The Physical Educator Vol. 74 • pp. 127–149 • 2017
https://doi.org/10.18666/TPE-2017-V74-I1-6901

SPORT

Youth Sport Development Through Soccer: An Evaluation of an After-School Program Using the TPSR Model

Mark Cryan and Thomas Martinek

Abstract

The Soccer Coaching Club program used the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (TPSR) model in an after-school soccer program for sixth grade boys between 11 and 12 years old in a local middle school. Soccer, as the featured physical activity, provided the "hook" for regular attendance. Desired outcomes included improved self-control, respect, and cooperation with others. Research efforts included formative program evaluation, focusing on fidelity to the TPSR model, and summative evaluations of immediate effects on participant understanding of TPSR concepts and participant behavior as part of the program evaluation. The population was of particular interest. The program participants were predominantly Latino, a population for which the TPSR model has not been extensively researched. A mixed methods approach was used, and data were gathered through a validated survey instrument, a program narrative, and postprogram interview with the participants' classroom teachers. Program evaluation using the two-factor model of analysis of the survey data yielded statistically significant improvements in the factor of social responsibility, although no statistically significant change was measured in the second area, personal responsibility. The observation-

Mark Cryan is an assistant professor, Sport & Event Management Department, Elon University. Thomas Martinek is a professor and the program coordinator for Graduate KIN Pedagogy, Department of Kinesiology, University of North Carolina Greensboro. Please send author correspondence to mcryan@elon.edu

al data including the program narrative and the data gathered through field notes provided evidence of frequent use of the strategies associated with fidelity in implementing a TPSR program and participant behaviors consistent with TPSR learning. The postprogram interview with the participants' classroom teachers yielded observations that indicated some element of transference of program principles to the classroom, as well as strong support for the program's return, another indicator of a successfully executed program.

Children of poverty of every race and ethnicity face an uphill climb. Increasing concentrations of poverty and joblessness leave many youth isolated from the mainstream in an environment in which pursuit of negative and criminal behaviors may become a seemingly logical path (Wilson, 1997; Hamilton & Hamilton, 2004; McLaughlin, Irby, & Langman, 1994).

One possibility to address these issues lies in the field of youth development as defined by a number of researchers and practitioners (Hamilton & Hamilton, 2004; Fraser-Thomas, Côté, & Deakin, 2005; Hellison et al., 2000). Youth development can be categorized as a natural process through which youth grow toward a fulfilling, productive adulthood; as a set of principles that includes viewing youth as a resource to be developed and a rejection of the "deficit model"; and finally, as a set of practices that can be applied to youth programs in a variety of settings (Hamilton & Hamilton, 2004).

These practices typically also include creating physically and psychologically safe places for kids to be kids, nurturing a caring environment with positive adults in long-term relationships with participants, embedding youth development principles into the programming, providing kids opportunities to build skills, promoting positive social norms, and developing resiliency and belonging in kids (Hellison et al., 2000; Fraser-Thomas et al., 2005).

Within the field of youth development, social responsibility programs have shown promise with underserved youth. A meta-analysis of many such programs has established that there is promise in the approach, but that there is need for more research (Hellison & Walsh, 2002). More specifically, the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (or TPSR) model has been used with some success in a variety of settings (Escartí, Gutiérrez, Pascual, & Marín, 2010;

Walsh, 2007; Wright, 2012; Wright & Burton, 2008), but it has rarely been researched in settings with a predominantly Latino population.

Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility Model

It is important to remember that these positive traits that need to be nurtured must be taught as part of a well-planned program and generally do not happen by accident. Further, as Hellison (2011) pointed out, successful youth development is possible through sport, but it must be "good sport," in other words, age-appropriate activities in which values such as sportsmanship and teamwork are higher priorities than winning or personal success. Staff training and attitude are also vital. Therefore, good sports programs can develop positive attributes in youth, but they must be properly designed and purposefully create an environment in which positive values and life skills are taught. And if character is not just "caught" by being part of sports, a framework such as TPSR is needed in which that purposeful teaching can be created.

The Soccer Coaching Club program sought to include these generally accepted hallmarks of successful youth programs through use of Hellison's TPSR model (Hellison et al., 2000) as the framework for the program. TPSR uses physical activity to teach values or life skills. Some key elements of the TPSR model are treating youth as a resource, respecting the individuality of youth, empowering youth, helping youth envision possible futures for themselves, providing a psychologically and physically safe environment, keeping program numbers small, and providing significant contact with caring adults (Hellison et al., 2000).

