanings, a shared identity, mutually-acceptable interpretation, a common language and perceived interdependence” (Lawson, 2014, p. 283) must be actively developed, as it will not materialize spontaneously. The theory suggests that in order to develop these conditions, individuals may engage in the active, collaborative, and discursive processes of diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational framing, collectively referred to as ‘core framing tasks.’

To explain, diagnostic framing involves negotiating a common understanding of the problematic conditions in need of change as well as the corresponding behaviours required; prognostic framing involves generating a detailed and practical plan that is intended to foster the aforementioned needed behaviours; and motivational framing involves determining ways to inspire others to engage in the plan that aspires toward such behaviours (Benford & Snow, 2000). The core framing tasks are in essence “meaning work… which implies agency and contention at the level of reality construction” (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 613-4). The “active processual phenomenon” (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 614) of the core framing tasks mobilizes dialogue and action, thereby “moving people from the balcony to the barricades” (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 615). In
other words, the process of the CAF theory not only gets people ‘talking the talk,’ but also ‘walking the walk.’

**The Application of Core Framing Tasks in this Investigation**

In order to develop the conditions necessary to successfully form and maintain the social movement of LDS in kinesiology, the core framing tasks of diagnosis, prognosis, and motivation have been addressed in this investigation through its four research questions. The first two research questions were diagnostic in nature and were concerned with investigating *what* LDS in kinesiology might entail and *why* it might be needed. The third research question was prognostic in nature and was concerned with *how* LDS in kinesiology could be realistically developed. Finally, the fourth research question was motivational in nature and was concerned with what strategies could be implemented to *motivate* individuals in kinesiology to participate in such LDS development.

**Beyond the Content of Framings to the People and Process Involved: From ‘What’ to ‘How’**

Attending to the core framing tasks provides insight into the substantive *content* of the framing issue at hand, that is, the *what* of the framing process (van Hulst & Yanow, 2016). However, a focus on the content or *what* of framing alone is insufficient, as “in the momentary ‘freezing’ of actors’… positions for the purposes of description and analysis, framings take on a static aspect” (van Hulst & Yanow, 2016, p. 102). That is, such an exclusive focus on the content or the *what* of framing results in falsely treating frames as “stable, self-contained entities whose component elements can be taxonomized and generalized” (van Hulst & Yanow, 2016, p. 103). Rather, to get at the inherently dynamic, political character of framing, analysis must be focused beyond the content or *what* of framing, to the *how* of framing, that is the identities and relationships of the people involved in the framing process and the process itself.

The identities and relationships of the people involved in framing are important to focus upon because actors’ identities can become strongly intertwined with a particular framing of an[ ]… issue. They might discover their calling, earn their keep, find friends or partners, or be in some other way(s) drawn into the articulation of a particular framing of an[ ]… issue, or tied in with the organization or group that has
constructed, supported, or fought that framing… A public change to that position might feel to them like losing a part of who they are—their social and/or political identity, or part of that. For actors involved in intractable controversies, then, reframing the… issue might involve reconceptualizing not only vested interests but also personal identities—identities that are interwoven with beliefs that the world is or ought to be as they perceive it. (van Hulst & Yanow, 2016, p. 102)

Thus, considering the identities and relationships of those involved in framing means acknowledging the “politics of who people are or perceive themselves to be. Any call for reflection and reframing needs to be acutely aware of and sensitive to the all-too-human, power-laden barriers posed by such framing-related identities” (van Hulst & Yanow, 2016, p. 105).

A focus on the process of framing means a focus on “meta-communication: the ways in which people communicate about what is being communicated” (van Hulst & Yanow, 2016, p. 103). This may include, for example, an individual’s narration/description of who initiated a particular position in the framing process and their own response to it, such as “I think that you think …” (van Hulst & Yanow, 2016, p. 103). It is through meta-communication that actors try to determine the kind of… [actions] they and others will undertake.

Such recursive sense-making can entail a reflective practice, to the extent that… relevant actors might explore and perhaps question the basic assumptions guiding their thinking and actions, especially when these are bringing them into conflict with each other. This reflective process could help those actors see their own… framing, possibly enabling them to grasp how it is preventing them from exerting fundamental efforts to change the… [issue] under debate (van Hulst & Yanow, 2016, p. 103)

Thus, attention to process is important to focus upon because it “leads us to see the ongoing work framing entails and the struggles that can take place over developing and defending certain ways of framing an issue” (van Hulst & Yanow, 2016, p. 103).

Such a shift in focus from frames to framing—or from the ‘what’ (i.e., content) to the ‘how’ (i.e., identities, relationships, and process) of framing—allows for the following:
Seeing the sense-making work entailed in framing—engaging how selections are made, how names are given, how categories are created, and how stories are told—brings a stronger process orientation to framing, seeing it as a many-dimensional socio-political process grounded in everyday practices and ordinary beliefs. This moves analysis away from generating more static taxonomies of fixed frames toward a more dynamic understanding of framing processes, including questions of maintenance and change. (van Hulst & Yanow, 2016, p. 105)

The ‘How’ of Framing in this Investigation

Considering not only the what of framing, but also the how (i.e., the identities, relationships, and process), was key to this investigation of LDS in kinesiology for a number of reasons. For instance, given that kinesiology is a field with very diverse and strongly identified sub-disciplines, between which there have been decades of ongoing conflicts, a focus on the ‘how’ of framing allows for the acknowledgement, and even showcasing, of the inevitable/endemic tensions. Furthermore, a consideration of the participants’ metacommunication allows insight (or acts as a gauge or barometer) into how the findings of this investigation of LDS in kinesiology might be received by others, which is paramount given that buy-in by others is essential to a social movement.

The ways in which the ‘what’ and ‘how’ of framing have been applied in this investigation are described in the data analysis section.

Methodology – Participatory Research

The methodology of participatory research, with its “emphasis on research for change and the development of communities” (Tandon, 2005a, p. 37), has a long history of links to social movements (Tandon, 2005c). Participatory research projects have been described as “giving life” (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005, p. 597) to social movements. This inquiry has taken a participatory research approach so as to ‘give life’ to its social movement theory-informed investigation of LDS in kinesiology. Thus, this investigation is based in the participatory perspective’s ontological assumption that reality is socially constructed with the purpose of changing the world, and the epistemological assumption that knowledge is the constructed meaning of individuals, for which practicality is of primacy (Guba & Lincoln, 2005; Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba, 2011). What follows is a
description of some of the tenets of participatory research and their alignment with the aims and design of this project and also with the principles of CAF theory.

First, participatory research is centered around problems that exist in the real world (Bryceson et al., 2005; Kezar & Maxey, 2014). This tenet is aligned with this project’s aim to investigate the development of LDS in kinesiology, the lack of which has been identified by scholars in kinesiology themselves (through their academic writing) as a problem in their practice that requires action (Lawson, 2014, 2016). This tenet is also reflected in the theory of CAF, which, as a social movement theory, “seek[s] to remedy or alter some problematic situation or issue” (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 616).

Second, participatory research respects and actively engages the affected community in a collaborative research process that can be considered doing research with people, rather than to or for people (Bryceson et al., 2005; Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011; Hall, 2005; Tandon, 2005a). This project reflects this tenet in the following ways: (a) it engaged scholars in kinesiology as participants, purposefully selecting those who have written explicitly or implicitly about this problem; (b) its research questions were formulated to reflect the concerns that some scholars in kinesiology have articulated themselves in their writing (e.g., Lawson, 2014); (c) the interview questions asked participants develop their own plan for action regarding LDS in kinesiology; and (d) the Delphi method was utilized as its format allows for data to be gathered via structured group communication and asks participants to respond to an anonymized synthesis of all participants’ data and thus be involved in the interpretation of data in some way (Gordon, 1992). This tenet is also reflected in the theory of CAF as it is conceptualized as an “arena, [where] activists [read: researchers] and targeted audiences [read: affected communities] interact” (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 630 – emphasis added).

Third, participatory research aims to affect change in the form of participant action (e.g., raised consciousness, policy and/or political development, etc.; Bryceson et al., 2005; Kezar & Maxey, 2014). This tenet is reflected in this investigation’s two action-oriented research questions regarding what a plan for developing LDS in kinesiology might look like, as well as how to motivate individuals in kinesiology to engage in this plan. This tenet is also reflected in the theory of CAF, particularly in its motivational framing task, which “provides a ‘call to arms’ or rationale for engaging in
ameliorative collective action, including the construction of appropriate vocabularies of motive” (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 617).

Finally, in participatory research the researcher is subjectively committed to the group they research with no pretense of value-neutrality (Bryceson et al., 2005). This tenet is reflected in this investigation as I openly shared my positionality (see previous description in the reflexivity section) with participants at the outset of the interviews. Specifically, I described my reasons for purposefully pursuing a doctoral degree outside of a kinesiology academic unit, how I identify as part of the physical education sub-discipline of kinesiology, the critical incidents that caused me to become interested in the construct of LDS, and also my personal and professional motivations for pursuing this work. Benford and Snow (2000) make it clear that CAF is a process in which all (i.e., researcher included) are “deeply embroiled… in the politics of signification” (p. 613), and dismiss the idea held by other social movement theories that “meanings, beliefs, and values… are irrelevant in the development of social movements” (p. 613).

Research Design

The following subsections detail the design and conduct of this investigation⁴.

Method

This investigation utilized a version of the Delphi method that is qualitative, interview-based, and “change-oriented” (Fletcher & Marchildon, 2014, p. 2; Kezar & Maxey, 2014, p. 1), and has been described as having particular “potential,” “value,” and “alignment” (Kezar & Maxey, 2014, p. 1) with participatory research.

It is important to note that there is “no ‘typical’ Delphi method, rather the method is modified to suit the circumstances and research question” (Skulmoski, Hartman, & Krahn, 2007, p. 5). However, the integral features of expert participants, participant anonymity, and the provision of feedback constitute the basic structure of the method and offer some basis for understanding. When using the Delphi method, the researcher acts as the discussion facilitator and gathers data from each expert participant individually (using

—

⁴ The design of this research was informed by and improved upon through the findings of a small pilot study with two kinesiology faculty members from a Canadian university.
whichever method is appropriate, e.g., interviews, questionnaires, etc.) and then
synthesizes the participant-specific data into a cohesive ‘discussion’ across participants
via content analysis (Gordon, 2009). The researcher’s synthesized ‘discussion’ is then
fed-back to participants in an anonymous format that allows each participant to see their
responses amongst the group’s. Then, in a subsequent Delphi round, participants are
asked to respond to the synthesized results in some way, such as indicating their
agreement or disagreement with the items and/or offering narrative explanations for their
positions that differ greatly from the group (Hsu & Sandford, 2007). The rounds of data
gathering, analysis, and feedback can be repeated as many times as suits the nature of the
research.

This particular Delphi inquiry took the form of a two-round semi-structured
interview investigation, via telephone and video-conference, with 10 scholars who could
be considered ‘experts’ on LDS in kinesiology based on their scholarship (details to
follow in the subsequent subsections). As informed by the theoretical framework of CAF,
in the two Delphi rounds of this study participants were asked to engage in the three core
framing tasks of diagnosis, prognosis, and motivation. In round one participants were
asked diagnostic questions about why LDS is needed in kinesiology and what LDS
does/should entail in this particular discipline. In round two, participants responded to the
results of round one by indicating their agreement and/or disagreement and providing
commentary. Participants were then asked prognostic questions about how LDS in
kinesiology could be realistically developed, as well as asked motivational questions
about what strategies could inspire individuals in kinesiology to participate in such
development. Figure 1 provides a visual representation of this process.

*Figure 1*
Visual representation of the Delphi method as employed in this investigation.
The use of the Delphi method was key to this investigation for a number of reasons. First, the Delphi is a particularly effective *participatory* method as it not only engages a group of individuals in a communication process about a particular problem, but its anonymity and feedback processes allow the method to do so in a structured way that mitigates some of the temporal, geographical, and social challenges associated with other forms of participatory research, such as focus group interviews. To explain, the Delphi method mitigates the temporal and geographical challenge of having individuals meet at the same time and/or place (which is often logistically and financially challenging) by having the researcher gather data from each participant individually and then synthesize each of the participants’ responses into one cohesive ‘discussion.’ The Delphi method mitigates some of the social challenges that are inherent when participants meet face-to-face, such as “oratory,” “pedagogy,” “loudest voice,” and/or “reluctance to abandon a previously stated opinion in front of his or her peers” (Gordon, 1992, p. 28), through its use of anonymity which allows for all voices to be heard without the influence of power relations. The Delphi method was logistically helpful given that the participants in this investigation were located in various countries around the world. Furthermore, given that the participants in this study were all senior scholars with established opinions...
from various sub-disciplinary viewpoints, this method provided a more productive way to have a conversation.

Second, the Delphi method is a particularly effective *change-oriented* research method as the necessary time-lapse between Delphi rounds, as well as the explanations for extreme opinions that are provided in the feedback process, affords participants more ideal circumstances to calmly receive divergent opinions and honestly re-evaluate, and perhaps even change, their position, thereby moving the group discussion forward (Gordon, 2009; Mullen, 2003). These features were particularly important to this investigation because it allowed for both the management and showcasing of inevitable conflict on the unclear construct of LDS. The fact that Delphi participants explicitly discuss the feedback of the previous round allows for insight into the *how* of framing, that is the identity, relationships, and process (i.e., metacommunication) of framing that is central to the theoretical framework of this study.

**Purposeful Sampling**

The Delphi method typically involves the purposeful selection of individuals who can be considered ‘experts’ on the topic under study. One rationale for this is that “experts, particularly when they agree, are more likely than nonexperts to be correct about future developments in their field” (Gordon, 1992, p. 28). The use of ‘expert’ opinion is also central to this investigation’s theoretical framework of CAF. The developers of the theory have argued that “the greater the status and/or perceived expertise of the frame articulator and/or the organization they represent…the more plausible and resonant the framings or claims” (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 621). Furthermore, ‘expert’ opinion was used in Golde and Walker’s (2006) seminal work on disciplinary stewardship (i.e., the CID). The CID recruited “leading scholars” (Golde & Walker, 2006, p. 9) in six different disciplines to develop ideas about the nature of stewardship in their particular disciplines. The justification for the selection of these experts was that these scholars “had already shown themselves to be thoughtful” (Golde, 2006, p. 15) about the topic.

In a Delphi investigation, expert participants “are usually identified through literature searches to find those who have published on the subject under study” (Gordon, 1992, p. 29). Therefore, the purposeful sampling process for this investigation began with
an extensive literature search for English-language books and peer-reviewed articles that discussed disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology explicitly. However, as previously mentioned, disciplinary stewardship is a relatively new interest in kinesiology and thus this process revealed only a very small number of works that focused on this topic explicitly, leaving very few ‘experts’ to be identified. Therefore, the purposeful sampling process was broadened to include a literature search for English-language books, peer-reviewed articles, and conference presentations that were: (a) consistent with, although not necessarily explicit about, the key tenets of disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology outlined in Chapter Two; and/or (b) exemplified disciplinary stewardship, as Lawson (2014) has described that works which offer passionate arguments about disciplinary issues (e.g., the name, scope, and missions of the discipline) are “a form of leadership in service of the discipline” (p. 285).

The publications identified through these literature searches were further reviewed so as to organize them in order from most to least reference to, and/or representation of, disciplinary stewardship tenets. As a result of this review, approximately 25 scholars were identified. The backgrounds of these individuals were then investigated through a review of their online institutional profiles. Attention was paid to the following factors explained in the subsequent paragraphs: sub-disciplinary perspective, geographical perspective, level of experience, and diversity.

Attempting to glean the sub-disciplinary area to which individuals contributed and perhaps affiliated was carried out with the intention to gather perspectives from a variety, rather than a paucity, of sub-disciplinary areas of kinesiology. The importance of diverse sub-disciplinary viewpoints on LDS was highlighted in Chapter Two and is also explained in Block and Estes’ (2011) quote about the breadth of the discipline of kinesiology. They argued kinesiology can be understood as “a microcosm of the super-complex nature of higher education. The discipline is made up of scientists, pedagogues, artists, and management and humanities scholars that interact in multiple ways in the wider society” (p. 189).

The geographical perspective of these identified scholars was determined from the location of their current academic post. The aim was to select scholars from a variety of English-speaking countries who make up the international epistemic community of
kinesiology, rather than perpetuate the largely American-dominated discussion on LDS. Lawson (2014) has argued that an investigation into stewardship must draw from multiple national contexts as “all such critically important work depends on collective action – locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally” (p. 282).

The identified scholars’ level of experience was gleaned by examining such factors as whether they held a senior rank and/or additional leadership positions at their institution or in academic societies, journals, and so on. The importance of engaging leaders in the discussion of LDS was described in Chapter Two and is also articulated by Enright et al. (2017) who have explained that many new and young members of a field perceive the best advice comes from those “who understand the history of the field, are respected and powerfully networked within the field” (p. 24).

Consideration was given to whether any of the potential participants identified as female, scholars of colour, or members of other historically underrepresented groups in kinesiology. This consideration was made in an effort to include the perspectives of those who may have experienced various inequities that have narrowed their access to leadership experiences in the discipline, and about which we do not yet know enough about (Douglas & Halas, 2013; Ransdell, 2014).

As a result of this consideration process—which was weighted most heavily toward scholarship but took into account the factors of sub-discipline, geography, experience, and diversity in an effort to achieve some balance—13 individuals were identified as ideal participants, with the aim to secure involvement of at least 10.

A sample size of between 10-15 participants can be considered to be appropriate for this investigation as the number of participants in an interview-Delphi study is “usually small, [as] Delphi studies do not – and are not intended to – produce statistically significant results” (Gordon, 1992, p. 28). This sample size is consistent with other interview-based Delphi investigations. Moreover, this sample size is reflective of the actual number of ‘experts’ writing on this topic (as evidenced in Chapter Two). Finally, given the broad exploratory nature of this investigation, it was decided that capping the sample size at 15 participants would allow for the production of an amount of Delphi feedback that expert participants could reasonably, practically, and meaningfully be expected to respond to (Skulmoski et al., 2007).
Recruitment

Following the granting of ethical clearance from Western University’s Non-Medical Research Ethics Board (File Number 108749; Appendix A), 13 experts were invited to participate in the research using a personalized letter of invitation sent via email. In addition to a description of the purpose and protocol of the research, the personalized letter of invitation outlined in detail the reasons that particular expert was recruited to participate by making specific references to their scholarship which was about, consistent with, and/or exemplified LDS in kinesiology (personalized letters of invitation are not shared in appendices for confidentiality reasons). Attached to this recruitment email experts were also provided with a brief summary of the content to be discussed in the interview (Appendix B), the round one interview guide (Appendix C), tentative round two interview guide, as well as the informed consent form (Appendix D) to be reviewed at their convenience. If an expert responded to express interest in participating in this research, he/she was contacted to establish a time and date for the round one interview. If an expert did not respond within one week of the email invitation, a second and final follow-up email invitation was sent. Ultimately, 10 experts were interested and available to participate.

Sample

Given that participants were selected for their publicly available scholarship on the topic of LDS, their demographic information is presented in Table 5 collectively, rather than individually, so as to protect their confidentiality. Additional information about participants’ scholarship on the topic, how they came to be interested in the topic, and factors in their background that influenced their views on this topic will be shared throughout the findings chapter.

Table 5

**Participant Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristic</th>
<th>Participant Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>5 Females, 5 Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race construct</td>
<td>All identified as White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current post</td>
<td>7 Full Professors, 2 Emeritus Professors, 1 Associate Professor (concurrently 1 Head of School, 1 Associate Dean, 1 Department Head, 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current unit location: 7 in kinesiology* units, 3 in education units

Geographic perspective: 5 United States of America, 4 United Kingdom, 3 Australia, 1 New Zealand, 1 Canada, 1 Ireland**

Length of academic career: Range of 18-50 years, Average of 36 years

Area(s) of expertise / Sub-disciplinary affiliation: 7 physical education (curriculum, assessment, pedagogy, history, critical pedagogy); 2 sport/physical activity/physical education policy; 1 sport management; 1 equity/inclusion; 1 history of physical culture; 1 philosophy of sport, physical activity, games, play; 1 dance (Other: 4 higher education administration and leadership)***

Examples of relevant leadership roles held: Associate Provost, President of University Senate, Dean, Associate Dean, Department Head, Research Centre Director, Program Coordinator, Graduate Coordinator, President of National and/or Provincial/State Scholarly/Professional Association (various other roles within associations), Editor in Chief of academic journal, Associate Editors and Advisory Board Members of academic journals

*The names of the units were varied, kinesiology is used as a categorical descriptor.

**Some participants indicated that they held multiple geographical perspectives based on their academic migration and current international work.

***Some participants indicated multiple sub-disciplinary areas of expertise/affiliation.

Round One Data Gathering

As the expert participants were located in various countries around the world, interviews were conducted via telephone or Skype. Interviews took place between June and August 2017. Interviews typically lasted between 60 to 90 minutes and were audio-recorded to later produce written transcripts for analysis.

At the outset of the meeting, the consent form was reviewed with participants orally for their verbal consent. Following consent, the interview began and followed a semi-structured interview guide (Appendix C). Prior to the commencement of actual interview questions, a brief summary document about LDS in kinesiology (Appendix B) was reviewed with participants so as to provide context and the opportunity to clarify understandings of key terminology and ideas to be discussed in the interview.
Given the participatory nature of the research, demographic information was shared and asked for in a conversational manner. That is, I began by sharing demographic information about myself and describing my motivations for conducting the research (i.e., my positionality), and then participants were asked to reciprocate with theirs. More specifically, participants were asked to: (a) confirm the publicly accessible demographic information I had gathered about them, and to provide any outstanding information (e.g., current post; sub-disciplinary affiliation; relevant academic background [i.e., education, academic posts, administrative posts]), (b) tell me about the stimulus and motivation for their scholarship on disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology (or related topics); and (c) share their reasons for agreeing to participate in the study. Gathering this information not only helped me to interpret each participant’s responses with more accuracy, but was key to the consideration of identity, relationships, and process in framing within this investigation.

Following the discussion of demographic information, participants were asked to engage in a diagnostic framing exercise by answering interview questions related to two of the investigation’s research questions: (1) What does/should LDS in kinesiology entail? and (2) why is LDS needed in kinesiology? In regard to the first research question, examples of interview questions included presenting participants with the generic framework’s roles/skills and principles of disciplinary stewardship and asking them to describe: an example of that role/skill or principle from theirs or others’ experience; whether they agreed the role/skill or principle was an important component of the construct and, if so, what the top priorities for this component entailed; and how commonly they observed this component of stewardship and why they thought that was the case. An example of an interview question asked in relation to the second research question is ‘what might be the consequences of kinesiology’s elimination from the academy?’

Participants were then given the opportunity to ask questions and/or offer additional comments, particularly whether there was anything else they considered to be key to LDS in kinesiology. The interview closed by thanking the experts for their participation and reminding them to expect the round one feedback document once all
participants had been interviewed, and also to expect contact about scheduling a final round two interview.

**Round One Data Processing and Synthesis**

I began data processing by transcribing the round one interviews verbatim. Participant responses, along with their participant identifier, were then organized by question. This resulted in a list of responses from each expert for each question. The responses were then reduced for meaning by removing extraneous language (Patton, 2002). For each question the reduced responses were then content analyzed across experts by looking for similarities and differences so as to group similar comments into summarizing responses approximately one-line in length (Patton, 2002). Once the final list of unique and grouped responses was determined for each question, the number of experts contributing to each comment was listed in a frequency column beside it. Transcripts were then reviewed again in entirety to ensure the synthesis had not distorted participants’ original message.

In order to develop an executive summary that participants could reasonably and meaningfully respond to in a 60- to 90-minute round two interview, only some of the round one synthesis could be included. The following components were included in the executive summary as they were deemed to be most relevant to the diagnostic framing exercise (note that the entirety of the data was considered in a holistic analysis following round two and is described in a subsequent analysis section). For each of the generic framework’s roles/skills of disciplinary stewardship (i.e., generation, conservation, transformation), a table of the corresponding priorities outlined by participants was provided. For each of the generic framework’s principles of disciplinary stewardship (i.e., action- and future-oriented, morally-courageous, and collective) a table of priorities and a table of examples/evidence were provided. Tables of tallied responses were also provided for: overall descriptions of stewardship; priorities for stewardship; barriers to stewardship (as organized by roles/skills and principles); and origins of interest in stewardship or related topics. For each of these components of the executive summary, select quotes of interest were included to relay sentiment not fully captured in the tallied responses and to spark discussion of the tallied responses.
In order to feed the executive summary/synthesis back to participants in an anonymous format for negotiation during round two interviews, participant-specific executive summaries were developed. Each participant-specific executive summary included an anonymized list of responses to each question with an asterisk beside the responses that the particular participant offered and/or contributed to (Appendix E).

**Round Two Data Gathering**

Prior to the round two interviews, experts were provided with their participant-specific executive summary of the round one diagnostic framing discussion as well as the round two interview guide (Appendix F). Round two interviews were conducted between November 2017 and January 2018 and done primarily by telephone or Skype, with one interview being conducted in-person in the university office of the participant.

The round two interviews began by asking participants for their general reaction to the executive summary and whether they would like to respond to any items by agreeing, disagreeing, or providing comment, and whether they would like to adjust or explain any of their own responses—particularly those that differed considerably from the group. Participants were then prompted, as appropriate, for their reaction to particular round one responses and quotes of interest (examples listed in Appendix F).

Next, participants were asked to engage in a prognostic framing exercise by answering questions related to where, when, and how LDS could be developed by individuals within kinesiology. The intention here was to develop a detailed and practical plan for LDS development in the discipline. Following this, participants were asked to engage in a motivational framing exercise by answering questions about what strategies they felt would motivate individuals within kinesiology to participate in LDS development.

Participants were then asked concluding questions such as what specific outcomes they would like to see as a result of an LDS orientation in kinesiology, as well as what message(s) and/or question(s) they might have for kinesiology doctoral students and early career scholars regarding LDS.

