

Theoretical Paper

Flourishing through Leisure Practice Model, Capabilities Approach, and MacIntyre's Theory of Flourishing: Compatible and Interrelated

James B. Wise

Abstract

Flourishing is a burgeoning concept in therapeutic recreation (TR) with some authors arguing for it to be a principal goal of the profession. However, there are three conceptualizations in the literature raising questions of compatibility and interrelationship. Are the Capabilities Approach (Nussbaum, 2006), MacIntyre's (2007) theory of flourishing, and the Flourishing through Leisure: An Ecological Extension of the Leisure and Well-Being Model (FTL; Anderson & Heyne, 2012a) compatible, and if so, how are they interrelated? An investigation revealed the conceptualizations are harmonious and nested according to level of generality. The Capabilities Approach is the most abstract and serves as a foundation that accommodates MacIntyre's theory which, in turn, details multiple capabilities and their contributions to flourishing. The FTL model links both to service recipients by transforming theoretical rhetoric into specific actions professionals take to facilitate flourishing. Considered jointly, the complementary entities serve at least two functions. They mutually support flourishing as a principal goal and supply clear guidelines on how to help people live well.

Keywords

Capabilities approach, flourishing, Flourishing through Leisure Model, therapeutic recreation

James B. Wise is a professor within the Recreation, Parks and Leisure Services department at Minnesota State University, Mankato.

Please send correspondence to james.wise@mnsu.edu

Flourishing is a burgeoning concept in therapeutic recreation (TR) with some authors arguing for it to be a principal goal of the profession (Anderson & Heyne, 2012a, 2012b; Heyne & Anderson, 2012; Wise, 2010, 2014a, 2014b, 2015, 2017, 2019). However, there are multiple conceptualizations in the professional literature, which raises at least two questions. First, are the Capabilities Approach (Nussbaum, 2006, 2013), MacIntyre's (1999, 2007) theory of human flourishing, and the Flourishing through Leisure: An Ecological Extension of the Leisure and Well-Being Model (FTL; Anderson & Heyne, 2012a, 2012b; Heyne & Anderson, 2012) compatible or adversarial? Second, if compatible, how are they interrelated? The questions are not frivolous as the answers impact the profession. For one, correlated conceptualizations strengthen the case for flourishing as a central outcome due to multiple authors with different orientations concluding that helping people live well through engagement in recreation and leisure activities is a worthy endeavor. Furthermore, identifying the interrelationship ensures the entities are employed in an integrated, complementary manner. For instance, the Capabilities Approach and MacIntyre's theory supply strong justification for designating facilitation of human flourishing as a primary mission while the FTL model supplies explicit ideas on services specialists deliver and the best way to deliver those services.

Research aimed at determining the conceptualizations' compatibility and interrelationship has commenced. Wise (2018a) summarized the Capabilities Approach (Nussbaum, 2006, 2013) and explained how the broad theory of justice acts as a foundation for many doctrines of flourishing. One of those doctrines is a prominent theory authored by MacIntyre (1999, 2007) that stipulates how capabilities coalesce into a particular vision of flourishing. Wise situated MacIntyre's theory of human flourishing within the broad theory of justice and discussed implications associated with adopting both frameworks. The present investigation extends the previous study (Wise, 2018a) to the FTL model (Anderson & Heyne, 2012a, 2012b), a third conceptualization.

This article begins with reviews of the Capabilities Approach, MacIntyre's theory of human flourishing, and similarities between the two (Wise, 2018a). Next, the FTL model is described and linked to the Capabilities Approach and theory of human flourishing. Additionally, a concordant interrelationship among the three is articulated. The paper concludes with a number of actions emanating from the investigation's findings.

Capabilities Approach

Its suitability for TR firmly established by Sylvester (2011) and Anderson and Heyne (2012b), the Capabilities Approach (Nussbaum, 2006, 2013) ascertains conditions or capabilities necessary for living well. A capability is defined as the freedom to choose from a set of environmental opportunities related to what one wants to do and be. The definition reflects an ecological perspective as does the theory which explicitly acknowledges flourishing results from interactions between people's "personal abilities and the political, social and economic environment" (Nussbaum, 2013, p. 20). The approach insists everyone must have sufficient opportunities to develop and express capabilities they believe are important and that contribute to worthwhile, meaningful lives of their own choosing. Thus, a just society is charged with guaranteeing all inhabitants have access to capabilities so they can live well (Nussbaum, 2009).

