

# Analysis of Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility model-based programmes applied in USA and Spain.

PABLO CABALLERO-BLANCO<sup>1</sup> , MIGUEL ÁNGEL DELGADO-NOGUERA<sup>2</sup>, AMPARO ESCARTÍ-CARBONELL

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Physical Activity and Sport, University of Olavide, Sevilla, Spain


<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Physical Activity and Sport, University of Granada, Granada, Spain

<sup>3</sup> Faculty of Psychology, University of Valencia, Valencia, Spain

## ABSTRACT

Caballero-Blanco P, Delgado-Noguera, MA, Escartí-Carbonell, A. Analysis of Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility model-based programmes applied in USA and Spain. *J. Hum. Sport Exerc.* Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 427-441, 2013. Over the last three decades, several studies have applied Hellison's Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (TPSR) model; most of them have generated strong empirical evidences that support that theoretical framework. TPSR is a programme for positive youth development through physical activity. This article compares the different studies that have implemented the TPSR model in the United States and Spain. This paper reviews those researches by analysing their key features such as the research contexts, the profile of participants, the programme duration, the kind of physical activity used during the research, the research methodology employed and the results obtained by these researches. This article stresses some similarities and differences between those previous studies. **Key words:** RESPONSIBILITY MODEL, POSITIVE DEVELOPMENT THROUGH PHYSICAL ACTIVITY, POSITIVE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT.

---

 **Corresponding author.** Universidad Pablo de Olavide de Sevilla. Carretera Utrera, km. 1, 41013 Sevilla, España  
E-mail: pcaballero@upo.es  
Submitted for publication May 2013  
Accepted for publication June 2013  
JOURNAL OF HUMAN SPORT & EXERCISE ISSN 1988-5202  
© Faculty of Education. University of Alicante  
doi:10.4100/jhse.2012.82.10

## INTRODUCTION TO THE PERSONAL AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (TPSR) MODEL

The personal and social responsibility model (teaching personal and social responsibility, TPSR) was designed by Donald Hellison in the 1970's, with the objective of making youth at-risk of social exclusion to live success experiences that would favour the development of their personal and social skills and of their responsibility, both in sports as in life (Escartí et al., 2005; Hellison et al., 2000; Hellison, 2011).

The model perceives responsibility as a load or a moral obligation with respect to oneself and others; therefore, the values related to personal responsibility are the effort and the autonomy; and the values related to social responsibility are the respect for other's feelings and rights, the social empathy and sensibility (Llopis-Goig et al., 2011). The core of the TPSR model is in considering that in order for young people to be efficient individuals within their social context, they have to learn how to be responsible for themselves and for others. Those who participate in the TPSR model learn how to develop their personal and social responsibility in a gradual fashion, experiencing behaviours and attitudes that will help them in becoming responsible persons.

There is a good number of studies which have questioned the efficiency and the applicability of Hellison's responsibility model, generating a wide theoretical basis and empirical contrastation, which place it as a solid program of positive development through physical activity and sports (Escartí et al., 2009; Hellison et al., 2000; Hellison & Walsh, 2002; Petitpas et al., 2005; Sandford et al., 2006; Walsh et al., 2010; Hellison, 2011). However, since the review carried out by Hellison & Walsh (2002) a decade ago, no other article analysing the most recent research has been published. The present article arises from this shortage, with the objective of offering an updated review of the published researches carried out in the USA and Spain, regarding the programmes based on the TPSR model.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### *Procedure*

The procedure followed in this study began with the bibliographic research in three major documentation systems: databases (Physical Education Index, Science Direct, Sport Discus, Scopus, PsycInfo, ISI Web of Knowledge, Medline, TESEO), libraries (University of Seville, University of Pablo de Olavide and University of Granada) and specific websites on the TPSR model.

The keywords used on the research systems of the databases and libraries, in English and Spanish, were: responsibility model, personal and social responsibility, teaching/taking personal and social responsibility. For the specific research on the web, the tools used were: the meta search engine Metacrawler, the intelligent tool Copernic, the search engine Google and the TPSR Alliance web.

Once the bibliographic research was concluded, an information selection process was carried out. First, all the duplicated registries were eliminated; the process continued by revising the main fields (title, abstract, authorship, keywords, publishing date, subject and document type), and then by discarding all the works which did not follow the line of the study. Later on, the selection criteria were applied: by place where the study was carried out (only the ones carried out in the USA and Spain were selected) and by usage of the TPSR model in an intervention with children and young people (the studies selected were those which applied the TPSR model with children and young people). Finally, a critical reading of the documents was performed (Guirao-Goris et al., 2008), which allowed us to evaluate the quality and competency of the studies, and to finalise the information selection process.

The last procedure to be carried out was to analyse the different selected studies, and to structure the data, following the categories proposed by Pardo (2008): the background of the intervention, the profile of the participants, the duration of the programme, the physical activity contents, the research methodology applied and the results obtained.

## RESEARCHES ON THE TPSR MODEL IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (USA)

The majority of the researches on the TPSR model have been developed in the USA, due to the fact that the founder of the model, Don Hellison, spent his professional career of 30 years at the University of Illinois in Chicago, promoting the implementation of the model in different universities of that country, creating networks (such as TPRS Alliance) and giving courses and seminars on the model.

