

Article

Comparing Traditional Teaching and the Personal and Social Responsibility Model: Development of Values in Secondary Education Students

David Manzano-Sánchez 

Department of Didactic of Musical, Plactical and Corporal Expression, Faculty of Education and Psychology, University of Extremadura, 06006 Badajoz, Spain; davidms@unex.es

Abstract: Personal and Social Responsibility Model (TPSR) is considered an ideal methodology for promoting values while teaching academic or physical activity contents. The purpose of this study was to carry out an intervention in an educational center with TPSR to exceed 70% of the total teaching time. A total of 105 students participated in the present study as experimental group and 147 as control group (12 to 16 years old). A series of questionnaires were passed to check their responsibility (PSRQ questionnaire) and for the experimental group, a questionnaire to evaluate their TPSR satisfaction (ECVA-12 questionnaire). On the other hand, we check with interviews teachers opinion about the experience with TPSR intervention. The results showed that TPSR allowed after six months a favorable opinion including a values near to 4 (3.78 and 3.72) in a 1–5 scale in the satisfaction with TPSR and values acquisition comparing this methodology with their previous way of receiving classes. At the same time, personal and social responsibility values had significative scores after intervention in both personal ($p < 0.05$) and social responsibility ($p < 0.01$) and taking into account the control group. In addition, the teachers interviewed showed high satisfaction with the methodology, valuing the importance of adapting very well to the most complex students, and the need to carry out continuous training in the methodology. It is concluded that TPSR is an adequate methodology to improve students and teachers satisfaction with teaching, as well as allow an improvement in the responsibility values.

Keywords: physical education models; formal teaching; secondary education; TPSR; personal and social responsibility



Citation: Manzano-Sánchez, D. Comparing Traditional Teaching and the Personal and Social Responsibility Model: Development of Values in Secondary Education Students. *Sustainability* **2023**, *15*, 6964. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15086964>

Academic Editor: Antonio P. Gutierrez de Blume

Received: 26 March 2023

Revised: 15 April 2023

Accepted: 20 April 2023

Published: 20 April 2023



Copyright: © 2023 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

For years, participation in programs based on positive youth development (PYD) has been linked to positive developmental outcomes such as increases in self-control, goal setting and leadership skills [1]. The positive youth development perspective can be traced to the late 1980s and early 1990s, when Rick Little was founding the International Youth Foundation (IYF) [2]. These programs mainly seek the positive development to young people, especially those who are at higher risk of social exclusion, seeking to promote resilience and avoid discrimination between people [3]. It is here where promoting physically and psychologically safe contexts in order to achieve positive development is necessary for youth. PYD programs operationalized a dynamic based on “big three curricular features” [4]. The first is “positive and sustained positive relationships between youth and adults” [5], the second is “activities designed to build life skills” [6] and finally “opportunities for youth to use life skills in context like family, school or community activities” [7]. In sum, PYD-based programs are made to provide opportunities for skills development to intentionally provide opportunities for personal and social skills development in young people [8].

In this sense, sport and Physical Education (PE) has been considered an ideal context to develop motor skills and physical development, but also to promote educational values

such as personal and social responsibility, something essential for the development of children and young people [9] or values related to the promotion of social relationships, decision-making or autonomy [10]. It is not surprising that teaching methodologies have emerged over the years, which aim to deepen the ideas of the PYD using the field of sport as a means for its development.

This is where the Personal and Social Responsibility Model (TPSR) was born [11,12], a methodology developed by Donald Hellison with the idea of promoting a sports culture in minors who were at risk of social exclusion. But he did not only seek to play sports to promote healthy habits, but rather the main foundation of his teaching is to teach educational values while learning sports content. TPSR is based on the idea that people, to develop adequately in society, must learn to be responsible with themselves and with others [13]. In addition, following the mentioned “big three curricular features” [4], TPSR complies with these elements: firstly, because among its basic pillars is the relationship between equals and between equals with the teacher or coach. Secondly, due to the model is based on strategies that allow the development of skills while promoting educational values. Finally, the final objective of the TPSR is to reach the transfer of everything learned, beyond the sports context where the activities are being carried out [13].

In this sense, TPSR has proven to be useful since the beginning of the 2000s, in sports activities for the development of values and the improvement of responsibility [14,15]. In turn, following the review by Whitley et al. In 2019 [16], this methodology showed improvements in extracurricular activities in its country of origin (USA), especially in social relations and the task-oriented climate [17–20].

The potential of TPSR to promote values has allowed that this methodology enter to the educational system starting with the subject of PE, showing this subject as an ideal context for the development of coexistence in addition to the promotion of healthy habits [21]. Focusing on the research that has applied the TPSR in PE classes, it is noteworthy that research has been carried out both in the Elementary Education [22–25] and Secondary Education [26–29] stages and combining both stages [30]. All these studies have evaluated different aspects related to the development of values of the model, highlighting above all the work on responsibility, fun, behavior and attitude towards PE classes [31].

The next step in the application of the TPSR has been its contribution with other methodologies, consolidating TPSR as one of the basic models of PE teaching together with Sport Education, Teaching for Understanding and Cooperative Learning [32]. In PE it has shown to be effective hybridizing with gamification methodology both in aspects related to motivation, and even in the development of physical condition [33]. In turn, the hybridization with Sport Education has shown good results to improve basic psychological needs satisfaction, such as responsibility and a violence reduction [34] being adaptable to students with disabilities [35]. The hybridization of the TPSR with Teaching for Understanding has been seen in research such as that of García-Castejón et al. [36] improvements in terms of the intention to be physically active, as well as in autonomous motivation, responsibility and enjoyment. Finally, TPSR has been hybridized with active breaks on one occasion, also demonstrating very favorable results in behavior and responsibility in Primary Education students [37].

