

---

# INTERPROFESSIONAL COLLABORATION FOR YOUTH DEVELOPMENT THROUGH SPORT, EXER- CISE, AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

**Caly Setiawan<sup>1</sup>**  
**University at Albany, State University of New York**

---

## Abstrak

*Tulisan ini bertujuan untuk menstimulasi suatu diskusi tentang kolaborasi interprofesi untuk pembinaan pemuda melalui program olahraga, latihan, dan pendidikan jasmani dalam konteks kemitraan sekolah-keluarga-komunitas. Sebagai pembuka, artikel ini dimulai dengan paparan singkat asumsi kunci tentang kolaborasi. Kemudian, paparan tersebut diikuti oleh bagaimana munghubungkan kemitraan antara sekolah-keluarga-komunitas yang memungkinkan integrasi pelayanan. Artikel ini juga menekankan inovasi yang melibatkan pembahasan tentang hambatan dan fasilitator. Bagian akhir dari tulisan ini mengidentifikasi implikasi kebijakan ataupun praktis.*

*Kata Kunci: Interprofessional Collaboration, Youth Development, Sport, Exercise, and Physical Education.*

Many efforts have been made by schools to encompass and facilitate youth to promoting healthy adolescent development. This includes the integration of instilling students with a sense of belonging and purpose in life, development a positive self-image and the ability to become productive citizens. As educational leaders, we look forward to building an educational institution where we could have committed leaders and administrators, well - trained teachers, sophisticated curriculums, and adequate facilities and textbooks. Nevertheless, with all these facilitators, what can we expect from schools as a home for youth development if those young people grow up in families and community characterized by poverty, violence, lack of health care, high unemployment rates, low-wages, single-parent families, and crime? Under these circumstances, any devotion to school's improvement without involving simultaneous efforts to address the problems occurred in the family and community will likely remain undesirable outcomes.

---

<sup>1</sup> Caly Setiawan adalah mahasiswa pasca-sarjana di University at Albany, State University of New York, Albany, NY, USA.

In this paper, I intend to discuss the interprofessional collaboration for youth development programs using Sport, Exercise, and Physical Education (SEPE) programs in the context of school-family-community partnerships. It begins by exposing key assumptions of collaboration. Then, it follows by connecting the dots (schools, communities, families; see Lawson & Briar-Lawson, 1997) to enable service integration. It emphasizes promising innovations, which include possible barriers, constraints, and potential facilitators. Finally, this paper identifies implications for SEPE practice and policy.

To begin with, there are at least two assumptions underpinning collaboration. First, collaboration requires and at the same time reproduces social capital (e.g., Coleman 1988; Bourdieu, 1999; Putnam, 1995). Social capital involves relationships among people. Social capital also provides supports such as relational trust, network/cooperation, and access (to get resources). The strong and stable social capitals enable schools, families, and communities to benefit from bonding (glue), bridging (between equal institutions), and linking (vertical, e.g. access to people with power/ hard places to influence policy change). Thus, social capital will produce collective efficacy needed to improve conditions.

Second, the basic idea of collaboration is that it involves new relations between two or more 'entities' (Lawson, 2004). These relations are characterized by interdependency, which assumes that no one can achieve goals unless collaborates with others. In this sense, the pattern of interdependency is integrated services and positive-based asset for youth development. For example, we may want to overcome youth-related problems in schools such as misbehavior, aggressive behavior and violence, truancy and poor school attendance. However, under the conditions in which these students are living in the unhealthy families and poor communities, these problems will still exist. Thus, following social-ecological perspectives, there should be concurrent efforts operated not only by the schools but also by the families and communities (Taylor, 2002). At this point, intervention logic is needed, which means tailoring the structures to the problems. With these structures, "*if you want to achieve x, under conditions of a, b, and c, then do y*" has been suggested by Lawson (2004) as the logic of collaboration.

Integrating services for addressing youth problems can be initiated by connecting schools to communities and families. Here are four reasons why the schools, families and communities should be connected (e.g. Warren, 2005). First, youth cannot learn and develop well if they lack of adequate housing, health care, nutrition, and safe and secure environments, or their parents are experiencing stress because of their low wages and insecure employment. Second, schools cannot teach youth well and facilitate their development if teachers lack an understanding of their students' cultures and lives, and if they lack meaningful relationships with their families. Third, youth coming from low-income families or minorities often experience ignorance and isolation; seen as part of the problem. Finally, some urban and rural schools suffer from a lack of resources tied to their location in poor communities.

Another point of departure can also possibly begin from communities and families, then to schools. Community-family initiatives can contribute to school improvement (Warren, 2005). First, these initiatives improve the social context of education so that students come to school better equipped to learn. Second, they foster parental and community participation

in the education of youth and the work of schools. Third, the initiative works to transform the culture of schools and the practice of schooling and hold school officials accountable for educational gains. Fourth, they help build a political constituency for public education to support the delivery of greater resources to schools and to address in other ways the profound inequalities in public education. At this point, collaboration *enables healthy and sustainable communities that are* conducive for learning so that youth are able to learn and teachers are able to teach.