Operationally, the TPSR model includes a series of levels the students work through, with each building on the other. These levels create a logical path of progression for participants and a way to identify goals that the participants and staff can identify and understand with a common vocabulary. The levels used in TPSR are respect the rights and feelings of others, effort, self-direction, helping others, and taking it outside the gym (Hellison et al., 2000).

This research study sought to establish fidelity to the model, which is particularly important for a new program, and this research effort also included an examination of immediate outcomes in terms of TPSR. More specifically, the research questions are as follows:

1. Are the principles of TPSR being implemented with fidelity as evidenced by data gathered through field notes? This question was addressed through the field notes compiled by the program director. These data help determine if the activities within the program were consistent with implementing a TPSR program with fidelity. These written notes were analyzed and sorted according to the Personal–Social Responsibility Themes, which are used to evaluate the use of desirable Responsibility-Based Strategies as outlined in Part 2 of the Tool for Assessing Responsibility-Based Education (TARE; Wright & Craig, 2011), including Integration, Transfer, Empowerment, and Teacher–Student Relationship. Regular attendance and consistent staff are indicators of a successful youth program (Hamilton & Hamilton, 2004); therefore, attendance data for staff and participants were tracked to provide quantitative data supporting fidelity in application of the TPSR model.
2. Are the students exhibiting learning of TPSR principles, including respect, effort and participation, self-direction, and helping and caring for others, by measures taken through the administration of the Personal and Social Responsibility Questionnaire (PSRQ; Li, Wright, Rukavina, & Pickering, 2008) as a pre- and posttest, field notes, and a postprogram interview with the participants' classroom teachers? TPSR learning may also indicate fidelity.

Method

The Soccer Coaching Club program provided a cohort of male participants aged 11–12, in a 6-week after-school soccer program that met for two afternoons per week for approximately 2 hr/session. The program used the TPSR model to teach the program participants concepts such as respect, self-control, and teamwork through physical activity, primarily soccer. The accompanying research was done using a mixed methods approach, including quantitative elements using a validated instrument and qualitative elements such as field notes and a focus group interview, to conduct a program evaluation. The goals were to evaluate the fidelity with which TPSR, the program's theoretical model, was applied and to evaluate the ef-

fectiveness of this model in affecting student learning of TPSR principles, including respect, effort and participation, self-direction, and helping and caring for others.

Sample Population

The population served by this program was male sixth grade students (aged 11–12) of a low-income middle school in central North Carolina. The sixth grade classroom teachers at the school were asked to recommend male sixth grade students who exhibit risk behaviors. This generated an initial pool of roughly 50 students. The final pool of participants was generated by sending a letter home to the parents with each child who was recommended for the program explaining the program and inviting their student to participate. A group of 14 "regular attendees," defined as students who were present for at least half of the program sessions, emerged over the course of the program. This group comprised four African Americans, eight Latinos, and two Whites.

Physical Activity

In the interest of attracting regular attendance, the program used soccer as the primary activity as a "hook" to engage the participants, tapping into the passion that many of these young people have for the sport (Hartmann, 2003). A team-oriented activity such as soccer is particularly well suited to teaching the principles of youth development and TPSR.

The regular use of soccer scrimmage games was a primary vehicle to address the issues of effort and participation as well as self-direction. The program also included team-building activities, which provided great opportunities to talk about concepts such as respect as well as helping others and caring.

Setting and Schedule

The program ran for 9 weeks during the spring, including 3 weeks of pilot sessions (Phase 1) and 6 weeks during which data were gathered (Phase 2). The program met two afternoons per week at a public school that serves roughly 650 students in Grades 6–8. The large front lawn was used for playing soccer and doing other physical activities, and an auditorium room with a backstage area served as a changing room, and some tables and chairs in front of

the curtain were used when the participants were doing paperwork including the pre- and posttests.

The use of the school setting provided a familiar environment for the participants and one where needed facilities were available. That location also avoided some complications involving transportation. Parents only had to pick up students at the end of the session.

Staffing and Training

The program director, who also served as the principal investigator, has had significant coursework in the TPSR model (Hellison, 2011), on which the program was based. As a long-time youth coach and a youth athletic program administrator, the program director was experienced in working with diverse populations through prior professional and personal experiences and also was conversant in Spanish.

Program staff. Six students from a local university where the program director is a faculty member served as program staff. The program staff brought a variety of skills and backgrounds to the program, which added diversity and strength to program staff's efforts, including experience playing college soccer, working in youth sports camps, and some Spanish language skills. The program director stressed an affinity for all types of children to help create what Noddings (2003) called an "ethic of caring" and what TPSR experts often classify as "putting kids first" (Hellison, 2011). The staff received two classroom sessions on the TPSR model, including a test on the principles of the model. They also received further instruction during the first three weeks of pilot sessions.