At this time participants were given another opportunity to ask questions and/or offer additional comments. Finally, the interview closed by thanking participants for their
participation, and reminding them that they could expect a final report upon completion of the dissertation.

**Round Two Data Processing**

I began round two data processing by transcribing the audio-recordings of the round two interviews verbatim. At the outset of the investigation, the plan was to create an executive summary of the round one and two data following the round two interviews. The intention of this plan was to: (a) capture the participants’ reaction to the round one data by revising wording as necessary and tallying frequency of any agreement and/or disagreement; and (b) synthesize the round two data and create tables of tallied responses to the prognostic and motivational framing exercises using the same process described in round one for the diagnostic framing exercise. However, in reading and re-reading the round two transcripts this plan was deemed no longer appropriate for various reasons. First, in the round two interviews participants responded to the round one executive summary in a more global than specific way. That is, they spoke about their thoughts on the executive summary as a whole, and when they did offer specific comments, they were in response to the quotes of interest rather than the tallied tables. This may have been because the round one data were rather diverse, and the quotes were more accessible and compelling. Second, as will be described in Chapter Four (Findings), the participants’ responses to the prognostic and motivational framing exercises were often broadly articulated and, as such, were not conducive to reductive content analysis. Given these developments, I abandoned the plan to develop an executive summary and moved directly into thematic analysis of the entire data set.

**Data Analysis**

Data analysis occurred in two major stages. The first stage involved thematic analysis so as to identify themes in the experts’ diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational framings (i.e., the ‘what’ or the content of their framings) and thereby capture their vision of and for LDS in kinesiology. These themes are presented in Chapter Four and are contextualized with insight into the people and process involved in these framings (i.e., the ‘how’ or the identities, relationships, and process of framing). The second stage involved theoretical interpretation of the themes so as to respond to the rationale of the research: whether the experts’ vision of and for LDS in kinesiology suggests it is a
relevant and promising way for the discipline to survive and thrive in the 21st Century. These theoretical interpretations are presented in Chapter Five.

**Thematic Analysis**

Stage one of data analysis was guided by Braun and Clarke’s (2006) six thematic analysis phases: (1) familiarizing oneself with the data, (2) generating initial codes, (3) searching for themes, (4) reviewing themes, (5) defining and naming themes, and (6) producing the report. To begin, round one and two transcripts were read and re-read, and initial ideas were jotted. During this process of familiarizing myself with the data, it was clear that it was most appropriate to organize the data as they related to the four research questions (i.e., to conduct a deductive analysis guided by research question) and then to inductively analyze data within those research question categories. To do so, transcripts were reviewed again and, using NVIVO software, data were manually organized by whether they related to diagnosis (i.e., [1] what LDS in kinesiology might entail and [2] why it may be needed), prognosis (i.e., [3] how LDS in kinesiology might be realistically developed), or motivation (i.e., [4] what strategies might motivate those in kinesiology to participate in LDS development).

Once data were organized, initial codes were generated inductively within each research question organizer by applying labels to the smallest units of meaning in the data. Once initial codes were applied to the data, an iterative process of reviewing, comparing, and, where there was shared meaning, grouping codes was conducted to create initial themes that reflected a broader understanding of the data. These initial thematic groupings were then iteratively reviewed to ensure coherence within the coded extracts for each theme and also to ensure sufficient distinction between themes. To further refine the themes, I produced summary statements that captured the essence of what each theme signified. These summary statements were then also used to create working titles for each theme. Thematic maps for each of the research questions were created and recreated throughout this process of reviewing, refining, and naming themes.

Through these efforts to review, define, and name themes, the inextricable links between themes related to what LDS means and why it is needed (i.e., research question one and two) become obvious. The same was also true for the themes related to how to develop LDS and motivate individuals to participate in development (i.e., research
question three and four). A return to the transcripts in their entirety confirmed that the experts’ discussion of what LDS means and why it was important was inherently linked, and again the same could be said for how to develop LDS and how to motivate people to participate in development. Therefore, it was clear that it was most appropriate to merge the themes falling under research question one and two as well as to merge the themes falling under research question three and four. For example, in relation to the third research question of how to develop LDS in kinesiology, I had originally identified the theme that ‘LDS could be developed via dialogue,’ and in relation to the fourth research question of what would motivate people to participate in LDS development, I had identified the theme that ‘the dialogue associated with story sharing was motivational.’ These themes were then combined to create an encompassing theme: ‘Develop LDS by providing opportunities for dialogue and the sharing of narratives.’ Once satisfied with the content and organization of the themes and research questions, I again returned to the original transcripts to ensure the themes appropriately captured the raw data and minor adjustments were made as needed.

Ultimately, five themes were generated in relation to the diagnostic research questions of what LDS in kinesiology is and why it is needed: (1) LDS is a slippery term, yet powerful and valuable construct; (2) LDS is the collective responsibility of all scholars in kinesiology and takes many concomitant forms; (3) LDS is a philosophy that is intentionally embedded throughout one’s professional actions; (4) LDS in kinesiology is about ensuring and enhancing the discipline’s future by pursuing integrity within in it, for which communication is critical; and (5) LDS in kinesiology requires an orientation towards collective purposes and impacts. Three themes were generated in relation to the prognostic and motivational research questions of how to develop LDS in kinesiology and motivate participation in that development: (1) There must be dedicated and incentivized LDS development initiatives; (2) LDS development must be multifarious and contextualized; and (3) Develop LDS by providing opportunities for dialogue and the sharing of narratives.

As I wrote the narratives for these themes (which appear in Chapter Four), effort was made to offer context regarding the people and process involved. That is, in order to highlight the sense-making and dynamic and political nature of framing, wherever
possible, and to the extent possible, insight into the following was provided: (a) identities and relationships of participants; and (b) examples of meta-communication and contests.

**Theoretical/Interpretive Analysis**

Stage two involved a theoretically informed analysis of the themes so as to interpret whether the experts’ vision of and for LDS in kinesiology suggests it is a relevant and promising way for the discipline to survive and thrive in the 21st Century, and if so, how. To do so I considered the themes in relation to various theories to see which offered the most illuminating lens. Ultimately, I determined Swedish organizational scholar Mats Alvesson’s (2012) organizational culture theory was the most revealing. In the subsections that follow, a summary of Alvesson’s theory is outlined, and a description of how the theory was used to interpret the themes is then provided.

**Alvesson’s (2012) Cultural Approach to Organization**

Alvesson (2012) has advocated for an approach to understanding and acting within organization that attends carefully to culture. Although Alvesson has acknowledged that culture is a concept with no fixed meaning, he has been critical of its varied and vague use to “cover everything and consequently nothing” (p. 4). In contrast, Alvesson has outlined a more focused and detailed description of culture than is common in academic and popular literatures. His view of culture is most fundamentally about the shared *meanings* that govern the “cognitive and affective aspects of membership in an organization and the means whereby they are shaped and expressed” (Kunda, 1992, p. 8, as cited in Alvesson, 2012, p. 4). He has further clarified that these meanings are below the surface of observable behaviour and as such are deep-level and partly unconscious. These meanings can also be understood as multiple, dynamic, multi-level, and messy, as they are continuously formed and reformed through the interplay of local interactions and macro-level societal imprints, and also may be contradictory across the various sub-groups of an organization. In other words, culture is not to be confused with surface-level social structures in an organization that can be easily observed or described. Nor is culture to be seen as static, singular, and homogenous across an organization.

Through Alvesson’s (2012) more focused and detailed description of culture, the importance of the concept to organization and working life can be appreciated. For instance, when culture is understood as a sense of common, taken-for-granted meanings,
it can be seen as: (a) what makes coordinated action, and thereby organization itself, possible, as without some degree of shared meaning there is constant confusion and no organization to speak of (i.e., culture as ‘social glue’); and simultaneously (b) what constrains and blinds individuals into established beliefs, ideas, and understandings that limit personal autonomy and prevent “novel, [and] potentially more ethically thought-through ways of organizing social life from being considered” (i.e., culture as ‘mental prison’; p. 13). From this detailed understanding, “organizational culture is not just another piece of the puzzle, it is the puzzle” (Pacanowsky & O’Donnell-Trujillo, 1983, p. 146, emphasis added).

When culture is viewed from Alvesson’s (2012) perspective, the concept can be considered one of the most powerful ways to guide understanding of and action in a wide variety of organizational aspects. Yet this kind of approach to cultural understanding and action within organization has been underutilized. To explain, it is useful to consider Alvesson’s characterization of the various approaches to organizational culture. He has described these approaches as taking three broad forms that map onto Habermas’ (1972) three cognitive- or knowledge-constitutive interests: technical, practical-hermeneutic, and emancipatory.

The most common approach to organizational culture is a technical one, which can be understood to assume a causal relationship between culture and organizational outcomes like efficiency and performance. From this calculating view, culture is considered a ‘tool’ – something that can be manipulated, usually by formal leaders – or a ‘trap’ – something that can be controlled/avoided – in order to achieve particular outcomes. Much less common are practical-hermeneutic and emancipatory approaches to culture. A practical-hermeneutic approach to organizational culture is one focused upon understanding culture (i.e., meanings) in organizational communities. This view suggests that an appreciation of culture may improve mutual understanding and, thereby, coordinated action may be more possible. An emancipatory approach to organizational culture can be understood as one involving critical reflection upon the meanings underpinning aspects of organizational life and questioning whether/how they may be the result of asymmetrical power relationships or taken-for-granted (i.e., institutionalized) assumptions and, as such, limit personal autonomy. The idea here is that such eye-
opening insight can be transformational as organizational actors’ thoughts and actions are liberated from repressive or unnecessary dominant patterns.

It is Alvesson’s (2012) opinion that a technical interest in culture for organizational efficiency and/or effectiveness, simplifies and trivializes the concept by focusing on the more simple alteration of surface-level factors, such as behaviour, and claiming it to be cultural change, rather than the more difficult management of deep-level, partly unconscious, multi-level, plural, and sometimes contradictory meanings, which actually constitute culture. Here, the challenges of managing meanings are minimized or avoided all together. The result is often misleading notions of quick fixes that nurture grandiose fantasies of radical organizational cultural change by heroic (and typically formal) leaders. Furthermore, approaching culture from a technical perspective often presents a solely positive view of culture. That is, such a view precludes the use of the culture concept to raise broader questions about [power-imbued and ingrained] cultural patterns in organizations… and working life, and diverts attention from questioning the status quo, for example in terms of dominant ideologies, political interests and self-constraining, taken-for-granted assumptions and beliefs. (p. 211)

Instead, Alvesson (2012) has argued that an approach which considers culture in all its complexity and takes seriously the capacity of culture to both guide and constrain organizational thinking and action calls for an understanding of culture (i.e., a practical-hermeneutic approach), which then facilitates and encourages critical reflection on that understanding (i.e., emancipatory approach). Such an approach may or may not then benefit technical concerns (e.g., efficiency, effectiveness), as such cultural “understanding and reflection may precede effective action” (p. 13). In other words, the three interests in or approaches to culture need not be entirely disconnected. However, a view of culture as complex and deep rules out a solely technical approach, and instead suggests that a broadened cultural understanding (i.e., practical-hermeneutic) that encourages problem-awareness (i.e., emancipatory), and perhaps results in problem-solving (i.e., technical), is most appropriate.

What does Alvesson’s (2012) recommended approach to organizational culture entail? There are no simple answers to this question as Alvesson has explained that
“cultural interpretation cannot be pressed into a formula or model” (p. 15). Alvesson’s view on this is reflected in how he has referred to the approach as, for example, “a rather broad and open framework for sensitized thinking about organizations” (p. 200), or a “loosely integrated theoretical framework facilitating cultural interpretation and reflection on such interpretation” (p. 210). Perhaps most telling is his description that the approach is about using “culture theory as a resource for…questioning thinking and consciousness development, not outlining tactics for interventions by people eager to stimulate emancipatory cultural change” (p. 177). Put another way, in a cultural approach “reflexivity and insight, not procedure and truth…become catchwords” (p. 13).

Despite expressing that it is easier to describe the pitfalls of the approach than to offer clear guidelines, Alvesson (2012) has described some hallmarks of his approach. Perhaps most fundamental is that, because meanings are deep-level and partly unconscious, this approach requires deciphering. That is, cultural analysis “move[s] beyond and beneath behaviour, text and talk, and…easily observable organizational forms and practices” (p. 200) to consider the meanings and ideas behind them. Furthermore, because meanings are multi-level, plural, dynamic, and formed by both the macro and micro, cultural analysis must always be contextual/situated and requires consideration of multiple aspects at once. Additionally, because culture both guides and constrains, engaging in cultural analysis involves questioning how meanings may be shaped by asymmetrical power relationships and/or taken-for-granted assumptions, as well as what particular meanings make possible or impossible. All of this “de-familiarization, disclosure, and eye-opening” (p. 177) requires “space for deep reflection but also for the thinking and possibly speaking-out of non-conformist talk” (p. 176).

Ultimately, this is “hard and difficult work” (p. 2014) for many reasons. One reason is that “culture is as significant and complex as it is difficult to understand and ‘use’ in a thoughtful way” (p. 1). That is, one must be careful not to fall into a number of common traps or fallacies in cultural thinking such as reifying (i.e., treating culture as a ‘thing’), essentializing (i.e., suggesting culture is something with few identifiable traits), unifying (i.e., viewing culture as homogenous), idealizing (i.e., treating culture as an end-all), consensualizing (i.e., depicting culture as harmony), totalizing (i.e., seeing culture as everything), or otherizing (i.e., treating culture in dichotomies).
Alvesson’s (2012) cultural approach has implications for two important organizational phenomena: leadership and cultural change. From Alvesson’s viewpoint, leadership is not about controlling behaviour but about impacting meaning formation and thus is cultural by definition. The idea is that leaders focus on “altering moods, evoking images and expectations, and establishing specific desires and objectives… to change the way people think about what is desirable, possible, and necessary” (Zaleznik, 1977, p. 71). Alvesson has highlighted how this understanding distinguishes managers and leaders. Managers can be understood as those in formal positions who work through bureaucratic processes (i.e., budgeting, etc.) to control material and social structures of organizations. Leaders, on the other hand, may or may not be in formal positions and instead rely on “their personal abilities, work with visions, agendas and coalition building, and mainly through non-coercive means [to] affect people’s feelings and thinking” (p. 107). Therefore, leadership is highly contextual work. There are no standardized recipes for doing leadership in a culturally sensitive way, as it is less about a leaders’ intentions or particular behaviours and more about the particular targets’ interpretations and meanings. Given this, “leadership efforts are rarely about large-scale engineering projects controlling and intentionally changing [organizational] culture: they are typically better understood in more incremental, everyday life, and in culturally constrained work” (p. 75). In sum, leadership is not work on culture, but work within and as an outcome of a cultural context. The actions of leaders may gradually change the cultural context, but “a precondition for changing culture is to connect to it” (p. 116).

Connected to Alvesson’s (2012) view of leadership as the management of meaning is his view of cultural change as occurring through everyday reframing of cultural orientations. Such change work can be understood as an incremental and “informal culture-shaping agenda, involving pedagogical leadership in which an actor exercises a subtle influence through the renegotiation of meaning” (p. 189). As such, cultural change is seen as a situated and gradual social process. Actors work to negotiate, rather than impose, new or revised meanings with the people they directly interact with, and this may create wider effects as those people may, in turn, influence others they interact with. Such a vision of change can be understood not as ‘top-down’ (i.e., grand technocratic change project driven by senior administrators) or ‘outside-in’ (i.e., organic
social movement driven by broader external forces), but from the organizational ‘middle and around.’ Given this, everyday reframing could be considered a somewhat ‘weak’ version of change as it is neither backed by formal authority and resources nor by powerful societal forces. However, because, as previously mentioned, “a precondition for changing culture is to connect to it” (p. 116), everyday reframing has a practical realism to it as it is connected to the level of meaning through its anchorage in ‘interactions and ‘natural’ communication. It is also better adapted to the material work situations of people and thus has stronger action implications” (p. 190).

Like his view of leadership, Alvesson (2012) has argued there is no formula or set of rules for modifying organizational culture via everyday reframing, but there are some general tenets. These tenets include, but are not limited to the following: (a) avoid hyperculture, that is, avoid trendy, but generic, management buzzwords that are disconnected from the way people think about their everyday work life; (b) have realistic aims, there must be an appreciation that only so much change is possible in the immediate future and that the targets of change will struggle to relate to radical ideas; (c) combine push and dialogue, “change work calls for both determination, conviction, and initiative, [as well as] a willingness to listen to, learn from, and respect the views of” those targeted in change initiatives (p. 196); (d) have stamina and follow-through, cultural change (i.e., change in meanings) takes time and as such it is important to selective about what change projects are undertaken as “disillusion, erosion of trust, and resistance to change…are possible consequences of change programs not carried through” (p. 199); (f) align culture-focused and material rearrangements, “efforts to accomplish change in meanings…that do no cohere with substantive arrangements exercising behavioural control are often doomed…New cultural messages must connect to the material level to be fully credible and to ‘stick’ in [targets’] hearts and minds”(p. 192); and (g) receptiveness is needed, intentional cultural change is very difficult without a receptiveness among the organizational collective to new meanings, such openness may, however, be facilitated by growing awareness of organizational problems.

Ultimately, there are powerful rationales for approaching organizational understanding and action through Alvesson’s (2012) cultural approach, particularly for the insight and inspiration it can offer. In terms of insight, Alvesson has argued that “a
developed capacity to think in terms of organizational culture facilitates acting wisely” (p. 2), that is, in ways guided by culturally sophisticated thinking. The idea is that while we all ‘do’ culture, most of this is done unconsciously; this approach suggests that, as one becomes more able to interpret cultural phenomena, “it is possible to act in a more reflective, thoughtful way and be less guided by the taken-for-grantedness of cultural meanings” (p. 201). In other words, such an approach “may encourage more autonomous personal choices and the development of social meanings based on careful considerations” (p. 154), rather than taking what exists as natural. In terms of inspiration, a cultural approach may inspire interest in escaping some of the constraints culture exercises as attention is drawn to hidden ethical and political dimensions of organizational life. This is a much-needed benefit of Alvesson’s cultural approach as empirical work on organizational culture indicates “the predominance of cultural values embracing a primarily amoral view on organizational life in many organizations” (p. 172). This widespread minimization of ethical issues and “disinclination to raise ethical problems or engage in reflection and dialogue about these [can be understood] as ‘ethical closure’” (p. 171). Alvesson has argued, however, that the ethical qualities of organizations – that is, the “capacity for, attention to and space for reflections, clear-sightedness and dialogue within the workplace” (p. 177) – can be improved through a cultural approach. It is his view that most organizations have space for this and that this space can be expanded through thoughtful interventions. He has explained,

Sometimes what may appear to be a culturally fixed shared understanding is much more fragile and fragmented – and critical interventions (story-telling, irony, introduction of critical concepts) may lead to unpacking of cultural meanings and the emergence of a more diverse set allowing for more autonomous assessment and standpoints. (p. 177)

This approach is not without risks, however. Alvesson has warned that dealing with morally sensitive issues… is like walking on a minefield…a person insisting on high-profile moral standards is less likely to be described as courageous and of high integrity than as having a rigid mind or being religious about the issue or a troublemaker. (p. 169-170)

*Interpretive Application of Alvesson’s (2012) Theory*
Themes in the experts’ discussion of the meaning of and need for LDS in kinesiology were interpreted through the tenets of Alvesson’s (2012) organizational culture approach. Themes in the experts’ discussion of the development of and motivation for LDS in kinesiology were interpreted through the tenets of Alvesson’s vision of organizational cultural change via the approach of everyday reframing. These interpretations appear in Chapter Five (Discussion).

**Ethical Considerations**

In addition to the ethical considerations already described throughout the chapter, this section is included to explicitly note the low level of risk to participants in this study, both as it was designed and conducted. Participants are referred to by pseudonyms only. The identity of all participants will remain confidential in any publications or conference presentations resulting from this research.

**Quality Criteria**

Throughout this chapter accounts of, and justifications for, the methodological decision junctures of this investigation were provided so as to allow the reader to evaluate its quality. However, here my trustworthiness efforts are expanded upon more explicitly by connecting to general quality criteria for assessing qualitative inquiries (i.e., credibility, confirmability, dependability) as well as criteria for assessing participatory inquiries more specifically.

To enhance the credibility of the inquiry, that is, the accuracy of the findings (Guba & Lincoln, 1994), the construct of LDS in kinesiology was investigated from multiple sub-disciplinary perspectives. This triangulation of expert perspectives from across some of the sub-disciplines of kinesiology was pursued to ensure a more comprehensive, rather than singular, view of the phenomenon under study (Patton, 2002). A further aspect of this investigation that enhanced its credibility was the member check function that is built into the Delphi method’s feedback process. This allowed the participants to validate the accuracy of my synthesis and direct me to revise if necessary.

To enhance the investigation’s confirmability, that is, whether other researchers could confirm my findings (Guba & Lincoln, 1994), and dependability, that is, whether other researchers could repeat this investigation, the following steps were taken. An audit
trail that captures the data gathering and analysis process at every stage was maintained for transparency (Patton, 2002). Furthermore, reflexive memos were made at regular intervals throughout data gathering and analysis, and particularly in those instances in which methodological questions arose, so as to capture my ideas as the researcher as well as how and when conceptual connections were made (Birks, Chapman, & Francis, 2008). Finally, considerable detail has been provided in this dissertation regarding the context, design, and conduct of the research, as well as thick description of the findings, including participant quotations as support (Anney, 2014).

In terms of quality criteria for participatory research, Guba and Lincoln (2005) contend that such work may be judged by the degree to which the resulting knowledge is practical and “leads to action to transform the world” (p. 196). First, as previously described, the investigation was designed to ask practical questions posed by members of kinesiology themselves, that is, why is LDS needed in kinesiology, what does LDS entail in kinesiology, and how can LDS be developed and encouraged within kinesiology? Second, the findings were presented in a way that was intended to emphasize practicality, including real-world examples and stories from participants’ experience wherever possible. Finally, as for whether this work has led to action, this, of course, will remain to be seen as the work is disseminated. However, I can anecdotally report that some participants have shared with me that they have already taken action as a result of their engagement in the project. For example, in the round two interviews, some of the participants described the action they had been inspired to take following round one, and other participants shared their stories of action with me in settings outside of the research.

**Chapter Conclusion**

This doctoral research was a qualitative, participatory investigation. More specifically, the research took the form of a two-round interview-Delphi investigation, in which 10 international scholars within kinesiology were asked to consider the meaning of, need for, development of, and motivation for LDS in kinesiology, as framed in CAF theory. The data were analyzed through thematic analysis and the findings are presented in Chapter Four. These thematic findings were theoretically interpreted through Alvesson’s (2012) organizational culture theory and are discussed in Chapter Five.
Chapter 4 – Findings

This chapter presents the thematic findings of this doctoral investigation. Specifically, the chapter outlines the ‘what’ or the content of the expert participants’ diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational framings. This includes themes in the experts’ discussion of what LDS in kinesiology entails and why it is needed, as well as how to realistically develop LDS in kinesiology and strategies to motivate participation in that development. These themes are presented with attention to the ‘how’ or the people and process involved in the experts’ framing so as to highlight their dynamic and political nature. Quotations from the experts are presented throughout the findings chapter, with pseudonyms used to identify the speakers (e.g., Dr. Frankel, Dr. Bryant, etc.). If a quotation was from the first Delphi round, it is labelled ‘RD1,’ and if it was from the second Delphi round, ‘RD2’.

Diagnostic Framings:

What Does LDS in Kinesiology Entail? Why is LDS Needed in Kinesiology?

The experts’ diagnostic framing regarding what LDS in kinesiology entails and why it is needed can be summarized into five themes. The theme, ‘LDS is a slippery term, yet powerful and valuable construct,’ is presented first as it captures important discussion about the challenges associated with the term LDS, particularly some individuals’ lack of familiarity with it and its vast range of associated connotations. Despite acknowledging challenges with the terminology of LDS, the experts’ emphasized the power and value of the construct, particularly the fact that it encompasses key meanings that other constructs do not.

With the value of LDS in kinesiology established, the second theme, ‘LDS is the collective responsibility of all scholars in kinesiology and takes many concomitant forms,’ encapsulates the experts’ discussion about who is responsible for LDS and how it manifests. The experts described LDS as the responsibility of all scholars in the discipline regardless of their career stage, academic position, or group affiliation. It was also described that, given the individual differences between scholars within kinesiology, each will manifest LDS in a different, although essentially related, form, and all such forms are needed.
The experts’ discussion of the nature of LDS is presented in the third theme: ‘LDS is a philosophy that is intentionally embedded throughout one’s professional actions.’ This theme is comprised of the experts’ accounts that LDS is less about one’s particular actions, products, and outcomes, and more about one’s values and the ongoing choices they make about what kind of scholar they want to be and how they want to work. The experts depicted these values-based choices as requiring intentionality given the difficulty and risks of LDS.

The purpose of LDS in kinesiology and the key responsibilities involved in the pursuit of that purpose, are addressed in the fourth theme entitled, ‘LDS in kinesiology is about ensuring and enhancing the discipline’s future by pursuing integrity within it, for which communication is critical.’ Here, the caretaking responsibilities of critically and actively honouring the discipline’s past and open-mindedly and conscientiously evolving it into the future are detailed, as is the communication needed within and beyond the discipline to do so. The immense contributions that have, are, and could be made in the name of kinesiology; the limits in contemporary kinesiology degrees and graduate quality; and the communication failures within the discipline are highlighted as needs for this LDS caretaking function in kinesiology today.