### Intervention backgrounds

#### *Extracurricular sports programs*

The majority of the researches on the TPSR model in the USA were carried out in extracurricular sports programs (Extended Day Programs); i.e. by integrating the TPSR model in the teaching of one or several sports disciplines, in a sports club background and outside the school schedule (Buchanan, 2001; Cutforth & Puckett, 1999; Hayden, 2010; Hayden et al., 2012; Hellison & Wright, 2003; Kahne et al., 2001; Lee & Martinek, 2009; Martinek & Hellison, 2009; Martinek et al., 1999, 2001; Newton et al., 2006; Schilling, 2001; Walsh, 2007, 2008; Walsh et al., 2010; Watson et al., 2003; Wright, 2012; Wright et al., 2004, 2012; Whitley & Goukd, 2010).

#### *Physical Education Programs*

On the other hand, we did find some researches, but not many, carried out in the physical education classes (Physical Education Programs), that comprised the responsibility model in the educational curriculum (DeBusk & Hellison, 1989; Compagnone, 1995; Kallusky, 2000; Wright et al., 2010; Walsh, 2012). The applications of the model in alternative educational centres (Alternative School Programs) are also a minority (Hellison et al., 2000; Ward et al., 2012).

#### *Cross-age programmes and mentoring programmes*

Another group of researches based on the TPSR model is made of the young leaders programmes (Cross-Age Teaching Programs) and of the mentoring programmes (Mentor Programs). The cross-age teaching programmes aim to train young people, who have participated in the TPSR model as students, and to give them the ability to apply the programme with younger students. The Project Effort, led by Martinek, is the peak of this model, in which some participating students convert into tutors (Cutforth, 2000; Cutforth & Martinek, 2000; Cutforth & Puckett, 1999; Hammond-Diedrich & Walsh, 2006; Martinek & Hellison, 2009; Martinek et al., 2006; Ruiz et al., 2006; Schilling et al., 2007; Walsh, 2008).

The mentoring programmes aim to train mentors (university students) to implement the TPSR model on the different programmes, developed by the university, on unfavoured populations, such as ethnic minorities or youth at-risk of social exclusion (Martinek et al., 2001; Martinek & Hellison, 2009; Martinek & Parker, 2000; Ruiz et al., 2006; Walsh, 2012; Wright, 2012).

#### *Outdoor activities programmes*

Several interventions applying the TPSR model have been made through outdoor activities programmes (Stiehl, 2000; Hansen & Parker, 2009), differing from the Outdoor Programs and Adventure Programs; however, despite its potential, no research has been published on this subject.

### **Profile of the participants**

The majority of the educational actions carried out in the USA have been applied with youth at-risk, which is a group with low care given within the American educational system, and in need of programmes that allow a positive change in their lives (Buchanan, 2001; Hammond-Diedrich & Walsh, 2006; Lee & Martinek, 2009; Martinek et al., 1999; Newton et al., 2006; Schilling, 2001; Walsh, 2007, 2008; Walsh et al., 2010; Whitley & Gould, 2010; Wright, 2012; Wright et al., 2010, 2012; Wright & Burton, 2008).

There is a predominance of young people from racial minorities, especially Afro-American (Martinek et al., 1999; Schilling, 2001; Hellison & Wright, 2003; Hammond-Diedrich & Walsh, 2006; Walsh, 2007, 2008; Wright & Burton, 2008; Lee & Martinek, 2009; Walsh et al., 2010; Whitley & Gould, 2010; Wright, 2012; Wright et al., 2010, 2012) and Latin (Buchanan, 2001; Cutforth & Puckett, 1999; Kallusky, 2000; Lifka, 1990; Newton et al., 2006; Watson, Newton & Kim, 2003). Many of these young people have serious problems of conduct, low motivation within the educational environment, low academic performance and low school attendance (DeBusk & Hellison, 1989; Kallusky, 2000; Martinek et al., 2001; Schilling, 2001; Walsh, 2012).

In the researches carried out during the physical education classes, the students were also troubled young people within the educational centre and/or youth at-risk of social exclusion (Compagnone, 1995; DeBusk & Hellison, 1989; Kallusky, 2000; Walsh, 2012; Wright et al., 2010).

The model begun to be applied with the group of handicapped young people, and opened a new field of intervention with a great future (Wright, 2001; Wright et al., 2004).

Regarding the age of the participants, the majority of the studies has focused in elementary school students (6 to 10 years old) and middle school students (11 to 13 years old), according to the American educational system (Compagnone, 1995; Cutforth, 1997; DeBusk & Hellison, 1989; Hellison & Walsh, 2002; Lifka, 1990; Martinek et al., 2001; Lee & Martinek, 2009; Walsh, 2007, 2012; Walsh et al., 2010; Ward et al., 2012; Whitley & Gould, 2010; Wright, 2012; Wright et al., 2004, 2012).

In most recent years the researches on the TPSR model with students in the first years of high school (14 to 17 years old) have increased, more specifically between the ages of 14 and 15 (Buchanan, 2001; Georgiadis, 1990; Hammond-Diedrich & Walsh, 2006; Hayden, 2010; Hayden et al., 2012; Kallusky, 2000; Martinek et al., 1999; Newton et al., 2006; Schilling, 2001; Walsh, 2008; Watson et al., 2003; Whitley & Gould, 2010; Wright, 2012).

However, the interventions with students above 16 years old are scarce (Wright & Burton, 2008; Wright et al., 2010). The most significant interventions with students above 16 years old are carried out through Project Effort and Cross-Age Teaching Programs (Cutforth, 2000; Cutforth & Puckett, 1999; Hammond-Diedrich & Walsh, 2006; Martinek et al., 2006; Martinek & Hellison, 2009; Schilling et al., 2007; Walsh, 2008).