It is noteworthy that the expansion of the model has also extended to preschool education [38] and to the University environment in the preparation of future teachers. It has been observed in the application of this model better behaviors in students [39,40] and a better development of skills and educational values [41] being the TPSR a suitable model for the promotion of social values in classroom [42].

These investigations have been complemented over the years with studies applied in the general educational context. This is because researchers like Llopis-Goig et al. [24] or Manzano-Sánchez et al. [29] already highlighted the perceived need for the model to be implemented for more hours to possibly improve the results obtained.

In this way, the extension of the TPSR to other subjects began with a pilot study in an Elementary Education class, where the students achieved improvements in autonomy

and in the values of responsibility, with the perception of teachers being very positive regarding the possibility of use of TPSR [43]. This study preceded the first research of the model in general education within Primary and Secondary Education schools [44] showing improvements in motivation and prosocial behaviors along with a reduction in violence in both stages. These results were of great interest in the investigation that was carried out comparing the benefits of TPSR applied only in PE and applied in PE and other subjects [45] since in both cases, the results to values promotion were positive but these results were superior on the experimental group where more teachers participated.

All cited studies have analyzed this methodology with qualitative and quantitative instruments, mainly with interviews, observations and questionnaires. But the use of a mixed methodology being not common except for some specific investigations as indicated by Valero-Valenzuela et al. [46]. In turn, the acquisition of own values of the TPSR according to the responsibility levels that the model reflects (indicated in the procedure section of this paper) has not been measured to date, only recently existing the ECVA-12 scale [47] that has been applied in a study within the field of PE [48], where the results were a positive student perceptions of the TPSR implementation and its promotion of values.

In sum, it has been seen how TPSR is a methodology that has been widely analyzed in different contexts, but that its application in PE and other subjects together is recent, and no studies have been found that have analyzed this methodology regarding the acquisition of values. with the ECVA-12 scale [47] in the general curriculum.

Therefore, the objective of this study was to implement the TPSR in a Secondary Education center as a program participating teachers of various subjects, in order to assess, through a mixed method, the impact of this model in their values of responsibility, as well as the results in the acquisition of values with the ECVA-12 scale. As a second objective will be to check the teachers' perception of its implementation through semi-structured interviews.

In the first place, it is hypothesized that this methodology will be suitable for improving the levels of personal and social responsibility of experimental students' group. A second hypothesis will be that students will value positively the use of TPSR in terms of satisfaction with the classes compared to the previous way of teaching by their teachers. This will allow, as a third hypothesis, that teachers have greater satisfaction with teaching and a desire to continue using the TPSR in the future in any subjects.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Study Design and Participants

The study was a quasi-experimental research where participants were selected according to accessibility and convenience [49]. This intervention included 14 teachers from PE (n = 2), History (n = 1), Spanish Language (n = 2), English Language (n = 3), Music (n = 1), Mathematics (n = 1), Ethics values (n = 1), Catholic religion (n = 1) and Social sciences (n = 2). Only four of the participants (Spanish Language, PE, English Language and Music teacher), in the interviews had previous experience with the TPSR.

These teachers were applying TPSR as a center project for experimental groups (six classes, two of first year, two of second year and two of third year). The questionnaire was used in control group composes by six classes (two from first, three from second and one from third course). Teachers receiving initial training and continuous follow-up on the development with a sustained training and assessment for them [50]. They applied for the program for six months with at least a 70% of lective lessons (between 19.5 and 22 h per week) in 105 students (M = 13.61; SD = 1.19) and a control group (M = 14.33; SD = 0.62) with 147 students ranged from 12 to 16 years old and a total of 252 students (M = 13.60; SD = 1.09). This project were approved by the Ethical Committee of University by University of Murcia (1685/2017); furthermore, the Head of the Schools permitted the implementation of this Model. Informed consent (for confidential data processing) was obtained from both the students and their parents or legal guardians.

The inclusion criteria from students were: (1) complete the pre and pos-test questionnaire; (2) not be more than one week or reiterate their absence weekly in class. Additionally,

atypical cases were removed (explained in statistical analysis section) specifically, three students from experimental group and two from control group. From teachers, they have to carry out initial and continuous training (see Section 2.2.2.) and have a maximum of one absent session, which was later recovered by coordinating with the main research. It was not necessary to hold these sessions as everyone attended.

2.2. Procedure

First, the participating center was informed of the project's objectives and how it would be developed. For this, an informative letter was made and a subsequent meeting with the management team to once obtain their acceptance and have a new meeting with the teaching staff. In this sense, the project was proposed so that those interested could participate voluntarily in the training and intervention with TPSR by signing up for a list.

After the meeting, the experimental groups were chosen according to the teachers who wanted to participate in the project to ensure the participation requirements by the teachers (more than 60%) as indicated by previous studies [51,52] obtaining in the end a participation percentage of more than 70%. The project was then presented to the Center for Teachers and Human Resources (CPR) for approval and once approval was obtained, the training described in Section 2.2.2. was carried out and the initial questionnaires on responsibility in school were passed.