Data Collection

The primary source of quantitative data was the Personal and Social Responsibility Questionnaire (PSRQ; Li et al., 2008). This validated instrument measures TPSR constructs including the first four levels of the TPSR model—respect and self-control, effort and participation, self-direction, and caring and leadership—and is designed for use by program participants, and the language is simple and was appropriate for the students in this study.

The PSRQ uses 14 questions formatted in a 6-point, forced response scale with answers beginning with *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Using the two-factor measurement model of the PSRQ,

the responses to the questionnaire are grouped to measure the two major factors of the TPSR model: social responsibility and personal responsibility (Li et al., 2008). Personal responsibility includes the elements of Level 1, respecting the rights and feelings of others, and Level 4, helping others and caring, and the measure of this factor includes the questions that relate to these two levels of the TPSR model. Social responsibility includes Level 2, effort and participation, and Level 3, self-direction, and the measurement of this factor also includes those questions on the PSRQ that relate to those two levels.

The PSRQ used by the students had the original English language version on one side and a Spanish language version on the other. In the end, this group of participants did not include any youngsters with a preference for Spanish.

Field notes compiled by the program director after consultation with program staff yielded significant qualitative data. These field notes were organized into a detailed program narrative sorted according to a priori themes drawn from the Personal–Social Responsibility Themes categories of the TARE (Wright & Craig, 2011). This narrative provided qualitative data that assisted in evaluating fidelity in implementing the TPSR model. Instances of desired teaching behaviors from this data indicate fidelity to the TPSR model.

Additional data were gathered to add triangulation to program narrative. Portions of the TARE instrument were used to gather summative data on the staff's own perceptions of their actions during the course of the program, and a postprogram focus group–type interview was also undertaken with participants' teachers. This focus group specifically helped to examine the teachers' and students' perceptions of the program, including any observations of transference of TPSR principles to the classroom. The teachers were prompted with open-ended questions focusing on what the kids were saying about the program in school and what (if any) changes in classroom behavior and interaction did the teachers observe.

Data Analysis

The program evaluation research starts with "fidelity to the model," in other words, whether the model is being applied correctly, or "Am I doing it right?" (Hellison, 2011, p. 174). Beyond fidelity, the next evaluation research question is whether the program is produc-

ing the desired outcomes in the predominantly Latino sample population. These two areas of inquiry can be thought of as "process" and "outcomes," which correspond respectively with the research questions addressing fidelity and learning of TPSR principles.

This question of fidelity was addressed through the field notes compiled by the program director, which were compiled into a chronological narrative and then analyzed and sorted according to the Personal–Social Responsibility Themes, which serve to evaluate the use of desirable Responsibility-Based Strategies as outlined in Part 2 of the TARE (Wright & Craig, 2011), including Integration, Transfer, Empowerment, and Teacher–Student Relationship.

The learning or immediate outcomes were measured using the PSRQ (Li et al., 2008). The PSRQ measures the first four levels of the TPSR model, which include respect, effort and participation, self-direction, and helping others and caring. The PSRQ was administered to the participants (n = 14) at the beginning of Phase 2 of the program and at the conclusion of program as pre- and posttests. The pre- and posttest administration of the PSRQ yielded results that were analyzed using the two-factor model, breaking the results into Personal Responsibility and Social Responsibility (Li et al., 2008).

Results

The purpose of this program evaluation was to examine the fidelity with which the TPSR model was being applied and to determine the immediate outcomes in terms of the learning of TPSR principles and behaviors consistent with those principles. Indicators of fidelity include regular attendance and evidence of desired TPSR behaviors.

Attendance

Regular attendance and consistent staff are both indicators of a successful youth program (Hamilton & Hamilton, 2004); therefore, attendance data for staff and participants were tracked to provide quantitative data supporting fidelity in application of the TPSR model. These data are represented in Table 1. Attendance was tracked during the 6 weeks of Phase 2 of the program, during which two sessions were held each week, with each session lasting approximately 2 hr. Two sessions were rained out, leaving 10 sessions.

Table 1
Participant and Staff Attendance

Participant and staff	Sessions attended	%
Participants		
Chance	8	80
Brighton	5	50
Edwin	7	70
Isaiah	7	70
Marty	5	50
Jayden	7	70
Vincent	6	60
Kellen	7	70
Mickey	9	90
Charlie	6	60
Justice	6	60
Kelten	6	60
Georgie	6	60
James	5	50
Staff		
NS	10	100
AS	8	80
BD	7	70
CF	8	80
JW	7	70
RH	10	100
MC	10	100

The participants listed in Table 1 attended at least half of the sessions in Phase 2 and therefore had regular contact with the program staff. The attendance data of the staff are also represented here.