### **Duration of the programme**

The duration of the interventions over the TPSR model shows a great variability. A distinguished group of researchers (Cutforth, 2000; Cutforth & Puckett, 1999; Hellison, 2011; Martinek et al., 2001; Schilling, 2001) advise the application of the model over the period of a complete school course, involving the participants during 9 months (an academic course). A great number of researches have applied the TPSR model during 9 months, according to this criterion (Hayden, 2010; Hayden et al., 2012; Martinek et al.,

1999; Martinek et al., 2006; Schilling, 2001; Schilling et al., 2007; Walsh, 2008; Walsh et al., 2010; Ward et al., 2012; Wright, 2012; Wright et al., 2010, 2012).

However, the majority of the implementations of the TPSR model has been over shorter periods of time:

- Between 1 and 2 months (Buchanan, 2001; Compagnone, 1995; Cutforth & Puckett, 1999; DeBusk & Hellison, 1989; Newton et al., 2006; Watson et al., 2003).
- Around 3 months (Hammond-Diedrich & Walsh, 2006; Whitley & Gould, 2010; Wright & Burton, 2008; Wright et al., 2004).
- Around 4 months (Kallusky, 2000; Walsh, 2007, 2008).
- Over one semester (Cutforth, 1997; Lee & Martinek, 2009; Martinek et al., 2001; Walsh, 2012).

Regarding the duration of the sessions and the weekly frequency, the majority of the interventions are in between 1 hour sessions once per week (Hammond-Diedrich & Walsh, 2006; Walsh, 2007; Walsh et al., 2010; Whitley & Gould, 2010; Wright, 2012; Wright et al., 2004, 2010, 2012) and 1 hour sessions twice per week (Hayden, 2010; Hayden et al., 2012; Lee & Martinek, 2009; Martinek et al., 1999; Schilling, 2001; Walsh, 2008, 2012; Ward et al., 2012; Wright & Burton, 2008).

Only in a few occasions interventions of two or more hours, several times per week, have been made (Buchanan, 2001; Newton et al., 2006; Watson et al., 2003).

### **Physical activity contents**

The origin of the TPSR model has basketball as the most used content in the different interventions applying the TPSR model (Cutforth & Puckett, 1999; DeBusk & Hellison, 1989; Georgiadis, 1990; Hellison & Wright, 2003; Martinek et al., 2001; Schilling, 2001; Walsh, 2008; Walsh et al., 2010). However, other traditional sports have also been used, such as tennis, swimming, football, lacrosse, volleyball or fencing (Buchanan, 2001; DeBusk & Hellison, 1989; Hayden, 2010; Hayden et al., 2012; Kallusky, 2000; Lee & Martinek, 2009; Lifka, 1990; Martinek et al., 1999, 2001; Newton et al., 2006; Schilling, 2001; Ward et al., 2012; Whitley & Gould, 2010).

Little by little, the TPSR model has been extending to the use of other type of sports and physical activities, such as cooperation activities (Kallusky, 2000; Walsh et al., 2010), martial arts (Lee & Martinek, 2009; Walsh, 2012; Wright, 2001, 2012; Wright et al., 2004, 2012), tai-chi (Wright & Burton, 2008; Wright et al., 2010), acrobatics (Hammond-Diedrich & Walsh, 2006; Martinek et al., 1999) or dance (Walsh, 2012; Ward et al., 2012), due to, among other factors, the increase of interventions carried out in the physical education class, were the official curriculum establishes the approach to different types of physical activities and sports.

Physical activities in the natural environment have also been incorporated in several TPRS model programmes, like climbing, orientation, hiking, ski, camping, etc. (Stiehl, 2000; Hansen & Parker, 2009).

### **Research methodology**

#### *Designs applied*

The most used research design was the case study. Of the 26 studies analysed by Hellison and Walsh (2002), 21 had used case study. And so there is a great number of researches that use this design (Hammond-Diedrich & Walsh, 2006; Lee & Martinek, 2009; Newton et al., 2006; Schilling, 2001; Walsh, 2007, 2008; Walsh et al., 2010; Ward et al., 2012; Wright, 2012; Wright et al., 2012; Wright & Burton,

2008). We would also want to highlight that the multiple-case study (a variant of the case study), has been applied on the TPSR model (Martinek et al. 1999; Wright et al., 2004).

The quasi-experimental design is a minority in researches in the USA (Cummings, 1998; Hellison & Walsh, 2002; Wright et al., 2010). In this sense, Hellison and other researchers insist on the incorporation of quasi-experimental designs, which can provide another perspective on the efficiency of the TPSR model programme (Escartí et al., 2010a; Hellison & Walsh, 2002; Petitpas et al., 2005; Sandford et al., 2006; Li et al., 2008).

The comparative analysis is another type of design that has also been applied in small proportions (Hellison & Walsh, 2002; Kahne et al., 2001; Martinek et al., 1999, 2001; Walsh, 1999; Wright, 1998).

#### *Methodology applied*

In respect to the methodology, the qualitative methodology is the one most predominant in the researches on the TPSR model (Hellison & Walsh, 2002; Pardo, 2008). Studies can be found, which exclusively use the qualitative methodology (DeBusk & Hellison, 1989; Galvan, 2004; Kallusky, 2000; Schilling, 2001; Ward et al., 2012), even though there are more and more researches which combine it with quantitative methodology (Collingwood, 1997; Cutforth & Puckett, 1999; Hayden, 2010; Hayden et al., 2012; Hellison & Walsh, 2002; Kahne et al., 2001; Li et al., 2008; Martinek et al., 2001; Walsh, 2007; Wright, 2012; Wright & Burton, 2008; Wright et al., 2010, 2012).

## **Results**

The majority of the researches carried out on the TPSR model in the USA have focused on evaluating and knowing the effects the programme produces on the participants. The following contains the most relevant results.