2.2.1. Personal and Social Responsibility Model

Based on the book by Manzano-Sánchez et al. [51] and Hellison [14], TPSR has four fundamental aspects for its development, which are briefly described below. These aspects were the main elements that were seen in the training that was given to the participating teachers:

1. *Responsibility levels*: one of the most important pillars of this methodology are the "responsibility pyramid". Five levels composed this pyramid and they are increasing in "responsibility necessity". (1) "Respect": respect for other people's rights and feelings; (2) "Participation and Effort", where the students try to participate in the activities proposed with effort; (3) "Autonomy", the aim was to promote students' autonomy and the ability to overcome pressure from others; (4) "Helping others and Leadership" seeking to be able to control groups as democratic leaders, and not authoritarian; (5) "Transfer", which consisted of applying the values learned in the previous levels.
2. *Session structure*: based on Hellison, the session was divided in 5 parts: (1) Relation time: the teachers interacted with their students to create a comfortable climate, (2) awareness talk: the teachers presented the academic contents and values according the responsibility level to the session, (3) action responsibility: the moment when the students make the "main part" of the session, integrating responsibility strategies with academic contents, (4) group meetings, and (5) reflection time. These two parts (four and five) following a Manzano-Sánchez et al. [51] came together to optimize class time.
3. *Conflict resolution*: Hellison proposed that for the model to function properly, it is essential that conflicts that may arise in the classroom be resolved appropriately. For this, he devised several strategies both for the work of individual conflicts and for collective conflicts like "five clean days", "responsibility court" or "the supervised student".
4. *Methodological strategies*: teachers used general strategies like assigning tasks, providing opportunities for success, or redefine success, and specific strategies linked to each responsibility level (for instance, to promote help others, the reciprocal teaching or cooperative learning).

2.2.2. Teachers Training

All participants were trained with a CPR course from the Murcia Community. The different teachers received a thirty hour training course. Fourteen hours of this course in

six sessions (two of four hours and three of two hours). These sessions were dedicated to learning the TPSR methodology in a theoretical-practical way. These sessions followed the study of Hastie and Casey [50] that indicated to provide in instruction models: (a) a rich description of the curricular elements of the teaching unit, (b) detailed validation of program implementation based on models or strategies, and (c) detailed description of the “program context”.

In this way, five of the hours were dedicated to the theoretical part, three hours to carry out three activities: experience of a class session receiving the methodology; completion of a questionnaire on the methodology; preparation of a class adapted to the methodology based on the subject taught by the teachers. Later, these documents were corrected and shared with the teachers individually.

In addition, after this training, a follow-up of the intervention was carried out, recording the sessions carried out (at least one every fifteen days) to give feedback to the participants and to improve their teaching, based on TARE instrument [53]. An external observer expert in this methodology analyzed the sessions in periods of five min. This instrument has nine categories: Modeling respect; Setting expectations; Opportunity of success; Fostering social interaction; Assigning task; Leadership; Giving choices and voice; Role in assessment; Transfer. TARE instrument were used before to start the intervention and in the program time. In addition, at the end of each day, teachers also had to self-assess their performance using TARE to encourage reflection on the implementation of TPSR, answering in a dichotomous (yes/no) scale. Added to this training hours, the CPR course included other sixteen hours to “autonomous work” which consisted of meetings of the participating teachers where materials were prepared and shared weekly, the aspects of the methodology and its development in class.

2.3. Instruments

2.3.1. Students Questionnaire

A multiple-choice questionnaire was carried out considering age, gender, class and the different variables, specifically, two variables:

Personal and Social Responsibility. To evaluate student’s personal and social responsibility, the Spanish version of Personal and Social Responsibility Questionnaire (PSRQ) [54] was used. This instrument has fourteen items: seven to personal responsibility (e.g., students respect the teacher) and other seven to social responsibility (e.g., students help others). This scale had a scale from 1 to 6 where 1 was “totally disagree” and 6 “totally agree”. The alpha Cronbach values for social and personal responsibility were $\alpha = 0.893$ and 0.881 (pre-test) and $\alpha = 0.898$ and 0.821 in the post-test. The original scale adapted to the education and Spanish context from Escartí et al. [54] had an Alpha’s Cronbach values of 0.85 (social responsibility) and $a = 0.74$ (personal responsibility).

Questionnaire for evaluating the Personal and Social Responsibility model for promoting values in students (ECVA-12) [47], composed of 12 items that are grouped into two factors, each preceded by the premise “Compared to the previous way of teaching in my teacher’s classes, the responsibility model has caused. . .”. The first factor is “promotion of values” (items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, value of $\alpha = 0.64$), for example item 2, “I experienced a better climate of respect in class”. The second factor is “satisfaction with the methodology” (items 1, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, value of $\alpha = 0.74$), for example, item 8 “I applied what I have learned in class to situations outside the classroom, such as organizing my homework”. The scale was from 1 (totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree). The total scale alpha value was $\alpha = 0.789$, like the validation study of Rodríguez et al. [47] with $\alpha = 0.856$.

The questionnaire was completed in the classroom itself by Google Docs (<https://forms.gle/9A9o9c39a534MQq19>), in a quiet environment, taking a total of approximately 10 min to complete (from control group, only demographics and PSRQ scale was administered). In this sense, the main research and a classroom teacher gave a brief explanation of the questionnaire, rules and its objectives. Questions were read before to ensure their understanding and after this, the students completed the questionnaire.