For Nussbaum (2013), 10 capabilities are “central” (p. 70) or essential to living well. The following list of Central Capabilities are drawn from Wise (2018a, p. 258) and synthesize the contents of the original index (Nussbaum, 2006).

1. *Life* which is to be able to live a life of normal length.
2. *Bodily Health* which is to be able to experience good health and have access to adequate food and shelter.
3. *Bodily Integrity* which is to be able to move safely from place to place, have opportunities for sexual satisfaction, and be free from assault.
4. *Senses, Imagination, and Thought* which is to be able to use one’s senses and imagination, create works of one’s own doing, and reason in ways shaped by an adequate education. In addition, being able to experience pleasure, avoid pain, and exercise one’s senses, imagination, and reason in an environment supporting the freedoms of expression and religion.
5. *Emotions* which is to be able to develop attachments to other people and things.
6. *Practical Reason* which is to be able to conceptualize a life worthy of human dignity and plan for its attainment.
7. *Affiliation* which is to be able to live civilly with other people, engage in social interactions, and take on the viewpoints of other people. In addition, affiliation is to be treated as a full fledge human being who deserves other people’s respect and conditions essential to a dignified life.
8. *Other Species* which is to be able to demonstrate respect for other living things and nature.
9. *Play* which is to be able to laugh, play, and enjoy recreation and leisure.
10. *Control over One’s Environment* which is to be able to participate in the political process, possess property, and engage in humanity affirming work.

These capabilities form the core of people’s moral visions. A moral vision describes the good life and identifies constituent elements or capabilities of such a life (Donnelly, 1985, 2013; MacIntyre, 1991, 2008). There are many ways in which capabilities can be expressed and arranged so visions are diverse, representing a wide range of secular and religious views of the good life (Dieser, 2002a; Dieser & Peregoy, 1999; Nussbaum, 2006, 2013; Sylvester, 1992). The rich diversity of moral visions mandates any foundational framework for flourishing be capable of accommodating a plurality of views on the meaning of life. The Capabilities Approach satisfies the mandate because it was designed to encompass “diverse possibilities of flourishing” (Nussbaum, 2006, p. 182). The approach achieves the goal due to its abstract nature and resulting generality of each capability and the entire approach.

Up to this point, the focus has been on capabilities and not on what people do with the opportunities. What people do with the available opportunities is termed functioning. Formally, functioning refers to the exercise or realization of a capability. To exemplify, members of a just society have opportunities to engage in meaningful work (i.e., capability). When they obtain employment and begin working they have exercised or realized the concomitant capability (i.e., functioning). Nussbaum (2006, 2013) is concerned with capabilities rather than functioning because choice and freedom play significant roles in living well. For example, being guaranteed the right to practice a religion is an important element of many people’s moral visions; they can

freely choose to practice or not to practice. Whether or not they actually practice represents their functioning with respect to this capability. In another example portraying the importance of choice and freedom, requiring people to engage in play, recreation, and leisure counters the purpose of the corresponding capability. Depriving people of the ability to freely choose to participate drastically changes the experiences because the freedom to participate is a defining feature of all three constructs (e.g., McLean, Hurd, & Anderson, 2017). Eliminating freedom by prescribing the constructs results in experiences that are not play, recreation, or leisure (Mobily, 1985; Sylvester, 1985; Sylvester, Voelkl, & Ellis, 2001).

A Particular Moral Vision of Human Flourishing

Grounded in Aristotle's (2001) notion of flourishing, the Capabilities Approach is "ethical from the start" (Nussbaum, 2013, p. 28) because the goal is for people to live lives worthy of human dignity. However, since there are multiple manifestations of living well, the Capabilities Approach does not advance a particular moral vision. Rather, the approach recognizes people create and pursue visions of flourishing based on the enumerated requisite conditions. Space limitations do not permit an exhaustive review of visions so what immediately follows is one extensively described in several, recent *Therapeutic Recreation Journal* articles, compatible with the approach, and applicable to TR (Wise, 2015, 2017, 2018a, 2019).

Human flourishing. The moral vision, founded on the works of MacIntyre (1999, 2007) and applied to the TR profession (Sylvester, 2007, 2009; Wise, 2014a, 2014b, 2015, 2017, 2018a, 2019), hypothesizes the ultimate goal of living is flourishing. The central aspect of MacIntyre's (2007) theory is performing well or excelling in practices. A practice is a "coherent and complex form of socially established cooperative human activity" (p. 187) and excelling enriches the lives of practice members who, in turn, provide socially valuable goods and services.