Narrative Program Notes

The program director took a detailed set of field notes at the conclusion of each session that provides a rich, thick narrative description of the program. These observation data were compiled by the researcher, who was on-site for all planning, all preparation, and all

operations of the program. They provided a comprehensive view of the program and the activities within the program, including staff and participant behavior. These data helped determine if the activities within the program were consistent with implementing a TPSR program with fidelity. These written notes were compiled into a chronological program narrative. This narrative was then analyzed and sorted according to the Personal–Social Responsibility Themes, which were used to evaluate the use of desirable Responsibility-Based Strategies as outlined in Part 2 of the TARE (Wright & Craig, 2011), including Integration, Transfer, Empowerment, and Teacher–Student Relationship.

Integration. In planning the daily schedules in the program, program staff aimed to incorporate TPSR themes into the activities in ways that were natural and meshed with that day's theme(s). Different formats for the soccer activity were used, and program staff sought to integrate the lessons of TPSR and also to find a style of play that engaged the kids, made it fun, and kept it positive. Program staff heavily relied on participant feedback in determining the format for the day's activities.

In the situation of disputes, program staff sought to allow the kids to resolve their conflicts themselves, thereby integrating Levels 1 (respect) and 3 (self-direction). The students demonstrated real "ownership" of this area of program management after program staff introduced rock–paper–scissors as the method for resolving conflict. Teamwork was a key element in other activities, such as blindfolded obstacle courses or certain passing drills. Taken together, these entries and others indicated a frequent integration of TPSR lessons into program activities throughout the duration of the program.

Transfer. Transfer is certainly the hardest element to judge from the standpoint of program staff, but they spent considerable time discussing the idea of taking the principles of the program "out of the gym," or in this case, "off the field."

In illustrating Level 4, helping behaviors, and in working on Level 5, transference, program staff sought to remind the students of instances when they were already doing the right things and to develop and emphasize those behaviors. In the session described below, the participants were asked to talk about helping behaviors they had engaged in outside of the program, particularly in certain

"opening reflections" done at the start of the session. The participants were generally able to demonstrate understanding of helping behaviors and transference by the examples they provided.

Although program staff did not have a chance to observe the participants outside the framework of the program, the program activities presented opportunities to discuss transfer of TPSR principles to other settings, and the participants also offered examples of their behaviors suggesting transference.

Empowerment. The concept of empowerment is one of the most important features of maintaining fidelity to the model in TPSR teaching. The idea of respecting the kids was frequently discussed during training and regularly during the program, but this was the category in which the reported frequency was lowest. The idea of "accentuating the positive" and not spending as much time trying to "remediate" what program staff may have perceived as problems was repeated regularly. For example, the program director always carried a whistle during sessions, partly as a "coaching prop," but tried not to use it.

In youth development programs such as this one, there should also be an effort to provide kids with a voice in the program activities. This was a point that was discussed in staff training and during the operation of the program. The most common ways this principle played out was choice of activities and trying to provide leadership opportunities such as choosing the teams, setting the rules, and being responsible for resolving their own disputes during games.

Playing alongside the kids also provided opportunities for the participants to feel empowered. It is certainly empowering for a youngster to strip the ball or block a shot of one of their adult leaders, and this happened with some regularity when staff were involved in the scrimmages. Of course, there were also instances of staff demonstrating considerable skills, but this added to the sense of accomplishment when the participants got the better of a staff member on the soccer field.

By late in the program, the participants had become accustomed to having a role and a say in the program. Several took it upon themselves to help set up the field and gather the cones and balls after practice, an example of empowerment and a self-direction activity. The youngsters also volunteered some truly positive thoughts and

actions about program activities. In one instance, the participants, with no prompting, exhibited empowered behavior by selecting their own activity and embracing a rule modification that had previously been used to encourage more teamwork and cooperation by insisting on three passes before any shot instead of two, as program staff had suggested.

This instance of the participants embracing their ability to have a voice was echoed in the way they used the simple conflict resolution tool they were provided early in the program. Rock–paper–scissors was a way for the kids to take responsibility to resolve their own disputes over instances such as who the ball bounced off of when it went out of bounds, who would be on which team, or if a foul had occurred. The participants used it frequently and successfully, and staff only occasionally had to intervene.