Finally, the requisite perspective described as fundamental to LDS in kinesiology is presented in the fifth and final theme, ‘LDS in kinesiology requires an orientation toward collective purposes and impacts.’ This perspective was characterized by the experts as the capacity to see beyond oneself to the larger discipline and, moreover, to the discipline’s societal need and contributions. The qualities required in such a perspective were described as including humility to challenge one’s ego and personal identity, as well as inclusivity to appreciate the discipline’s sum of its parts and its place in the broader intellectual and societal landscape. The increasingly individualizing pressures of academia and resulting faculty self-interest, as well as the failure to prepare kinesiology graduate students with holistic identities, were highlighted by the experts as evidence of the need for such LDS perspectives in kinesiology today, as was the discipline’s fragmentation and lack of unifying aim.
Theme One: LDS is a Slippery Term, Yet Powerful and Valuable Construct

This theme captures the experts’ varied conversation about LDS in kinesiology, particularly as it related to terminology. The experts explained and demonstrated that the term LDS is unfamiliar to many in kinesiology and has a number of associated connotations. While the challenges of the term’s unfamiliarity and multiplicity were acknowledged, the value of the construct was repeatedly emphasized. Specifically, the power of LDS to convey key meanings that other constructs do not was highlighted as a central reason for its value.

“I Continue to Struggle to State it Clearly”

The variation in the conversation about what LDS in kinesiology entailed was clear in Dr. Bryant’s commentary about the round one executive summary, which he described as “flailing… all over the place… not exactly consensus” (RD2). Similarly, Dr. Frankel joked, “there’s enough diversity there to keep you busy” (RD2). What was clear, however, was that the term LDS was a “slippery” (Dr. Bryant, RD2) one. Dr. Black described that part of this slipperiness stems from the fact that the term “has a rather larger set of meanings” (RD2). This larger set of meanings was evident throughout the interviews as the experts referred to the various and, at times, contradictory, imagery, terms, and feelings they associated with LDS. For example, in terms of associated imagery, Dr. Williams described that LDS

reminded me of… going back to the likes of Tolkien, and those kind of fantasy models, where… the king dies, and the heir to the throne is five years old, and a steward is appointed… The steward is there to make sure that the kingdom is safe and continues to move forward until the king can take over. (RD2)

As another example, Dr. Armstrong shared that “the idea of stewardship, I mean, the monks panning around in the monasteries, you know, as the repositories for writing down scripts and all this. In a sense they were being stewards of knowledge at a particular time” (RD2). As for associated terms and feelings, the experts’ discussion of LDS reads like a game of word-association. For example, Dr. Bryant described LDS to have “quasi-religious overtones” (RD2); Dr. Armstrong felt it had a “corporate sort of ring” (RD2) to it; Dr. Black suggested that it was from the word “service, from which the word stewardship tends to flow” (RD2); Dr. Morgan shared that she often used “mentoring”
(RD2) as a synonym for stewarding; Dr. Bailey felt it was “something you would align with more, sort of, unionized… jobs… a working-class, you know, connotation” (RD2); while, for Dr. Richards, LDS held “an element of formality, almost an element of, sort of, authority and management” (RD2). Given the larger set of meanings that LDS seems to hold, it is no wonder that, despite having published several items on the topic, Dr. Frankel remarked, “I continue to struggle to state it clearly” (RD2).

Important to note is that one expert voiced serious reservations about the term LDS and, in his opinion, its contrived and grandiose undertones. In a round one interview session Dr. Armstrong explained, “I never use the word stewardship, it’s one of those organizational framework bits of speak” (RD1). To explain his view, he drew on his experience serving on hiring committees and interviewing potential kinesiology administrators:

I’ve never heard the word stewardship used, but I have heard words like, ‘What would you do with an underperforming faculty member?’ ‘What’s your vision for the school?’… I’ve never heard anybody talk about, ‘How would you steward your particular field?’ Because, in a sense, it seems to me like an artificial construct ‘stewardship’… this notion of steering the field is what I am a little bit uncomfortable with. I think there is people-management that is important, there is strategic challenges and strategic directions that are really important. For example, can we focus? Are there any projects that can bring us all together? (RD1)

Dr. Armstrong’s statement was fed-back to the other participants in the round one executive summary and sparked a discussion in the round two interviews about the challenges associated with the term, most of which related to others’ unfamiliarity with it. Some of the experts acknowledged that LDS is not a particularly “common” term (Dr. Bailey, RD2). Dr. Moore suggested the lack of familiarity with the term is connected to the fact that “there is not a lot of overt discussion of what it takes to carry the discipline forward” (RD2). Similarly, Dr. Black suggested that LDS is not the kind of discourse you’d tend to hear in kinesiology circles… It’s education-speak… professional-speak… it could be that the scientists, who are
less and less interested in the professional side of things, just may not see that as a particularly useful focus. (RD2)

“I Don't Know if There is Another Word that Does It”

Following acknowledgements of the term’s challenges, many arguments in support of the meaning behind the term were offered. This is clear in Dr. Frankel’s statement that

I think this [i.e., Dr. Armstrong’s comment] is an understandable and predictable technical perspective… I have no doubt about the fact that some people might prefer a simpler, more accessible concept like ‘leadership to the discipline.’ Fair enough. And that works. But leadership has hierarchy in it and stewardship does not. It's fundamentally a democratic concept. And the other part of it, you steward because you care. And so, norms of caring accompany stewardship in ways that leadership does not without considerable qualifications. (RD2)

This notion that LDS was a construct that carried key meanings that other concepts did not was a common one. Dr. Williams also argued in this vein,

I think the word [i.e., LDS] is valuable because I’m not sure that some of the other terms in that management-speak lexicon that the business school would have available to them will necessarily capture that notion of looking after, caring for, safeguarding, protecting, preserving, moving forward, all of those words that you would associate with the steward who steps in in place of the king whilst the heir is growing, you know? (RD2)

Dr. Josephs similarly stated “the term says it all. It implies that we honour something enough to steer it in the right direction. It implies that there is some place to go, and that the field is worthy enough to have someone shepherding.” The experts’ discussion about the term LDS is well-summarized in the following comment by Dr. Bryant. He explained that the power and utility of the construct ultimately outweighs any negative reception of the term by those unfamiliar with it:

You know, when you're talking about language, you're sort of talking about a two-sided animal. One [side] is… how does it hit one's ear?… And then another side of it is the conceptual side… Is it a handy word that allows you to get the concepts?… I like the word [i.e., LDS]. I think it does a lot of potential work on
the conceptual side… And you found out that it hits people’s ears very differently, like that one quote from the person that didn't like the word stewardship at all [laughter]… [while] others vibrate to it because they think it has nice connotations and it speaks to them. So, I guess I wouldn't be overly concerned about the how-it-hits-the-ear side of the equation if the word stewardship is a vehicle for moving us forward and touching on ideas that are important as we try to unify ourselves to a certain extent and promote passion in our field… this is such a powerful term or such a powerful umbrella for us as we consider our professional identities and responsibilities… I don't know if there is another word that does it. (RD2)

Theme Two: LDS is the Collective Responsibility of all Scholars in Kinesiology and Takes Many Concomitant Forms

This theme reflects some of the experts’ adamant statements that the responsibility for LDS is not exclusive to any particular subset of scholars within the discipline. Rather, LDS was described as the collective responsibility of all scholars in kinesiology, irrespective of career stage, academic role, or group affiliation. In explaining this view, experts indicated that LDS is: (a) more about how one does what they do at any and all times in their career, rather than something extra they do in a particular stage or role in their career; and (b) not intended to be carried out independently, but collaboratively. These characteristics of LDS mean it manifests in many different, but essentially related, forms. One way to conceptualize this plurality is as small ‘s’ stewardship, that is, what happens on more micro scales, and big ‘S’ stewardship, that is, what happens on more macro scales. Ultimately, each scholar contributes to LDS differently depending on the particulars of their situation, but, as the experts stressed, all of these efforts are needed.

“Of Course, Everybody Should Take Responsibility for Stewarding Their Discipline”

Much of the round one executive summary regarding what LDS might entail was either explicitly or implicitly connected to the work of formal leaders and/or senior scholars. That is, while many of the items listed in the tables of LDS priorities were not specific to any particular career stage, academic role, or group affiliation, many of the examples and evidence of action were so (e.g., anecdotes of what an Editor-in-chief, scholarly association president, or a senior mentor might do). In fact, one expert went so
Dr. Armstrong explained,

I would say it's the dean's responsibility to have a sense of stewardship, as you are calling it. I don't think it's the responsibility of every academic. Everybody isn't the General, right? Some people have got their own tasks to do and they may, in the process, contribute to the enlightenment of the field's status, or whatever. But most of them, their focus is on themselves and their research projects. I just think it's unrealistic to consider that everybody would be going in with a stewardship mindset, 'Oh I got to do this for the discipline'… but I do think that's the role of the senior staff, particularly the Dean… I just think that being an academic now… is incredibly difficult… Much more difficult than I experienced in my career. So, I see young ones now as overloaded and snowed under… So then to expect them to be more ‘eyes on the big picture,’ I think is just totally unrealistic. There will be some people in various stages of their career who think this is a worthy thing to do, but they are already probably late professors, to shore up the boat that they are on or whatever… If you want to be an academic, then you need good research skills… to publish… to get grants… to be successful in your teaching… to have community outreach… I am not particularly optimistic that on top of that people should be saying, 'Hey, which way can I help the field?' It's a lot more individual than that. And that's not bad, that's just how it is in particular phases of your life, I think. (RD1)

Dr. Armstrong’s comment was fed-back to participants in the round one executive summary and sparked expressive reactions from the other experts as well as clarifications of what they had shared in the previous round. The first clarification repeatedly made was that LDS is for all scholars in kinesiology. For instance, Dr. Richards asserted, “I’d just passionately say it [i.e., LDS] is everyone’s responsibility” (RD2), while Dr. Bailey suggested that “we all have a duty of care in relation to having that [LDS] responsibility” (RD2). In fact, Dr. Bailey described being rather disturbed by Dr. Armstrong’s comment. She explained,

I was quite appalled by the comments with respect to how the whole notion of stewardship wasn't central to what they did. There is no excuse for that. If they
were in a position where they are, I presume, being paid more for a leadership role or whatever, they *might* engage with it *then*, but that otherwise, no [they wouldn’t be doing it - emphasis added to reflect speaker’s intonation]. (RD2)  

A second clarification was made by some of the experts who had held a number of administrative academic roles. They argued that it might actually be more difficult for administrators to take on LDS than it would be for the average scholar. For example, Dr. Josephs explained that administrators, such as Deans, are sometimes managing multiple disciplines. She shared,

> how can a Dean, who has several academic units that are disparate, steward each?… I don’t think they can do it. I think they can support, but… our Dean has seven or eight academic units under him, and kinesiology is just one, so… (RD2)

For his part, Dr. Moore highlighted that those in the position of Dean or Department Chair have taken on a special remit to focus upon their particular institution rather than the discipline at large. He explained,

> This writer [i.e., Dr. Armstrong] goes ‘heads of departments or deans.’ Well, they’re not going to really be stewarding an academic discipline, their job is to administer the bureaucracy that houses the academic discipline… And administrators in many cases will also wear that [LDS] hat, but when they’re doing the job of administration, they’re shepherding their particular institution, their unit within their institution. (RD2)

Two important further clarifications were made in this regard – both suggest that the nature of LDS is misunderstood when it is portrayed as an exclusive responsibility. First, some experts used the case of early career scholars to make the point that LDS is both a possible and necessary responsibility of all scholars in the discipline because it is more about *how* one does what they do throughout their career, than something *extra* they do in particular career stages, academic roles, or group affiliations. Dr. Richards explained that LDS,

> isn’t something that at some point in your career becomes your, once you’re appointed to some sort of level, becomes your responsibility. How you work as a doctoral student, how you work as an early career researcher, the choices you make all along, you’re playing a stewardship role. Whether you want to
acknowledge that or not you actually are. Because the field is made up of the academics who constitute it, and, as a doctoral researcher and an early career researcher, as much as a professor, you are part of that field… Because if we say this is the responsibility of, you know, half a dozen or whoever, people who are leaders in any field in any particular national context or internationally then nah, we’re on to a loser. Its cultural, its value-based, yeah, it’s not easy. (RD2)

Dr. Williams and Dr. Morgan conceded that there have been changes to the university since they were early career scholars, but argued that core continuities remain, and shielding or excusing early career faculty from this work will not do them, nor the discipline, any favours. Dr. Williams explained,

Yes, some things have changed in terms of building a career as an academic. But that whole thing about balancing teaching versus service and scholarship… It was there for me 30 years ago. It’s still there… It’s actually about doing good quality work in the time you have got available, and that’s something you need to learn as an early career academic. (RD2)

Dr. Morgan elaborated that junior faculty should “at least be aware of what’s going on… it is important they at least be led to the understanding that, as they mature, that there will be more responsibility put on them” (RD2).

The last clarification made was that LDS is not intended to be independently pursued. Dr. Williams explained his perception that

this person [i.e., Dr. Armstrong] is thinking about ‘How do I do this by myself?’… It’s not something you do by yourself. It’s something you do collegiately with others in similar situations, who have shared interests, or a touchstone, you know? Whether it’s done regionally, whether it’s done nationally. (RD2)

Similarly, Dr. Frankel explained that “if you assume that stewardship is basically a solo act inside existing departments, and you look at the work intensification of early career professors in a growing neoliberal environment with incredible cross-pressures, there’s lots to support that [i.e., Dr. Armstrong’s] argument” (RD2). Dr. Richards commented on the connection between LDS and the pressures of the 21st Century university. She said,
it ultimately has to be a shared vision… I think there are real dangers in the sort of view… [that] we’ve got to let people get on and support them in being these individualistic people who are playing to this system, without any concern for the bigger picture of the field. I see real dangers in that… yes, this is the reality… the pressures are enormous, and stewardship needs to be a collective effort about countering and productively working with those pressures for the bigger picture interests of the field. (RD2)

Dr. Black pointed out, however, that LDS needs to be fleshed out in a contemporary way that appreciates the new challenges of the 21st Century university. She provided the example of the increasing number of non-traditional roles in academic units, such as postdoctoral fellows who are often paid by external sources and not the university itself, and the challenges that poses to more traditional understandings of LDS. She explained,

Of course, everybody should take responsibility for stewarding their discipline, or multiple disciplines, but some do, and some don't. And that’s partly because of the increasing fragmentation of roles… We’ve now got postdocs and grant tenure people, with very different responsibilities. So, all they have to do is to generate research funds, they may know nothing about trying to foster stewardship, or care, about fostering stewardship among the group, which, in a sense, is a group of which they are not really part. (RD2)

“Stewardship in the Discipline Manifests itself in so Many Different Ways”

Given that LDS is the shared responsibility of all the diverse scholars within kinesiology (i.e., across career stage, position, sub-discipline, etc.) and is meant to be collaboratively practiced, it is not surprising that the experts described LDS as expressed in many forms. This is clearly reflected in Dr. Bailey’s statement that “stewardship in the discipline manifests itself in so many different ways” (RD2). For example, LDS actions were discussed as taking place within teaching, research, and service responsibilities in home academic units, sub-disciplinary associations, cross-disciplinary associations, journals, and communities on regional, national, and international levels. Dr. Frankel offered an organizing framework as one way to make sense of this breadth. He described the idea of big and small ‘s/S’ stewardship, and the relationship, rather than the difference, between them. He explained,
The grand conversation about stewardship capital S, is about those core features that have gotten lost on the way to the 21st Century. And then there’s small s stewardship, that has to do with what happens locally. You have in this response… a ‘think globally, act locally’ sort of framework that is a dual one, but not one that carries with it antithetical tendencies, or even is a basis for conflict. Because, presumably, these things ought to map on to one another. The grand aims, they unite the field and its entities wherever they are. And then the more nuanced expressions of those, where a particular department or school or a college needs its own stewardship with a small s. So, you’ve got stewardship operating at two levels. (RD1)

Dr. Frankel’s comment was fed-back to participants in the round one executive summary and other experts responded by describing his framework as a useful way of viewing the LDS construct. It prompted Dr. Black to articulate another dual, but not dichotomous, LDS metaphor, which was that LDS is “like a parent paying attention to the future goals of their kids, but [also] paying attention to their daily needs” (RD2). In other words, although different forms of LDS may feel separate at times, they are connected; or, to use Dr. Moore’s words, these various forms of LDS are like “different windows into the same house” (RD2).

The experts’ dialogue seemed to concern the question of ‘who does what in all of this [i.e., LDS]?’ The answer appeared to be that LDS differs depending on one’s institutional role, whether that be related to career stage, position, context, skills, and/or interests. Dr. Bailey offered an explanation that there are people who “are the big [S], they're the global people. That's fine. Let them do that. There are the little [s] people. Fine, let them do that. And then there are people who can match both. Let them do that” (RD2). She went on to share the example of her personal interest and skill set,

I teach undergrads and I teach professional masters. But my energies are very much with… preparing graduate students… that’s a huge passion… Other people, who maybe only have one graduate student, their energy is very much going to the undergrads, for example. (RD2)
Dr. Josephs argued that, “each of us in our roles… has their own responsibilities. One level can’t do it all. It takes all levels to steward the profession forward” (RD2). Or, as Dr. Bryant put it, when it comes to LDS, “one size does not fit all” (RD1).

**Theme Three: LDS is a Philosophy that is Intentionally Embedded Throughout One’s Professional Actions**

This theme captures the idea that LDS is a philosophy that one intentionally embeds in all of their professional actions. In other words, LDS is about one’s process or approach, not one’s products or outcomes. As such, LDS is not reducible to, nor additional to, one’s academic roles and responsibilities. Because LDS is informal in nature (i.e., the way one works and lives out their profession), intentionality is key – especially since LDS can be difficult to implement and may carry with it notable risks.

“It’s More About the…Process That You Go Through, or You Take Others Through With You, in Relation to Embedding a Philosophy”

As the experts reacted to the examples of LDS actions collected in round one, many wished to clarify that there are aspects to LDS that were not, and moreover could not, be captured in these lists. The experts explained that it was important to recognize that these examples of LDS in research, teaching, service, and leadership were expressions of a “philosophy” (Dr. Bailey, RD2), “value-set” (Dr. Richards, RD1), or “disposition” (Dr. Williams, RD2) intentionally embedded in one’s professional actions. The nature of LDS as an embedded philosophy was described by experts in a few different ways. Dr. Bailey emphasized LDS as about process, not products. She explained, it is less helpful to understand LDS as

outcome-oriented… a lot of stewardship for me would be very much process-oriented… it’s more about the actual, the process that you go through, or you take others through with you, in relation to embedding a philosophy. And people go about that in different ways. (RD2)

Dr. Williams and Dr. Richards explained this another way, which is that LDS is not reducible to, nor additional to, one’s academic roles and responsibilities. For his part, Dr. Williams offered that while LDS is connected to all academic roles and responsibilities, “it is not reducible to” them (RD2). He elaborated that fulfilling these academic roles and responsibilities is “a necessary condition of stewardship but is not sufficient in itself”
For her part, Dr. Richards wished to make clear that “it [i.e., LDS] is not this addition, it is not this other, it is about how we can embed it, and that comes back to things like culture, and ways of working that you promote both implicitly and explicitly” (RD2).

The experts recognized that the nature of LDS as an embedded philosophy or, in other words, ‘who one is and how one works,’ makes it difficult to capture succinctly as it falls across all responsibility areas. As Dr. Richards described, it’s absolutely in the sort of informal, the everyday nature of how you work, how you interact, how you involve people, what you share with people, the conversations you have, and the ways in which they see you working, others see you working. A lot of it is really hard to pinpoint. Values have to run through everything that you do. It’s never going to come down to the fact that you do x, y, and z in a formal sense… The actual living it out is really important. (RD2)

This informal and abstract nature is further evidenced in Dr. Williams’s comment that LDS is “not concrete and can be quite intangible. It’s not like trying to organize a trades union. It’s a lot less formal” (RD2). Dr. Morgan used an analogy to express this same sentiment; she explained that the informal nature of LDS means it “can’t become a cookbook recipe” (RD1) that can be easily described. Perhaps the nature of LDS as an embedded philosophy that is informal and abstract explains why many of the experts described the individuals that they considered to be exemplary stewards as “quiet… subtle… [and] modest” (Dr. Richards, RD1). As Dr. Bailey put it, “I think you tend to find those who are most effective at stewarding their own discipline, do it in a relatively quiet and unassuming way” (RD2).

“If You Haven’t Got That Individual Commitment to Valuing Stewardship and Enacting Stewardship Then It’s Not Going to Happen”

The experts made it clear that the informal nature of LDS as an embedded philosophy means it requires intentional choices about who one is and how one works. This notion of intentionality in one’s choices was expressed in a number of different ways such as requiring “commitment” (Dr. Moore, RD1; Dr. Richards, RD1), “motivation” (Dr. Richards, RD1), “passion” (Dr. Bryant, RD1; Dr. Bailey; RD2), “investment” (Dr. Bailey; RD2), “willingness” (Dr. Morgan, RD2; Dr. Williams, RD2),
“care” (Dr. Frankel, RD2), “courage” (Dr. Morgan, RD2), “conscious[ness]” (Dr. Josephs, RD2), and “generosity” (Dr. Williams, RD1; Dr. Richards, RD2). As Dr. Richards explained, LDS relies on the individual, and if you haven’t got that individual commitment to valuing stewardship and enacting stewardship then it’s not going to happen… [LDS] is never going to be on someone’s job description… It’s a matter of professional choice and professional responsibility whether you do these things or not. And people may or may not acknowledge it as a choice, but I would say their actions speak to the choices that they are making. (RD2)

A second reason LDS requires intentionality is that carrying out expressions of LDS can be quite difficult; thus, one must be motivated to choose an LDS path. Dr. Richards explained, LDS takes “a certain motivation… a certain commitment to actually try to do [this] amidst structures and requirements for accreditation [for example] that will inevitably pull you back to conservatories and pull you back to safe places” (RD1). She went on to explain that

yes, I’m busy doing all of those things. I feel the pressures… but it is in what way do I do them… That, fundamentally, is what this is all about for me. It’s about finding those spaces, finding those ways… you can find those ways if you basically go looking and go to create them. And sure, it isn’t easy, but it is the way of the academic world we live in. (RD2)

A third reason LDS requires intentionality is that it can be risky. The experts told stories about themselves and their colleagues who had received backlash for their choices to carry out their professional actions in an LDS fashion. Some described being gossiped about (Dr. Bailey, RD2), being “branded as an ideologue or radical” (Dr. Williams, RD1), and having the “battle scars and assassination attempts to show for it… the backlash and the backbiting are brutal. It’s important to know. It’s all part of it” (Dr. Frankel, RD1). Dr. Bryant illustrated this risk in his story about standing up to his Dean in his former role as Department Head in an effort to keep the physical activity program in his department. He explained that while it “wasn’t a politically smart thing for me to do [i.e., stand up to the Dean]” (RD1), the reason he did so was related to his passion for movement and his core belief that all should have access to it. He explained that standing
up to the Dean “came from the gut, not just my head… a good steward has to have
passion for the subject matter… It’s hard for me to picture a good steward who is just
doing their job as opposed to feeling their job” (RD1).

Perhaps this entire theme can be summarized by emphasizing two words in Dr.
Moore’s short statement: “you need to develop the perspective of one who wants to be a
steward” (RD1).

**Theme Four: LDS in Kinesiology is About Ensuring and Enhancing the Discipline’s
Future by Pursuing Integrity Within It, For Which Communication is Critical**

This theme describes disciplinary stewards of kinesiology as temporary caretakers
of the discipline. The caretaking purpose of LDS was described as needed in kinesiology
given the immense contributions those within the discipline provide to society, as well as
the potential consequences of losing those contributions should kinesiology be eliminated
from the academy in the future. Such caretaking must be done critically, actively, open-
mindedly, and conscientiously so as to ensure scholars and scholarship with integrity, as
a discipline without integrity is not one worth safeguarding. Limits in contemporary
kinesiology degrees and graduate quality were provided as examples of the need for such
attention to integrity in LDS. Central to caretaking work are various communication
responsibilities, including active, effective, and meaningful communication with scholars,
practitioners, and the public. Relatedly, the communication failures of scholars within
kinesiology were highlighted as part of the need for LDS in kinesiology.

**“We're Temporary Caretakers of this… Precious Subject Matter”**

The importance of protecting, or being a caretaker of, the academic discipline of
kinesiology for future generations was described as incredibly central to LDS. For
example, some described caretaking as the “purpose” (Dr. Moore, RD1) or “essence”
(Dr. Frankel, RD1) of LDS. In his description of the responsibility of ensuring some
disciplinary continuity across generations, Dr. Bryant explained:

the word steward presupposes something of value that’s being not only preserved
but furthered… we're temporary caretakers of this precious history and this
precious subject matter that we have. And after we're dead, that precious subject
matter and that history is going to keep moving into the future and there will be
additional individuals who we expect to be good stewards of the field and perhaps morph it into something we don’t even recognize today. (RD1)

Such caretaking was described by experts as needed to protect the immense contributions that those within kinesiology make to society. Dr. Black explained the precious subject matter of kinesiology as

right in the middle of work around the body, health and the body, sport and the body, physicality and the body, with amazing opportunities in popular culture, and also in the globalized world where, increasingly, knowledge about the active moving body is so critically important. (RD1)

Dr. Bryant elaborated that, while scholars from other disciplines may contribute to this subject matter, “we are the experts at putting the package together… [the] focus on human wellbeing and environments… that puts a very complex package together… No other department, the way the university is structured now, can put those pieces together” (RD1). Dr. Frankel very clearly linked the immense current and future societal contributions of those within the discipline to the need for LDS caretaking. He explained that kinesiology,

draws amazing people, who have the right kinds of values, who care deeply about the human condition. If given the proper conditions and preparation, there is no limit to what the field can provide. Because it has got this incredible noteworthy and significant mission that is available to it, even if there isn’t agreement on it. That’s the need for stewardship. (RD1)

The need for LDS and its caretaking is further evidenced in some experts’ concern about the potential consequences of kinesiology’s elimination from the academy should caretaking not occur. Dr. Frankel described that “where the consequences would be profound would be in the preparation of helping professionals who have the full breadth and depth of what kinesiology potentially offers in the service of helping other people” (RD1). Dr. Josephs pointed out that while there are scholars in other disciplines who study the same topics that scholars within kinesiology do, they are often focused on particular populations, such as elite athletes, and thus “the consequence for humanity [of kinesiology’s failure to survive] will be that there is nobody dealing with the average
person” (RD1) and their relationship with their body and movement. This was echoed in Dr. Moore’s reflection that

if you weren’t here, or if I weren’t here, then you get into people who have such a narrow slice of what physical activity is or can be… [without] those of us who understand the interconnected approaches to understanding physical activity, you end up not getting it right, and you can even cause some harm. So, what we do by having many perspectives, [is provide] a broader education about physical activity. We take into account the physical, the psychological, the managerial, the spiritual, all of those aspects. (RD1)

Some experts also offered more general warnings about the failure to engage in disciplinary caretaking. As Dr. Josephs explained, “If we don’t steward our profession then it will get steered by something or somebody else. It will get steered right into the ditch… we’ve got to take ownership of our field… what we want the future… to look like” (RD2). Dr. Armstrong similarly stated, if scholars within kinesiology keep their heads down they “could be moving very fast towards the edge of a cliff… Think of the people who worked for Kodak years ago… [we have] got to keep an eye out for where the ship’s going… [we] can’t just keep [our] head in the lab” (RD2).