2.3.2. Teacher Interview

This interview consists in thirteen questions mainly coming from Sánchez-Alcaraz et al. and Manzano-Sánchez et al. [52,55] (Table 1). This instrument was based on the study of Sánchez-Alcaraz et al. [55] with adequate values of validity and quality (Aiken's V test 0.84 to 0.98).

Table 1. Interview questions about TPSR.

1	Do you feel that you have more tools available to teach in schools and deal with children with coexistence issues?
2	Do you feel that you are sufficiently trained to implement the TPSR?
3	What are the main problems that have arisen?
4	How do you feel when you apply the TPSR?
5	What are the most innovative aspects that you feel the TPSR is bringing to your classes?
6	What do you think can be improved in the application of the TPSR?
7	What characteristics of the students do you think could be more adequate for an appropriate application of the TPSR?
8	What improvements do you think could be made to the contents of the TPSR?
9	Do you think that TPSR works in terms of the inclusion of values, attitudes and socially adequate values?
10	Do you think that through the TPSR students learn the contents of the subject as well as attitudes and values?
11	What advantages have you found in the TPSR with respect to the methodology you have used until now?
12	Are the tasks better adapted to the interests of the students?
13	Is there anything else you would like to add?

The interviews were carried out in a discussion group in a meeting room at the end of the project (for an hour and thirty minutes) where the participants answered the questions. This session was audio recorded for later transcription and the teachers answered the questions (in some cases, confirming what was indicated by other teachers). All teachers answered all questions after one of them began to answer following an established order.

2.4. Statistical Analysis

The statistical treatment of the collected data was performed using IBM SPSS 24.0 software, as well as Excel for the visualization of the teachers' interviews. First, we checked the atypical cases from the students and then reliability of the instrument was analyzed by calculating its internal consistency, using the Cronbach's Alpha test. The normality of the distribution of the data was then verified using a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and chi-square analysis. All variables presented a non-normal distribution, so non-parametric procedures were used for their assessment (Mann-Whitney's U and Wilcoxon-test) with the Z-score and *p*-values. But the results were checked to with parametric test (t-student and MANOVA test) with similar results. Finally, we include in excel the interviews statements to check the opinion of the teachers, specifying in turn the different aspects of the model in the opinion of the teachers (positive, neutral or negative opinions). The session was recorded and when finished, the conversations were transcribed in Excel. The rows of this program were identified from 1 to 14 (participant) and the columns from 1 to 13 (interview questions).

3. Results

3.1. Descriptive Analysis

We can see the descriptive values in Table 2, including the skewness and kurtosis, showing adequate according to Curran et al. [56] except for social and personal respon-

sibility in the pos-test, where the value was over two. In Table 2, we have to check that ECVA-12 scale values are only for experimental group, taking into account that value of 3 is “neither agree nor disagree” and higher values are “agree or totally agree” with questions about TPSR intervention [47].

Table 2. Descriptive analysis and correlations.

	M	SD	R	S	K
1 Personal_Responsibility_Pre	4.47	0.90	1–6	−0.672	0.666
2 Social_Responsibility_Pre	4.45	0.84	1–6	−0.313	0.036
3 Personal_Responsibility_Pos	4.61	0.82	1–6	−0.980	2.121
4 Social_Responsibility_Pos	4.65	0.76	1–6	−1.215	2.185
5 TPSR_Satisfaction	3.78	0.56	1–5	−0.179	−0.512
6 TPSR_Values	3.72	0.71	1–5	−0.634	0.748

M = mean; SD = Standard deviation; R = Range; S = Skewness; K = Kurtosis.

3.2. Responsibility Results

In this section, we can see the results in the responsibility values of both groups. In this sense, it is noteworthy that initially, the control group did not obtain significant differences in personal responsibility in relation to the experimental group. But they did have differences in social responsibility values since they were higher in the pre-test in favor of control group ($p = 0.001$). However, in the post-test there were no significant differences ($p = 0.23$). As we can see in Table 3, experimental group showed comparing pre-test and post-test improvements in terms of social and personal responsibility. In this sense, the experimental group improved in $p < 0.05$ ($p = 0.011$) personal responsibility and in $p < 0.01$ ($p = 0.002$) social responsibility. On the other hand, the control group did not modify its values from the pre-test to the post-test (values of $p = 0.312$ and 0.671 for personal and social responsibility).

Table 3. Responsibility results.

		Control		Experimental	
		M	SD	M	SD
Personal_Responsibility	pre-test	4.50	1.14	4.49	0.36
	post test	4.61	0.82	4.54	0.97
	Z and p-value	−1.01	0.312	−2.57	0.011 *
Social_Responsibility	pre-test	4.66	1.01	4.15	0.33
	post test	4.67	0.69	4.58	0.89
	Z and p-value	−0.42	0.671	−4.24	0.002 **

M = mean; SD = Standard deviation; ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$.

3.3. Interview Results

Finally, from the 14 participating teachers, some of the most outstanding comments are collected in relation to the intervention carried out. First, we checked if the teacher had come participated before in the TPSR interventions or she/he was novel. Only four to 14 teachers had participated in the last year applying TPSR. In sum, we write some the statement that the teachers say:

Question 1: 13 to 14 teachers (92.8%) said “yes” and three of them (21.5%) added aspects like “we have more strategies” (PE teacher) or “I meet new teaching techniques” (Ethics values). A Spanish language teacher (7.1%) said that “I need learn more about the model to properly use the strategies”.