Teacher–student relationship. One strength of the program was the staffing numbers; generally, the program director and anywhere from four to six student staffers were present. This means the program did not have to be run in a rigid fashion; the program had the luxury of lots of eyes on the field and the ability for one staff member or the other to be fully engaged with one or two kids while the remaining staff could keep program activities flowing. The student staff exhibited positivity and genuine interest in the kids, and, maybe just as important, they had fun with the kids. The program benefited from several of the staffers having had significant experience with kids and from the engaging positive personalities of all the staffers. As opposed to the staff of many youth physical activity programs, the college student volunteer program staff came to the program with no preconceived views on any of the particular participants in the program, which is not always the case with programs run by parent volunteers or school staff.

During training, program staff spent time talking about respecting each of the kids and about understanding that many of them would be coming to the program because they had demonstrated negative behaviors in school. In many cases, these kids had already experienced lots of negative attention, and therefore, if program staff were going to develop the desired relationships, they needed to strive for a positive environment, including respecting each student, and it

seems that some level of this was achieved, as evidenced by the disappointment of several of the participants when the program ended.

PSRQ Outcomes

The PSRQ measures the first four levels of the TPSR model, which include respect, effort and participation, self-direction, and helping others and caring. The PSRQ was administered to the participants ($n = 14$) at the beginning of Phase 2 of the program and at the conclusion of program as pre- and posttests. The pre- and posttest administration of the PSRQ yielded results that were analyzed using the two-factor model, breaking the results into Social Responsibility and Personal Responsibility (Li et al., 2008).

Social responsibility. The Social Responsibility factor includes Level 1 behaviors, respecting the rights and feelings of others, and Level 4 behaviors, helping others or caring. The pretest yielded a combined mean score of 31.35 with a standard deviation of 5.12 for the questions pertaining to social responsibility. The posttest yielded a combined mean score of 33.63 with a standard deviation of 5.44. A paired t test (two-tailed) showed a significant increase in student self-perception of social responsibility behaviors by an average of 2.29 on the combined scores of the Social Responsibility questions on the PSRQ, with a standard deviation of 3.53. This increase was statistically significant, $t(13) = 2.33$, $p < .05$.

Personal responsibility. On the second factor, Personal Responsibility, the combined scores of the PSRQ questions that involved Level 2, effort and participation, and Level 3, self-direction, showed no significant change. The pretest yielded a combined mean score of 34.36 with a standard deviation of 4.57 for the questions pertaining to personal responsibility. The posttest yielded a combined mean score of 34.29 with a standard deviation of 5.19. On these questions, the mean difference of the combined scores was -0.08, with a standard deviation of 5.43. This test indicated that there was not a significant difference, $t(13) = 0.05$, $p > .05$, (see Table 2).

Table 2
Mean Differences of Personal and Social Responsibility Factors in PSRQ Scores

	Time 1		Time 2		Difference			
Variable	***M***	***SD***	***M***	***SD***	***M***	***SD***	***t*(13)**	***p***
Social Responsibility	31.35	5.12	33.63	5.44	2.29	3.53	2.31	0.0364
Personal Responsibility	34.36	4.57	34.29	5.19	0.08	5.43	0.05	0.9599

Note. Statistical significance was set at $p < .05$.

Teacher Interview

The PSRQ is designed to measure Levels 1, 2, 3, and 4. The final level, Level 5 or Transfer, was evaluated through a focus group–style interview with the participants' classroom teachers. This meeting was held shortly after the conclusion of the program, and a group interview was conducted with the 10 sixth grade classroom teachers. The interview was conducted at the school prior to the sixth grade teachers' weekly meeting, and the principal investigator asked the questions to the group as a whole and took notes on their responses. These data were added to provide triangulation to the data derived from other sources and specifically to examine the teachers' and students' perceptions of the program, including any observations of transference of the principles to the classroom. Several themes emerged from the teachers' comments.

One theme that emerged from this interview was obviously transference; the instances of improved behavior in the classroom support transference of the lessons of TPSR. Although it is impossible to know if the program was the cause of these improvements, the teachers' observations were consistent with transference. One of the teachers said, "'Vincent' really opened up, started to talk and participate more in class." In regard to another program participant, one teacher said, "'Mickey' really enjoyed it, and his behavior improved a lot. He was more positive with other kids." In reference to another young man in the program, a teacher offered, "'Isaiah' became more of leader. He became interested in helping."

Another theme that came up in several of the teachers' comments was the improved confidence of the participants and the relationships between the kids in the program. This is, of course, linked with transference of Level 1 and Level 4 skills, with the TPSR model placing great value on the relationships between program staff and participants, but the data gathered from the teachers support the idea that another benefit is strengthened relationships among participants, above and beyond improvements in Levels 1 and 4. One teacher said, "'Danny' really improved a lot; he was more positive in his relationships with other kids, particularly the ones that were in the program."