Regarding to the youth development, SEPE provides physical activities designed for school-based and -linked after-school programs as the tool to reduce risk factors and built protective factors for youth. There appears to be growing evidence, which reveals that physical activity can nurture the dimensions associated with resiliency and adaptability to youth development. It also enables youth to reduce their alienation and to gain social networks and collective identity (attachment). Equally important, physical activity benefits youth with good health and well-being. Research conducted by Martinek, et al (2001) indicates that engaging in the well-designed programs of physical education class, after school, and sport club is supportive for youngsters to be better in learning tasks in the classroom. In short, more than the physical benefits, SEPE provides the social work (Lawson, 2005) for youth development.

However, the social work of SEPE is only achievable by inter professional collaboration (e.g., Lawson, 2005). There are significant barriers to begin collaborative efforts addressing youth development issues in Indonesia. To illustrate, SEPE leaders have no sufficient knowledge base about the social work of SEPE. As a result, a great deal attention has been paid to SEPE related policies and programs planning that are less socially contributive. For example, most SEPE policies and programs are designed to build nationalism (Adams, 2002), and pro-Olympic sport (e.g., Lawson, 2005). Another barrier is that SEPE leaders have a lack of understanding about inter professional collaboration and its benefits. Even worse, this deficiency is also noticeable for school and community leaders. In the same way, there are other barriers in designing and implementing youth development programs (see the details including strategies to eliminate them in Anderson-Butcher, D., Lawson, H., Bean, J., Boone, B., Kwiatkowski, A., et al., 2004).

Indeed, inter professional collaboration is not easy to put into practice (e.g., Mizrahi & Rosenthal, 2001). By including a range of institutions and agencies (e.g., YMCA, sport clubs, business, the Institute of Youth Development, family empowerment centers, community development agencies), couple of challenges are apparent. First, collaborative leadership requires SEPE-school-community leaders to work within the less bureaucratic/ structured institutions but strongly demand their commitment. It means that there will be paradigm shift from coercive bureaucracy (old) to enabling bureaucracy (new). Second, in order to frame and name, SEPE-school-community professionals often excessively employ technical languages. As a result, the interprofessional collaborations among them deal with language discrepancy. Therefore, one way to frame new things in the collaboration leaderships is to change the language. At this point, intermediaries are crucial.

From my experience as a faculty member working to prepare SEPE professionals, my jobs enable me to be the intermediaries for the youth interprofessional collaborations through SEPE. Universities can mediate schools, communities, and families connections to produce

integrated services. In this position, faculty members have to be able to ensure equal communication leading to collaboration actions. In addition, the university can facilitate interprofessional collaborations by fostering research, making policy recommendations, training for professionals, providing consultations, piloting models, and producing guides to practices.

In conclusion, I expect that there will be real implications in the SEPE policies, programs, and practices addressing youth development involving schools, communities, and families. There are challenges of addressing persistent barriers to learning and enhancing healthy development. To deal with those challenges, it requires blending resources of home, school, and community to create a comprehensive, integrated approach. Getting there from here involves initiatives, intermediaries, and policy shifts.

*Penulis mengucapkan terimakasih kepada Prof. Hal A. Lawson atas masukan-masukan penting pada draft awal tulisan ini. Ucapan terimakasih juga disampaikan kepada Wanda Carter dan Shakira Damiron atas kesediaannya meluangkan waktu untuk mengoreksi tata bahasa, akurasi, dan koherensi karangan ini.*

## **REFERENCE:**

- Anderson-Butcher, Lawson, et al., (2004). Youth development. In D. Anderson-Butcher, H. Lawson, J. Bean, B. Boone, et al., *Implementation guide: Ohio community collaboration model for school improvement*. Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Education.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1999). Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction. In In Arum, Richards & Irene R. Beattie (ed). *The Structure of Schooling: Reading in the Sociology of Education*. McGraw-Hill: New York.
- Coleman, James S. (1988). Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *American Journal of Sociology* 94, pp. 95-120.
- Lawson, Hal A. (2005). Empowering people, facilitating community development, and contributing to sustainable development: the social work of sport, exercise, and physical education programs. *Sport, Education and Society*. Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 135-160.
- Lawson, H., & Briar-Lawson, K. (1997). *Connecting the dots: Progress toward the integration of school reform, school-linked services, parent involvement, and community schools*. Oxford, OH: The Danforth Foundation and the Institute for Educational Renewal at Miami University.
- Mizrahi, T., & Rosenthal, B. (2001). Complexities of coalition building: Leaders' successes, strategies, struggles, and solutions. *Social Work*, 46(1), 63-77.
- Putnam, Robert D. (1995). Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital. *Journal of*

***Interprofessional Collaboration for Youth Development through Sport,  
Exercise, and Physical Education***

---

*Democracy*. Volume 6, Number 1.

Taylor, Jr., H. L. (2002, March). *Linking school reform to the neighborhood revitalization movement*. Keynote address, Leave No Child Behind Conference, University at Albany, State University of New York, Albany, NY.

Warren, M. R. (2005). Communities and schools: A new view of urban education reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 75(2), 133-173.