Question 2: 11 to 14 (78.6%) said yes but two of them from Spanish language and Social sciences (14.2%) reported that “they are in process” and the Catholic Religion teacher (7.1%) “I consider I am formed but I consider always can be more formed”.

Question 3: all teachers ask that they could apply this methodology with their class. And suggest that is important their homogeneity and with “some classes” is more difficult.

Question 4: Comfortable, well, with resources, brave, sure, different, satisfy, etc. None of the participants indicated negative assessments.

Question 5: 7 to 14 teachers (50%) said that the most important thing was to “make a routine for the children” and the autonomy session. On the other hand, the auto and co-evaluation daily is highly considered by four teachers (28.9%) and three the conflict resolution strategies (21.4%).

Question 6: The teachers suggest not change anything except for high students (14–16 years old) in order to make different materials and motivational recourses.

Question 7: 12 to 14 teachers (85.7%) said that the model works well with everybody. But, two or them from Ethics values and Mathematics (14.2%) said that is better with disruptive children.

Question 8: All teachers agreed that TPSR is apply to all subjects, but the content or subject with more practical content are more adequate to this model.

Question 9: All teachers agreed with this statement.

Question 10: All teachers agreed with this statement except a Spanish teacher (7.1%) that she would have liked to better implement the model from the beginning, because it took him a bit to adapt.

Question 11: Teachers in general said answer like “To have more resources in class, better classroom climate and teacher-student relationship, a motivation way to evaluate, a different focus to the traditional learning” etc.

Question 12: 13 to 14 teachers agreed with this statement (92.8%). The teacher that said not it was because:

“I tried to adapt all tasks but sometimes in Maths it was difficult, for instance to make groups to learn some contents.” (Mathematics teacher)

Question 13: the more open question, here some of the statement:

The sessions should start much earlier and even some the first week of September, before starting classes with the students, thus having the tools from the first day. (PE teacher)

I think it must be a project that if applied it would be better to train people before they start with the group, so that from the first day of class, they know what we have to do and if the entire teaching team of a group in it would be much better. (Ethical values teacher)

What influences the most is the cooperation between teachers and the involvement of all. (PE teacher B)

Perhaps unify criteria among teachers to create a card system or a similar document to make it as simple as possible. (History teacher)

The model itself is useless if the teacher does not understand the meaning of it and is not personally involved in the development of the model. (English language teacher)

I would say that the model is perfect, but putting it into practice implies an awareness on the part of the teacher about the profile of his group and the contents of his subject. (Language teacher)

4. Discussion

The main purpose of this study was to implement the TPSR in a Secondary Education center, to assess the impact of this model on both students and teachers.

Considering the first of the hypotheses, analyzing the values of responsibility, in the intervention group, it can be indicated that improvements were obtained between pre and pos-test in experimental group (in $p < 0.05$ and $p < 0.01$ in personal and social responsibility respectively) but personal responsibility changes were small in relation with social responsibility. It is noteworthy that in this study, it was not done only in PE or in extracurricular content as has been done previously, where these improvements were also

only applied in PE [29,57,58], with improvements in the values of both personal and social responsibility [14,15,59]. Therefore, the results in the improvement of these variables are more similar to those of recent studies applying the TPSR in the general educational context, including the subject of PE [44,57]. However other studies with similar samples found only an improved of personal responsibility [54,60] or social responsibility [29], in our study both responsibility types improved, specifically in $p = 0.011$ from personal responsibility and $p = 0.002$ in social responsibility).

Regarding the second of the hypotheses, the students in ECVA-12 scale had an average of 3.72 (acquisition and promotion of values with TPSR) and 3.78 (satisfaction with TPSR respect to the previous methodology) considering in this 1–5 scale a value of 2 is “disagree”, 3 is “neither agree nor disagree” and 4 “agree” the values are near to agree. The results are similar to the only study that used this scale in an intervention with the TPSR in PE [51] where the average values analyzed in the 121 secondary school students (12 to 16 years old) were 3.83 for the promotion of values and of 3.87 for satisfaction with the methodology compared to the previous way of teaching, without finding differences according to the sex.

Describing the items answered by the students who received training in the methodology, it is especially noteworthy that the item “I respect and care for the materials” and “I am able to self-evaluate myself and my peer’s process” and “I acquire values such as respecting and helping others” obtained a score higher than four which indicates that the application of TPSR is specially useful to improve respect and helping others and to improve self-awareness of actions.

The third and last hypothesis posed that the teachers who participated in the intervention would positively assess the experience applying the TPSR as indicated in the interviews. The qualitative analysis of the interviews has made us see how, in general, satisfaction with the methodology was appropriate both for new teachers and for teachers who had previously participated in applying TPSR in their classrooms. Within the mentioned aspects, it is highlighted that, as we saw in the questionnaire, the perception where the acquisition of values by the students was very high. Although something to note is that the teachers largely cited how good they felt applying the model and, above all, the good relationships that were generated, like other studies [29,59–61], including self-efficacy [23] where the relationships between students improved with TPSR.

It should be noted that this study has a series of limitations. In the first place, the sample that could have been broader and more inclusive could have considered applying the intervention program with Primary Education students to compare the options of the teachers and the values collected or use the same teachers from experimental and control group (but without applying TPSR). The second aspect to take into account is that although the duration was over six months, it could always have been done during an academic year, maybe obtaining better results. Finally a limitation could be the reliability of the ECVA-12 scale since a value of 0.64 is good but it could be higher to 0.70 to be accord with Curran et al. [56] and the use of discussion group because some of the answers were limited to repeating what other colleagues indicated or affirming the answer.