Another major theme that emerged from the teacher interview was the participants having a sense of belonging. Teachers also made other comments regarding the kids feeling engaged in the program and feeling like they belonged, and although these were not specific examples of transferring TPSR lessons to the school setting, it indicated that they were talking about the program in the school setting. One teacher said, "They were excited to be a part of something."

The teachers' comments also produced a theme in regard to future direction for the program. First, the teachers stressed how much they hoped the program returned and also said they hoped for a similar program for girls.

Another item that came up was that they felt the serious and skilled soccer players did not find it competitive enough and became less enthused about the program as the spring progressed. This was something the staff felt as well, and something that warranted consideration for future programs. Some thoughts and options in this area include playing "official" games with other teams near the conclusion of the program, offering a multisport model that would "level the playing field," or perhaps having a "competitive" track and a "participation" track.

These data, which include strong support from the participants' teachers for the continuation of the program and numerous observations of improvement in classroom behavior and student interactions, suggest the effectiveness of the program in teaching the lessons of the TPSR model and also indicate some transference. This suggests that the model was implemented with fidelity and that there were some immediate effects on the participants.

Discussion

The Soccer Coaching Club used the TPSR model to teach the program participants concepts such as respect, self-control, and helping and caring through physical activity, primarily soccer with some additional activities. This study was undertaken to examine the use of the TPSR model in an at-risk population of predominantly Latino sixth grade boys and to add to the empirical base in the field of youth development in general and TPSR specifically. Youth development is complex, and the program evaluation research in this field demands the ability to examine multiple dimensions of a program simultaneously. The variety of data sources served to triangulate the results and added validity and credibility to the findings.

Regardless of the methodological approach, program evaluation is challenging. Evaluating the processes and outcomes of youth programs is a complicated, messy business. Youth programs do not follow a predetermined blueprint, regardless of the amount of planning that goes into them. Nonetheless, it is still necessary to figure out a way to evaluate such programs in the interest of best serving youth.

The research also had the specific goals of helping improve the program by evaluating the fidelity with which the TPSR model was implemented and of measuring the immediate outcomes of the program. There is room for improvement in every program overall, but the findings indicate that the TPSR model was applied with fidelity, as supported by a variety of data. These data sources included qualitative data that provided a narrative of the program and brought forth elements that could not be measured via other means and quantitative data that indicated some positive results in immediate outcomes as measured by pre- and posttest application of a validated instrument. This evaluation may serve to expand the empirical base in TPSR, as the use of quantitative instruments such as the one employed in this study, the PSRQ (Li et al., 2008), has been relatively rare in the field (Hellison & Walsh, 2002).

Analysis of observational data including the program narrative and teachers' exit interview revealed that there were significant and consistent applications of the principles of the model and many instances of the students demonstrating their learning through their behaviors in the program.

In the application of the PSRQ pre- and posttests, the results indicated significant improvement in one of the two factors (Li et al., 2008) analyzed quantitatively through the PSRQ. The Social Responsibility factor showed statistically significant improvement, with an increase in student self-perception of their behaviors in regard to social responsibility. The second factor in the model, Personal Responsibility, showed a statistically insignificant difference of the combined scores of the personal responsibility questions.

In the interest of best serving youth, it is the researcher's hope that the implications of these conclusions will contribute to the youth development field in general and the practice of TPSR specifically. It may be helpful to consider this evaluation in the context of a major meta-analysis of TPSR programs in which Hellison and Walsh (2002) sought to answer the question, is it working? In that study of 26 research studies, Hellison and Walsh found some programs without adequate data to determine what level of success was achieved, but even within programs with solid evaluation, there were successes and failures. Some results in this program can be classified as success, including implementing the TPSR model with fidelity and the participants' perceived changes in social responsibility principles and behaviors. There are results that could be classified as failure as well, such as the statistically unchanged area of personal responsibility. This reinforces that youth development work is often difficult, that many factors are at work in young people's lives, and that progress can be uneven, even when programs are well run (Hellison, 2011).