Practices are varied, encompassing professions such as therapeutic recreation and farming, and social roles such as father and friend. Though varied, the goal of all practices is for members to excel, which entails achieving technical and ethical standards (MacIntyre, 2007). Technical standards often center on gaining and applying foundational knowledge, skills, and abilities. Besides being good at the practice, members must be good people, meaning they behave virtuously and treat others ethically. When members of a practice meet or exceed standards in both areas, they obtain internal goods. Internal goods are available to everyone who excels, better people's lives, and benefit society (MacIntyre, 2007). Examples of goods include quality services and products, pride from delivering those services and crafting those products, camaraderie with other members, and enhanced well-being.

Excelling is illustrated with therapeutic recreation specialists (TRs) (Sylvester, 2009). Specialists excel when they possess knowledge and perform tasks delineated by the 2014 job analysis (National Council for Therapeutic Recreation Certification, 2018) and standards of practice (American Therapeutic Recreation Association; ATRA, 2015). Competent TRs create personalized treatment plans based upon accurate assessment data, facilitate effective therapeutic programs, author unambiguous documentation, present results to stakeholders, lobby for accessible programs and facilities, and advocate for patients. They also adhere to the profession's code of ethics (ATRA, 2009). Virtuous specialists respect patients' choices and treat them fairly, are

honest with patients and colleagues, and maximize therapeutic outcomes. These goods, services, and actions enrich lives and contribute to a better society. TRSs take pride and satisfaction in their work, and enjoy positive, social relationships with colleagues and patients; patients experience improved health and functioning; and society becomes more inclusive.

Leisure, recreation, and work. Sylvester (2007) initiated scholarship applying MacIntyre's (1999, 2007) theory to relevant capabilities. The first scholarly text (Sylvester, 2007) was a three-page conference abstract envisioning leisure pursuits as MacIntyrean practices with a focus on describing internal goods and virtues common to all leisure practices. Wise (2014b) expanded Sylvester's (2007) content and extended the application to recreation (2019) and work (2017). The articles elucidated how envisioning leisure, recreation, and work as practices ensures the capabilities are closely aligned factors of flourishing. "The practice of leisure forms a synergy with other practices, such as work and family [and recreation], for the purpose of a unified good life" (Sylvester, 2007, p. 210).

Since the capabilities are substantial determinants of living well and TRSs are facilitators of flourishing, they are charged with a number of tasks (Wise, 2014a, 2014b, 2017, 2019). One, guarantee people have ample opportunities to participate in inclusive leisure and recreation practices. Two, help people cultivate and exercise virtues required for excelling in leisure and recreation practices. Ethical behavior extends to TRSs who must acquire virtues necessary for effectively functioning in a pluralistic society (Riggs, 2010; Sellman, 2003; Stewart-Sicking, 2008). One such virtue is openness, which involves actively seeking out, learning about, acknowledging, and appreciating various conceptions of flourishing (Stewart-Sicking, 2008). Three, support people's autonomy to formulate and pursue visions of flourishing and collaborate with them to bring those visions to fruition. Four, join with vocational rehabilitation counselors in developing and facilitating plans promoting flourishing through involvement in leisure, recreation, and work practices. Finally, assist with making individual leisure, recreation, and work practices even more powerful contributors to flourishing. Consider adaptive alpine skiing. The practice is more inclusive now than it was 40 years ago, enabling a greater number of people with severe disabilities to excel, access internal goods, and flourish (Professional Ski Instructors of America/American Association of Snowboard Instructors, 2003). Increased inclusivity is due to instructional improvements and equipment advances. One equipment innovation is the bi-ski. People once prevented from skiing due to limited physical function now carve turns on challenging terrain and in challenging snow conditions.

Relationship and Connections between the Capabilities Approach and MacIntyre's Theory of Flourishing

At this point, a relationship and connections between the Capabilities Approach and MacIntyre's theory of flourishing are presented. The Capabilities Approach catalogs "important prerequisites of reasonable conceptions of human flourishing" (Nussbaum, 2006, p. 182) while the specific theory of human flourishing advanced by MacIntyre (1999, 2007) and expanded by Sylvester (2007) and Wise (2014b, 2017, 2019) epitomizes one of those reasonable conceptions. In other words, the theory of flourishing is nested in the Capabilities Approach (Pickett, Kolasa, & Jones, 2007). In nested relation-

ships, “[l]ess general theories are often subsets of, or related to, more general theories” (Pickett et al., 2007, p. 91). Frequently, this means components outlined in a general theory are further developed in a less general theory. Leisure, recreation, and work are outlined in the Capabilities Approach and detailed in MacIntyre’s expanded theory.