On the other hand, future research must continue with the line of the application of TPSR as an ideal methodology for the promotion of values in the classroom considering other variables besides personal and social responsibility, being continuous follow-up a fundamental aspect to guarantee the success of any teaching. In addition, different authors defend the need for the model to involve not only the general educational context, but also the families of students [24,29] which must be taken into account.

5. Conclusions

It is concluded that the use of the TPSR is a methodology that can be applied in general teaching, including different subjects. In the first place, with benefits both for the students, at the level of acquisition of values, satisfaction and levels of responsibility. Secondly, for teachers and students with a view to assessing the use of the TPSR as a different and more appropriate methodology for teaching and receiving classes than traditional teaching,

combining academic content with the development of transferable responsibility values in the present and in the future.

In sum, TPSR is postulated as a basic model in PE and due to its own characteristics, and it could be suitable for the general educational context and possibly it could be adequate to be hybridized and modified while maintaining its basic pillars, with other methodologies and pedagogical models.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and approved by the Ethics Committee of The this project were approved by the Ethical Committee of University of Murcia by University of Murcia (1685/2017).

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: Available data is to the readers by a reasonable request.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Fraser-Thomas, J.; Côté, J.; Deakin, J. Youth sport programs: An avenue to foster positive youth development. *Phys. Educ.* **2005**, *10*, 19–40. [CrossRef]
- Lerner, R.M.; Lerner, J.V.; Murry, V.M.; Smith, E.P.; Bowers, E.P.; Geldhof, G.J.; Buckingham, M.H. Positive youth development in 2020: Theory, research, programs, and the promotion of social justice. *J. Adolesc. Res.* **2021**, *31*, 1114–1134. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Redd, Z.; Moore, K.; Andrews, K. Embedding a Racial Equity Perspective in the Positive Youth Development Approach. *Child Trends*. 2020. Available online: https://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/GenWorkPYDracialequity_ChildTrends_April2020.pdf (accessed on 24 January 2023).
- Lerner, R.M. *Concepts and Theories of Human Development*; Routledge: New York, NY, USA, 2018.
- Smith, E.; Faulk, M.; Monteic, A.; Sizer, A. Exploring the mesosystem: The roles of community, family and peers in adolescent delinquency and positive youth development. *Youth Soc.* **2016**, *48*, 318–343. [CrossRef]
- Jones, S.M.; Kahn, J. *The Evidence Base for How We Learn: Supporting Students' Social, Emotional, and Academic Development*; National Commission on Social, Emotional, and Academic Development Aspen Institute: Washington, DC, USA, 2017; Volume 13.
- Wray-Lake, L.; Abrams, L.S. Pathways to civic engagement among urban youth of color. *Monogr. Soc. Res. Chil. Devel.* **2020**, *85*, 7–154. [CrossRef]
- Holt, N.; Neely, K.; Slater, L.; Camiré, M.; Côté, J.; Tamminen, K. A grounded theory of positive youth development through sport based on results from a qualitative meta-study. *Int. Rev. Sport. Exerc. Psychol.* **2017**, *10*, 1–49. [CrossRef]
- Santos, F.; Neves, R.; Parker, M. Future pathways in implementing the teaching personal and social responsibility model in Spain and Portugal. *Retos* **2020**, *38*, 802–810.
- Jacobs, J.; Wright, P. Social and emotional learning policies and physical education. *Strategies* **2014**, *27*, 42–44. [CrossRef]
- Hellison, D. *Beyond Balls and Bats*; Aahper Publications: Washington, DC, USA, 1978.
- Hellison, D. *Goals and Strategies for Teaching Physical Education*; Human Kinetics: Champaign, IL, USA, 1985.
- Hellison, D. *Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility through Physical Activity*, 3rd ed.; Human Kinetic: Champaign, IL, USA, 2011.
- Hayden, L.; Baltzell, A.; Kilty, K.; McCarthy, J. Developing responsibility using physical activity: A case study of team support. *Ágora* **2012**, *14*, 264–281.
- Bean, C.; Forneris, T. Using a time-series analysis to evaluate a female youth-driven physical activity-based life skills program based on the teaching personal and social responsibility model. *Ágora* **2015**, *12*, 94–114.
- Whitley, M.A.; Massey, W.V.; Camiré, M.; Boutet, M.; Borbee, A. Sport-based youth development interventions in the United States: A systematic review. *BMC Pub. Health* **2019**, *19*, 1–20. [CrossRef]
- Whitley, M.A.; Massey, W.V.; Farrell, K. A programme evaluation of ‘exploring our strengths and our future’: Making sport relevant to the educational, social, and emotional needs of youth. *J. Sport Dev.* **2017**, *5*, 21–35.
- Melendez, A.; Martinek, T. Life after project effort: Applying values acquired in a responsibility-based physical activity program. *Rev. Int. Cienc. Dep.* **2015**, *11*, 259–280.
- Walsh, D.S.; Ozaeta, J.; Wright, P.M. Transference of responsibility model goals to the school environment: Exploring the impact of a coaching club program. *Phys. Educ. Sport Pedagogy*. **2010**, *15*, 15–28. [CrossRef]
- Wright, P.M.; Burton, S. Implementation and outcomes of a responsibilitybased physical activity program integrated into an intact high school physical education class. *J. Teach. Phys. Educ.* **2008**, *27*, 138–154. [CrossRef]
- Sandúa, M.C. Aprendizaje dialógico y educación física: Hacia una educación física y un deporte escolar promotores de salud, éxito escolar y cohesión social. *Intan. Capit.* **2015**, *11*, 393–417. [CrossRef]
- Beaudoin, S. Using responsibility-based strategies to empower in-service physical education and health teachers to learn and implement TPSR. *Ágora* **2012**, *14*, 161–177.