For the analysis of immediate outcomes, it is interesting to note that despite the relatively short duration of the program, there was a statistically significant improvement in Social Responsibility as perceived by the participants. In much of the TPSR literature, it has been written that TPSR programs must begin with the principles involved in Level 1, respecting the rights and feelings of others. These principles are foundational, and most programs, particularly in the early stages, will spend a large portion of their time and effort on this part of the TPSR. In addition, with the base activity in the program being a team-oriented physical activity such as soccer, Level 4, helping and caring for others, is also a key concept with a strong overlap with the concept of teamwork, one that was inherent in many of the daily activities in the program. It is interesting to note that Level 1 is

generally considered a basic skill and Level 4 is more of an advanced concept, but the improvements in these two areas were strongest. It seems that improvement in Level 1 is consistent with much of what is found in the TPSR literature (Hellison & Walsh, 2002); the improvement in Level 4, the other part of the Social Responsibility factor, is more unusual. Most TPSR programs that have been studied have been after-school programs or physical education classes. But this program involved a team sport and specifically focused on soccer as the primary form of physical activity, and this may have been a contributing factor and may warrant further study. The context of a team game certainly seems to lend itself to teaching lessons on helping others and has a natural overlap with the team sports concept of teamwork. There may be an inclination toward these concepts among program staff with team sports experience, and continued use of the PSRQ to measure perception in team sports–based TPSR programs may show improvements in Level 1 and Level 4 occurring in concert.

Conversely, no significant change occurred in the area of Personal Responsibility. In fact, a consistent, but very slight, decrease occurred in the combined scores on the questions in this area. It is probably not wise to put much weight on this measure as the change in scores did not rise to the level of significance, but it seems possible that the consistent small decreases in the students' self-perception in this area may reflect some learning of the principles involved. The decrease in self-perception in this area was very slight but consistent across almost all participants. This may indicate a greater awareness of what the expectations were in these areas and that their own expectations of their behavior were raised by what they were learning in the program. This type of effect has been referred to as response-shift bias (Howard & Dailey, 1979) and could be addressed in future research by adding a retrospective pretest to the current pre- and posttest design. This can also be expressed as reflecting that the participants "didn't know what they didn't know" at the beginning of the program. By the end of the program, they had encountered feedback from other participants and staff when they did not meet their "new standards," which provided them with information that they did not have to benchmark against during the pretest.

In the Personal Responsibility factor of the PSRQ, there was consistency. There were very small decreases in the participants' scores in questions with operative words such as *try hard* and *want to improve.* Across the length of the program, it seemed that students did, in fact, improve in some small way in their effort and participation, but as noted earlier, it may be that they rated themselves lower in these areas because they gained a better understanding of these concepts and were comparing their efforts to a higher standard as a result of response bias shift (Howard & Dailey, 1979).

These are also levels in the model that seem to come into play later in the program for a variety of reasons. Hellison (2011) described the levels of TPSR as something of a loose progression in which certain levels are typically approached earlier. Level 1 is normally the first level discussed, because without some level of respect and respectful behaviors, it is difficult to establish an environment in which the other levels can be approached. On the other hand, there seems to logic to Hellison's "loose progression," but there also seems to be a natural link between Levels 1 and 4, the two components of the Social Responsibility factor in Li et al.'s (2008) analysis. The observational data from this program seem to indicate that Levels 1 and 4 fit together in a way that they can be easily addressed at the same time, and they were addressed from the very beginning of the program. On the other hand, Levels 3 and 4 were difficult to address until issues tied to Levels 1 and 4, particularly Level 1, showed positive movement. It may be that if the program duration was longer and more time was devoted to Levels 2 and 3, the researchers would have seen results more similar to those in Buckle's (2005) study, which lasted 27 weeks. This contention is supported by the fact that his program saw statistically significant gains in both the Social and Personal Responsibility factors, but the improvements in the Social Responsibility factor were more robust.

Transfer is the final listed level of the TPSR model, and this is reflective of the challenges of transfer. The traditional view of sports and physical activity programs is that they build character and teach lessons that apply to other areas of life (Sage, 1998). This attitude implies that sports or physical activity naturally teaches these lessons, but the evidence is inconclusive. Physical activity and sport certainly can be a conducive environment for character development

(Solomon, 1997), but Davidson and Moran-Miller (2005) found that participants in sports often do no not make the connection between the lessons of sport and life. This indicates the importance of being mindful about connecting the lessons of the field with other areas of life and of involving intentionally designed programs that include carefully designed program structures and staff training (Smith & Smoll, 1997). This ultimately should lead to successful transfer, or what the TPSR model calls "taking it outside the gym."

Viewed holistically, the data illustrate certain limited positive immediate results from the program, particularly in the social responsibility area, as well as instances of transfer. This was consistent with earlier TPSR studies in which strong indications of transfer of respect and self-control to the classroom were found (Hellison & Walsh, 2002).

In addition, some elements were not considered in advance, including the teachers' view that some of the students not only exhibited more positive interaction with their teachers and classmates, but also developed stronger relationships with other participants in the program. This area warrants further examination during future versions of the program.