Beyond the Capabilities Approach accommodating MacIntyre’s theory, the two share at least four features. First, the frameworks are based upon Aristotle’s idea of living well (Aristotle, 2001). MacIntyre (2007) declared he was “an Aristotelian” (p. x) and drew heavily on Aristotle’s (2001) *Ethics* while formulating his theory of flourishing. Similarly, Nussbaum (2006) notes her indebtedness to Aristotle when she says, “The capabilities approach takes its start from the Aristotelian...conception of the human being” (p. 85) and what it takes to flourish as human beings.

Second, there are at least three distinguishing features of human beings: the capacity for reasoning, the capacity is embedded in an animal body, and both characteristics are marked by dependence. The Capabilities Approach recognizes a wide range of reasoning abilities exists across people and that people “are inevitably dependent” because their animal bodies require care supplied by other people (Nussbaum, 2006, p. 218). Comparably, MacIntyre (1999) contends reasoning is a skill whose advancement and application are largely dependent upon the direct tuition of others. Also, because human bodies are animal bodies that take time to mature and are vulnerable to impairments, people rely upon one another for protection, nourishment, comfort, and sometimes reasoning. For example, parents provide care and make many decisions for their young children whose bodies and reasoning abilities are not yet fully developed. In another example, people in advanced stages of Alzheimer’s who experience debilitating physical disabilities extensively rely upon others for legal and medical guidance and performance of activities of daily living.

Third, MacIntyre (1999) and Nussbaum (2006) believe disability is a natural part of human life and does not prevent flourishing. MacIntyre (1999) said “vulnerability and disability ... pervade human life” (p. 155) but do not prevent flourishing while for Nussbaum (2006), people with disabilities want “options for diverse forms of choice and functioning in life” (p. 189) because they “are members of the human community ... who have the ability to lead a good human life” (p. 190).

A fourth feature and one very germane to the present discussion is the conviction that leisure and recreation are principal contributors to flourishing (Wise 2014a, 2014b, 2018a, 2019). Substantiated by this connection, leisure and recreation are designated as human rights or capabilities that any just society is obligated to guarantee its inhabitants (Nussbaum, 2006; Sylvester, 1992; Wise, 2015, 2018a).

Flourishing through Leisure (FTL) Model

This section describes the Flourishing through Leisure (FTL) model. The FTL model (Anderson & Heyne, 2012a, 2012b) extends a previous practice model, the Leisure Well-Being Model (LWM; Carruthers & Hood, 2007; Hood & Carruthers, 2007) by adding the domain of spirituality, expanding recognition of the effects environmental factors exert on flourishing, and acknowledging that TRSs must assume responsibility for fashioning supportive environments.

The FTL model’s theoretical foundation consists of the Capabilities Approach, strengths-based theories, a social model of disability and an ecological perspective

(Anderson & Heyne, 2012b). A number of principles emphasizing recipients of TR services stem from the foundation (Anderson & Heyne, 2012a, 2012b). For instance, two interrelated principles are that the people being served are the heart of TR so they are the experts regarding their lives, and it is their goals, dreams, and aspirations that drive the TR process. Additionally, people can only be understood if they are seen as being embedded in environments. Relatedly, the experience of disability, resulting from interactions between personal and environmental factors, is transitory and best gauged with a continuum (Anderson & Heyne, 2012a, 2012b; Wise, 2016). Finally, leisure is considered a chief contributor to living well because it fosters positive affect and develops personal strengths.

Guided by these principles, TRSs focus on facilitating quality leisure experiences, nurturing personal strengths, and making environments more conducive to flourishing. TR services strive to enhance personal knowledge and skills in the leisure, psychological and emotional, cognitive, social, physical, and spiritual domains. Yet, personal variables are only one part of the flourishing equation so TRSs must also address the other half of the equation, cultivating environmental resources in the same domains.