23. Escartí, A.; Gutiérrez, M.; Pascual, C. Implementation of the Personal and Social Responsibility model to improve self-efficacy during physical education classes for primary school children. *Int. J. Psychol. Psychol. Ther.* **2010**, *10*, 387–402.
24. Llopis-Goig, R.; Escartí, A.; Pascual, C.; Gutiérrez, M.; Marín, D. Strengths, Difficulties and Aspects Susceptible for Improvement in the Application of a Program of Personal and Social Responsibility in Physical Education. An Evaluation Based on the Perceptions of Its Implementers. *Cult. Educ.* **2011**, *23*, 445–461. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
25. Pascual, C.; Escartí, A.; Llopis-Goig, R.; Gutiérrez, M.; Marín, D.; Wright, P. Implementation fidelity of a program designed to promote personal and social responsibility through physical education: A comparative case study. *Res. Quarter. Sport.* **2011**, *82*, 499–511. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
26. Gordon, B. An examination of the Responsibility Model in a New Zealand secondary school physical education program. *J. Teach. Phys. Educ.* **2020**, *27*, 138–154. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
27. Sánchez-Alcaraz, B.J.; Gómez-Mármol, A.; Valero-Valenzuela, A.; De la Cruz, E. Aplicación de un programa para la mejora de la responsabilidad personal y social en las clases de educación física. *Motricidad* **2013**, *30*, 121–129.
28. Wright, P.M.; 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*, 277–298. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
29. Manzano-Sánchez, D.; Valero-Valenzuela, A.; Conde-Sánchez, A.; Chen, M.-Y. Applying the Personal and Social Responsibility Model-Based Program: Differences According to Gender between Basic Psychological Needs, Motivation, Life Satisfaction and Intention to be Physically Active. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2019**, *16*, 2326. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
30. Lee, O. Teacher candidates' implementation of the Personal and Social Responsibility Model in field experiences. *Phys. Educ.* **2012**, *69*, 150–170.
31. Pozo, P.; Grao-Cruces, A.; Perez-Ordas, R. Teaching personal and social responsibility model-based programmes in physical education: A systematic review. *Europ. Phys. Educ. Rev.* **2018**, *24*, 56–75. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
32. Pérez Pueyo, Á.L.; Hortigüela Alcalá, D.; Fernández Río, J. *Pedagogical Models in Physical Education, What, How and Why*; Universidad de León; Servicio de Publicaciones: Madrid, Spain, 2021.
33. Melero-Cañas, D.; Morales-Baños, V.; Ardoy, D.N.; Manzano-Sánchez, D.; Valero-Valenzuela, A. Enhancements in Cognitive Performance and Academic Achievement in Adolescents through the Hybridization of an Instructional Model with Gamification in Physical Education. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 5966. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
34. Menéndez-Santurio, J.; Fernández-Río, F.J. Violence, responsibility, friendship and basic psychological needs: Effects of a sports education program and personal and social responsibility. *Rev. Psicodid.* **2016**, *21*, 245–260. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
35. Menéndez-Santurio, J.; Fernández-Río, F.J. Hybridizing sport education and teaching for personal and social responsibility to include students with disabilities. *Eur. Journ. Spec. Needs Educ.* **2017**, *32*, 508–524. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
36. García-Castejón, G.; Camerino, O.; Castañer, M.; Manzano-Sánchez, D.; Jiménez-Parra, J.F.; Valero-Valenzuela, A. Implementation of a Hybrid Educational Program between the Model of Personal and Social Responsibility (TPSR) and the Teaching Games for Understanding (TGfU) in Physical Education and Its Effects on Health: An Approach Based on Mixed Methods. *Children* **2021**, *8*, 573. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
37. Jimenez-Parra, J.F.; Manzano-Sanchez, D.; Camerino, O.; Prat, Q.; Valero-Valenzuela, A. Effects of a Hybrid Program of Active Breaks and Responsibility on the Behavior of Primary Students: A Mixed Methods Study. *Behav. Sci.* **2022**, *12*, 153. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
38. Pavão, I.; Santos, F.; Wright, P.; Gonçalves, F. Implementing the teaching personal and social responsibility model within preschool education: Strengths, challenges and strategies. *Curric. Stud. Health Phys. Educ.* **2018**, *10*, 51–70. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
39. Richards, K.; Jacobs, J.M.; Lawson, M.A. Preservice teachers perspectives and experiences teaching personal and social responsibility. *Phys. Educ. Sport. Pedagog.* **2020**, *25*, 188200. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
40. Shiver, V.N.; Richards, K.A.; Hemphill, M. Preservice teachers' learning to implement culturally relevant physical education with the teaching personal and social responsibility model. *Phys. Educ. Sport. Ped.* **2020**, *25*, 303–315. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
41. Nieves, A.M.; Oliver, L.E.; Vargas, A. Preservice Physical Education Teachers' Experiences Implementing the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility Model. *Phys. Educ.* **2021**, *78*, 183–205.
42. Manzano-Sánchez, D.; Belando-Pedreño, N.; Valero-Valenzuela, A. Preservice Teachers from Physical Education: Differences between Ireland and Spain in Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility. *Sustainability* **2022**, *14*, 8380. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
43. Manzano-Sanchez, D.; Valero-Valenzuela, A. The model of personal and social responsibility (MRPS) in the different subjects of primary education and its impact on responsibility, autonomy, motivation, self-concept and social climate. *J. Sport Health Res.* **2019**, *11*. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
44. Manzano-Sanchez, D.; Valero-Valenzuela, A. Implementation of a Model-Based Program to Promote Personal and Social Responsibility and Its Effects on Motivation, Prosocial Behaviors, Violence and Classroom Climate in Primary and Secondary Education. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2019**, *16*, 4259. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
45. Manzano-Sánchez, D.; González-Víllora, S.; Valero-Valenzuela, A. Application of the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility Model in the Secondary Education Curriculum: Implications in Psychological and Contextual Variables in Students. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2021**, *18*, 3047. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
46. Valero-Valenzuela, A.; Camerino, O.; Manzano-Sanchez, D.; Prat, Q.; Castañer, M. Enhancing Learner Motivation and Classroom Social Climate: A Mixed Methods Approach. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2020**, *17*, 5272. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