This program, like all programs, was not perfect. The year-round schedule at the middle school created a challenge in gaining and keeping momentum. Conversely, this logistical challenge also serves to point out the strength of the on-campus site; having the students come to the program right after school and staying until parents pick them up after work was a strength, but the schedule for the following year's program was modified to begin after the intersession break.

In regard to program attrition, the attrition happened early and brought participant numbers close to the original goal of about 12–15 kids, which is consistent with the characteristics of good TPSR programs (Hellison, 2011). The sessions were more engaging with the group size between 12 and 15, with the students and staff able to interact more one to one and with enough players for one small-sided game, which was ideal.

In the end, based on multiple sources of data, including the participants' perceptions as measured by the PSRQ, the perception of staff, the perception of the participants' classroom teachers, and the observation data gathered by the program director, the research-

ers found that the Soccer Coaching Club was largely implemented with fidelity and that the program was successful in creating positive immediate outcomes despite the constraints under which it was operated.

Another indicator of the success of the program is that the teachers and school leadership asked for the program to return. It became clear that the program had a positive effect on the participants, and the staff as well. Perhaps the strongest endorsement of the overall success of the program was the reaction of students on the final day. Several loudly voiced their disappointment that it was over: "No, don't let it be the last day!"

References

Buckle, M. (2005). *A social responsibility program for Latino teens in the Police Athletic League* (Unpublished master's thesis). San Francisco State University, San Franciso, CA.

Davidson, M. L., & Moran-Miller, K. E. (2005). Character development in sport: An ethnographic study of character development in an elite pre-school basketball program. *Journal of Research in Character Education, 3,* 121–138.

Escartí, A., Gutiérrez, M., Pascual, C., & Marín, D. (2010). Application of Hellison's Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility model in physical education to improve self-efficacy for adolescents at risk of dropping-out of school. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology, 13,* 667–676. https://doi.org/10.1017/S113874160000233X

Fraser-Thomas, J., Côté, J., & Deakin, J. (2005). Youth sport programs: An avenue to foster positive youth development. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 10,* 19–40. https://doi.org/10.1080/1740898042000334890

Hamilton, S., & Hamilton, M. (2004). *The youth development handbook.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hartmann, D., (2003) Theorizing sport as a social intervention: A view from the grass roots. *Quest, 5,* 118–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2003.10491795

Hellison, D. (2011). *Teaching personal and social responsibility through physical activity.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Hellison, D., Cutforth, N., Kallusky, J., Martinek, T., Parker, M., & Stiehl, J. (2000). *Youth development & physical activity: Linking universities & communities*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Hellison, D., & Walsh, D. (2002) Responsibility-based youth program evaluation: Investigating the investigations. *Quest, 54,* 292–307. https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2002.10491780

Howard, G. S., & Dailey, P. R. (1979). Response-shift bias: A source of contamination of self-report measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *64,* 144–150. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.64.2.144

Li, W., Wright, P. M., Rukavina, P., & Pickering, M. (2008). Measuring students' perceptions of personal and social responsibility and its relationship to intrinsic motivation in urban physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 27,* 167–178. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.27.2.167

McLaughlin, M., Irby, M., & Langman, J. (1994). *Urban sanctuaries*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Noddings, N. (2003). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics & moral education.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sage, G. (1998). Does sport affect character development in athletes. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 60*(1), 15–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.1998.10605041

Smith, R. E., & Smoll, F. L. (1997). Coaching the coaches: Youth sports as a scientific and applied behavioral setting. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 6*(1), 16–21. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.ep11512606

Solomon, G. (1997). Does physical education affect character development in students? *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance, 68*(9), 38. https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.1997.10605028

Walsh, D. S. (2007). *Supporting youth development outcomes: An evaluation of a policy.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Wilson, W. J. (1997). *When work disappears: The world of the new urban poor*. New York, NY: Knopf.

Wright, P. M. (2012). Offering a TPSR physical activity club to adolescent boys labeled at-risk in partnership with a community-based youth serving program. *Agora para la educación física y el deporte, 14*(1), 94–114.

Wright, P. M., & Burton, S. (2008). Implementation and outcomes of a responsibility-based physical activity program integrated into an intact high school physical education class. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 27,* 138–154. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.27.2.138

Wright, P. M., & Craig, M. (2011). Tool for Assessing Responsibility-Based Education (TARE): Instrument development, content validity, and inter-rater reliability. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science, 15,* 204–219. https://doi.org/10.1080/1091367X.2011.590084