A small sample of behaviors professionals may perform to promote flourishing by addressing personal and environmental facets in the various domains may help readers grasp the scope of objectives sought by TRSs (Anderson & Heyne, 2012a). Related to the leisure domain, TRSs help people discover or clarify their leisure-related dreams and participate in virtuous leisure practices. Professionals also ensure there are adequate social supports and numerous options for participating in a wide range of leisure practices. With respect to the psychological and emotional domain, TRSs nurture participants' optimism and clearly convey their high expectations of participants. Concentrating on the cognitive domain, professionals educate participants about goal-setting skills. In addition, specialists break down complex activities into simple steps and decrease the number of rules. Targeting the social domain, TRSs teach friendship skills and work to instill within community peers more positive attitudes toward interacting with people with disabilities. Turning to the physical domain, specialists design interventions to increase muscular strength and endurance and advocate for a greater number of accessible community-based leisure facilities and availability of adapted equipment. Regarding the final domain, higher levels of spirituality are fostered through the meaning and purpose that come with engaging in leisure and recreation practices. Lastly, and with respect to augmenting spirituality, professionals make sure there are plenty of nature-based venues for people to visit and explore.

Connections among the Three Conceptualizations

There are a number of connections among the FTL model, Capabilities Approach, and MacIntyre's theory of flourishing. First, when describing theories concordant with and underlying their practice model, Heyne and Anderson (2012) called the Capabilities Approach "a tremendously relevant and comprehensive [foundational] framework for therapeutic recreation" (p. 122) that can help TRSs "improve quality of life and well-being for individuals and their communities" (p. 124). Second, the FTL model and MacIntyre's theory stipulate virtuous behavior promotes flourishing (MacIntyre, 2007). Anderson and Heyne (2012a) contend virtuous leisure contributes to meaningful lives, especially when participating advances the flourishing of others. Third, the model and MacIntyre's theory also discern personal narratives are an effective means

for assessing flourishing because the format captures detailed interactions between people and their environments (Anderson & Heyne, 2012a, 2012b; Clifton, 2018; Clifton, et al., 2018). The captured information is used to create plans aimed at nurturing flourishing. Fourth, according to the ecological perspective adopted by all three entities, environments must supply people with ample opportunities or freedoms to pursue a broad array of inclusive leisure and recreation practices (Anderson & Heyne, 2012a; Nussbaum, 2006, 2013; Wise, 2018a). Fifth, disability is caused by interactions between personal and environmental factors (Wise, 2016) so the dynamic condition is most accurately represented as a continuum. “[D]isability is a function of interaction between the person and the environment” (Anderson & Heyne, 2012a, p. 132) and “is a matter of more or less, both in respect of degree of disability and in respect of the time periods in which we are disabled” (MacIntyre, 1999, p. 73). Sixth, disability is a natural aspect of the human condition and does not preclude people from flourishing or enjoying leisure and recreation (MacIntyre, 1999; Wise, 2014a). People with disabilities can “have a good life and ...enjoy the fruits of leisure” (Anderson & Heyne, 2012a, p. 146). Similarly, people with disabilities “encounter unusual impediments on the way to flourishing” but can and do flourish (Nussbaum, 2006). Seventh, the variability inherent in human beings and their lives leads to variability in the portrayals of flourishing exhibited among people, a claim validated by recent scholarship (Clifton, 2018; Clifton, Llewellyn, & Shakespeare, 2018). Finally, leisure and recreation are fundamental elements of human flourishing (Anderson & Heyne, 2012a, 2012b; Nussbaum, 2006, 2013; Wise, 2014a, 2019).

Interrelationship among the Three Conceptualizations

The correlated conceptualizations exhibit a nested relationship (Pickett et al., 2007). As previously noted, MacIntyre’s theory expanded by Sylvester (2007) and Wise (2014b, 2017, 2019) is nested in the relatively abstract Capabilities Approach. The expanded theory details the capabilities of leisure, recreation, and work and expounds their contributions to flourishing. The FTL model, displaying the greatest level of specificity, is nested in MacIntyre’s theory. A model bridges “the difficult and tenuous ground between theory and practice” (Mobily, 1999, p. 176) by “extract[ing] the essence of a ...theory” (Pickett et al., 2007, p. 81) and converting the essence into practical applications. Moreover, a model “captures the purpose and scope of practice” (Anderson & Heyne, 2012b, p. 42), delineating the ultimate goal(s) of a profession, what services are delivered, and expected outcomes of those services. The FTL model delineates flourishing as an ultimate goal and definitively communicates concomitant services and delivery methods. The model’s applied nature is readily apparent from the growing body of literature highlighting FTL informed therapeutic interventions (Anderson & Heyne, 2012a, 2012b, 2016; Heyne & Anderson, 2012; Hood & Carruthers, 2016a, 2016b) and metrics (Anderson & Heyne, 2013; Witman, Jacob, Anderson, Heyne, & Malcarne, 2014).