“I Very Much Associate [LDS] to that Academic Credibility, Rigor, Professional Standard, And Integrity of the Field”

The experts were adamant that the caretaking mission of LDS should be not a neutral, passive, inflexible, nor lackadaisical endeavour. Instead, one must be active and critical in how they honour the discipline’s history, as well as open-minded and conscientious in how they evolve it into the future. In terms of honouring the past, this should not look like “great men remembering” (Dr. Williams, RD1), being “clones or… mindless copycats” (Dr. Bryant, RD2), or a “this-is-the-way-we-have-always-done-it” type of attitude (Dr. Bailey, RD1). Rather, as Dr. Josephs explained, “it is key to remember the past, and how we evolved where we are now and be open-minded to some of the traditions that exist, while at the same time looking for new ways… ideas… [and] traditions” (RD2). In terms of evolving into the future, while we need to “take the idea of redesign seriously” (Dr. Frankel, RD1), to “think outside the box and do some things that may not be traditional” (Dr. Bryant, RD1), and to “anticipate trends or directions and say
we’ve got to be positioned, and we’ve got to have the resources and the base to run with these” (Dr. Richards), we must also “be careful not to follow trends that pull us off our path” (Dr. Josephs, RD1).

The experts described a number of instances of this type of caretaking work from their own and others’ past experience. Examples included changing the name of a scholarly association to showcase ‘kinesiology’ rather than ‘physical education’ in anticipation of future trends, or the creation of a new journal that allowed for the discussion of issues that, at the time, were outside of the status quo (e.g., gender, sexuality, etc.) and did not have an suitable outlet within the discipline. Dr. Bryant offered the following example from his own experience,

when I came as department head, I intuited a close connection between the health and movement nexus… Somebody said that we have no physician assistant program [here]… so we started working on a joint PA [i.e., physician assistant] program. It never came to fruition, but it laid the groundwork in our department for this… physiotherapy [program] we [now] have in our undergraduate program. And so, I guess, seeing the health issue coming down the pike. And this was before the obesity epidemic. This was 30 years ago. There wasn’t that much stuff about that health crisis and so forth and sedentary living and, I guess, seeing where the action is going to be in the future… I think we have benefited as a department because we got in early… I think looking ahead, anticipating trends in culture, taking advantage of the trends, while staying true to your subject matter. (RD1)

Experts’ examples from the present, however, indicated the need for LDS. For example, Dr. Moore described that LDS is needed to avoid the lack of critical transformation he sees in undergraduate physical education programs in the United States today. He explained,

They’re trying to continue on with the style… of teacher training that was designed early in the 20th Century, was perfected in the early 1950s, and started to die out in the 1980s… they don’t behave like good stewards do… they’re trying to perfect a way of understanding physical activity that just isn’t fitting with our times. (RD2)
The notion of integrity was described as paramount in LDS caretaking. In other words, there is no point of passing on a discipline that is not of quality. Dr. Richards captured this in her statement that she “very much associate[d] [LDS] to the academic credibility, rigor, professional standard, and integrity of the field… maintaining that whilst seeking to grow and strengthen the field” (RD1). The integrity of the discipline, however, was described as dependent upon the integrity of its scholars. As Dr. Frankel described, “the field, however defined, ‘kinesiology,’ ‘physical education,’ ‘sports science,’ ‘public health’… depends upon the intellectual temperament and characteristics of its members” (RD2).

There was much discussion about the particular qualities that the pursuit of integrity within the discipline required. The need to have a real awareness (Dr. Moore, RD1) and willingness to interrogate (Dr. Bailey, RD1) both oneself and the discipline were identified. Asking difficult questions, such as, “Are we fit for purpose?” (Dr. Frankel, RD1), as well as “different questions, with different frames of reference in somewhat different language” (Dr. Frankel, RD2), were repeatedly mentioned as examples of integrity-focused caretaking in action. Dr. Richards provided the example that this aspect of LDS may include

wanting to draw some barriers and set some benchmarks and be able to say ‘that fits within the field, that speaks to the field and speaks for the field. Now, hang on, [here is where] we draw the line, that is really beyond the field, or doesn’t align with the essence of the field’… The challenge is to say, ‘yep, I can tick all of those boxes [the university requires], whilst at the same time pursuing these agendas which, to me, if we don’t have them, we have nothing.’ (RD1)

It was in regard to integrity that the need for LDS was further evidenced. That is, the experts described limits in kinesiology degrees and graduate quality as in need of LDS integrity measures. Dr. Morgan described she was “worried about the quality of faculty that we were putting out” (RD1), with Dr. Frankel offering the elaborated explanation that,

today’s early career researchers are the most technically advanced that we have ever seen. It's incredibly exciting. But they are also the least prepared to… work
in a peer review system… what I would call considerable hyper-specialization, rigidity, and some intellectual intolerance for the other ways of knowing. (RD1)

Dr. Bailey summarized that “it matters that this [i.e., LDS] moves because there are people in the system who are really, really struggling and suffering. So, there is a level of urgency about it” (RD2).

“If You are a Steward, You Have to Make Sure There is a Place For These Conversations [in Service of Caretaking to Happen]”

The experts described various communication responsibilities as central to the caretaking function of LDS. For example, some experts described communicating with the public as important to carrying the discipline into the future. Therefore, notions like “being a public intellectual” (Dr. Williams, RD1) and engaging with mediums the public is interested in, such as television, newspapers, social media, and so on were highlighted (Dr. Josephs, RD1). Other experts focused on maximizing the communication happening within the academic unit, whether it be improving the university’s physical spaces for engaging with students (Dr. Morgan, RD1; Dr. Black, RD1) or ensuring the existence of staff rooms where department members could interact in an intergenerational space (Dr. Bailey, RD2).

Speaking specifically in regard to communication within the discipline, Dr. Moore detailed the connection between LDS and communication. He described,

There are stories, there are narratives in stewardship, and you are both creating these stories and putting them in the literature so they outlive you. And you are also making sure that the youngsters coming along are partaking in these stories and becoming one with the field… A lot of our scholarship in NAKHE, which is in Quest and in the International Journal of Kinesiology in Higher Education, is philosophical in nature and we literally debate this stuff, so we get into our histories, our narratives, our traditions, and we describe all that… So, if you are going to be a steward, you are going to have to set up the bureaucracy that everybody can come in and be heard and give people an opportunity to grow in some way… it could be a journal, it could be online stuff, it could be a conference, it could be all of those kinds of things.
Dr. Moore went on to draw on the work of philosopher Alasdair MacIntyre to not only argue the importance of intradisciplinary communication to LDS, but also what the content of that communication should entail.

What MacIntyre argues is that you can understand anything like the discipline of kinesiology, he describes it as a ‘practice’… And a practice has two components that make it really important. One is the concept of the ‘tradition’… The tradition is the living conversation we all have when we come together in our society meetings or read our journals. That describes what the field is and what is excellence in the field, what does it take to be excellent, and all those kinds of things. And there has to be a place for that. So, one of the priorities is that, if you are a steward, you have to make sure there is a place for these conversations and in doing so, the field is conserved. The next thing… what is the ‘perfect life of a practitioner’? So, let’s use Earle Zeigler, where was he born, what did he study, where did he write, where did he live, who did he train, what did he write about…

So this conversation, which is the tradition and then the perfect life of the practitioner, those two things get combined and discussed in these places and then you and I know how to live, and it’s my job to tell the story to you so that you know how to live inside the discipline. So, to conserve this whole thing [i.e., the discipline of kinesiology], that story has to get passed on. It’s a living narrative… a tradition is alive and doing well when people within a thing, he calls it a practice, we’re all kicking it around and trying to figure out what it is. And as soon as you’re engaging in that conversation, you are implicitly doing stewardship, just talking about where the field has been… what excellence is.

(RD1)

In the same way that communication responsibilities were described as priorities for disciplinary stewards of kinesiology, failures in scholars’ communication were also described as part of the need for LDS. One such identified failure was the “lack [of] a broader coherent strategy for the whole issue of engagement with the public domain… the idea of being a public intellectual… doesn’t seem to be so well-developed” (Dr. Williams, RD2). Dr. Josephs described this in her statement that, for example,
we are not on Good Morning America challenging our research results. We just sit around and go, ‘oh man, look at that. They didn’t do this, and everybody knows this doesn’t work.’ Or we might write a paper about it, or comment on a paper, but we don’t really, like, go out and fight for what it is that we know. And, I think, that’s being a bad steward. (RD1)

Another identified communication failure was a lack of real connection between kinesiology’s scholars and practitioners. As Dr. Bailey described,

Yes, you have your professional outlets, your professional journals… but I don’t think enough of us [scholars] do the translation of our academic peer-reviewed papers to that audience. So, there is always this frustration of ‘oh, nobody is reading my work’ or ‘it’s not reaching teachers or coaches.’ Well, of course not. (RD1)

The last identified communication failure was poor communication across the sub-disciplinary areas of kinesiology. Dr. Josephs explained,

we are only talking to people who agree with us. So, the philosophers are only talking to philosophers [for example]. They are only reading their own journals. And we have become so siloed… The philosophers… they have great stuff but the physical educator at the schools and the exercise physiologist don’t hear those stories. So, I think that’s our biggest weakness. Often, we don’t talk to each other. (RD1)

**Theme Five: LDS in Kinesiology Requires an Orientation Toward Collective Purposes and Impacts**

This theme is about the necessary perspective of a disciplinary steward of kinesiology, which was described as an orientation toward collective purposes and impacts. The experts’ discussion suggested that the particulars of such an orientation differs depending upon the scale. At more micro levels, this orientation was portrayed as seeing beyond oneself and one’s sub-discipline to the larger discipline. Doing so was described as involving the overcoming of ego and personal identity, which in turn requires humility and, at times, sacrifice. Such qualities of LDS were described as needed in kinesiology given increasingly individualizing pressures in the university and associated faculty self-interest, as well as failures to provide holistic identity preparation
in kinesiology graduate degrees. At more macro levels, an orientation toward collective purposes and impacts was portrayed as seeing beyond the discipline itself to its societal need and contributions. Having such a respect and appreciation for the sum of the discipline’s parts was described as requiring an inclusive or open-minded perspective. Disciplinary fragmentation, marginalization of the professional aspects of the discipline, and a lack of unifying aim in kinesiology were provided as evidence of the need for these LDS qualities in kinesiology.

“It’s About Leaving the Profession in a Better Place Than When I Got Here”

At micro levels, an orientation toward collective purposes and impacts was described as a recognition of the discipline that transcends us as individuals. As such, Dr. Morgan suggested that a potential “slogan” (RD2) for disciplinary stewards in this regard might be: how can I leave the discipline better than when I entered it? Dr. Morgan provided two related examples from her own experience to demonstrate what this orientation might look like in action. First, she described the collective purpose- and impact-focused decision-making involved in her contemplation of a fork in her career path years ago. She explained,

as the door knocked two or three times about moving into the department chair role, I had to stop and think, ‘what’s going to leave the place better?’ … Am I willing to give up the pursuit of going for full professor and doing the research that needs to be done to get a full professor? Or, do I move into administration in order to help the broader good of more people?’ I chose the route that I did, which then left me at the role of an associate professor… And so, the collective good, the old Spock term, the needs of the many outweigh the needs of the one, was kind of what I chose. (RD1)

In the second example, she described that her decision-making as an administrator continued to reflect this orientation. She explained,

in my role as department chair, I often had to put the other programs, who needed the resources based on their student credit hours and the number of majors, I had to put their needs even above the needs of my own program. And while I didn't like that, I had to swallow my own pride, so to speak, and say ‘ok, this program is where the resources are going.’ And even as an administrator, what that meant
was then I had to continue teaching because there weren’t enough resources within my own program… I might not have won the favour of my own colleagues in my own program as much, but I had to defend the broader umbrella. (RD1)

Dr. Morgan’s examples, and the many other examples provided by the other experts, indicated that considering the broader discipline over oneself or one’s sub-discipline requires humility, and sometimes sacrifice, to be able to overcome ego and personal identity. In fact, some experts, like Dr. Bryant, explained this explicitly. He noted, there is “a connotation of humility when you talk about stewardship. Right? I'm not the boss, I didn't create everything. The world doesn't begin and end with me” (RD2).

In an effort to provide an antithetical example of a collective purpose- and impact-focused orientation, in round one Dr. Williams raised the prominence of ego and personal identity in Donald Trump’s style as President and steward of the United States. In Round Two, Dr. Richards agreed and elaborated on these issues of ego and identity. She explained,

it has to be an emphasis on ours not mine, and a shared identity… ultimately the collective is what is important, and it’s that critical mass and shared identity that is going to mean that its anything more than individual. I’d certainly agree with that sort of challenging of egos and our identity. Our field needs to be what is emphasized.

At micro levels, an orientation toward collective purposes and impacts was described as needed in kinesiology given the increasingly individualizing pressures in the university and the faculty self-interest that has resulted. As Dr. Armstrong described, because the reward system of the university is “inherently individualistic… people go back into their offices [alone] and they publish” (RD1). As a result of these pressures, “people get so focused in on the career-building stuff, and the day-to-day management of people, the day-to-day putting out of spot fires and fending off crises” (Dr. Williams, RD2). Dr. Moore elaborated that often, “working on things that are urgent, or timely, or right in front of us, that keeps us from doing the things that are big picture, that are important to the actual good conduct of our discipline” (RD2). Dr. Morgan made the link between these pressures and the need for LDS clear in the following statement,
the current climate for faculty would suggest that ‘it’s all about me. I have to take
care of myself in order to get tenure and promotion’… The recommendations are
given to young faculty ‘don’t do too much service, only worry about your
teaching and your research. Only do this, don’t do that.’… [This] present[s] a gap,
which is why it’s very important for the senior leaders to also provide… those
mentoring behaviours, those stewardship behaviours… otherwise, when the senior
leaders leave, there will be a huge hole. And it’s going to be all these people who
are thinking ‘it’s all about me, it’s all about me,’ instead of, ‘it’s about leaving the
profession, leaving the institutions in a better place than when I got here.’ (RD2)

This sentiment seemed to be shared amongst many of the experts as some described their
experience with colleagues who were “ego-centric” (Dr. Frankel, RD1), or “pretentious”
(Dr. Bryant, RD1), or “all-about-me” (Dr. Morgan, RD1), or “career-people” (Dr. Bailey,
RD1) as one of the primary reasons they became interested in LDS and related topics. Dr.
Williams described, “self-interest overruling what would be for the good of the field
more generally… [is] the opposite of stewardship” (RD1), yet, Dr. Bailey pointed out, “at
the moment, self-interest overrides the interest of kinesiology” (RD1). It does not seem
this trend will improve in the future without an intervention such as LDS as, in round
one, Dr. Frankel identified the lack of “preparation for this kind of holistic
understanding” as a “giant gaping hole in doctoral programs… they are wholly
suboptimal on this.” In round two Dr. Bailey responded to Dr. Frankel’s comment in
definitive agreement,

    this training piece actually catches me out. The doctoral programs don't train
    faculty to do this work. I think that's absolutely right… I just am appalled by the
    level of professional development opportunities that they give candidates… in
    relation to being a lifelong participant in the actual discipline itself. And that's
    clear.

As a result of these limits in identity preparation, many experts pointed out that too many
in kinesiology identify solely with their sub-disciplinary area and not at all with the larger
discipline. Dr. Armstrong explained, “If you asked people in a kinesiology faculty, ‘what
is your intellectual community?’ I would be interested in the response they’d make…
that, to me, is a really important test of where their heart lies and maybe where their
future lies” (RD1). Interestingly, when the experts were asked to describe themselves in the demographic section of the interview, virtually all resisted a sub-disciplinary categorization. They each, in their own way, described themselves as spanning the boundaries of kinesiology in some manner.

“What Do You Need Kinesiology For? It’s That Sum of The Parts Thing That is Actually the Key”

At macro levels, an orientation toward collective purposes and impacts was described as placing emphasis on the societal need and contributions of the discipline of kinesiology over the discipline itself. Dr. Frankel described this as focusing not on the “academic discipline that simply exists to study phenomena apart from everyday reality” (RD1), but on “what is the field for?... for what and to whom are we accountable? And, particularly, how do we stand uniquely?” (RD2). Dr. Bryant similarly described the need to “put the wagon [read: discipline] behind the horses [read: purpose]” (RD1). In other words, he suggested that scholars in kinesiology need to be driven by what society needs from them and then organize themselves accordingly, rather than being driven by what they might prefer given their personal interests and/or what their existing disciplinary configuration might dictate.

The experts offered some suggestions as to what the contemporary purpose of kinesiology might be. The general consensus seemed to be the need to help address the movement- and health-related needs of all people, including and particularly those outside the mainstream. For instance, Dr. Richards suggested the need to address “issues of inclusion and equity” (RD1). Dr. Josephs described the need to “not get caught in the status quo dealing with, you know, athletes and athletic people, and good movers, and people who are hetero… [and instead concern ourselves with] equal access and opportunity and diverse populations… [and] under-represented groups” (RD2). Perhaps most comprehensively, Dr. Frankel described his vision of kinesiology’s purpose in the 21st Century as to help maximize “the physical activity, exercise, play, and overall health behaviour by people who are challenged by structural, social, and economic disadvantage, and particularly those that are clustered in particular social geographies” (RD1).
To articulate the need for such a focus on the discipline’s collective purposes and impacts, some of the experts offered warnings of what might happen without such an orientation. There were suggestions that without a “sense of… higher purpose, or a broader sort of strategic remit” (Dr. Williams, RD2) kinesiology would be “an impoverished discipline or a shadow of a discipline, something that isn’t real” (Dr. Bryant, RD1). Dr. Armstrong similarly pointed out, “you could be a hero in kinesiology, but not have any connection with the broader world. And that for me is a limitation. Stewardship in kinesiology… requires that you can connect and speak beyond your discourse community” (RD1). Unfortunately, Dr. Black described that she has often observed this disconnect to be the status quo. She described witnessing too many scholars in the discipline carrying out their responsibilities “without attention to what it all means” (RD1). Dr. Williams went as far as to suggest “I think the norm is apolitical, not immoral, but almost [laughter]… there is no recognition that there are values to be fought for in some contexts” (RD1). Similarly, Dr. Frankel lamented the many scholars in the discipline “who see their primary responsibility… as analysis and not action… the grand hope [of LDS] is that we re-centre the field as one that is focused on helping in service of broader ideals… and you won’t get there with analysis alone” (RD2). He went on to speak of the consequence of a lack of such an orientation in what he called:

runaway kinesiology… it’s going to lose all of its outcomes and its responsibilities. There will be gall displacement… one consequence of not having defensible outcomes that have both empirical warrants, theoretical grounding, and philosophical underpinnings, is that we don’t have… as [Carroll] wrote in ‘Alice in Wonderland’… ‘if you don’t know where you’re headed then any road will take you.’ (RD2)

The experts described that a focus on the discipline’s collective purposes and impacts requires an “inclusive” (Dr. Bryant, RD1), “open” (Dr. Armstrong, RD2), “10,000 feet” (Dr. Moore, RD1), “unselfish” (Dr. Josephs, RD1), “flexible” (Dr. Richards, RD1) perspective that respects and appreciates all parts of the discipline for what it is that they can achieve together. In other words, when the focus is on collective purposes and impacts “there is no ‘we vs. they.’ There is ‘us’ with multiple areas of expertise. And we better talk, and we better understand each other, or else we are going
to be not a very strong department or as good as we should be.” (Dr. Bryant, RD1). Dr. Bailey similarly stated, “it doesn’t matter if you are a biomechanist, or physiologist, or sport pedagogue, you can all appreciate the complementary nature of the different [sub-]disciplines within your faculty and how they actually deliver the shared value” (RD1). Dr. Bryant expressed this comprehensively in his river metaphor.

I see our discipline like a river where we are all needed. And the micro people are at the headwaters of the river and look at the things that cause the river to be, so they need certain tools to measure things at the headwaters of the river. But I work down at the deeper, bay part of the river and I’m trying to understand human life as it interfaces with movement and we need different kinds of tools… Don’t you people see that we are all studying water and you are looking at it in a different place of the stream than I am?… The water down in the bay affects the water upstream, and the water upstream affects the water down in the bay. So, I cannot do my work without at least an appreciation for, if not some sort of knowledge about, water at the headwaters. So, in fact, I read chemistry, I read biology myself… They are not all philosophy books. So, we philosophers need to understand the micro part, at least a little bit. I’m not an expert by any stretch. I would urge my colleagues in the micro parts of our field to have at least respect for, if not a degree of knowledge of, the macro parts of our field. That’s one of my big pitches… I hate dichotomies. Are you a science guy or a philosophy guy? I just say, ‘yep!’ It drives them crazy… It’s not either or, it’s ‘yes’ [laughter]. So, if you love human movement, you are a ‘yes’ person. You study it in all ways that help us interface better with human movement to ensure we have a better life. I don’t care how you do it as long as it works. (RD1)

Dr. Williams put this more succinctly in his statement: “What do you need kinesiology for? It’s that sum of the parts thing that is actually the key” (RD1).

The discipline of kinesiology was described as is in need of such an inclusive perspective given the historical and ongoing fragmentation of its sub-disciplinary areas and the marginalization of the more professionally-oriented areas in particular. Dr. Morgan lamented this fragmentation in her statement that “We aren’t good at having a focus so that we can be united. Our sub-disciplines have become so strong that the
general category suffers. And so, therefore, it’s easy to pick off some of the sub-disciplines that aren’t as powerful” (RD1). For his part, Dr. Bryant highlighted the “discipline-profession dichotomy that has [historically] informed the discipline” (RD1). He explained that professional knowledge has received short shrift in the academy and thus he suggested a priority of LDS in kinesiology is to

redefine the discipline and what counts as discipline… as the domains of questions related to human movement. Some of them are practical questions, like how to hit a ball more effectively. Some of them are more theoretical questions about what effect does exercise have on one’s health… I don’t care if it’s practical, in the gym or out of the gym, in the lab or out of the lab, as long as it’s a good question that is going to move us forward in the understanding of the relationship between people and movement. So that’s the discipline, the discipline is grounded in good questions. (RD1)

Dr. Frankel summarized the link between the need for an inclusive perspective and LDS in his statement that “diversity is a strength, but needs to be maintained, and one of the mechanisms for maintaining it is stewardship” (RD2).

Prognostic and Motivational Framings:
How Could LDS in Kinesiology be Realistically Developed? What Would Motivate Participation in LDS Development?

The prognostic and motivational framing about how to realistically develop LDS in kinesiology and how to motivate those in kinesiology to participate in an LDS development agenda, drew much less discussion than the previously described diagnostic framing. This is clear in Dr. Bailey’s statement that

I actually haven’t considered how you would do that [i.e., develop and motivate LDS]… I’m still trying to work through that in my mind. I think that’s the one thing I haven’t engaged with… so you’ve hit a nerve. It’s something I need to think seriously about. (RD2)

The prognostic and motivational discussion that was had, however, can be summarized into the following three themes.

The first theme captures the experts’ perspectives that some LDS development must happen in initiatives that are specifically dedicated to it. In essence, this theme
addresses the question of when LDS development should happen, with the answer being it should not be left to chance nor interpretation. What might happen in these dedicated LDS development initiatives is not described in this theme; what is described, however, is that such dedication is necessary because LDS is something that must be consciously engaged with for it to be understood. If such dedicated initiatives are to be established, experts indicated that extrinsic incentives must also be established for motivation.

The next theme addresses the question of where within the kinesiology discipline LDS development should happen. This theme is entitled ‘LDS development must be multifarious and contextualized’ and suggests that LDS development must be addressed in multiple formats and through various disciplinary structures, akin to the way LDS itself manifests in multiple forms. The experts’ framing suggests that, for both meaning and motivational reasons, it is key to have LDS development in every context so as to continuously reach scholars in kinesiology wherever they are.

The third and final theme addresses the question of how LDS development might unfold, or what the mode of LDS development might be. In this theme, the provision of opportunities for dialogue, or ‘talking not telling’ about LDS, is emphasized. The method of sharing narratives was particularly endorsed by the experts’ as a way to start such dialogue, given that narratives can illuminate the rewards of LDS, which can function as a motivational factor in development.

It is important to note that the prognostic and motivation themes should be read with a caveat in mind. Some of the experts raised the issue that some scholars might not be open to receiving messages about LDS at all. Dr. Bailey made this clear in her statement that,

I have seen and experienced some people who have come in [to the discipline] and they are not interested in this [i.e., LDS]… they already come with a disposition that doesn’t necessarily maybe position them to actually engage with this notion of stewardship… So, it’s interesting because we were talking, we’ve spent a lot of time talking about what we can do, but I think there has to be some level of acknowledgement that a lot is dependent, as well, on who is coming to the table. (RD2)
There were some suggestions that this was most often the case with mid- to late-career faculty members. As Dr. Armstrong put it, “there is a narrowing of the arteries, or hardening of the categories, over time for most people” (RD2).