47. Rodríguez, I.; Valero-Valenzuela, A.; Manzano-Sánchez, D. Elaboración de una escala para el análisis de los valores adquiridos con el Modelo de Responsabilidad Personal y Social en el entorno escolar (ECVA-12). *Cuad. Psicol. Dep.* **2021**, *21*, 156–167. [[CrossRef](#)]
48. Manzano-Sánchez, D.; Gómez-Mármol, A.; Valero-Valenzuela, A. Student and Teacher Perceptions of Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility Implementation, Academic Performance and Gender Differences in Secondary Education. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 4590. [[CrossRef](#)]
49. Montero, I.; León, O.G. A guide for naming research studies in Psychology. *Int. J. Clin. Health Psychol.* **2007**, *7*, 847–862.
50. Hastie, P.A.; Casey, A. Fidelity in Models-Based Practice Research in Sport Pedagogy: A Guide for Future Investigations. *J. Teach. Phys. Educ.* **2014**, *33*, 422–431. [[CrossRef](#)]
51. Manzano-Sánchez, D.; Merino-Barrero, J.A.; Sánchez-Alcaraz, B.J.; Valero-Valenzuela, A. *Personal and Social Responsibility Model. From Physical Education to General Education*; Wanceulen: Sevilla, Spain, 2020.
52. Manzano-Sánchez, D.; Conte-Marín, L.; Gómez-López, M.; Valero-Valenzuela, A. Applying the personal and social responsibility model as a school-wide project in all participants: Teachers' views. *Front. Psychol.* **2020**, *11*, 579. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
53. Wright, P.M.; Craig, M.W. Tool for Assessing Responsibility-Based Education (TARE): Instrument Development, Content Validity, and Inter-Rater Reliability. *Meas. Phys. Educ. Exerc. Sci.* **2011**, *15*, 204–219. [[CrossRef](#)]
54. Escartí, A.; Gutiérrez, M.; Pascual, C. Propiedades psicométricas de la versión española del Cuestionario de Responsabilidad Personal y Social en contextos de educación física. *Rev. Psic. Dep.* **2011**, *20*, 119–130.
55. Sánchez-Alcaraz, B.J.; Cañadas, M.; Valero-Valenzuela, A.; Gómez, A.; Funes, A. Results, difficulties and improvements in the model of personal and social responsibility. *Apunts. Educ. Física Deporte* **2019**, *35*, 66–82. [[CrossRef](#)]
56. Curran, P.; West, S.; Finch, F. The robustness of test statistics to nonnormality and specification error in confirmatory factor analysis. *Psycho. Methods* **1996**, *1*, 16–29. [[CrossRef](#)]
57. Sánchez-Alcaraz, B.J.; Gómez-Mármol, A.; Valero-Valenzuela, A.; De la Cruz, E. Application of a program to improve personal and social responsibility in Physical Education classes. *Mot. Eur. J. Hum. Mov.* **2013**, *30*, 121–129.
58. Carbonero, M.A.; Martín-Antón, L.J.; Monsalvo, E.; Valdivieso, J.A. School performance and personal attitudes and social responsibility in preadolescent students. *Anal. Psicol.* **2015**, *31*, 990–999. [[CrossRef](#)]
59. Merino-Barrero, J.A.; Valero-Valenzuela, A.; Pedreño, N.B.; Fernández-Río, J. Impact of a sustained TPSR program on students' responsibility, motivation, sportsmanship, and intention to be physically active. *J. Teach. phys. Educ.* **2019**, *39*, 247–255. [[CrossRef](#)]
60. Caballero, P. Design, implementation and assessment of an outdoor activities programme to promote personal and social responsibility in professional training students. *Cuad. Psicol. Deporte* **2015**, *15*, 179–194.
61. Carreres, F. Effects on Adolescents of a Programme of Personal and Social Responsibility Through Extracurricular Sport. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Alicante, Alicante, Spain, 2014.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.