Future Actions

The present discussion suggests five actions. First, conduct further research on the proposed nesting configuration. Though rational and coherent, the articulated arrangement requires elaboration and empirical verification.

Second, extend the investigation to other conceptualizations. A logical starting point is with TR practice models and two rise to the forefront. The LWB since it is the precursor to the FTL model and the Social/Recreation Community Model (Mobily & Dieser, 2018) since it is based on a social model of disability and an ecological perspective.

Third, uncover individual moral visions congruent with the FTL model because existing practice models cannot be universally applied. Dieser and his colleague (Dieser, 2002b; Dieser & Perego, 1999) extensively reviewed six practice models that appeared in a special series hosted by the *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*. They concluded that the indiscriminant use of any of the models could lead to unintended negative consequences for recipients of TR services due to a mismatch between the values held by service recipients and the values underlying a particular model. Values, as the “conditions, qualities, and actions deemed to be good” (Wise, 2018a, p. 255) because they contribute to living well, can and do differ among moral visions. And, in some cases, values may be antagonistic. This condition was poignantly illustrated in a personal narrative where Dieser (2002a) described how a mismatch between the values undergirding treatment interventions and those important to the moral visions held by members of non-dominant cultures led to a couple of patients prematurely ceasing treatment. Because of the potential for harmful effects, “therapeutic recreation practice models should not be blindly used” (Dieser, 2002b, p. 353). Instead, TRSs should purposefully select a model that closely aligns with a recipient’s values or in the terms of the present discussion, with the recipient’s vision of what it means to live well or flourish.

A fourth, multifaceted action follows from the third. TRSs gain competency with all practice models since they serve people who subscribe to widely differing moral visions and models are not universally applicable. This undertaking entails being cognizant of moral visions accordant with each model in order to minimize negative consequences and maximize positive consequences for recipients of TR services. Other related enterprises are creating new models that are harmonious with the existing plurality of treatises on living well and revising existing models to be congruent with those visions.

Fifth, collaborate with service recipients in critically appraising capability destroying moral visions such as those revolving around drinking excessive amounts of alcohol or participating in harmful leisure and recreation activities. This action opposes Nussbaum (2006, 2013), who staunchly defends autonomous behavior even if it is antithetical to living well because “[i]ndividuality, freedom, and choice are...very important goods” (2006, p. 217). People must have sufficient opportunities to pursue healthy lifestyles but “they should not be penalized for unhealthy choices” (2006, p. 80). Furthermore, she does not support making “unhealthy activities such as boxing, unsafe sex, football, and smoking illegal” (2006, p. 171). The only exceptions deal with children and citizens. Children must receive a compulsory education and not be abused and governments must treat all people with respect (Nussbaum, 2006, 2013).

Though compelling, Nussbaum’s stance does not relieve us of our responsibility as moral agents (Sylvester, 2002, 2009; Widmer & Ellis, 1998; Wise, 2018a, 2018b) “to challenge issues of right and wrong” (McKenney, 2016, p. 265) and “confront...challenging [ethical] choices participants make” (p. 287). We can meet our responsibility by facilitating moral development discussions (McKenney, 2016), a technique aimed

at helping people become more ethical. Moral development occurs as people proceed through hierarchical stages, progressing from behaving morally to avoid punishment to acting in a manner that respects everyone's freedom and human dignity (Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977). Using recreation-related ethical dilemmas, the technique generates group based deliberations leading people to examine their thinking about moral issues and consider other's well-being when making decisions (McKenney, 2016).

The final action is to deepen the conceptualizations of leisure and recreation (Wise, 2014b, 2019). As socially constructed phenomena, leisure and recreation are mutable and dynamic so both must be periodically reviewed to assure they reflect advances in our knowledge and understanding of what it means to live well. The goal is to make both serve as even more significant contributors to multitudinous visions of living well.

Summary

The different yet congruous views strengthen the case for establishing flourishing as a core goal because multiple authors reached the conclusion that helping people live well is a crucial human endeavor. Additionally, each view imparts distinctive but complementary evidence bolstering TR's standing as the profession that nurtures flourishing. The Capabilities Approach firmly establishes the importance of leisure and recreation in living well. MacIntyre's expanded theory details leisure and recreation and their relationships to one another and flourishing. Finally, the FTL model supplies precise guidance on how best to facilitate flourishing through engaging in leisure and recreation. Jointly, the conceptualizations form a solid foundation for therapeutic recreation (Sylvester et al., 2001).