**Theme One: There Must be Dedicated and Incentivized LDS Development Initiatives**

This theme reflects some of the experts’ arguments that LDS development in kinesiology will require some dedicated development initiatives to be instated (although this is not to suggest that LDS development happens exclusively in dedicated initiatives). One reason dedicated development initiatives were recommended was to ensure that LDS development is not left to chance, as it historically has been to largely unsuccessful results. Another reason that dedicated LDS development initiatives were recommended was because the nature of LDS, as a philosophy, requires that it be consciously engaged with and practiced if it is to be developed. There was also discussion amongst the experts that if such dedicated LDS development initiatives were actually instituted, there must be accompanying incentives. It was argued that without incentives, the motivation to create and engage in LDS development initiatives would be unlikely.

“We Need to be More Intentional about It”

Some of the experts lamented assumptions that if an individual is a good scholar, they will be a good steward, or that if an individual is engaged in service, they will automatically come to understand and embody LDS. Many experts made it very clear that they did not believe this to be the case. That is, they did not believe that LDS automatically follows from excellence in particular academic areas, nor did they believe that LDS development happens by osmosis. Rather, one must consciously work to develop an LDS philosophy, and thus there should be initiatives dedicated to that development. As Dr. Armstrong put it, these “things have got to be taught” (RD1). Dr. Moore explained his belief that scholars in kinesiology need to “talk explicitly about [LDS and]… make sure there are training mechanisms to make people good at it” (RD1); in round two he went on to add that “there just needs to be some kind of consciousness raising” (RD2). Dr. Bryant expressed a similar sentiment in his assertion that we need to be more intentional about it [i.e., LDS development]… we should educate for courage and future decisions [referencing Golde’s descriptors of...
stewardship]… We’ve left it to happen-stance… If we are lucky, they [i.e., scholars in kinesiology] are future-oriented and courageous. But we’re not always that lucky. It’s status-quo or worse… Our training needs to be strengthened.

(RD1)

In articulating the point that LDS must be intentionally developed – that is, that there should be dedicated LDS development initiatives in which the learner is conscious of what they are engaging in – the experts highlighted the importance of practice and feedback. For example, Dr. Moore explained, “you have to practice being a steward, then you gotta get feedback, you have to be assessed in your stewardship… at some point we need to actually step back and see how we’re doing and have discussions about it” (RD1).

As another example, Dr. Bryant described the embodiment of an LDS philosophy as ‘know-how,’ which he argued takes practice to develop. He explained,

Teach it. Practice it. Get repetitions in it. You don’t get ‘know-how’ without repetitions. I play the piano. I don’t know if you play the piano, but you gotta practice. You gotta go to the keyboard… allow for practice no matter what domain of kinesiology you happen to be in. Practice, practice, practice. (RD1)

He later went on to suggest that such practice requires the “need to have places where we can talk about it [i.e., LDS]. It has to be in the curriculum. It has to be in our department meetings. It has to be in our journals” (RD2).

As justification for their recommendation of dedicated LDS development initiatives, some experts called upon their own personal experiences. These reflections included stories of how their own conscious engagement with the construct of LDS caused them to become invested in it and/or helped them to develop it in others. For example, Dr. Frankel described becoming interested in LDS and related concepts when he spent time in a research centre focused upon the study of higher education during his doctoral program where he read and debated these concepts. Later, in his role as department chair, Dr. Frankel described that through “nothing short of day-in and day-out teaching and learning, deliberate pedagogy focused on the academic discipline of kinesiology” (RD1) he actually tried to develop the mechanisms for [LDS] and talked a lot about organizational culture and made it a point to make sure everyone we hired was
inducted into that culture and assumed collective responsibility for who we were and what we do. (RD2)

For Dr. Josephs, it was later in her career that she became interested in LDS because it was then that she had set out to write a paper about a related topic. It was through her reading about LDS and related concepts that she felt she began to understand it. As a result of her experience, she developed annual workshops via the cross-disciplinary scholarly kinesiology association she belongs to. She described that, in these workshops, “we really talk a lot about stewardship and bringing the next generation along to be stewards of our field” (RD1). Dr. Josephs shared her belief that “you cannot have a good steward if they haven’t studied” LDS (RD1).

“Lives are Based on Incentives”

If dedicated LDS development initiatives are to actually be instituted, there was adamant discussion amongst the experts that there must be corresponding incentives. The rationale provided was that without incentives, the motivation to create and engage in LDS development efforts will likely not exist, nor will the motivation to actually embed an LDS philosophy into the way one works. Dr. Bryant was clear about this in his statement that

lives are based on incentives. Does it [for example] pay to do collective stuff? Because it’s harder to do collective stuff. It takes more time. I’m more efficient when I just write my articles by myself and nobody bothers me… So, the [extrinsic] incentives have to be there. (RD1)

He and some of the other experts offered specific suggestions as to the relevant type of incentive needed: criteria in faculty member evaluation systems. Dr. Bryant suggested, “there has to be a degree of generic change that modifies the P and T [i.e., promotion and tenure] kinds of requirements” (RD2). To emphasize this point, Dr. Moore made the following suggestion, “I would argue you should never tenure somebody who is not a good steward” (RD2). The experts who argued for these incentives acknowledged how difficult it would be to secure such a change in requirements. As evidence of the nature of this challenge, Dr. Black provided a recent example from a department meeting discussion about the measures used to evaluate annual performance at her institution. She explained,
There was a lot of discussion now around this [evaluation] form. And what came up is, particularly the scientists, who are in the majority, wanted the form simplified. And they wanted a lot of the stuff that the former lecturers had insisted putting related to service removed. And somebody said, ‘Isn’t it important we note how many letters of reference we’re writing for students?’ And the administrator said ‘Why?’… He more or less said, ‘If you think that’s good, then great, but, in a sense, ‘I’m not interested in seeing this on my form, that’s your business.’ So, I thought… isn’t that exactly a contrary example to what you’re talking about in terms of stewardship? (RD2)

Despite the incredible challenge of changing university evaluation structures to become incentives for LDS, Dr. Bryant still lobbied for it. He argued,

We have to undo a little bit of the bias that exists in the modern university, that is, that things that can’t be measured aren’t real. We have to undo that. Things that can’t be measured are very real, and perhaps more real in the sense of importance than some of the things that you can measure. And so, there’s that bias that I think is partly responsible for the shape of our curriculum and it’s partly responsible for the fact that we don’t talk about these things. We have Quest, one little journal where we are sort of allowed to talk about squishy things like values. And then all of the other really important journals where you’re not allowed to talk about those things. So, there needs to be a bit of a culture shift back towards the significance of the intangible. (RD2)

**Theme Two: LDS Development Must Be Multifarious and Contextualized**

This theme captures the experts’ discussion that LDS development must be addressed in multiple formats and through various structures in the discipline. Such a multifarious development approach parallels the multiple manifestations of LDS previously described, as well as ensures that development is contextualized, which is particularly key for motivational purposes. The most prominently discussed LDS development initiatives were related to the coursework of undergraduate and graduate students in the discipline, structured exercises at faculty meetings and academic unit events, as well as initiatives in kinesiology’s sub-disciplinary and cross-disciplinary scholarly associations.
“It’s Not a One-Off… It’s a Whole Way of Approaching the Process”

Similar to the way the experts’ described that LDS is embedded throughout one’s approach to academia and thus cannot be reduced to one activity, career stage, group, and so on, they also described that LDS development cannot be reduced to one format or structure. Dr. Williams explained,

strategically, there needs to be multiple things that are done. It’s not a one-off that you do a course in the history of physical education and then you’re going to have that disposition to see the field. It’s a whole way of approaching the process [of development]. (RD2)

As such, each of the suggested LDS development initiatives that follow were not intended to stand on their own, but rather to be complementary to other initiatives.

“We Need to Revitalize the Philosophy-Tending Kind of Courses”

The most widely discussed forms of LDS development were related to the formal education of kinesiology students. Much of this conversation revolved around coursework. There were suggestions that undergraduate and graduate courses that addressed the discipline’s history, principles, values, and philosophies would be key to the development of a collective purposes and impacts orientation that was previously described as so central to LDS (see Theme Five of Diagnostic Framing). As Dr. Frankel pointed out, these degree programs should be about “occupational or professional socialization… [and] the best kind of socialization is the formation of an identity” (RD1). Dr. Bailey similarly described, that students need “outlets that allow them to be these future, you know, stewards of a discipline… professional identity has to be nurtured for them [i.e., students] and they have to feel that” (RD2).

In regard to undergraduate programs, Dr. Bryant spoke about the now defunct “history and principles” (RD2) courses that used to be in every program. He explained, “so right at the start of your curriculum, the important thing that you did was debate ideas about our values… we need to revitalise the philosophy-tending kind of courses… so that we do [develop stewards]” (RD2). Similarly, Dr. Williams spoke about the need for such learning in graduate education, and while there is not typically any coursework in doctoral education in the country in which he currently works, there is at the master’s
level. He explained that these courses, particularly those with a historical focus, are key to understanding where you have common roots, where you have touchstones, and how that’s evolved over time, how you have a shared place in the world, how those commonalities might be effected even now, what the residual continuities are from the past, [and] what the discontinuities are. Understanding that stuff is about fostering a disposition to view the field in particular ways. And I do think that is one of the missing links, the fact that we don’t teach [history], and when we [do] teach history, it’s history of sports, it’s not history of [the discipline].

(RD2)

Specific to doctoral education, the need for courses related to the philosophy of science was repeatedly articulated. It was in this context that Dr. Black suggested LDS development “starts… with doctoral students and bringing them together [i.e., from across the sub-disciplinary areas] in soul-searching seminars where they actually… really look at philosophy of science” (RD2). Dr. Bryant expanded upon what such a course might entail, he explained, “a philosophy of science course… talks about the nature of good research, chaos theory, systems thinking, the kinds of modern philosophy of science ideas that show how things are connected” (RD2). Also speaking about doctoral education, Dr. Josephs suggested reinstating a revamped version of a now-defunct doctoral course that was more practical in nature and included more explicit reference to LDS. She described a course called “professional preparation” (RD2) that was offered, although has now been removed, from the two universities she had worked for. The course covered “everything from, like, getting tenure, and, you know, developing your line of scholarship and working in the field, and being a leader in the field” (RD2). She went on to suggest that a new version of this course could include “a capstone course that covered stewardship issues with doctoral students… like a seminar course where the doc[toral] students would be in there with professors… and they would talk about how to steward” (RD2). Important to note is that, in the same breath that some of the experts suggested these courses, they acknowledged that such proposals would be very difficult to secure. As Dr. Bryant described, “they’d laugh at me here at [my university… they’d
say] ‘Why would we waste time on that?’” (RD2), with the implication being that these courses would take time away from the priority of specialized sub-disciplinary learning.

“We Should Have Mandatory Seminars Where All Scientists… Meet Together and Talk About the Philosophy of Science”

Two main suggestions for LDS development in academic units were discussed. One was related to the organization of structured exercises in faculty meetings. Some of the experts suggested that faculty should be asked to read articles on LDS and then engage in dialogue about its import for their particular unit. Dr. Armstrong explained, “If I was a head of department, what I’d want is… a book club and we sat around over lunch and talked about it. It could be just a paper [on LDS]… let’s get a bit of a dialogue going” (RD2). Dr. Frankel suggested that a way to structure such an initiative and ensure that it both happened and was sustained was to have “one faculty member every semester devoted to [it]… making it a shared opportunity. Someone is brought in, we Skype in someone, we agree to do a shared reading” (RD1).

The other suggestion for LDS development in academic units was related to unit-wide colloquia that would be mandatory for faculty and graduate students. These colloquia would not be intended for researchers to take turns presenting sub-disciplinary research to students and faculty from other sub-disciplines. The experts emphasized that the intention should not merely be exposure to one another’s research. Rather, speakers should be carefully selected who could either present cross- or inter-disciplinary research or who could discuss philosophy of science issues that would be relevant to all in the unit. Dr. Black suggested,

We should have mandatory seminars where all scientists – social scientists, hard scientists and humanities – meet together and talk about the philosophy of science. I think that we should have visiting scholars come in, not just friends and relatives of various faculty, but ones who can speak to all sides of the school. So again, you need to have someone with a desire to actually find a way to join the professional and the disciplinary groups together in common discussion about central issues in kinesiology, and that’s quite difficult to do. (RD2).

“There’s an Ecology for This That Could Be Mapped”
Finally, some of the experts spoke about the role of sub- and cross-disciplinary scholarly associations in the LDS development agenda. This conversation tended to be less about specific development initiatives and more about the responsibility of, and opportunity for, such organizations in this regard. In terms of sub-disciplinary scholarly associations, Dr. Frankel suggested that these organizations could be the answer to “where will the impetus [for engagement in LDS development] come from?” (RD1). He went on to explain that while most kinesiology faculty members do not belong to a cross-disciplinary scholarly association, they typically are associated with a sub-disciplinary one. Therefore, these sub-disciplinary associations could be key to the rollout of an LDS development agenda. He described,

I could imagine a way for these sub-disciplinary societies to start these conversations and have them spill over into home units or field-wide sorts of [organizations]. In other words, there’s an ecology for this that could be mapped… what happens in the societies [could] come back to home departments, what happens in home departments [could] go back to the societies. (RD1)

It was suggested by some of the experts that one of the responsibilities of cross-disciplinary scholarly associations is to “show leadership and take initiative” (Dr. Williams, RD1) to get LDS conversations started in sub-disciplinary associations. Similar to the previously discussed colloquia, the value of cross-disciplinary scholarly association meetings was described as not about exposure to sub-disciplinary research. Rather, it was suggested that these cross-disciplinary associations are key to the LDS development agenda because they enable people across the discipline to come together and “allow [for] those kind of strategizing opportunities to happen” (Dr. Williams, RD2). Some of the experts highlighted NAKHE, a cross-disciplinary scholarly association of kinesiology based in the United States, as an example of an association taking such leadership and providing such opportunities to strategize. Experts highlighted the fact that the association hosted a conference on the topic of LDS in 2015 and have infused the construct into their annual Leadership Development Workshops, as just two examples.
Theme Three: Develop LDS by Providing Opportunities for Dialogue and the Sharing of Narratives

A strategy for LDS development discussed by the experts was the provision of opportunities for dialogue. This development strategy was promoted because it is not prescriptive and, as such, is not likely to prompt resistance. Instead, dialogue allows individuals to take some initiative in their LDS development and ascribe their own personal meaning to the construct for lasting investment. The sharing of narratives was described as a particularly useful way to start a dialogue about LDS as it ‘shows’ rather than ‘tells’ about the construct. Narratives were highlighted as an especially effective strategy when aiming to start a motivational dialogue because they can illuminate the way LDS can be both professionally and personally rewarding.

“I’m Not Telling People ‘Do It This Way’… I’m Trying to Set Up Opportunities, Dialogues”

Although communication was previously described as critical to what LDS in kinesiology entails, it was also described as a strategy to develop LDS, and one that can be particularly motivational. To use some of the experts’ language, dialogue can be considered as both a “strategy for” and “outcome of” LDS (Dr. Moore, RD1). Dr. Bailey even suggested that, given the novelty of the LDS construct in kinesiology at this time, “having the conversation [about LDS] is, I think, as much [of an] outcome that we can have at the moment” (RD2). Experts like Dr. Frankel offered reflections that “in opening up opportunities with people to have dialogue about stewardship, I actually provided an avenue for stewardship in ways that would not have happened had not that idea been presented” (RD2).

Some specific examples of LDS development via dialogue were described. Dr. Williams suggested that,

when you actually talk about what is the touchstone, you would immediately begin to stimulate a conversation around the nature of the field, where it’s come from, and then you can talk about continuities and discontinuities… all of a sudden you’re opening up a new universe in terms of discourse, and the sorts of conversations that could possibly be had in a department. (RD2)
Another suggestion was from Dr. Richards who described, when talking “about ways of working, and what sorts of excellence we’re actually interested in, what sort of culture of research we’re trying to build… if you… talk about those sorts of things you’ll find more points of connection and commonality.” (RD2)

One reason dialogue was explained to be an effective LDS development strategy was that it is not dictatorial, and this helps to avoid prompting resistance from those engaging in LDS development initiatives. The issue of resistance to LDS and the need to, and challenge of, not sounding prescriptive and condescending in one’s messaging was raised by a few experts. This was evidenced in Dr. Frankel’s reflection about his years spent talking about LDS and related concepts in more declarative terms that provoked unwanted reactions, and his eventual realization of the value of a dialogical approach. He recounted,

after looking in the mirror for the 150th time, or more, and wondering why people got really upset with me at a faculty meeting or at a conference… what I hit on was it wasn’t so much the message that I delivered, because in so many ways people thought the message to be engaging. It was… [that] I was presenting it, as so many of our colleagues present things, as a win-lose sort of debate… [I wasn’t] looking at how mature [scholarly associations] of all kinds that are engaged in stewardship prioritize that dialogue. That took me to Bakhtin’s idea of dialogical understanding, and it has fundamentally changed the way I look at the world and how I act in it… [Nowadays] I’m not telling people ‘do it this way’… I’m trying to set up opportunities, dialogues, with some frameworks that are available… frameworks that allow us to have meaningful dialogue and with the idea being we’re not going to have a one best answer and that so much of the one best answer [thing] has been wrapped up in people’s egos in their careers. (RD2)

The reality that scholars’ academic careers are so personal to them and that their egos are so entangled in them, was often repeated and underscores the importance of talking about, rather than telling about, LDS.

Another reason dialogue was explained to be an effective strategy for LDS development was that it allows individuals the opportunity to take some of the initiative and ascribe personal meaning to the construct of LDS and actually become invested in it.
Dr. Moore used the analogy of gardening to explain this. He described that LDS development via a strategy such as dialogue is much more like gardening than it is like instruction or telling somebody how to do something. You plant a seed and then… growth has to come with a healthy dose of personal responsibility, creativity, and an initiative on the part of the people who are becoming leaders. So, my role is… to set up those structures [for dialogue] so that new leaders can both be planted and grow. (RD1)

Dr. Josephs also hit on the importance of dialogue and compared it to other possible methods of LDS development. She explained that, for example, she doesn’t think that people “get… or learn how to be stewards from a[n article in a] journal alone” (RD2) rather they need to also engage with it through dialogue and make it their own if it is to result in changes in their actions. When the experts described the unit-wide colloquia and the department meeting ‘book club’ initiatives in Theme Two, they portrayed them as efforts to get some “fun” (Dr. Bryant, RD2), “relaxed,” and “playful” (Dr. Armstrong, RD2) dialogue going.

“There are Examples of People in the System [who] have Managed that.”

The sharing of narratives was described as a useful way to spark dialogue about LDS. Importantly, sharing and discussing narratives, whether they are in the form of critical incidents, one’s own biography, or exemplars of others, provides some evidence and description of LDS rather than “preaching… this is what I’ve done, and this is how effective it’s been” (Dr. Bailey, RD2). The sharing of narratives and subsequent discussion about those narratives was described as helpful for early career scholars, so that they might be able to see how senior scholars have gotten where they are now, and also for senior scholars, so that they might be reminded of the opportunities they grew through and that these must be provided for others. Most prominently, the sharing and discussion of narratives was described as an effective LDS development strategy because it is a way to help others see how LDS is possible and how rewarding it can be. In terms of the possibility of LDS, Dr. Bailey explained that sharing narratives can demonstrate that

with appropriate guidance and mentorship and thinking strategically, there is no reason why leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship cannot be central to the work
that you do. There is no need... [for] tension in relation [to that]. And there are examples of people in the system [who] have managed that. (RD2)

In terms of the professional rewards of LDS, narratives can also demonstrate how LDS:
(a) can be “an opportunity creator for things that matter for one’s career... an employment-related asset, [as it] announces to employers that you are the kind of person for whom work is more than a job” (Dr. Frankel, RD1); (b) can “help ease your pathway through tenure and promotion” (Dr. Morgan, RD1); and also (c) that the scholars who are engaged in LDS are more likely “to become department chairs, or program coordinators, or graduate coordinators... than the people who have not been associated with this” (Dr. Moore, RD2). In terms of personal rewards, narratives provide an outlet to showcase the experience of scholars like Dr. Morgan who described the feedback she received about her LDS efforts to “mean more to me than any accolade I could get from the college or the university” (RD2). These experts’ comments suggest that the sharing of narratives could prompt motivational discussion about “what your mark will be on the profession when you leave... what do you want [written] on your [professional] headstone?” (Dr. Morgan, RD2).

Chapter Summary

In this chapter the thematic findings of this doctoral research were detailed. Described first were the experts’ diagnostic framings of LDS as: (a) a slippery term, yet powerful and valuable construct; (b) the collective responsibility of all scholars in kinesiology and taking many concomitant forms; (c) a philosophy that is intentionally embedded throughout a scholar’s professional actions; (d) about ensuring and enhancing the discipline’s future by pursuing integrity within in it, for which communication is critical; and (e) requiring an orientation towards collective purposes and impacts.

Described second were the experts’ prognostic and motivational framings of LDS development as needing to be: (a) dedicated and incentivized; (b) multifarious and contextualized; and (c) dialogical and narrative-based. These findings are summarized in Table 6 and are discussed in the following chapter.

Table 6

Summary of Thematic Findings: The Experts’ Vision of and for LDS in Kinesiology
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The need for LDS in kinesiology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who disciplinary stewards of kinesiology are</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The scope of LDS in kinesiology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The meaning of LDS in kinesiology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The development of LDS in kinesiology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation for LDS development in kinesiology</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having LDS development infused in various academic structures enables contextualization of initiatives, which is important for motivational purposes (i.e., reaching people wherever they are).

Dialogical development initiatives are non-prescriptive and interactive and, as such, lessen potential resistance to construct and allow for the ascription of personal meaning, which spurs investment in the construct of LDS.
Development initiatives should involve sharing stories of other scholars’ LDS engagement as it shows others how LDS is possible and how it can be advantageous for one’s career (e.g., ease pathways to tenure and promotion and administration)

Issues related to LDS in kinesiology

- LDS is a slippery term, it is difficult to state its meaning clearly.
- Many scholars in kinesiology are unfamiliar with the term LDS, it may be perceived by many in the natural science sub-disciplines of kinesiology as ‘educational-speak.’
- The LDS role and responsibility of those scholars in non-traditional academic roles (e.g., postdoctoral fellows, non-teaching staff) is unclear.
- Motivation for LDS in kinesiology has not been considered in detail.
Chapter 5 – Discussion

In this investigation I aimed to inquire into the promise of the LDS construct as a way for kinesiology to survive and thrive in the 21st Century, and did so by investigating the construct’s meaning, need, development, and motivation. In this chapter I discuss the findings of this investigation in relation to the aim. I argue that the experts’ vision of and for LDS in kinesiology suggests it is a relevant and promising way for scholars within the discipline to successfully negotiate the demands of the current, and foreseeable future, academic climate. This argument is based in my interpretation of the close alignment between the experts’ vision and Alvesson’s (2012) organizational culture theory (described in Chapter Three). That is, it is my view that LDS in kinesiology can be interpreted as an approach focused on understanding and critically reflecting upon organizational culture, and as developed through the everyday reframing of cultural orientations. At an itemized level, the connections with Alvesson’s work illuminate, explain, and substantiate the experts’ vision as sufficiently specific, practical, and transformative for realistic and fruitful application. At a holistic level, alignment with Alvesson’s work indicates LDS is well-suited to navigate the fragmenting and depoliticizing challenges of the 21st Century given the enriched cultural understanding, coordination, and ethical consciousness it stimulates. Discussion of these two levels of alignment and their corresponding impact are presented sequentially in this chapter.

Illuminating, Explaining, and Substantiating the Experts’ Vision of and for LDS in Kinesiology through Alvesson’s (2012) Organizational Culture Theory

In this section I discuss how Alvesson’s (2012) organizational culture theory illuminates, explains, and substantiates the experts’ vision of and for LDS in kinesiology as specific, practical, and transformative enough for realistic and fruitful application. In particular I discuss how the experts’ vision of: (a) the meaning of and need for LDS in kinesiology – as a philosophy focused on ensuring and enhancing the discipline’s future through the pursuit of integrity that is variously and intentionally embedded in all aspects of all scholars’ work – can be interpreted as an approach to organization that is focused on understanding and critically reflecting upon cultural meanings so as to inspire some resistance from undesirable patterns and stimulate more thoughtful and ethical
alternatives; and (b) the development and motivation of LDS in kinesiology – as intentional, incentivized, multifarious, contextualized, and dialogue- and narrative-driven – can be interpreted as a cultural change agenda through the everyday reframing of cultural orientations.

**LDS in Kinesiology as an Approach Focused on Understanding and Critically Reflecting upon Organizational Culture**

The experts’ depiction of the meaning of LDS in kinesiology can be interpreted as focused on understanding and critically reflecting upon organizational culture as advocated by Alvesson (2012). One of the ways this can be seen most fundamentally is in the experts’ description of what they considered the “essence” or “purpose” of LDS in kinesiology: to ensure and enhance the discipline’s future through integrity-focused caretaking. This integrity-focused caretaking was described by the experts as entailing the interrogation of oneself and one’s discipline through the asking of “difficult questions,” such as “what is the field for?” and “are we fit for purpose?”, in the hopes of evolving the discipline more conscientiously. This description clearly links to Alvesson’s (more systematic) approach of questioning whether/how the meanings underpinning particular organizational actions and features might be the result of asymmetrical power relations and/or taken-for-granted assumptions, in the hopes of liberating organizational actors’ thoughts and actions from the status quo and perhaps advancing the organization in more ethical directions.