#### *Results related to level 1: to respect the rights and opinions of others*

Manifest improvements in the self-control of young people have been achieved, regarding the respect for material, colleagues, facilities, authority, standards, etc. (DeBusk & Hellison, 1989; Georgiadis, 1990; Hayden, 2010; Hayden et al., 2012; Kahne et al., 2001; Kallusky, 2000; Lifka, 1990; Martinek et al., 2001; Schilling, 2001; Walsh et al., 2010; Wright, 2012; Wright et al., 2012; Wright & Burton, 2008).

The programme contributed in establishing and maintaining a positive class environment, which is a key element to the accomplishment of the rest of the programme objectives (Cutforth & Puckett, 1999; DeBusk & Hellison, 1989; Hayden, 2010; Hayden et al., 2012; Hellison & Wright, 2003; Lee & Martinek, 2009; Newton et al., 2006; Schilling, 2001; Walsh, 2007; Ward et al., 2012; Wright et al., 2012; Wright & Burton, 2008).

#### *Results related to level 2: participation and effort.*

Participation and effort, measured through the time of involvement in the task, have improved in the studies of Lifka (1990), Compagnone (1995), and Schilling (2001). Other studies have also obtained evidences of this improvement (Hayden, 2010; Hayden et al., 2012; Martinek et al., 1999, 2001; Schilling, 2001; Walsh, 2007; Walsh et al., 2010; Wright, 2001; Wright et al., 2012).

*Results related to level 3: personal autonomy.*

Significant improvements have been found when it comes to work independently and establishing specific goals (Georgiadis, 1990; Hayden, 2010; Hayden et al., 2012; Lifka, 1990; Mulaudzi, 1995; Wright, 2001; Walsh et al., 2010).

*Results related to level 4: help and leadership.*

In respect to helping others, team work and cooperation (key elements for social responsibility), improvements have been identified in several studies (Georgiadis, 1990; Hayden, 2010; Hayden et al., 2012; Martinek et al., 1999, 2001; Mulaudzi, 1995; Schilling, 2001; Walsh, 2007).

In respect to other social abilities, the studies of Cutforth (1997), Kallusky (2000), Lifka (1990), Wright (2001), have shown consistent evidences of improvement of the communication techniques and interpersonal relationships of the participants.

*Results related to level 5: transfer.*

Significant improvements were found when transferring the objectives of the TPSR model. More specifically, the results were obtained in the self-control in other classes, in the effort in other disciplines, in the reduction of suspensions and school abandonments, in the decrease of school violence, in a greater resolution of problems through dialogue, etc. (Cutforth, 1997; DeBusk & Hellison, 1989; Georgiadis, 1990; Hayden, 2010; Hayden et al., 2012; Lifka, 1990; Martinek et al., 2001; Walsh et al., 2010; Wright et al., 2010, 2012).

The study of Wright & Burton (2008), has determined that the TPSR model had an influence on the improvement of intermediate academic results directly related to the notion of responsibility, such as attendance, delays and conduct in class.

*Results related to other effects found in the researches on the TPSR model.*

The following are the most relevant results related to other effects on the participants:

- Positive evolution regarding the participant's behaviour related to personal and social responsibility (Compagnone, 1995; Kallusky, 2000; Hayden, 2010; Hayden et al., 2012; Hellison & Walsh, 2002; Lee & Martinek, 2009; Wright et al., 2012; Wright & Burton, 2008).
- The study of Watson et al. (2003) shows that the TPSR model is related and foments the enjoyment and interest in sports, future expectations and the respect for group leaders.
- It has been ascertained that the TPSR model is a mediator between the components of the goal theory and the positive motivation indicators (Newton et al., 2006).
- Several studies have found that high levels of personal and social responsibility are associated with high levels of intrinsic motivation in physical education (Hellison & Walsh, 2002; Hellison & Martinek, 2006; Li et al., 2008).
- In the research made by Wright et al. (2004), in which the TPSR model was applied on handicapped young people, the motivation, participation and effort were improved in the activities of the programme, the perception of the abilities was increased, social skills were developed and therapeutic goals were improved.
- Several studies made on the project effort subject showed that young leaders, among other aspects, increased the confidence in their own possibilities, improved their social skills and the ability to help others, acquired skills to solve conflicts, increased the motivation to continue learning and to continue with their training, acquired didactic experience to teach and apply the TPSR

model (Cutforth & Puckett, 1999; Hammond-Diedrich & Walsh, 2006; Martinek et al., 2001, 2006; Schilling et al. 2007; Walsh, 2007, 2008).

## RESEARCHES ON THE TPSR MODEL IN SPAIN

The researches on the TPSR model in Spain began in the year 2000, which represents a little more than a decade. Despite the short time, there is a valuable set of researches that studied the application of the model in the Spanish context; making Spain as the second country with the most publications about the TPSR model. The following presents an analysis of the studies published, following the factors applied above (Pardo, 2008).

### Intervention backgrounds

Contrary to what happens in the USA, the majority of the researches made in Spain were carried out in the physical education classes, both in elementary school and in middle school (Cechini et al., 2003, 2007; Escartí et al., 2005, 2006, 2010a, 2010b; Jiménez, 2000; Marín, 2011; Pascual et al., 2011a, 2011b). And the TPSR model was applied during extracurricular activities only in one study (Vizcarra, 2004).

Another intervention background used in the Spanish context are the social guarantee programmes, where two studies, in which the model was applied during the complementary activities, were carried out (Pardo, 2008).