References

- American Therapeutic Recreation Association. (2009). *Code of ethics*. Retrieved from <https://www.atra-online.com/page/Ethics>
- American Therapeutic Recreation Association. (2015.). *Standards of practice*. Retrieved from <https://www.atra-online.com/page/SOP>
- Anderson, L. S., & Heyne, L. A. (2012a). Flourishing through Leisure: An ecological extension of the Leisure and Well-Being Model in therapeutic recreation strengths-based practice. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 46(2), 129–152.
- Anderson, L., & Heyne, L. (2012b). *Therapeutic recreation practice: A strengths approach*. State College, PA: Venture.
- Anderson, L. S., & Heyne, L. A. (2013). A strengths-based approach to assessment in therapeutic recreation. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 47(2), 89–108.
- Anderson, L. S., & Heyne, L. A. (2016). Flourishing through leisure and the upward spiral theory of lifestyle change. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 50(2), 118–137.
- Aristotle. (2001). *Nicomachean ethics* (W. D. Ross, Trans.). In R. McKeon (Ed.), *The basic works of Aristotle* (pp. 928–1112). New York, NY: The Modern Library.
- Carruthers, C., & Hood, C. D. (2007). Building a life of meaning through therapeutic recreation: The Leisure and Well-Being Model, part I. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 41(4), 276–297.
- Clifton, S. (2018). *Cripple grace: Disability, virtue ethics, and the good life*. Waco, TX: Baylor.

- Clifton, S., Llewellyn, G., & Shakespeare, T. (2018). Quadriplegia, virtue theory, and flourishing: A qualitative study drawing on self-narratives. *Disability & Society*, 33, 20-38. doi:10.1080/09687599.2017.1379951
- Dieser, R. B. (2002a). A personal narrative of a cross-cultural experience in therapeutic recreation: Unmasking the masked. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 36(1), 84–96.
- Dieser, R. B. (2002b). A cross-cultural critique of newer therapeutic recreation practice models: The Self-Determination and Enjoyment Enhancement Model, Aristotelian Good Life Model, and the Optimizing Lifelong Health through Therapeutic Recreation Model. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 36(4), 352–368.
- Dieser, R. B., & Peregoy, J. J. (1999). A multicultural critique of three therapeutic recreation service models. *Annual in Therapeutic Recreation*, 8, 56–69.
- Donnelly, J. (1985). *The concept of human rights*. London, UK: Croom Helm.
- Donnelly, J. (2013). *Universal human rights in theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Ithaca, NY: Cornell.
- Heyne, L. A., & Anderson, L. S. (2012). Theories that support strengths-based practice in therapeutic recreation. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 46(2), 106–128.
- Hood, C. D., & Carruthers, C. (2007). Enhancing leisure experience and developing resources: The Leisure and Well-Being Model, part II. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 41(4), 298–325.
- Hood, C. D., & Carruthers, C. (2016a). Strengths-based TR program development using the Leisure and Well-Being Model: Translating theory into practice. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 50(1), 4–20.
- Hood, C. D., & Carruthers, C. (2016b). Supporting the development of strengths-based narrative: Applying the Leisure and Well-Being Model in outpatient mental health services. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 50(2), 103–117.
- Kohlberg, L., & Hersh, R. (1977). Moral development: A review of the theory. *Theory into Practice*, 16(2), 53–59.
- MacIntyre, A. (1991). Community, law, and the idiom and rhetoric of rights. *Listening*, 26, 96–110.
- MacIntyre, A. (1999). *Dependent rational animals: Why human beings need the virtues*. Chicago, IL: Open Court.
- MacIntyre, A. (2007). *After virtue* (3rd ed.). Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame.
- MacIntyre, A. (2008). What more needs to be said? A beginning, although only a beginning, at saying it. *Analyse & Kritik*, 30, 261–276.
- McKenney, A. (2016). Moral development discussions. In J. Dattilo & A. McKenney (Eds.), *Facilitation techniques in therapeutic recreation* (3rd ed., pp. 265–290). State College, PA: Venture.
- McLean, D. D., Hurd, A. R., & Anderson, D. M. (2017). *Kraus' recreation and leisure in modern society* (11th ed.). Burlington, MA: Jones & Bartlett.
- Mobily, K. E. (1985). The ethical dilemma of freedom in therapeutic recreation. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 19(4), 22–30.
- Mobily, K. E. (1999). New horizons in models of practice in therapeutic recreation. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 33(3), 174–192.
- Mobily, K. E., & Dieser, R. B. (2018) Seeking alternatives in therapeutic recreation/recreation therapy: A Social/Recreation Community Model. *Leisure/Loisir*, 42, 1–23. doi: 10.1080/14927713.2017.1403860