The experts can be understood as having engaged in and advocated for this exact form of cultural analysis (i.e., focused on power and assumptions) in their discussion of the need for LDS in kinesiology. For example, they can be seen to have questioned asymmetrical power relationships when they critiqued the marginalization of professionally-oriented aspects of kinesiology in the increasingly scientized university environment, and spoke of the corresponding need for LDS as a way to avoid the discipline being “steered by something or somebody else.” They can be seen to have questioned taken-for-granted assumptions when they critiqued American undergraduate physical education programs as not having changed since the 1950’s, and as such argued LDS was needed as a way to avoid “be[ing] clones or mindless copycats.” Recognizing the alignment between the expert-described caretaking of LDS in kinesiology and the
more clearly defined cultural analysis foci of Alvesson’s (2012) approach is informative for scholars in kinesiology who are interested in LDS. That is, Alvesson’s two cultural analysis foci – power and assumptions – could serve as a clearer structure from which to frame LDS caretaking beyond the somewhat vague direction of ‘difficult question-asking,’ consequently making LDS a more accessible and practical endeavor for scholars in kinesiology.

A second way the alignment with Alvesson’s (2012) work can be seen is when it comes to the experts’ view that LDS caretaking requires an ability to orient oneself toward the consideration of the collective purposes and impacts within/of the discipline. Here an appreciation of the parallels to Alvesson’s work not only helps to illuminate why this collective orientation is important to the discipline’s future, but also provides some additional guidance as to how to adopt the orientation most effectively. To explain, parallels can be seen in Alvesson’s description that cultural analysis “calls for an ability to vary perspectives” (p. 13) so as to enable consideration of how organizational “objectives, arrangements, and acts…contribute to, or work against, the common good” (p. 3). Alvesson has suggested that the effect of such consideration on the common good “draws attention to hidden ethical and political dimensions of organizational life” (p. 3). Given the close parallels, it is not surprising that this ethical and political effect was evidenced by the experts in a number of ways. For example, the experts described that a focus on LDS in kinesiology would translate to an “inclusion and equity” focus on the movement-related needs of all people, including and particularly those outside the mainstream. When these parallels are considered alongside Alvesson’s assessment of widespread ethical closure in most organizations, and the experts’ corresponding perception that the “norm [within the discipline is to be] apolitical, not immoral, but almost,” the importance of the ethical and political emphases of LDS as a counterbalancing response to the current organizational status quo is highlighted. However, both the experts and Alvesson have acknowledged the risks of attending to ethical and political issues in such an ethically closed climate. For example, the experts’ described the risk of being “branded as an ideologue or radical,” while Alvesson similarly described the risk of being labelled as “rigid” or “religious,” rather than courageous or of high integrity. Fortunately, from Alvesson’s work scholars in kinesiology who are
interested in LDS can find some guidance, informed by organizational theory and research, to make such work more practical: take a balanced approach and start slow. Alvesson has suggested that “the trick is… to navigate between managerial technocratic consciousness and critical good-doing elitism” (p. 13). He has also advised that

There is often an unnecessary degree of caution, conformism and self-repression in raising issues in organizations, and one can often test – rather than just assume – the responses to critical questioning, starting mildly and then perhaps becoming a little bolder, if emancipation-promoting interventions seem to work. (p. 177)

The experts’ vision of who disciplinary stewards of kinesiology are and are not, and Alvesson’s (2012) distinction between leaders and managers is a third instance of illuminating alignment. To explain, the experts described that, given the nature of LDS, it is not best suited to those in formal leadership positions, such as Deans, who are busy with the bureaucracy of multiple disciplinary units. Instead, they spoke of LDS as for any and, they hope, every scholar in kinesiology willing to take on the perspective required. The experts’ remarks in this regard are aligned with and further explained by Alvesson. He has described that those in formal management roles are tasked with controlling the material and behavioural matters of an organization and, as such, are often figuratively and literally distanced from organizational matters at the level of meanings, which, as previously described, are the concern of LDS caretaking. In contrast to managers and management, Alvesson has described that those who are concerned with impacting organizational matters at the level of meanings can be described as leaders. He also described that such leadership (or meaning work) can be observed as happening incrementally through everyday organizational actions (rather than rapidly through extraordinary heroic actions). However, no recipe for leadership can be provided because it is less about the particular actions of leaders and more about how those actions are interpreted by the particular persons with whom they interact. Alvesson’s depiction of leadership can be clearly seen in the experts’ discussion of LDS. For example, the experts described LDS as “the everyday nature of how you work, how you interact, how you involve people…the ways in which they see you working,” and that the exemplary stewards they could think of are “subtle” or “relatively quiet” in their LDS efforts. Ultimately, Alvesson’s work not only helps to support and explain the experts’ views that
LDS is not suited to formal managers, but also to clarify that disciplinary stewards of kinesiology can be understood, in a cultural sense, as leaders engaged in leadership efforts.

Finally, the experts’ depiction of LDS as a “slippery” construct to articulate given its nature as a “philosophy” that takes many contextualized forms and, as such, is “never going to come down to the fact that you do x, y, z, in a formal sense,” can also be seen in, and better understood through, Alvesson’s (2012) work. Alvesson has also acknowledged that what he is advocating is not easy to describe because it is an approach to, not a formula for or model of, organizational culture, and thus contextualized reflexivity, not standardized procedure, is what characterizes it best. It could be argued that Alvesson’s description of his approach as, for example, a “broad and open framework for sensitized thinking about organization” (p. 200) or a “loosely integrated theoretical framework for facilitating cultural interpretation and reflection on such interpretation” (p. 210) provides scholars in kinesiology who are interested in LDS not only with some clarity on what LDS is, but also with some language to speak more coherently, but not reductively, about the elusive construct. What can also be gleaned from Alvesson’s work is why improved clarity of language around LDS is important. He has explained the need to ensure organizational terms are not “used to cover everything and consequently nothing” (p. 4), nor as hyperculture, that is, as “nice-sounding terms…but which actually are uninformative and mean a form of pseudo- clarity” (p. 194). Both, he has argued, can result in the same misuse, criticism, and, ultimately, disillusionment that has been the case with other important, yet slippery, organizational concepts such as culture, leadership, and trust. Thus, those scholars in kinesiology attempting to forward the LDS agenda would be wise to heed Alvesson’s guidance that “it is important to use the concept without losing focus, direction, and interpretive depth” (p. 4).

The Development and Motivation of LDS in Kinesiology as Cultural Change Through Everyday Reframing

The experts’ depiction of the development of and motivation for LDS in kinesiology can be understood as requiring cultural change, and, in particular, cultural change that is pursued through the everyday reframing of cultural orientations as advocated by Alvesson (2012). To explain it is necessary to begin by describing why the
experts’ depiction of LDS development can be interpreted as calling for cultural change (i.e., change in the meanings governing membership in an organization and the means by which membership is expressed) rather than, for example, change in behaviour. Here it is important to recall that LDS can be understood as a philosophy or approach to organization, not as a model or formula for particular action within organization. Given this nature of LDS as more meaning, rather than behaviour, based, a development approach focused on convincing scholars in kinesiology to think like stewards, rather than coercing scholars to behave like stewards, is most appropriate. The nature of LDS development as focused on cultural, rather than behavioural, change can be clearly seen in the experts’ discussion. For example, a focus on the alteration of meanings in LDS development can be seen in the experts’ discussion of the need to “undo a little bit of the bias that exists in the modern university…[for] a bit of a culture shift” such that engaging in LDS integrity-focused caretaking is more accepted. The focus on meanings can also be seen in the expert suggestion that LDS development should happen via “philosophy-tending [undergraduate and graduate] courses” which “foster a disposition to view the field in particular ways.” Thus, while the experts did not explicitly title their LDS development agenda as cultural change, through Alvesson’s work their views can be better understood as such. What can also be understood through Alvesson’s work is that the experts’ vision is on the right track, as cultural change is indeed the type of change that is most appropriate given that LDS is a meaning, rather than behaviour, based construct.

As for how to pursue the cultural change needed for LDS development in kinesiology, the experts’ vision of the best way forward is supported and clarified through Alvesson’s (2012) views on change. To explain, the experts were clear that LDS will not be successfully developed via a natural “osmosis” type of process, nor will it be developed by forcing scholars to “do it this way.” Instead, the experts described LDS development as requiring “day-in and day-out teaching and learning, deliberate pedagogy” on LDS. This view of LDS development is very similar to Alvesson’s view that cultural change is most realistically achieved through the everyday reframing of cultural orientations, rather than via organic social movements or grand technocratic edicts. Alvesson has described the everyday reframing of cultural orientations in more
detail as: an incremental and “informal culture-shaping agenda, involving pedagogical leadership in which an actor exercises a subtle influence through the renegotiation of meaning” (p. 189). In this instance of alignment, Alvesson’s work serves not only as a language resource for how to articulate the experts’ vision of LDS development more coherently, that is, as everyday reframing, but also supports the experts’ opinion that this type of development is the most realistic route.

Consideration of the alignment between the finer points of the experts’ vision of LDS development and motivation and the tenets of Alvesson’s (2012) everyday reframing approach to cultural change also suggests the experts’ vision is a realistic one and, in some cases, provides some additional guidance that may be useful to scholars in kinesiology who are initiating LDS development efforts. Take, for instance, the examples of LDS development initiatives the experts’ provided: LDS dialogue within undergraduate and graduate courses, faculty meetings, and academic unit colloquia. Through Alvesson’s work it can be understood that because the experts’ suggested development initiatives are located within the routine activities of scholars, they have a practical “realism” and “relevance” to them. Alvesson has explained this realism and relevance is due to these initiatives being “anchored in interactions and ‘natural’ communication… [and] adapted to the material work situations of people and thus ha[ving strong]…action implications. It means that there is good depth in terms of making clear the meanings and interpretations involved” (p. 190).

Another example of illuminating alignment with Alvesson’s (2012) work relates to the experts’ description that LDS development must be dialogical rather than dictatorial. The experts explained that the emphasis on dialogue is not only to avoid prompting resistance from those scholars with strongly formed perspectives, but also because there is “no one best answer.” Instead, they argued that scholars in kinesiology need to be engaged in LDS development opportunities that allow for their “ascription of personal meaning” to the construct, as is possible through dialogues. One expert even remarked that “having the conversation [about LDS] is, I think, as much [of an] outcome that we can have.” Alvesson has outlined a parallel perspective that not only suggests the experts are on the right track with dialogical cultural change initiatives, but also provides additional insight that he has seen himself and in the organizational literature to be
important to the success of such initiatives. He has explained that because cultural change means the revision of ways of thinking, believing, and valuing, it requires voluntary acceptance and commitment from the individuals who are the targets of change, and thus cannot be developed via coercive methods or enforcement measures (as is possible with behavioural change). Alvesson has underscored that the targets of cultural change efforts often have as much to say, if not more, than the initiators of such efforts, and thus dialogue is an essential part of a cultural change initiative. Here Alvesson’s work affirms the experts’ vision of dialogical LDS development as appropriate and necessary for the cultural change that is needed. Alvesson has also emphasized, however, that a focus on non-coercive dialogical change efforts does not mean there is no “pushing” (p. 196) required in cultural change efforts. He has explained that while cultural change efforts require a “willingness to listen to, learn from, and respect the views of” (p. 196) those targeted, they also require “determination, conviction, and initiative” (p. 196) to “push people to devote some time to addressing and discussing cultural issues… [and to] demand that this not be given a low priority or taken off the agenda” (p. 196, emphasis added). In other words, what scholars in kinesiology who are advocating for LDS development within the discipline can learn from this is that, although the change initiatives they plan must be non-coercive, there must be some vigor and persistence on their part to get LDS dialogue on the agenda, and also to ensure it remains there.

Next, consider, for example, the experts’ description that LDS development should be contextualized so as to reach scholars in kinesiology where they are, both literally and figuratively. As a specific example, the experts described that because most scholars in kinesiology belong to a sub-disciplinary scholarly association, and often enthusiastically so, this would be an ideal place to begin LDS conversations that might then “spill over into home units or field-wide sorts of [organizations].” Alvesson (2012) has also advocated for a contextualized and ecological approach to cultural change and through his work an understanding of why such an approach is effective can be understood. He has explained that because a precondition to changing culture is to connect to it, cultural change is a fundamentally local or situated matter. That is, actors should focus on influencing those they directly interact with (i.e., those with whom they have some shared meanings), and understand that those individuals may then influence
others, creating a wider effect. A paraphrasing of Alvesson’s views on the situated and gradual nature of cultural change could serve as a useful guideline for those scholars in kinesiology who are pursuing the development of and motivation for LDS in kinesiology: it is most appropriate and effective to think about making change within the discipline than it is to think about changing the discipline itself.

Two final examples of how the experts’ vision of LDS development and motivation is supported and better understood through Alvesson’s (2012) work are related to their views on incentives and narratives. In regard to the former, the experts’ described that LDS development initiatives must be accompanied by incentives that reward the embedding of an LDS philosophy into one’s work, such as criteria in faculty member evaluation systems. Alvesson’s work can be understood to endorse the experts’ view on incentives and clarify that they are necessary in cultural change initiatives. He has explained that “efforts to accomplish change in meanings…that do not cohere with substantive arrangements exercising behavioural control are often doomed…New cultural messages must connect to the material level to be fully credible and to ‘stick’ in [targets’] hearts and minds” (p. 192). In regard to narratives, the experts’ described LDS development as aided by the sharing and discussion of narratives. This view is shared by Alvesson, who has offered the additional clarification that narratives might be particularly useful to facilitate receptiveness from those who are not open to cultural change, which the experts identified as an issue. He has explained, “sometimes what may appear to be a culturally fixed shared understanding is much more fragile and fragmented – and critical interventions…[such as] story-telling…may lead to unpacking of cultural meanings” (p. 177).

Section Summary

In summary, an appreciation of the individual connections between Alvesson’s (2012) organizational culture theory and the experts’ vision of and for LDS in kinesiology functions to illuminate, explain, and substantiate the experts’ vision. First, Alvesson’s work can be understood to illuminate: more clearly defined foci for the cultural analysis involved in LDS caretaking (i.e., power and assumptions underpinning meanings); the ethical and political effect of such LDS caretaking; language to speak more coherently about the construct; and the cultural nature of the LDS development
agenda. Second, Alvesson’s work can be considered to explain: how a balanced and slow approach to ethical and political intervention may help to mitigate the risk; disciplinary stewards can be considered leaders engaged in leadership (i.e., meaning management); the meaning-based nature of LDS suggests it is best understood as an approach rather than a formula or model for action, and is best developed through cultural change; and that cultural change efforts require ‘pushing’ as well as dialogue. Third and finally, Alvesson’s work can be seen to substantiate the experts’ views that: LDS is not exclusive to, nor best suited for, formal leaders; everyday reframing of cultural orientations is the most realistic way to pursue the development of stewards; and that LDS development must be situated, incentivized, dialogical, and narrative-based. Considered together these connections suggest the experts’ vision of and for LDS in kinesiology is specific, practical, and transformative enough for realistic and fruitful application.

Appreciating the Promise of LDS as a Way for Kinesiology to Survive and Thrive in the 21st Century through Alvesson’s (2012) Organizational Culture Theory

A holistic consideration of the alignment between the experts’ vision of LDS in kinesiology and Alvesson’s (2012) organizational culture theory suggests the construct is well-suited for navigating the fragmenting and depoliticizing challenges of the 21st Century given the enriched cultural understanding, coordination, and ethical consciousness it stimulates.

To begin, when the experts’ vision of LDS in kinesiology is appreciated as a practical-hermeneutic and emancipatory approach to organizational culture – that is, as an approach focused on understanding and critically reflecting upon shared meanings within the discipline so as to inspire some resistance to undesirable patterns and stimulate more thoughtful and ethical alternatives – two major rationales for the approach’s suitability to the 21st Century context become clear. These two rationales are related to the dual significance of organizational culture (described in Chapter Three). The first is related to the significant reality that shared meanings are what make coordinated action, and thereby organization itself, possible – as without some degree of shared meaning there is constant confusion and no organization to speak of (Alvesson, 2012). Therefore, an approach such as LDS that is focused in part upon understanding cultural meanings can be considered a worthy and valuable endeavour as it has been seen to not only enrich
understandings of oneself and others, but also to aid in the development of common interpretations of situations, thereby enabling a greater degree of coordination in the organization (Alvesson, 2012).

Such enriched cultural understanding and improved coordination is critical to the successful navigation of the 21st Century academic context. For instance, as the diversity of viewpoints within academic spaces multiply due to the ongoing, but rapidly increasing, pressures to internationalize all aspects of higher education (including kinesiology), the importance of enriched cultural understandings becomes increasingly salient (Alvesson, 2012; Knight, 2015; Culp, Lorusso, & Viczko, In Press). Furthermore, as scholars are increasingly siloed and fragmented due to the competitive and individualizing audit culture that is predominant in the marketized academic climate, the importance of maintaining and/or restoring some degree of coordination is incredibly crucial (Brown, 2015; Lawson, 2014), particularly in the already “low-consensus” (Clark, 2003, p. 56) discipline of kinesiology. Scholars in kinesiology should take notice of Alvesson’s warning about the dismal survival odds for low-consensus organizations in competitive contexts, and his corresponding call for bounded ambiguity in those cases:

Organizations unsuccessful in shaping even a moderate degree of common understandings on at least some key issues, and a shared understanding of variation and sources of dispute, probably perform badly and may not, in a competitive context, survive. It is even possible to argue that if there is extreme ambiguity, then there is no organization, at least not in a cultural sense. Bounded ambiguity may be a useful concept here, drawing attention to ambiguity but also to the efforts to develop some shared meanings counteracting a stressful and impractical level of confusion and uncertainty. (p. 150)

This focus on understanding cultural meanings that is so central to the experts’ vision of LDS, and the effect of enhanced coordination that is arguably so crucial to navigating the 21st Century academic landscape, is not reflected in the original and evolved generic frameworks of disciplinary stewardship reviewed in Chapter Two, and signals an important impact of this research. While there are some parallels with the generic frameworks’ notion of ‘conservation’ in this regard, ‘conservation’ is focused on understanding the field’s history, and seemingly not at the level of the meanings
underpinning those histories (Golde, 2006; Rios et al., 2019). The focus on, and impact of, understanding cultural meanings is, however, identified in a small portion of the kinesiology literature on disciplinary stewardship, specifically that of Lawson (2016) and Lawson and Kretchmar (2017). The latter duo has written about the need for “values… [to be] taken seriously and made explicit…[as] value-based explorations…have unlimited generative potential” (p. 207). The findings of this doctoral research lend empirical support to Lawson and Kretchmar’s view.

The second rationale for how LDS is suited to the 21st Century context is related to the other significant reality of organizational culture. That is, while shared meanings are understood to bind organizational actors together and allow for coordinated action, they can also constrain and blind actors into established beliefs, ideas, and understandings that limit their personal autonomy and prevent more conscious, ethically-thought through ways of organizing from being considered (Alvesson, 2012). Thus, an approach such as LDS that calls for critical reflection upon the power and assumptions inherent in organizational meanings can be considered a worthy and valuable endeavour as the evidenced effect is to draw actors’ attention to ethical and political matters, liberating their thought from repressive or unnecessary patterns, and perhaps resulting in ethically-informed action that transforms the organization (Alvesson, 2012).

Such critical reflexivity and ethical and political consciousness can be argued to be critical to the successful navigation of the 21st Century academic context. To explain, as public funds to universities continue to decline and scholars are forced to become increasingly entrepreneurial, an ethical consciousness becomes critical to avoiding problematic research foci/emphases and funding sources, as just two examples (Blackmore, Brennan, & Zipin, 2010). Such neoliberal order governs through soft power, often described as governmentalities, rather than through explicit means or force, again signalling the importance of reflexivity and ethical attention at the level of meanings (Brown, 2015).

The focus on critical reflecting upon cultural meanings that is so central to the experts’ vision of LDS, and the effect of ethical and political consciousness that is arguably so crucial to navigating the 21st Century academic landscape, is only marginally reflected in the original and evolved generic frameworks of disciplinary stewardship,
indicating another important impact of this doctoral research. That is, while the generic frameworks include references to a ‘critical eye’ and ‘principles for moral direction’ (i.e., being action- and future-oriented, morally courageous, and collective), there is no indication nor guidance as to how these are to be implemented. This is limiting as Alvesson (2012) has pointed out that “theoretical support is vital to develop[ing] our capacity to interpret cultural phenomena and act in ways guided by culturally sophisticated thinking” (p. 200). While kinesiology scholars Lawson and Kretchmar (2017) offer some guidance on this matter by advocating for “stewardship-oriented dialogue” (p. 195; rather than debate), which involves a focus on “first order questions regarding purposes, ethics, values, moral imperatives, and social responsibilities” (p. 195), this doctoral research extends that work in more specific and practical terms (i.e., provides guidance on who should engage in such dialogue, where such dialogue might best occur, how such dialogue might be structured, as well as how to develop one’s skills to engage in such dialogue and motivate others to engage in such development).

Section Summary

In summary, a holistic consideration of the alignment between Alvesson’s (2012) organizational culture theory and the experts’ vision of LDS in kinesiology suggests the construct is a promising way for scholars in kinesiology to meet the challenges of the 21st Century university. More specifically, Alvesson’s work suggests that the LDS focus on: (a) understanding meanings could result in enriched cultural understanding as well as enhanced coordination within the discipline, both of which are critical to mitigating the increasingly diverse and fragmented academic context; and (b) critically reflecting upon cultural meanings could result in an enhanced ethical consciousness, which is essential to negotiating the myriad ethical challenges presented in the increasingly ethically-closed university environment.

Chapter Conclusion

Through Alvesson’s (2012) organizational culture theory, the experts’ vision of and for LDS can be interpreted as: focused on understanding and critically reflecting upon organizational culture, and as developed and motivated through cultural change via the everyday reframing of cultural orientations. Appreciating the individual and holistic connections between the experts’ vision and Alvesson’s theory suggests the construct is:
(a) sufficiently specific, practical, and transformative for realistic and fruitful application; and (b) well-suited to navigating the challenges of the 21st Century academic climate. Ultimately, the alignment with Alvesson’s work is significant as it comprehensively grounds the experts’ vision in a theoretically-supported and empirically-evidenced way of meaningfully understanding, acting in, and improving organization. In Chapter Six, the next and final chapter, a consideration of the contributions, limitations, implications, and future research directions of this research are shared.
Chapter 6 – Conclusion

In this concluding chapter I summarize my doctoral research, describe its key contributions and limitations, and outline the corresponding implications for practice and future research.

Research Summary

In response to the challenges threatening all disciplines in the 21st Century university, my doctoral research inquired into the potential of the promising, yet vague and abstract, LDS construct as a way for the kinesiology discipline to survive and thrive. To do so, I purposefully sampled 10 senior scholars from various countries and kinesiology sub-disciplinary areas for their demonstrated expertise on / interest in LDS and engaged them in a two-round interview-Delphi discussion about the meaning, need, development, and motivation of the construct within kinesiology. Through thematic analysis I determined that the expert participants viewed: (a) the meaning of and need for LDS in kinesiology as a powerful, yet slippery, philosophy focused on the pursuit of integrity that is variously and intentionally embedded in all aspects of all scholars’ work to ensure and enhance the discipline’s future; and (b) the development of and motivation for LDS in kinesiology as requiring dedicated, multifarious, and contextualized development initiatives that are dialogical, narrative-based, and incentivized. Interpretation of the thematic findings through Alvesson’s (2012) organizational culture theory suggests the experts’ vision of and for LDS in kinesiology can be understood as: (a) an approach to organization that is focused on understanding and critically reflecting upon organizational culture so as to inspire more thoughtful and ethical organizational perspectives; and (b) developed and motivated through cultural change via the everyday reframing of cultural orientations. An appreciation of the individual and holistic connections between the experts’ vision and Alvesson’s theory reveals LDS is: (a) sufficiently specific, practical, and transformative for realistic and fruitful application; and (b) well-suited to navigating the fragmenting and depoliticizing challenges of the 21st Century given the enhanced cultural understanding, coordination, and ethical consciousness it stimulates. Ultimately, what can be concluded from this research is that an investment in an organizational and cultural understanding of the experts’ vision of
and for LDS in kinesiology holds promise for a vibrant disciplinary future and is worth pursuing.

**Research Contributions**

This doctoral research contributes the following three major impacts. First, this research contributes to filling various gaps in the higher education and kinesiology literatures on LDS. To be specific, this research makes: an empirical contribution to the otherwise predominately conceptual LDS literatures; an international contribution to the otherwise American-dominated LDS literatures; a detailed and practical contribution to the otherwise vague and abstract LDS literatures; a more comprehensive contribution (i.e., considers meaning, need, development, motivation, and leadership) to the otherwise narrow LDS literatures (i.e., solely meaning and need focused); as well as a ‘connected’ contribution (i.e., brings various scholars’ opinions on LDS together) to the otherwise largely sole-authored and/or disconnected literatures. Taken together, this research constitutes a rich and cohesive understanding of LDS in kinesiology and, as such, contributes to the literature in a way not previously done.

Another major contribution of this research is that it grounds LDS in a theoretical and empirical literature base. This grounding is a result of my interpretive analysis of the close alignment between the thematic findings on LDS in kinesiology and Alvesson’s (2012) organizational culture theory. This grounding is significant because, as detailed in Chapter Two (Literature Review), the existing LDS literature demonstrates very little connection to theory or empirical evidence. In other words, LDS could be described as a somewhat ‘floating’ or ‘untethered’ construct up to this point. Therefore, this theoretical and empirical grounding is valuable in various respects. First, the organizational culture theory and literature helps to explain aspects of LDS that are otherwise unclear in this research and the existing LDS literature. Second, through this grounding many of the experts’ claims about LDS have been corroborated in a deep and longstanding theory and literature base. Third, this grounding means there is a resource base from which to seek additional insight about aspects of LDS not yet considered. Ultimately, this grounding not only helps to enhance the robustness of the LDS construct, but also the transferability of this research. That is, an understanding of the findings of this research on LDS in kinesiology as a cultural approach to organization helps this research to be seen as more
than a distinct dataset; it helps the research to approximate an accessible framework of LDS that can be more easily and meaningfully transferred to the particular situations of others.