A new intervention environment appeared in Spain, such as the application of the model in the professional training context, more specifically in the formative cycle of physical activities in the natural environment (Caballero, 2012).

### Profile of the participants

Most of the researches on the TPSR model made in the Spanish context were applied in children and young people of the middle class (Caballero, 2012; Cechini et al., 2003, 2007; Escartí et al., 2010b; Marín, 2011; Vizcarra, 2004) and lower class (Pascual et al., 2011a, 2011b), even though interventions have also been made with youth at-risk of social exclusion (Escartí et al., 2006, 2010a; Jiménez, 2000; Pardo, 2008). This data contrasts with the profile of the participants in the American researches, where the majority is youth at-risk of social exclusion belonging to ethnic minorities.

The age of the children and young people who have participated in the different programmes based on the TPSR model ranges from elementary school to professional training. According to the ages and educational cycle to which the studies correspond (according to the Spanish educational system), they are classified as follows:

- A great number of researches has intervened in primary education, with children between 9 and 12 years old (Escartí et al., 2010b; Llopis-Goig et al., 2011; Pascual et al., 2011a, 2011b; Marín, 2011; Vizcarra, 2004).
- The majority of the studies was developed in secondary education, with young people between 12 and 16 years old (Cechini et al., 2003, 2007; Escartí et al., 2006, 2010a; Jiménez, 2000; Vizcarra, 2004).
- Several interventions were made posterior to the mandatory secondary education (in professional training and in social guarantee programmes), with young people between 16 and 21 years old (Caballero, 2012; Jiménez, 2000; Pardo, 2008).



### **Duration of the programme**

In respect to the total duration of the implementation of the programme, a great variability occurs, similarly to what happens with the American studies. In this sense, the researches were grouped in three distinct time ranges:

- Short duration studies, which were applied during 2 to 3 months (of 10 to 20 sessions), which corresponds to approximately a school course quarter (Cechini et al., 2003, 2007; Pardo, 2008).
- Average duration studies, which were implemented during between 4 to 7 months, which corresponds approximately to half of a school course, with some researches actually completing two quarters (Caballero, 2012; Escartí et al., 2006; Jiménez, 2000)
- Long duration studies, which lasted the whole 9 months that correspond to a school course (Escartí et al, 2010b; Marín, 2011; Pascual et al., 2011a), and even 18 months, corresponding to two school courses (Escartí et al., 2010a; Pascual et al., 2011a; Vizcarra, 2004).

In respect to the duration of the session and its weekly frequency, the majority of the interventions was executed in 1 hour sessions, with a frequency of two days per week (Cechini et al., 2003, 2007; Escartí et al, 2010b; Jiménez, 2000; Marín, 2011; Pardo, 2008; Pascual et al., 2011a, 2011b; Vizcarra, 2004), inasmuch as they were carried out during the physical education classes; with the exception of one study in that context, which was implemented three days per week (Escartí et al., 2006). These data match with those of the researches made in the USA.

The application of the programme in the study made in the assessment cycle of secondary school physical activities in the natural environment (Caballero, 2012) was very different from the rest of the researches due to the fact that the application was carried out through sessions with a duration between 4 and 6 hours, three times per week.

### **Physical activity contents**

The majority of the studies in the Spanish context were carried out in physical education classes, which means that the contents applied were framed within the four blocks of contents established in the official curriculum. However, even though all the interventions used two or more blocks of contents, the block of games and sports was observed as the one most used (football, volleyball, basketball, handball, baseball, roller-skating, hockey, acrosport, tamburello, ultimate), when compared to the other three blocks, which are: physical fitness and health (healthy physical and sport habits), physical activity in the natural environment (orientation, climbing and adventure activities) and body expression (theatre and dance) (Escartí et al., 2006, 2010a, 2010b; Jiménez, 2000; Marín, 2011; Pardo, 2008).

Only two studies have applied the sport of football during all the intervention within the physical education classes (Cechini et al., 2003, 2007).

Another particular research to be pointed out is the one made within the context of the assessment cycle of physical and sport activities in the natural environment (Caballero, 2012), where due to the its curriculum, only the content of physical activity in the natural environment was applied, nevertheless with great depth and diversity (orientation, climbing, suspension techniques, hiking, mountain bike, horseback riding, canoeing, etc.).

Considering the exposed data, there is a match between the Spanish context and the American context in the majority use of traditional sports (football, basketball, volleyball, handball, etc.), in the researches on the TPSR model.

## Research methodology

### *Designs applied*

Regarding the research designs applied in the studies in Spain, a variability of methodological approaches is observed. In a greater number of studies, a mixed design was applied, composed by the quasi-experimental design and the case study (Caballero, 2012; Escartí et al., 2010a, 2010b; Marín, 2011). As pointed out by Tashakkori & Teedlie (2003, p. 5), there is a growing increase of mixed methodologies in the social and behavioural sciences studies, this peak is described as “the third methodological movement”.

In a lower scale, researches where the experimental design (Cechini et al., 2003, 2007), the case study (Pascual et al., 2011a, 2011b), the multiple-case study (Pardo, 2008) and the action research (Jiménez, 2000; Vizcarra, 2004) were applied, were observed.

### *Methodology used*

Regarding the methodology used, the combined use of qualitative and quantitative methodology is noticed in the majority of the researches (Caballero, 2012; Escartí et al., 2010a, 2010b; Jiménez, 2000; Marín, 2011; Vizcarra, 2004). However, there are also studies that exclusively applied the quantitative methodology (Cechini et al., 2003, 2007), the qualitative methodology (Pardo, 2008; Pascual et al., 2011a, 2011b), as well as the observational methodology (Escartí et al., 2006).