- National Council for Therapeutic Recreation Certification. (2018). *Part V: NC-TRC national job analysis*. Retrieved from <https://nctrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/5JobAnalysis.pdf>
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2006). *Frontiers of justice: Disability, nationality, species membership*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap.
- Nussbaum, M. (2009). The capabilities of people with cognitive disabilities. *Metaphilosophy*, 40, 331–351.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2013). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap.
- Pickett, S. T. A., Kolasa, J., & Jones, C. G. (2007). *Ecological understanding: The nature of theory and the theory of nature* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Academic Press.
- Professional Ski Instructors of America/American Association of Snowboard Instructors. (2003). Adaptive snowsports instruction. Lakewood, CO: American Web. Retrieved from http://www.thesnowpros.org/portals/0/News%20and%20Information/PSIA-AdaptiveManual_2003_as_PDF.pdf
- Riggs, W. (2010). Open-mindedness. *Metaphilosophy*, 41, 172–188.
- Sellman, D. (2003). Open-mindedness: A virtue for professional practice. *Nursing Philosophy*, 4, 17–24.
- Stewart-Sicking, J. A. (2008). Virtues, values, and the good life: Alasdair MacIntyre's virtue ethics and its implications for counseling. *Counseling and Values*, 52, 156–171.
- Sylvester, C. (1985). Freedom, leisure and therapeutic recreation: A philosophical view. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 19(1), 6–13.
- Sylvester, C. (1992). Therapeutic recreation and the right to leisure. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 26(1), 9–20.
- Sylvester, C. (2002). Ethics and the quest for professionalization. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 36, 314–334.
- Sylvester, C. (2007). A virtue-based theory of leisure [Abstract]. *Abstracts from the 2007 Leisure Research Symposium* (pp. 208–211). Ashburn, VA: National Recreation and Park Association.
- Sylvester, C. (2009). A virtue-based approach to therapeutic recreation practice. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 43(3), 9–25.
- Sylvester, C. (2011). Therapeutic recreation, the International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health, and the capability approach. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 45(2), 85–104.
- Sylvester, C., Voelkl, J. E., & Ellis, G. D. (2001). *Therapeutic recreation programming: Theory and practice*. State College, PA: Venture.
- Widmer, M. A., & Ellis, G. D. (1998). The Aristotelian Good Life Model: Integration of values into therapeutic recreation service delivery. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 32, 290–302.
- Wise, J. B. (2010). Theory of human flourishing for therapeutic recreation. *American Journal of Recreation Therapy*, 9(1), 27–34. doi:10.5055/ajrt.2010.0003
- Wise, J. B. (2014a). Personhood, flourishing, disability, leisure and a profession. *Journal of Unconventional Parks, Tourism and Recreation Research*, 5(1), 17–28.
- Wise, J. B. (2014b). What is leisure? A MacIntyrian based response. *Journal of Unconventional Parks, Tourism and Recreation Research*, 5(2), 17–22.

- Wise, J. B. (2015). Leisure: A human right. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 49(2), 166–178.
- Wise, J. B. (2016). Deepened ecological model: A fresh perspective on the experience of disability. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 50(3), 199–212. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18666/TRJ-2016-V50-I3-7156>
- Wise, J. B. (2017). Leisure and work: Interdependent facets of human flourishing. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 51(1), 1–17. doi: <https://doi.org/10.18666/TRJ-2017-V51-I1-7963>
- Wise, J. B. (2018a). Integrating leisure, human flourishing and the capabilities approach: Implications for therapeutic recreation. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 52(3), 254–268. doi: <https://doi.org/10.18666/TRJ-2018-V52-I3-8479>
- Wise, J. B. (2018b). Preparing future professionals to serve as moral agents. *American Journal of Recreation Therapy*, 17(1), 15–19. doi:5055/ajrt.2018.0150
- Wise, J. B. (2019). A conceptualization of recreation that contributes to human flourishing. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 53(1), 37–52. doi: <https://doi.org/10.18666/TRJ-2019-V53-I1-9027>
- Witman, J., Jacob, S., Anderson, L. S., Heyne, L., & Malcarne, B. (2014). The Well-Being Index (WBI): A pilot project. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 48(2), 188–198.