Finally, and most significantly, this research contributes a detailed and practical template for LDS in kinesiology that can be immediately implemented. As suggested in the rationale for this research and established through its findings, implementing LDS is likely to result in some degree of improvement to the discipline and scholars’ work life within it. These improvements have positive implications for the important contributions scholars in kinesiology make to society on many of today’s most pressing and meaningful movement-related matters (e.g., inquiries related to health crises and joy of movement, respectively). On a personal note, as a physical education teacher, teacher educator, and researcher contributing and connected to kinesiology, I am optimistic about the promise LDS holds for enhancing the appreciation and status of physical education within the discipline, and the positive implications this would then have for the physical education of children, youth, and young adults at the elementary, secondary, and tertiary levels.

**Limitations**

The contributions of this study should be appreciated alongside limitations related to its exclusive sample of senior scholars from many, but not all, kinesiology sub-disciplines. First, although the exclusively senior sample of this research was an important part of the Delphi method and CAF theory, which call for experts who have shown themselves to be thoughtful on the topic and who would be considered to generate the most credible framings, it influences the findings in particular ways. That is, the perspectives of the senior scholars in this research are inescapably shaped by the fact that they have long been in positions of power and privilege in the discipline and their universities, have considerable experience navigating the challenges of academic working life, and are familiar with the LDS construct. Therefore, their views of LDS may not seamlessly connect with the views of those with considerably less power, privilege, and experience, such as doctoral students and tenure-track faculty members. For example, senior scholars are likely to have more space to engage in the deep reflection their LDS caretaking/cultural analysis entails and are also more likely to have a respected voice and
secure position from which to speak out about the findings of their analysis. To explain, in the time since I undertook my research, a *Sport, Education, & Society* special issue entitled *Being and becoming an academic in the neoliberal university* has documented that the pressures of the 21st Century university may be heightened for kinesiology doctoral students and tenure-track faculty members given their lack of job security and cultural capital, and also that individuals at these ranks sometimes feel the guidance of senior scholars to be out of step with their reality (Alfrey et al., 2017; Enright et al., 2017). As such, it is important to recognize that this research did not include the voices of junior scholars and therefore the way in which individuals at this career stage receive this work and the LDS construct needs to be investigated in the future.

Second, while a number of sub-disciplinary areas toward the social science, humanities, and arts position of the kinesiology spectrum were represented in the sample of experts participating in this research (e.g., physical education, sport philosophy, dance, etc.), sub-disciplinary areas in the applied sciences were not (e.g., exercise physiology, biomechanics, etc.). Although this participant sample largely reflects the sub-disciplinary affiliations of the small number of scholars in kinesiology with demonstrated expertise on / interest in the construct of LDS, there were (as mentioned in Chapter Three) two scholars from the applied sciences sub-disciplines who were invited to participate in this research but declined the invitation. Hearing perspectives on LDS from across the broad discipline of kinesiology is important not only because the construct of LDS is intended to be for *all* in the discipline, but also because some of the findings of this research suggested that those in the applied science sub-disciplinary areas may be more resistant to the construct than those toward the other end of the spectrum. Therefore, the manner in which scholars from the applied science sub-disciplines of kinesiology receive this research and the LDS construct must be investigated moving forward.

**Implications for Practice**

While the findings of this research are already presented as a detailed and practical template for the implementation and development of LDS in kinesiology, the following are some further implications for practice which highlight important entry-points. First, for those scholars in kinesiology who are already open or committed to engaging in LDS caretaking/cultural analysis but who may need guidance about where to
begin, it is useful to consider Alvesson’s (2012) point that aspects of organizational life that are ambiguous, differentiated, and/or fragmented offer potential openings or sources for cultural understanding and questioning. Examples of such aspects within kinesiology were described by the experts in the findings – including the marginalization of professional components of the discipline, various communications failures, and lack of holistic identity preparation – any of which could serve as potential openings for cultural analysis if, and only if, these aspects are relevant to one’s particular context.

Second, regarding the development of LDS, NAKHE could be the scholarly association through which to initiate the ecological or fan-out effect of the LDS development agenda to sub-disciplinary associations and home units across the discipline that the experts described. As mentioned elsewhere, NAKHE is a cross-disciplinary scholarly association focused on future- and leadership-oriented issues within kinesiology in higher education. It is a uniquely receptive environment for such a cultural change agenda as scholars belonging to this organization choose to do so above and beyond their sub-disciplinary obligations. This receptivity is reflected in NAKHE’s motto “where scholars come to lead” and evidenced in the fact that the association has already hosted some preliminary disciplinary stewardship initiatives.

A final implication for practice related to LDS development concerns the need for stamina and follow-through. While the experts’ vision for LDS development covered many of Alvesson’s (2012) considerations for effective cultural change initiatives (e.g., avoid hyperculture, align culture-focused and material rearrangements, etc.), they alluded to but were not entirely explicit about the time commitment needed to see through the slow process of changing meanings so as to avoid the disillusionment, loss of trust, and resistance that is all too common with change initiatives abandoned too early. Thus, scholars in kinesiology who are taking on LDS development must not only put thought and care into planning the content of their development initiatives but must also plan to commit themselves to these initiatives across a substantial period of time.

**Future Research Directions**

Given the outcomes of this research, the following two research directions are important to pursue moving forward. The first is the need to engage in narrative inquiries of LDS in kinesiology. As the findings of this and other research have suggested,
narratives capturing “seemingly good examples of organizational practice or leadership should be used to inspire learning and insight” (Alvesson, 2012, p. 200) and are key to fostering receptivity to cultural change initiatives such as LDS development efforts. Therefore, having a set of LDS narratives on hand will be key to the successful roll-out of LDS development initiatives. I am not recommending, however, that such research set out to develop a bank of ‘LDS recipes’ for scholars in kinesiology to replicate. As the findings of this research have also revealed, LDS is context-specific and must be tailored to the specific details of one’s situation; therefore, copying the efforts of others is unlikely to be productive and may lead to unexpected and unintended outcomes (Alvesson, 2012). I am also not recommending that such narrative inquiries focus on the stewards themselves and develop portraits of heroic leaders. Such hero-focused literature, which is already in abundance in the broader leadership and organizational culture fields, has been critiqued to “score higher on entertainment value than on intellectual depth and insights” (Alvesson, 2012, p. 103). Rather, what this and other research has made clear is that “understanding leadership [and organizational culture] calls for the consideration of social process and cultural context; that is, descriptions must be relatively rich or thick” (Alvesson, 2012, p. 111). Ultimately, a diverse set of narratives that richly describe not only the LDS caretaking/cultural analysis of scholars in kinesiology, but also the details of the particular setting, the reactions of other scholars, and so forth, would be useful to LDS development efforts as well as contribute to filling gaps in the leadership, organizational culture, and stewardship literatures.

The other future research direction of value is to investigate how other scholars in kinesiology, especially doctoral students and tenure-track faculty members from all subdisciplinary areas, respond to the LDS vision depicted in this research. Because the findings of this research suggested LDS is for all scholars in kinesiology, but were forwarded by exclusively senior scholars, such research is important to the widespread adoption of LDS across the discipline. As mentioned in the limitations section of this chapter, it has been reported that early career scholars experience the challenges of the 21st Century university differently than senior scholars and thus early career perspectives are essential to a balanced vision for LDS. One way this research could be approached is by simply interviewing doctoral students and tenure-track faculty and asking them to
validate, repudiate and/or expand upon the LDS vision depicted in this research in terms of their particular beliefs, values, ideas, and experiences. This approach could be understood in CAF terms as a frame alignment investigation (Benford & Snow, 2000). A more significant – albeit more complex – approach, however, would be to investigate LDS development efforts in which doctoral students and tenure-track faculty are targeted. Such an approach would still allow for the gathering of these groups’ perspectives on the LDS vision because, as the findings of this research suggested, LDS development initiatives should be dialogical and allow for the targets to have as much to say as the initiators. However, what such an approach would also allow for is insight into the complexities of cultural change efforts such as LDS development initiatives. I am not recommending that such research focus on measuring cultural change, thereby treating organizational culture as merely an object reformed through leadership. Rather, such research should consider how organizational culture frames leadership and cultural change efforts by addressing how the targets interpret and impact these efforts. Such research that is situated in, rather than on, organizational culture is seldomly addressed but sorely needed.

**Final Thoughts**

In closing this doctoral research, it is useful to recall the seminal view of Carnegie, to which this research has added support and new dimension: “we must make the development of ‘stewards of the discipline’ our highest priority and understand that other goals, such as pursuing resources and prestige, are in service of this cause” (Walker, 2006, p. 423). For if we do not take care of our disciplines, we fail as stewards of knowledge generation. In kinesiology’s case, this means risking the decline of a discipline so well-positioned to address today’s most pressing and meaningful movement-related matters. The stakes are high.

“If my analysis contributes to leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship, it has achieved its aim.”

*(Lawson, 2014, p. 286)*
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Brief Summary of Content to be Discussed

This research is an investigation into how the academic discipline of kinesiology in higher education, and its membership, might ensure a favourable future through the approach of leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship.

The discipline of kinesiology has developed tremendously since what is considered to be its formation in the 1960s (Elliot, 2007). It has amassed considerable research achievements, impressive student enrolment, extensive public interest, and, perhaps most importantly, the potential to address many of today’s most pressing and meaningful physical activity matters (e.g., inquiries related to health crises and joy of movement, respectively; Kretchmar, 2014; Thomas, 2014). Despite this, kinesiology is not guaranteed an equally promising future in academia amidst the many challenges threatening all disciplines in the 21st century university, such as corporatization and competition for resources and prestige (Blackmore, Brennan, & Zipin, 2010). These challenges compromise the valuable work of kinesiology scholars (Kirk, 2014). For instance, the driving of research agendas by corporate funders, which has resulted in a privileging, rather than a balance, of matters of health or life itself (e.g., movement as duty or medicine) over matters of meaning or quality of life (e.g., movement as an end in itself or as play; Kretchmar, 2013; Thomas, 2014), contradicts the academic values of many kinesiology scholars and causes them difficult emotional labours (Kirk, 2014). These pressures may be heightened for those scholars in the pursuit of tenure and doctoral students, as the lack of job security and cultural capital may make it more difficult to resist such pressures (Casey & Fletcher, In Press). As a further example, the need to compete for resources and prestige means kinesiology scholars must battle challenges to their cultural and economic authority over physical activity against “untrained and uncertified ‘experts’ in fitness and sports” (Thomas, 2014, p. 320), and sometimes even against scholars from other kinesiology subdisciplines, both of which are counter-productive to academic work and fragment the discipline (Block & Estes, 2011; Lawson, 2014).

For the discipline of kinesiology to survive and thrive in academia amidst this structurally and emotionally challenging climate, a strategic and conscious investment in leadership that is “tailor-made for the social, political, cultural and economic realities of the 21st century” (Lawson, 2014, p. 274), and that emphasizes the transformation (rather than simply conservation; Lawson, 2016) this requires, is needed. In response, kinesiology scholars (e.g., Kretchmar, 2014; Lawson, 2012, 2014, 2016; Napper-Owen, 2012), drawing upon the work of higher education scholars (e.g., Golde & Walker, 2006; Walker, Golde, Jones, Bueschel, & Hutchings, 2008), have begun to advocate for the action- and future-oriented, morally courageous, and collective approach of leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship. To explain, the action- and future-oriented nature of leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship, whereby stewards act purposefully to conserve, restore, and transform their discipline for those yet to come (Golde, 2006), addresses today’s need for disciplines to strategically angle for cultural and economic authority over their core content (Block & Estes, 2011). The morally courageous nature of leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship, whereby stewards are guided by a “sense of
purpose larger than oneself...[and] take risks” (Golde, 2006, p. 13) to advocate for the
discipline and academic values they believe in, addresses today’s need for an “ethico-
emotive politics” (Zipin, 2010, p.159) to challenge the pressures of the corporatized
university (Kirk, 2014). Lastly, the collective approach of leadership-as-disciplinary
stewardship, which assumes that stewardship is a responsibility of all doctorate holders
and that it concerns one’s entire discipline, not just one’s own subdisciplinary area
(Walker et al., 2008), addresses today’s need to combat fragmentation (Kirk, 2014;
Lawson, 2014). In sum, it is not surprising that The Carnegie Foundation for the
Advancement of Teaching has argued, “we must make the development of ‘stewards of
the discipline’ our highest priority and understand that other goals, such as pursuing
resources and prestige, are in service of this cause” (Walker, 2006, p. 423). The rationale
is that “if we do not take care of our disciplines, we fail as stewards of knowledge
generation” (Prewitt, 2005, p. 32), which, in kinesiology’s case, means risking the decline
of a discipline so well-positioned to address many of today’s most important matters
(Kretchmar, 2014).

Despite the budding interest in leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship, there is a
lack of empirical research on the topic both in general and specific to kinesiology, and the
conceptual literature that does exist is argued to lack the specificity, practicality, and
transformative quality necessary for realistic and fruitful application (Lawson, 2014).
Thus, this research investigates the specific, practical, and transformation-oriented
questions of: (a) What is the discipline of kinesiology that is to be stewarded, and what
does/should such leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship entail in this discipline? (b) How
can leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship be realistically developed in kinesiology’s
membership? (c) What strategies will motivate kinesiology’s membership to participate
in leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship development? and (d) What is the response of
kinesiology’s membership to the understanding of, plan, and strategies for leadership-as-
disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology?

The appropriate use of the terms ‘academic discipline’ and ‘field’ are widely debated, particularly
regarding the area of kinesiology (Corbin, 1993). For the purposes of this research, the view of Corbin
(1993) will be followed, who asserts that a field is made up of an academic discipline(s) (i.e., the study of a
body of knowledge within institutions of higher education) and professions (i.e., the professional practice
occurring outside of higher education). The focus of this research is on the academic discipline portion of
the larger field of kinesiology.

Corbin, C. B. (1993). The field of physical education: Common goals, not common roles. Journal of
Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 64(1), 79-87.

There has been debate on an epic scale regarding which name is the most appropriate label for the
discipline of kinesiology (Lawson, 2007). The name ‘kinesiology’ is now widely accepted as the label for
the discipline in Canada and the United States of America (having evolved from the previously accepted
label of ‘physical education’) (Lawson, 2014), and is an umbrella term that is largely understood to
encompass the subdisciplinary areas of human anatomy, human physiology, exercise physiology,
biomechanics, motor learning and control, psychology of physical activity, pedagogy, health, adapted
physical activity, sociology of sport, sport history, sport management, and sport philosophy (Canadian
movement studies’ has fairly widespread acceptance in the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand.

iii I am referring to the English-speaking portion of the academic discipline of kinesiology. By this I mean the international epistemic community of academics that is indirectly formed by the language by which people read and write academic literature.

iv There has and continues to be vigorous debate about the core content or focus of the academic discipline of kinesiology. For the purposes of this research, the view of Rikli (2006) will be followed, who suggests that the core content of kinesiology is physical activity, with related topics falling within this umbrella (e.g., exercise, sport, recreation, fitness, wellness).
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Appendix C – Round One Interview Guide

- Informed consent
- Review pre-interview materials
- Sharing researcher and participant positionalities
  - Current academic post?
  - Current research area / subdisciplinary affiliation?
  - Tell me about your scholarship on organizational issues within kinesiology; how did you come to be interested in this topic?
  - Describe the academic training and/or employment experiences that have been pivotal to your view on this topic?
- Understanding the context that disciplinary stewards will confront
  - Describe your experience of what you consider to be one of the most pressing challenges to kinesiology in the 21st century university?
  - Describe your experience of what you consider to be one of the most promising opportunities for kinesiology in the 21st century university?
- Diagnostic Framing: Negotiating a common understanding of disciplinary stewardship
  - What is the discipline of kinesiology that is to be stewarded?
    - What are the core defining features of kinesiology that should be stewarded? As members of this discipline, what should constitute our ‘touchstone’ (i.e., what we all have in common)?
    - What purpose(s) of kinesiology should be stewarded?
    - Describe what you have experienced to be one of kinesiology’s greatest strengths or successes and why?
    - Describe what you have experienced to be one of kinesiology’s greatest weaknesses or failures and why?
  - Why is the discipline of kinesiology worthy of stewardship?
    - Tell me about a time you had to justify kinesiology’s unique and important contributions that make it worthy of public and/or university support and resources. What did you say?
    - What might be the consequences of kinesiology’s elimination?
  - What does/should leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology entail?
    - What is the first thing that comes to mind when you think of leadership as disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology?
    - Principles: My synthesis of the seminal work by Golde (2006) suggests that disciplinary stewardship involves three key principles that address the needs of the 21st century university, these include being: action- and future-oriented, morally courageous, and collective.
      - Action- and future-oriented: Golde (2006) suggests disciplinary stewards are “entrusted with the care of something valuable on behalf of others…a forward-looking manager” (p. 12).
        - Describe a time when you, or another, have acted in a way that can be understood as being action- and future-oriented in service of kinesiology.
What do you consider to be the top priorities of an action- and future-oriented steward of kinesiology?

How often do you see members of kinesiology carrying out action- and future-oriented behaviour in service of the discipline? If it’s common, where do you see evidence of it? If it’s uncommon, why do you think this is so?

Morally courageous: Golde (2006) suggests disciplinary stewards are “willing to take risks to move the discipline forward” (p. 13).

Describe a time when you, or another, have acted in a way that can be understood as being morally courageous in service of kinesiology.

What do you consider to be the top priorities of a morally courageous steward of kinesiology?

How often do you see members of kinesiology carrying out morally courageous behaviour in service of the discipline? If it’s common, where do you see evidence of it? If it’s uncommon, why do you think this is so?

Collective: Golde (2006) suggests “one is a steward of the discipline, not simply the manager of one’s own career” (p. 13).

Describe a time when you, or another, have acted in a way that can be understood as being collectively-oriented in service of kinesiology.

What do you consider to be the top priorities of a collectively-oriented steward of kinesiology?

How often do you see members of kinesiology carrying out collectively-oriented behaviour in service of the discipline? If it’s common, where do you see evidence of it? If it’s uncommon, why do you think this is so?

Roles: Seminal work by Golde (2006) suggests that disciplinary stewardship involves “generating new knowledge and defending knowledge claims against challenges and criticism, conserving the most important ideas and findings that are a legacy of the past and current, and transforming knowledge that has been generated and conserved by explaining and connecting it to ideas for other fields. All of this implies the ability to teach well to a variety of audiences, including those outside formal classrooms” (p. 10).

Generation:

What do you see as the top one or two priorities for generation in service of kinesiology at this time?

How often do you see other members of kinesiology demonstrating high levels of accomplishment related to generation in service of the discipline? If common,
where do you see evidence of this? If uncommon, why do you think this is so?

• Conservation:
  o What do you see as the top one or two priorities for conservation in service of kinesiology at this time?
  o How often do you see members of kinesiology demonstrating high levels of accomplishment related to conservation in service of the discipline? If common, where do you see evidence of this? If uncommon, why do you think this is so?

• Transformation:
  o What do you see as the top one or two priorities for transformation in service of kinesiology at this time?
  o How often do you see members of kinesiology demonstrating high levels of accomplishment related to transformation in service of the discipline? If common, where do you see evidence of this? If uncommon, why do you think this is so?
  
  Is there anything else that you consider to be key to disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology (e.g., principles, roles, commitments, competencies, values, knowledge, skills, attitudes)?

• Comments, questions, and closure.
  o In our next interview we will revisit the anonymous summary of the group’s responses and your reaction to it. We will also consider the prognostic and motivational frames, that is specifically how some of the things discussed in round one might actually be developed as well as how to motivate others to engage in that development.
Appendix D – Consent Form

Letter of Information and Consent - Scholar

Project Title: Leadership-as-Disciplinary Stewardship: A Social Movement for Kinesiology’s Future Success in the 21st Century University

Document Title: Letter of Information and Consent - Scholar

Redacted

1. Invitation to Participate

You are being invited to participate in this doctoral research study about leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology because of your scholarship on the topic and/or related topics.

2. Why is this study being done?

The realities of the 21st Century present many challenges that threaten all disciplines in higher education. For this reason, this study investigates how the academic discipline of kinesiology might ensure a favourable future through the approach of leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship.

The purpose of this study is to facilitate a dialogue amongst five kinesiology scholars, purposefully selected for their scholarship (and considered ‘experts’), so as to establish: a rich understanding of leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology; a detailed plan for the realistic development of leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology’s faculty members and students; and comprehensive strategies to motivate the discipline’s faculty members and students to participate in such development.

Following the completion of this study, two additional studies will be conducted. These studies will involve speaking with two other important groups in the discipline’s future, that is, select early-career kinesiology scholars and kinesiology doctoral students. The aim of these two additional studies is to gain a deep understanding of how the experts’ understanding of, plan, and strategies for leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship (i.e., the results of the present study) resonate with the beliefs, values, ideas, experiences, and culture of the discipline’s early-career scholars and doctoral students.

3. How long will you be in this study?

Redacted
It is anticipated that participation in this research will involve a total commitment of approximately 3 hours and 45 minutes. To be specific, you will be asked to participate in three one-hour interviews (i.e., one interview expected to take place per month from November 2016-January 2017), and asked to complete 15 minutes of voluntary preparation (i.e., reviewing documents) in advance of each interview.

4. **What are the study procedures?**

If you agree to participate you will be asked to engage in three one-on-one telephone or Skype interviews that will be audio-recorded for transcription purposes.

Prior to the first interview you will receive a brief summary of the content to be discussed, the round one interview guide, as well as tentative round two and three interview guides. These materials are provided for your optional review and are intended to be reviewed only at your convenience.

In the first interview you will be asked to answer questions related to the following research question: What is the discipline of kinesiology that is to be stewarded and what does/should leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship entail in this discipline?

After all round one interviews are complete, you will receive an executive summary via a study-specific OWL worksite. The executive summary will include an anonymized list of the group’s responses to each question with an asterisk beside the responses that you offered and/or contributed to. The executive summary is provided for your optional review prior to the round two interview with the intention of easing the interview process, but it is by no means required to review this in advance.

In the second interview you will be asked to respond to the round one executive summary by indicating which responses you agree and/or disagree with, and offering any comments you may have on your own or others’ responses. You will then be asked to answer questions related to following research question: How might leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship be realistically developed in kinesiology’s membership?

After all round two interviews are complete, you will again receive a participant-specific executive summary as before. Again, you have the option to review this prior to the third interview.

In the third interview you will be asked to respond to the round two executive summary as before. You will then be asked to answer questions related to the following research question: What strategies might motivate kinesiology’s membership to participate in leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship development? Finally, you will be asked some concluding questions that are experiential and opinion-based in nature (e.g., what formal and informal experiences have aided or hindered your own development of leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship behaviors?).
After all round three interviews are complete you will receive a participant-specific executive summary as before. You will be asked to provide any response you may have via the OWL worksite.

5. **What are the risks and harms of participating in this study?**

There are no known or anticipated risks or discomforts associated with participating in this study.

6. **What are the benefits?**

There are a variety of potential benefits that may result from your participation in this research, including for yourself, for the discipline, and for society. This research will contribute to filling a gap in the literature regarding the empirical understanding of leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology. Also, this research may result in the development of disciplinary stewards of kinesiology. Ultimately, such development would serve to combat the difficult challenges kinesiology scholars, such as yourself, face in today’s universities, thereby helping to ensure the discipline’s future in the academy and sustain, or perhaps even improve, its contributions to society.

7. **Can participants choose to leave the study?**

You have the right to withdraw from this study at any time and may do so without any penalty. To withdraw please inform the student investigator Jenna Lorusso via email. If you withdraw prior to the release of the executive summary for an interview round, the information collected from you will be removed from the study. However, if you decide to withdraw after the release of an interview round’s executive summary, it will not be possible to remove the information collected from you as it will have been pooled with data from other participants and shared in an anonymous format amongst all study participants in the participant-specific executive summaries.

8. **How will participants’ information be kept confidential?**

Any and all information you provide is confidential, and will not be shared with anyone unless required by law. The audio-recordings of the interviews will be transcribed by a professional transcriber who has signed a confidentiality agreement, otherwise access to this data will be restricted to the principal investigator and student investigator. However, please note that representatives of The University of Western Ontario Non-Medical Research Ethics Board may require access to your study-related records to monitor the conduct of the research.

Data collected during this study will be kept in a secure and confidential location for five years, after which it will be permanently destroyed. A list linking your pseudonym with your name will be kept by the student investigator in a secure place, separate from your study file. While we do our best to protect your information there is no guarantee that we
will be able to do so. The collection of your demographic information may allow
someone to link the data and identify you.

Please note that with your permission your anonymous quotations will be reviewed by
fellow participants in this research study in the same manner in which you will review
their anonymous quotations (i.e., in the executive summaries following each interview
round). Please note that no information will be provided that will render your quotations
personally identifiable. Furthermore, although your anonymous quotations may be used
in the dissemination of this research in academic journals and conferences, your name
will not be used.

9. **Are participants compensated to be in this study?**

You will not be compensated for your participation in this research.

10. **What are the Rights of Participants?**

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may decide not to be in this study.
Even if you consent to participate you have the right to not answer individual questions
or to withdraw from the study at any time. If you choose not to participate or to leave the
study at any time there will be no consequence.

We will give you new information that is learned during the study that might affect your
decision to stay in the study.

You do not waive any legal right by signing this consent form

11. **Whom do participants contact for questions?**

Redacted

This letter is yours to keep for future reference.

12. **Verbal Consent**

Do you confirm that you have read the Letter of Information [or the Letter of Information
has been read to you] and have had all questions answered to your satisfaction?
☐ YES ☐ NO

Do you agree to participate in this research?
☐ YES ☐ NO

Do you agree to be audio-recorded?
☐ YES ☐ NO

Do you consent to the use of unidentified quotes obtained during the study in the dissemination of this research?
☐ YES ☐ NO
Appendix E – Example of a Participant-Specific Round One Executive Summary

Round One Executive Summary

The tables below display some of the reduced and synthesized responses of the round one discussion on what disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology might/should entail. To remain true to the Delphi method, all 10 experts’ responses are listed together as an anonymous discussion. The responses that you offered are indicated with a *. Please note that in the instance that other experts offered a response that I felt to be consistent with your response, these were combined (if you feel your responses were inaccurately reduced and/or combined, please advise). The right hand frequency column indicates how many experts offered each response. Brackets appearing in the frequency column represent the small number of instances in which responses were moved (again, please advise if you feel your comment was moved inappropriately).