The data on the research methodology applied in the studies in the Spanish context shows a greater use of the mixed designs (incorporating the quasi-experimental design and the case study), as well as an increase in the combined application of quantitative and qualitative methodology, when compared to the studies in the USA.

## Obtained results

The analysis to the studies made in Spain on the TPSR model, similarly to the studies made in the USA, show positive results regarding the effects of the programme on the participants. The most relevant results are as follows:

- Positive evolution regarding the students' behaviour and attitudes related to personal and social responsibility (Caballero, 2012; Escartí et al., 2006, 2010a, 2010b; Pascual et al., 2011a; Vizcarra, 2004).
- Improvement in the self-efficacy of the students in obtaining social resources and for self-regulated learning (Escartí et al., 2010a), as well as in the self-regulatory self-efficacy (Escartí et al., 2010b).
- The programme has contributed in establishing a positive class environment (Caballero, 2012; Escartí et al., 2006, 2010b; Pascual et al., 2011a, 2011b; Vizcarra, 2004). In this sense, an improvement in the resolution of conflicts through dialogue and a decrease in violent conducts were produced (Caballero, 2012; Escartí et al., 2006, 2010b; Llopis-Goig et al., 2011; Pascual et al., 2011a).
- Development of the autonomy, empathy and social skills (Caballero, 2012; Escartí et al., 2010b; Llopis-Goig et al., 2011; Pascual et al., 2011a; Vizcarra, 2004)
- Positive transfer of the knowledge acquired during the programme, in contexts different from those of the intervention (Caballero, 2012; Escartí et al., 2010a; Cechini et al., 2003, 2007).
- Positive changes in the opinions and behaviours related to fair-play and self-control (Cechini et al., 2003, 2007).
- Increase of the number of students who evidence a motivational orientation towards the task regarding the result, after the intervention (Vizcarra, 2004).

## CONCLUSION

The review carried out in the present article, evidences the validity of the use of the TPSR model as an intervention programme with children and young people through physical activity and sports, both in the American context and the Spanish context.

The data found show that the TPSR has been implemented in a great diversity of research scenarios (physical education classes, extra-curricular activities, etc.), with a wide profile of participants (youth at-risk of social exclusion, middle class youth, etc.) and in distinct physical and sport activities (traditional sports, activities in the natural environment, etc.). In the same way, its efficiency was verified by applying distinct research designs (case study, quasi-experimental design, etc.) and by applying different methodological approaches (qualitative methodology, quantitative methodology, mixed methodology).

The results obtained in the analysed studies, related to the effects of the programme on the participants, indicate that the TPSR model has contributed to the positive development of the children and young people (improvement in responsibility behaviours, social skills, class environment, etc.).

Finally, with future reviews in mind, it would be convenient to complement the analysis made on the TPSR model in the USA and Spain, with other studies made at an international level (New Zealand, El Salvador, Canada, etc.).

## REFERENCES

1. BUCHANAN AM. Contextual challenges to teaching responsibility in a sport camp. *J teach phys educ.* 2001; 20(2):155-171.
2. CABALLERO PJ. Diseño y evaluación de un programa de responsabilidad personal y social a través de actividad física en el medio natural en alumnos de formación profesional. [Tesis doctoral no publicada]. Universidad Pablo de Olavide, Sevilla, España. 2012.
3. ESCARTI A, BUELGA S, GUTIÉRREZ M, PASCUAL C. El desarrollo positivo a través de la actividad física y el deporte: el programa de responsabilidad personal y social. *Revista de Psicología del Deporte.* 2009; 62(1-2):45-52.
4. ESCARTI A, GUTIÉRREZ M, PASCUAL C, LLOPIS R. Implementation of the Personal and Social Responsibility Model to Improve Self-Efficacy during Physical Education Classes for primary School Children. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy.* 2010a; 10(3):387-402.
5. ESCARTI A, GUTIÉRREZ M, PASCUAL C, MARÍN D. Application of Hellison's Teaching Personal Social Responsibility model in Physical Education to improve self-efficacy for adolescents at risk of dropping-out of school. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology.* 2010b; 13(2):667-676.
6. ESCARTI A, GUTIÉRREZ M, PASCUAL C, MARÍN D, MARTÍNEZ C, CHACÓN Y. Enseñando responsabilidad personal y social a un grupo de adolescentes de riesgo: un estudio «observacional». *Revista de Educación.* 2006; 341:373-396.
7. ESCARTI A, PASCUAL C, GUTIÉRREZ M. *Responsabilidad personal y social a través de la educación física y el deporte.* Barcelona: Graó. 2005.
8. CECCHINI JA, MONTERO J, ALONSO A, IZQUIERDO M, CONTRERAS O. Effects of personal and social responsibility on fair play in sport and self-control in school-aged youths. *European Journal of Sport Science.* 2007; 7(4):203-211.

9. CECCHINI JA, MONTERO J, PEÑA JV. Repercusiones del Programa de Intervención para desarrollar la Responsabilidad Personal y Social de Hellison sobre los comportamientos de fair-play y el auto-control. *Psicothema*. 2003; 15(4):631-637.
10. COLLINGWOOD TR. Providing physical fitness programs to at-risk youth. *Quest*. 1997; 49(1):67-84.
11. COMPAGNONE N. Teaching responsibility to rural elementary youth: going beyond the at-risk boundaries. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*. 1995; 66(6):58-63.
12. CUMMINGS T. Testing the effectiveness of Hellison's personal and social responsibility model: A dropout, repeated grade, and absentee rate comparison. [Tesis doctoral no publicada]. California State University, Chico, EEUU. 1998.
13. CUTFORTH N. What's worth doing: Reflections on an after-school program in a Denver elementary school. *Quest*. 1997; 49(1):130-139.
14. CUTFORTH N. Connecting school physical education to the community through service-learning. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*. 2000; 71(2):39-45.
15. CUTFORTH N, MARTINEK T. Cross-age teaching programs. In: Hellison D, Cutforth N, Kallusky J, Martinek T, Parker M, Stiehl J (Eds.), *Youth development and physical activity: Linking universities and communities*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics. 2000. Pp. 179-196.
16. CUTFORTH N, PUCKETT K. An investigation into the organization, challenges, and impact of an urban apprentice teacher program. *The Urban Review*. 1999; 31(2):153-173.
17. DEBUSK M, HELLISON D. Implementing a physical education self-responsibility model for delinquency-prone youth. *J teach phys educ*. 1989; 8(2):104-112.
18. GALVAN C. Investigating the impact of a service-learning course of teacher candidates and underserved youth. [Tesis doctoral no publicada]. University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, EEUU. 2004.
19. GEORGIADIS N. Does basketball have to be all W's and L's? An alternative program at a residential boys' home. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*. 1990; 61(6):42-43.
20. GUIRAO-GORIS JA, OLMEDO A, FERRER E. El artículo de revisión. *Revista Iberoamericana de Enfermería Comunitaria*. 2008; 1:1-6.
21. HAMMOND-DIEDRICH KC, WALSH D. Empowering youth through a responsibility-based cross-age teacher program: an investigation into impact and possibilities. *The Physical Educator*. 2006; 63(3):134-142.
22. HANSEN K, PARKER M. Rock climbing: an experience with responsibility. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*. 2009; 80(2):17-24.
23. HAYDEN LA. The power of a caring climate: assessing the fidelity of team support to Hellison's responsibility model and student-athletes perceived outcomes of participating in team support. [Tesis doctoral]. University of Boston, Boston, EEUU. 2010.
24. HAYDEN LA, BALZELL A, KILTY K, MCCARTHY J. Developing responsibility using physical activity: a case study of team support. *Ágora*. 2012; 14(2):264-281.
25. HELLISON D. *Teaching responsibility through physical activity (3er ed.)*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics. 2011.
26. HELLISON D, CUTFORTH N, KALLUSKY T, PARKER M, STIEHL J. *Youth development and physical activity: linking universities and communities*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics. 2000.
27. HELLISON D, MARTINEK T. Social and individual responsibility programs. In: Kirk D, Macdonald D, O'Sullivan M. (Eds.). *The handbook of physical education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 2006. Pp. 610-626.
28. HELLISON D, WALSH D. Responsibility-based youth programs evaluation: Investigating the investigations. *Quest*. 2002; 54(4):292-307.

29. HELLISON D, WRIGHT PM. Retention in an urban extended day program: A process-based assessment. *J teach phys educ.* 2003; 22(4):369-381.
30. JIMÉNEZ P. Modelo para educar en valores a jóvenes en riesgo a través de la actividad física y el deporte. [Tesis doctoral no publicada]. Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Madrid, España. 2000.
31. KAHNE J, NAGAOKA J, BROWN A, O'BRIEN J, QUINN T, THIEDE K. Assessing after-school programs as contexts for youth development. *Youth Society.* 2001; 32(4):421-446.
32. KALLUSKY J. In-school programs. In: Hellison D, Cutforth N, Kallusky J, Martinek T, Parker M, Stiehl J. (Eds.). *Youth development and physical activity: Linking universities and communities.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics. 2000. Pp. 87-114.
33. LEE O, MARTINEK T. Navigating two cultures: an investigation of cultures of a responsibility-based physical activity program and school. *Pedagogy.* 2009; 80(2):230-240.
34. LI W, WRIGHT P, RUKAVINA PB, PICKERING M. Measuring student's perceptions of personal and social responsibility and the relationship to intrinsic motivation in urban physical education. *J teach phys educ.* 2008; 27(2):167-178.
35. LIFKA BJ. Hiding beneath the stairwell: A dropout prevention program for Hispanic youth. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance.* 1990; 61(6):40-41.
36. LLOPIS-GOIG R, ESCARTI A, PASCUAL C, GUTIÉRREZ M, MARÍN D. Fortalezas, dificultades y aspectos susceptibles de mejora en la aplicación de un Programa de Responsabilidad Personal y Social en Educación Física. Una evaluación a partir de las percepciones de sus implementadores. *Cultura y Educación.* 2011; 23(3):445-461.
37. MARÍN D. Adaptación e implementación de un programa de intervención en la escuela a través de la educación física: el programa de responsabilidad personal y social. [Tesis doctoral]. Valencia: Servei de Publicacions Universitat de València. 2011.
38. MARTINEK T, HELLISON D. *Youth leadership in sport and physical education.* Palgrave MacMillan: Nueva York. 2009.
39. MARTINEK T, PARKER M. In: Hellison D, Cutforth N, Kallusky J, Martinek T, Parker M, Stiehl J. (Eds.). *Youth development and physical activity: Linking universities and communities.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics. 2000. Pp. 179-196.
40. MARTINEK T, MCLAUGHLIN D, SCHILLING T. Project Effort: teaching responsibility beyond the gym. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance.* 1999; 70(6):59-65.
41. MARTINEK T, SCHILLING T, HELLISON D. The development of compassionate and caring leadership among adolescents. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy.* 2006; 11(2):141-157.
42. MARTINEK T, SCHILLING T, JOHNSON D. Transferring personal and social responsibility of underserved youth to the classroom. *The Urban Review.* 2001; 33(1):29-45.
43. MULAUDZI L. A program evaluation of an implementation of a responsibility model for inner-city youth. [Tesis doctoral]. University of Illinois, Chicago, EEUU. 1995.
44. NEWTON M, WATSON D, KIM M, BEACHMAN O. Understanding motivation of underserved youth in physical activity settings. *Youth Society.* 2006; 37(3):348-371.
45. PARDO R. La transmisión de valores a jóvenes socialmente desfavorecidos a través de la actividad física y el deporte. Estudio múltiple de casos: Getafe, L'Aquila y Los Ángeles. [Tesis doctoral no publicada]. Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Madrid, España. 2008.
46. PASCUAL C, ESCARTI A, LLOPIS G, GUTIÉRREZ M. La percepción del profesorado de educación física sobre los efectos del programa de responsabilidad personal y social (PRPS) en los estudiantes. *Ágora.* 2011a; 13(3):341-361.
47. PASCUAL C, ESCARTI A, LLOPIS G, GUTIÉRREZ M, MARÍN D, WRIGHT PM. Implementation fidelity of a program designed to promote personal and social responsibility through physical