In the round two interview you will have the opportunity to respond to the synthesized responses (e.g., adjust and/or explain your responses; agree, disagree, and/or comment on any responses). We will also discuss where and how these disciplinary stewardship behaviours might be developed as well as what might motivate members of the discipline to engage in that development.
Principles: Action- and Future-Oriented

Golde (2006) suggests disciplinary stewards are “entrusted with the care of something valuable on behalf of others…a forward-looking manager” (p. 12).

Priorities of an action- and future-oriented steward of kinesiology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure discipline’s integrity by determining explicit social responsibilities, ethical obligations, and moral imperatives. Return to these over time.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of context in which you and your colleagues work.</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Come together across subdisciplinary lines (e.g., at broad kinesiology-wide scholarly meetings) to stimulate cross-disciplinary scholarship of most relevance.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote/market our work within multiple venues in wider society in an understandable and relevant way (e.g., technology, social media).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work towards a more unified voice for the field.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be careful not to follow trends that pull us off path.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a practical/philosophical understanding of disciplines and the histories and debates of kinesiology through reading (e.g., Quest).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly connect with other public and professional contexts to anticipate opportunities for the generation of knowledge with a movement dimension.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged senior scholars (e.g., present at conferences, willing to review).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to share expertise (e.g., share copy of paper, take on visiting students).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve our capacity to instil in people a stronger connection to movement.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A perspective that extends beyond the kinesiology academic unit.</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipating trends and preparing the resources/structures to pursue them (e.g., creating a journal, develop new course, etc.).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep an eye to shifting professions, how they are transformed with advancements in technology and science.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quote of interest.

- "Well I never use the word stewardship, it's one of those organizational framework bits of speak...I've been on interview panels...now, I've never heard the word stewardship used but I have heard words like, 'What would you do with an underperforming faculty member?' 'What's your vision for the school?'...I have never heard anybody talk about 'How would you steward your particular field?' Because, in a sense, it seems to me like an artificial construct, stewardship...Heads of departments or deans...well I am not too sure whether they would all be saying, 'Well I took this job because I want to steward the field in this sort of direction.' They might be saying to you 'It's the next thing to do' or 'It's a new challenge' or whatever. So this notion of steering the field is what I am a little bit uncomfortable with. I think there is people-management that is important; there are strategic challenges and strategic directions that are really important. For example, can we focus, are there any projects that can bring us all together?"

(In response to question about the first things that come to mind when you think of stewardship)
### Examples/Evidence of action- and future-oriented behaviour.

#### Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publications that deliberately attempt to move the discipline forward.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistently high-ranking status of <em>Quest</em> (and future-oriented special issues in other respected kinesiology journals, e.g., <em>Kinesiology Review</em>).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance of kinesiology-wide conferences that prioritize issues of leadership and futures.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Teaching / Mentoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide doctoral students opportunities beyond research qualification (e.g., take to conferences, connect them with others, co-publish).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor at international institute that brings students together across subdisciplinary areas.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Service – Academic Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Succession planning.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As head of school, create strategic plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As department head, facilitated departmental dialogue and consensus to advertise position for academic with skillset to work across subdisciplinary areas.</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As department head, facilitate learning about the discipline of kinesiology (e.g., status, potential, value to university) by faculty members, Dean, and wider university.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As department head, hire for selective excellence (i.e., decide what can and can’t be done).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As department head, intuit connections between disciplines and create joint programs with other departments to capitalize on these connections.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen to the needs and ideas of younger colleagues and students.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign reading on stewardship for department meeting and discuss import for unit.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appoint a faculty member each semester to: consider the status of the discipline at the departmental and university level; transform knowledge in department and university.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Service – Scholarly Associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated leader development workshops via a kinesiology-wide scholarly association.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated department head certification training via a kinesiology-wide scholarly association.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised strategic plan of a kinesiology-wide scholarly association to focus on faculty and leadership development.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily rewarded academics for bringing students to conference of a kinesiology-wide scholarly association to boost engagement (e.g., reduced conference fees; formal recognition).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruited early-career members to leadership roles in a kinesiology-wide association to prevent it from ageing out.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Service – Journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As editor of (subdisciplinary) journal, improve researcher and reviewer journal experience (e.g., shorter turnaround, careful desk rejections re: scope/quality, recognizing top reviewers).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The creation of a particular journal (spanning multiple subdisciplinary areas) that has allowed for the publication of important discipline-forwarding works.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Principles: Morally Courageous

Golde (2006) suggests disciplinary stewards are “willing to take risks to move the discipline forward” (p. 13).

Priorities of a morally courageous steward of kinesiology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Priority Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate the value and interdependence of scholars and scholarship in other subdisciplines.</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create structure where all voices are heard. Be prepared for things you don't want to hear.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider what is best for the collective in your academic unit or discipline.</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present evidence to senior administrators re: importance of kinesiology unit to the university.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move kinesiology from an academic discipline (that exists to study phenomena apart from everyday reality) to a helping discipline (that exists to make a difference in the world).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectfully take a stand for the things you've studied and found to be important.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a critical agenda in one’s scholarship.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carefully consider whether to pursue particular funding opportunities based on their alignment with a critical agenda and potential contribution to practice.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get involved in projects you may not entirely agree with to ensure critical lens is considered.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipate and pursue new fundable hybrid (i.e., between bench science and practice/profession) research areas that are cross- and/or interdisciplinary.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find creative ways to keep pedagogy programs alive (e.g., create hybrid undergraduate programs with a core that diversifies into various certifications in upper years).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quotes of interest.

- "The fact that people don't have the skills to carry forward those kind of contestational moments is actually a big, big gap in where we are as a field. And possibly explains a lot about why we are where we are."

(In response to questions about morally courageous behaviours)
Examples/Evidence of morally courageous behaviour.

**Research**

- Scholarship on gender equity and sexuality in the discipline.
- Incorporating research approaches not typically applied in an area and that may be considered controversial (e.g., quantitative scales in inclusion and equity work), to suit project needs, advance knowledge, and forge new connections for the field.
- Publications on the status and future directions of the discipline.

**Teaching / Mentoring**

- Supporting students to pursue a critical research agenda related to equity and social justice despite risk of negative public response.

**Service – Academic Unit**

- As department head, advocating to keep physical activity courses the Dean wanted to eliminate.
- As department chair, put the needs of other subdisciplinary areas ahead of one’s own (e.g., resource allocation).

**Service – Scholarly Associations**

- As executive member of a kinesiology-wide association, changed name to anticipate trends.
- As executive member of a kinesiology-wide association, changed mission to explicitly include development of disciplinary leaders.

**Other**

- Supporting junior colleague bullied by a formal leader.
- Engaging in quality, respectful conversations about disciplinary conflicts (e.g., names) in the department.
- Voted against split of subdisciplinary areas to different academic units in order to maintain broader umbrella and benefit those subdisciplines at risk of elimination in the move.

**Quotes of interest.**

- * [As department chair] “I advocate for the department probably more than other departments who are at the table, but the kickback that I experience with the dean is that it can't possibly be as good as you make it out to be because you are [kinesiology]. You are not medicine, you are not psychology... The comment of 'Here we go again, the pest department.' ... I worry that my advocacy for the department actually does them a disservice.’”
- "I have the battle scars and the assassination attempts to show for it...That's what she (i.e., Golde, 2006) doesn't write about - the backlash, and the back biting, and the attacks are brutal. So it's important to know. It's all part of it...”

(In response to questions soliciting stories of morally courageous behaviour and the reasons for a lack of such behaviour)
Principles: Collective

Golde (2006) suggests “one is a steward of the discipline, not simply the manager of one’s own career” (p. 13).

Priorities of a collectively-oriented steward of kinesiology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify things we have in common so everyone can be involved in a dialogue outside of disciplinary content and research in a more consistent way.</td>
<td>3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep the big picture in mind and engage in academic pursuits that go beyond oneself.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in dialogue about stewardship with others locally and broadly so stewardship at the departmental and disciplinary level becomes a shared priority.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build mutual respect across departments and the discipline.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote play across the department (e.g., lunch) so people feel good at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As department head, explain the pressures coming from the university and allow department members to collectively decide upon response.</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly associations (e.g., NAK) need to take initiative to bring people together.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals need to take initiative to bring people together.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior members of the discipline need to organize events and facilitate networks.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest in collective resources for the shared use of the academic unit.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quote of interest.

- "Stewardship capital S is about those core features [i.e., unifying aim, vision, and mission] that have gotten lost on the way to the 21st century. And then there's small s stewardship that has to do with what happens locally. You have in this response sort of a 'think globally, act locally' sort of framework...The grand aims they unite the field and its entities wherever they are and then the more nuanced expressions of those where a particular department or school or a college needs its own stewardship with a small s, and so you've got stewardship operating at two levels”

(In response to discussion about the core features of kinesiology to be stowed.)


**Examples/Evidence of collectively-oriented behaviour.**

**Research**

Sometimes publishing in low-ranking professional journals to build up areas of the field.

**Service – Academic Unit**

Involvement in team efforts towards departmental transformations (e.g., name and location changes, hiring priorities) in support of the discipline.

As department head, promote mutual respect by celebrating excellence in all multidisciplinary areas.

As department head, give everyone a chance to be consulted. Listen and assure them that their response matters even if they can't get what they want.

As department head, worked with department to identify shared, rather than individual, research themes for budget allocation and collectively decide where to spend funds.

Giving up pursuit of full professor to serve as administrator for broader good of unit.

Watch movie in department meeting and discuss how to address issue from different perspectives.

Departmental mission statement that everyone in the unit can buy into.

**Service – Scholarly Associations**

Attract young scholars across subdisciplines to a kinesiology-wide association’s leadership development workshop.

Welcomed scholars from outside kinesiology (e.g., history, music, etc.) to a kinesiology-wide association’s department head certification training.

As committee member of a kinesiology-wide scholarly association, revised strategic plan.

As executive member of broad education scholarly association, creating new structures to bring people together.

2014 Collaborative Congress (NAKHE, NAK, AIESEP, ACSM, AKA, AAHPERD)

**Quotes of interest** - Contrasting views of who is responsible for stewardship and its possible forms:

- “I would say it's the dean's responsibility to have a sense of stewardship, as you are calling it. I don't think it's the responsibility of every academic. Everybody isn't the General, right? Some people have got their own tasks to do and they may in the process contribute to the enlightenment of the field's status or whatever. But most of them, their focus is on themselves and their research projects. I just think it's unrealistic to consider that everybody would be going in with a stewardship mindset, 'Oh I got to do this for the discipline'...but I do think that's the role of the senior staff, particularly the Dean... I just think that being an academic now...is incredibly difficult... Much more difficult than I experienced in my career. So I see young ones now as overloaded and snowed under... So then to expect them to be more 'eyes on the big picture,' I think is just totally unrealistic. There will be some people in various stages of their career who think this is a worthy thing to do, but they are already probably late Professors, to shore up the boat that they are on or whatever... If you want to be an academic, then you need good research skills...to publish...to get
grants...to be successful in your teaching...to have community outreach... I am not particularly optimistic that on top of that, people should be saying, 'Hey, which way can I help the field?' It's a lot more individual than that, and that's not bad, that's just how it is in particular phases of your life, I think.”

(In response to question about action and future oriented priorities)

- "Sometimes it’s hard to separate this out from people doing innovative stuff...[e.g., disseminating knowledge via videos]... So maybe that is just what good researchers do... Maybe it's [that's sort of research that gets] distributed more widely in order to enhance its impact socially, economically.”

(In response to question about action- and future-oriented priorities)
Roles: Generation

Golde (2006) suggests that disciplinary stewardship involves “generating new knowledge and defending knowledge claims against challenges and criticism” (p. 10).

Priorities for generation in service of kinesiology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constantly develop the mechanisms (e.g., journals, conferences, etc.) to make research more widely available, especially social/digital media.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak up respectfully when knowledge is used inappropriately inside and outside academia (e.g., research cited improperly; research applied inaccurately to market products).</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be public intellectuals (e.g., educate wider society about what is and is not legitimate research; regular media responses regarding relevant issues).</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic alliances with sister disciplines to generate new lines of inquiry related to human movement (with particular attention to issues of social justice and equity).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation, respect for 'know how' (i.e., practical knowledge), not just theoretical knowledge.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders must allow for the practice required to develop ‘know how,’ even if it does not appear obviously academic.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use wellbeing as an encompassing term that allows contributions from all subdisciplines.</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage new scholars to consider more centrally the question of who (i.e., which audience) they want to serve in their research.</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate more knowledge about the discipline's future faculty members (e.g., their views on curriculum, mentoring experiences, etc.) so we can best support them.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Roles: Conservation

Golde (2006) suggests that disciplinary stewardship involves “conserving the most important ideas and findings that are a legacy of the past and present” (p. 10).

Priorities for conservation in service of kinesiology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the history of the discipline (i.e., how did we get here?).</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued recognition of the importance of PE/PETE to the broader discipline.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conserve all subdisciplines.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure there are places (e.g., journals, conferences, etc.) in the discipline for story-telling and conversation about what the discipline is, what constitutes excellence within it, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conserve the centrality of physical activity.</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledge important events and authors in one’s scholarship (e.g., cite seminal works).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conserve the pursuit of historical scholarship in kinesiology.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinstate the largely eliminated history of kinesiology-type courses.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quote of Interest

- "I think you have to steer a careful path here between the sort of great men remembering, typically it is men, and honouring great people... So what we get instead is the 'great men' stuff. And the NAK is bad for this kind of stuff: the instinct is right, to celebrate the past and all of the past, but the way they are doing it isn’t good."

(In response to priorities for conservation)
Role: Transformation

Golde (2006) suggests that disciplinary stewardship involves “transforming knowledge that has been generated and conserved by explaining and connecting it to ideas for other fields” (p. 10).

Priorities for transformation in service of kinesiology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral programs that develop more than research capacities, e.g., professionalism, character.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift from an academic to helping discipline.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have conversations about one’s research with scholars outside the discipline.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend conferences in other disciplines as well as kinesiology-wide conferences.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move beyond knowledge dissemination in the same disciplinary journals.</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather relevant knowledge from other disciplines and share it with kinesiology (e.g., medical literature on obesity).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to relevant academic conversations outside kinesiology (e.g., medical discussion on obesity).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct more interdisciplinary research. The process teaches scholars in other disciplines about our work and the dissemination sends message of our import to a broader audience.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider how kinesiology could be involved in those grants that require interdisciplinarity as a condition of application.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor doctoral students and early career scholars to start with an audience in their own area and to move to other areas as their work progresses.</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quote of interest.

- "I mean we are not on Good Morning America challenging our research results. We just sit around and go, ‘Oh man look at that, they didn't do this and everybody knows this doesn't work.’ Or we might write a paper about it, or comment on a paper, but we don't really like go out and fight for what it is we know."

(In response to question about generation priorities)
Other Comments on Stewardship

Stewardship is…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Having passion.</th>
<th>2*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not just for those in elected or appointed leadership positions, people can lead from all different positions, albeit differently.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a scholar (first and foremost), a legitimate member of the discipline.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to draw barriers to say ‘that fits within the discipline, and that is beyond it.’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reject dichotomies, particularly the profession-discipline dichotomy.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking the idea of redesign seriously.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes doing things that run counter to one’s personal beliefs to align with what is for the greater good.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to connect and speak beyond your discourse community to the broader, intellectual world.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An understanding and appreciation of cross- and interdisciplinary work.</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying with the discipline.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A commitment to leadership.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upskilling as necessary to understand other subdisciplines and relevant disciplines and how they interact.</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogating the experiences we live as members of kinesiology.</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovating, thinking of new ways to generate knowledge related to movement and encouraging others to do the same.</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining academic credibility, rigor, professional standards/values, as well as disciplinary core and integrity while seeking to grow and strengthen discipline.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About some continuity across succeeding generations.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At both the departmental and disciplinary level (e.g., from attention to a caring departmental culture through to grand ideals that unite the discipline).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quotes of interest.

Discussion of identity:

- "Induction is not just technical, it's also identity related...the idea being that you're a steward for a field when you identify with it...when your professional identify and your personal identity are intertwined."

- "When people become dean or head of a faculty or whatever and they talk about 'my department' it's like they own the thing, it becomes part of them. Their identity gets extended out into this institutional organizational unit. That's the opposite of stewardship from my point of view, because then you get people's egos being expressed through that particular identity."
### Priorities for Stewardship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational mentoring. Engaged senior faculty members (e.g., present at conferences, share expertise, volunteer for peer-review) who mentor not simply as they experienced, but in terms of what they want new scholars to be able to do.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address issue that academics become formal leaders without any preparation (i.e., studying leadership).</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More explicit, intentional agenda about leadership in the discipline.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to be assessed in our stewardship practices, given feedback.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redefine the discipline to appreciate the profession, such that any good questions that move knowledge about human movement forward are legitimate.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to identify with our own ontology and not tie our narratives to that of other disciplines, resulting in a loss of our identity.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotate formal leadership roles regularly to prevent ownership mentality (e.g., ‘my’ department’).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create the necessary structures/bureaucracies that facilitate the coming together of stewards.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widen an academic’s formal role beyond the kinesiology academic unit.</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdisciplinary scholarly associations could begin these conversations and have them spill over into home units or field-wide associations.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a feeder system for identity formation related to stewardship from undergraduate through to doctoral programs, and then similar systems in departments.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Barriers to Stewardship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Action- &amp; Future-oriented</th>
<th>Morally Courageous</th>
<th>Collective</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Conservation</th>
<th>Transformation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited incentives (i.e., tenure and promotion policies).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1*</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused on research and teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of explicit focus on leadership development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive, apolitical faculty members.</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoliberal constraints (e.g., uncertain funding, tightening accreditation, fewer hours with students, competition).</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members with no understanding and/or interest in kinesiology as a discipline and a profession.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty and/or risk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral programs don't train faculty to do this work, thus faculty members lack the necessary skills.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive subdisciplinary silo mentality and identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Private contractor’ mentality (i.e., view one can survive even if their department does not).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not always housed in collection (i.e., Kinesiology units).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of credibility with external audiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Quotes of interest.*

- "They don't want to do it...our faculty are busy teaching, desperately writing grants, and getting money... Engaging in discussions about disciplines and professions is not for the faint of heart. And I don't mean this disparagingly, people are doing fantastic work and are totally interested in their work...When it comes to discussions of the discipline and the profession, they don't have the time for that, nor the interest, nor the background. Many of them have not been trained in any way to think more broadly."
  
(In response to question about the lack of morally courageous behaviour)
"[Students] are mostly worried about their job...so what kind of stewardship are you going to be able to get from this situation where critical importance is finding a job. That means sitting in your subdiscipline and selling yourself to that subdiscipline...I do feel strongly that young faculty, and graduate students have lost interest, in some respects, or time, or ability, to be university citizens."

(In response to question about other aspects of stewardship not yet discussed)
**Origins of interest in organizational issues in kinesiology.**

| Interest in people (i.e., identities, contestation, change). | 3 |
| Feeling a responsibility to respond/ofer alternative perspectives to other scholars' contributions to these conversations re: organization, stewardship, etc. | 3* |
| Negative first hand experiences of fragmentation, conflict (e.g., name changes, marginalization) in academic units of kinesiology. | 3 |
| Aspirations for formal leadership roles in higher education. | 2 |
| Administration experience (e.g., managing fragmentation, advocating against dean for collective priorities). | 2 |
| Reading higher education leadership and policy literature. | 2 |
| Experiences with ego-centric, arrogant, pretentious faculty members. | 2 |
| Passion/concern for the development and support of the next generation of kinesiology scholars. | 2* |
| Doctoral student disinterest in being engaged, university citizens. | 2 |
| Experience in other disciplines which revealed similar issues. | 1 |
| Belief that pedagogy (in its broadest sense) must be an important part of undergraduate curriculum. | 1 |
| Feeling privileged in own positive postgraduate education and academic employment experience when learning others had not been similarly supported. | 1* |
| Positive experiences/learnings interacting with scholars in a kinesiology-wide leadership focused association. | 1 |
| Exasperation with narrow, health-channelling undergraduate curriculum. Belief in need to foster broader learning opportunities in the socio-cultural historical world. | 1 |
Appendix F – Round Two Interview Guide

• Respond to Round One Executive Summary
  • General reaction: Adjust and/or explain own responses? Agree, disagree, and/or comment on others’ responses?
  • Specific reactions:
    o A. Reaction to following quote:
      "Well I never use the word stewardship, it's one of those organizational framework bits of speak...I've been on interview panels...now, I've never heard the word stewardship used but I have heard words like, 'What would you do with an underperforming faculty member?' 'What's your vision for the school?'...I have never heard anybody talk about 'How would you steward your particular field?' Because, in a sense, it seems to me like an artificial construct, stewardship...Heads of departments or deans...well I am not too sure whether they would all be saying, 'Well I took this job because I want to steward the field in this sort of direction.' They might be saying to you ‘It’s the next thing to do’ or ‘It’s a new challenge’ or whatever. So this notion of steering the field is what I am a little bit uncomfortable with. I think there is people-management that is important; there are strategic challenges and strategic directions that are really important. For example, can we focus, are there any projects that can bring us all together?"
    o B. What is your reaction to the disciplinary stewardship ‘examples/evidence’ tables that show items falling heavily in the service category (rather than teaching and research)?
    o C. What is your reaction to the following quotes that conceptualize the responsibility for and forms of stewardship differently:
      “I would say it's the dean's responsibility to have a sense of stewardship, as you are calling it. I don't think it's the responsibility of every academic. Everybody isn't the General, right? Some people have got their own tasks to do and they may in the process contribute to the enlightenment of the field's status or whatever. But most of them, their focus is on themselves and their research projects. I just think it's unrealistic to consider that everybody would be going in with a stewardship mindset, 'Oh I got to do this for the discipline'…but I do think that's the role of the senior staff, particularly the Dean... I just think that being an academic now...is incredibly difficult... Much more difficult than I experienced in my career. So I see young ones now as overloaded and snowed under… So then to expect them to be more ‘eyes on the big picture,’ I think is just totally unrealistic. There will be some people in various stages of their career who think this is a worthy thing to do, but they are already probably
late Professors, to shore up the boat that they are on or whatever... If you want to be an academic, then you need good research skills...to publish...to get grants...to be successful in your teaching...to have community outreach... I am not particularly optimistic that on top of that, people should be saying, 'Hey, which way can I help the field?' It's a lot more individual than that, and that's not bad, that's just how it is in particular phases of your life, I think."

I. "Sometimes it’s hard to separate this out from people doing innovative stuff...[e.g., disseminating knowledge via videos]... So maybe that is just what good researchers do... Maybe it's [that’s sort of research that gets] distributed more widely in order to enhance its impact socially, economically."

o D. What is your reaction to the following conceptualization of stewardship?

"Stewardship capital S is about those core features [i.e., unifying aim, vision, and mission] that have gotten lost on the way to the 21st century. And then there's small s stewardship that has to do with what happens locally. You have in this response sort of a ‘think globally, act locally’ sort of framework...The grand aims they unite the field and its entities wherever they are and then the more nuanced expressions of those where a particular department or school or a college needs its own stewardship with a small s, and so you've got stewardship operating at two levels"

o E. What is your reaction to the following quote?

"The fact that people don't have the skills to carry forward those kind of contestational moments is actually a big, big gap in where we are as a field. And possibly explains a lot about why we are where we are."

o F: There was lots of discussion of passion, disposition, identity. What is your reaction to the following different conceptualizations of identity?

"Induction is not just technical, it's also identity related...the idea being that you're a steward for a field when you identify with it...when your professional identify and your personal identity are intertwined."....

"When people become dean or head of a faculty or whatever and they talk about 'my department' it's like they own the thing, it becomes part of them. Their identity gets extended out into this institutional organizational unit.
That's the opposite of stewardship from my point of view, because then you get people's egos being expressed through that particular identity.

• **Prognostic Frame**
  Generating a detailed, unified and practical plan to foster leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship in kinesiology
  • *Where and how should the disciplinary stewardship development of doctoral students and early-, mid-, and late-career scholars of kinesiology occur?* Comment on the roles, responsibilities, and/or policies of any of the following:
    o Doctoral programs
    o Home departments and universities
    o Departmental, faculty, and/or senior-level administrators
    o Scholarly associations
    o Other
  • *Is it reform, redesign, or some mix of the two that is required to develop disciplinary stewards in kinesiology today*

• **Motivational Frame**
  Determining ways to inspire others to engage in disciplinary stewardship development plans.
  • *How can doctoral students and early-, mid-, and late-career scholars be motivated to engage in leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship development/behaviours?*
  • *What is your reaction to the quotes/barriers cited for disciplinary stewardship?*

"They don't want to do it…our faculty are busy teaching, desperately writing grants, and getting money… Engaging in discussions about disciplines and professions is not for the faint of heart. And I don't mean this disparagingly, people are doing fantastic work and are totally interested in their work...When it comes to discussions of the discipline and the profession, they don't have the time for that, nor the interest, nor the background. Many of them have not been trained in any way to think more broadly."

"[Students] are mostly worried about their job…so what kind of stewardship are you going to be able to get from this situation where critical importance is finding a job. That means sitting in your subdiscipline and selling yourself to that subdiscipline…I do feel strongly that young faculty, and graduate students have lost interest, in some respects, or time, or ability, to be university citizens."

• **Culminating Questions**
• What specific outcome(s) would you like to see as a result of a disciplinary stewardship orientation in this discipline? How does one know if they (or the discipline at large) are achieving this?

• What is your message (or question) to kinesiology doctoral students and early-career scholars regarding leadership-as-disciplinary stewardship?

• Comments and Questions

• Closing: Thank you and follow-up contact for final report.
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