- education: a comparative case study. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*. 2011b; 82(3):499-511.
48. PETITPAS AJ, CORNELIUS AE, VAN RAALTE JL, JONES T. A framework for planning youth sport programs that foster psychosocial development. *The Sport Psychologist*. 2005; 19(1):63-80.
  49. RUIZ LM, RODRÍGUEZ P, MARTINEK T, SCHILLING T, DURAN J, JIMÉNEZ P. (2006). El Proyecto esfuerzo: un modelo para el desarrollo de la responsabilidad personal y social a través del deporte. *Revista de Educación*. 2006; 341:933-958.
  50. SCHILLING T. An investigation of commitment among participants in an extended day physical activity program. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*. 2001; 72(4):355-365.
  51. SANDFORD RA, ARMOUR KM, WARMINGHTON PC. Reengaging disaffected youth through physical activity programmes. *Brit Educ Res J*. 2006; 32(2):251-271.
  52. SCHILLING T. An investigation of commitment among participants in an extended day physical activity program. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*. 2001; 72(4):355-365.
  53. SCHILLING T, MARTINEK T, CARSON S. Youth leader's perceptions of commitment a responsibility-based physical activity program. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*. 2007; 78(1):48-60.
  54. STIEHL J. Outdoor and adventure programs. In: Hellison D, Cutforth N, Kallusky J, Martinek T, Parker M, Stiehl J. (Eds.). *Youth development and physical activity: Linking universities and communities*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics. 2000. Pp. 67-85.
  55. VIZCARRA MT. Análisis de una experiencia de formación permanente en el deporte escolar a través de un programa de habilidades sociales. [Tesis doctoral]. Bilbao: Servicio editorial de la Universidad del País Vasco. 2004.
  56. WALSH DS. A comparative analysis of extended day programs for inner city youth. [Tesis doctoral]. University of Illinois, Chicago, EEUU. 1999.
  57. WALSH DS. Supporting Youth Development Outcomes: An Evaluation of a Responsibility Model-Based Program. *The Physical Educator*. 2007; 64(1):48-56.
  58. WALSH DS. Helping youth in underserved communities envision possible futures: an extension of the teaching personal and social responsibility model. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*. 2008; 79(2):209-221.
  59. WALSH DS, OZAETA J, WRIGHT PM. Transference of responsibility model goals to the school environment: exploring the impact of a coaching club program. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*. 2010; 15(1):15-28.
  60. WARD S, PARKER M, HENSCHER-PELLET H, PEREZ M. Forecasting the storm: student perspectives throughout a teaching personal and social responsibility (TPSR)-based positive youth development program. *Ágora*. 2012; 14(2):230-247.
  61. WATSON DL, NEWTON M, KIM M. (2003). Recognition of values-based constructs in a summer physical activity program. *Urban Review*. 2003; 35(3):217-232.
  62. WHITLEY M, GOULD, D. Psychosocial development in refugee children and youth through the personal-social responsibility model. *Journal of Sport Psychology in Action*. 2011; 1(3):118-138.
  63. WRIGHT PM. The impact of a responsibility-based martial arts program on violence prevention. [Tesis de master no publicada]. University of Illinois, Chicago, EEUU. 1998.
  64. WRIGHT PM. Teaching holistic physical activity for personal and social development. [Tesis doctoral no publicada]. University of Illinois, Chicago, EEUU. 2001.
  65. WRIGHT PM. Offering a TPSR physical activity club to adolescent boys labeled "at risk" in partnership with a community-based youth serving program. *Ágora*. 2012; 14(1):94-114.

66. WRIGHT PM, BURTON S. Implementation and Outcomes of a Responsibility-Based Physical Activity program Integrated Into an Intact High School Physical Education Class. *J teach phys educ.* 2008; 27(2):138-154.
67. WRIGHT PM, DYSON B, MOTEN T. Exploring the individualized experiences of participants in a responsibility-based youth development program. *Ágora.* 2012; 14(2):248-263.
68. WRIGHT PM, LI W, DING S, PICKERING M. Integrating a personal and social responsibility program into a Wellness course for urban high school students: assessing implementation and educational outcomes. *Sport Educ Soc.* 2010; 15(3):277-298.
69. WRIGHT PM, WHITE K, GAEBLER-SPIRA D. Exploring the relevance of the personal and social responsibility model in adapted physical activity: a collective case study. *J teach phys educ.* 2004; 23(1):71-87.