

Sport Education Model: Improving Student Motivation in Physical Education

¹Hasyim, ²Gilang Ramadan, ³Dede Dwiansyah Putra, ⁴Ardo Okilanda, ⁵Nanang Mulayana, ⁶Oman Hadiana, ⁷Mutiara Fajar, ⁸Dedi Iskandar

Abstract--*The research conducted aims to determine the increase in student motivation after finding the learning process by using a sports education model (SEM) with a traditional learning model. The method used is Nonequivalent Control Group Design which uses 50 students as research subjects which are divided into 2 groups. Based on the findings in this study revealed a sense of comfort in students during learning activities carried out by using the sports education model (SEM) this can be seen from the activities of the involvement of all students in each learning activity with a sense of comfort and pleasure in the learning that they participated in. The results of this study suggest that almost all students involved in the learning process using SEM enjoy the model because the learning presented is not only in the form of understanding of skills but more on personal and social skills. Conclusion Sports Education Model (SEM) is very effective to be used in sports learning because this model can actively involve all students, also SEM presents competition in the learning process so that this will cause very high motivation among students so that the learning process will be very competitive.*

Key words--*Sport, Education, Model, Motivation, learning.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Physical education in schools is not only for relieving students; fatigue, but it is also for improving students' physical activity in order to achieve learning goals itself (Ginanjar et al., 2019). At the same time, physical education in schools should not be consider as only mastering the basic techniques of a sport, but must be able to increase student participation, perceived effort during learning, and students perception of physical education in schools (Wallhead & Ntoumanis, 2004; Ramadan et al., 2020). It is the step that needs to be understood before sport teacher gives learning to students in order to provide meaningful experience for their learning.

In many schools, mostly teachers only teach using direct learning models, where in this learning process, teacher holds full control of the learning process while students are less actively involved in the learning process provided by the teacher, therefore this direct learning model can be said fail to prepare students to be the center of their learning and to be able to understand the process sports games that have high complexity (Kirk & Macdonald,

¹Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia. E-mail: hasyim@unm.ac.id

²STKIP Muhammadiyah Kuningan, Indonesia.

³Universitas PGRI Palembang, Indonesia

⁴Universitas PGRI Palembang, Indonesia

⁵STKIP Muhammadiyah Kuningan, Indonesia

⁶STKIP Muhammadiyah Kuningan, Indonesia

⁷Universitas PGRI Palembang, Indonesia

⁸STKIP Muhammadiyah Kuningan, Indonesia

1998). In some cases of direct learning focused on teacher can lead students become inactive in the learning process and they only observe what teacher does and provide limited opportunities for (Roberts & Fairclough, 2011).

With this view that learning process should not put teacher as the center but students, this requires the teacher to provide different options of learning model to involve students actively in the class. Teacher-centered learning process is often determined by physical activities taught such as soccer, gymnastics and others, as a result the learning process taught to students tends to be the same in different classes, content and sequence of learning activities remain the same (Metzler, 1999). Sport education model is not only about mastering skills but more than that, sport education aims to provide experiences from student participation through learning process given, values and motivation (Siedentop, 1998; Perlman & Karp, 2010). Additionally, this helps students become more active individuals in the process of learning sports, hence sport teacher is required to be able providing learning strategy that matches with students' character and interest who want to move (Bryan & Solmon, 2012).

Sport Education Model (SEM) has an essential goal in the process of learning sports for students where the learning process by not only combining direct learning but also emphasizing the active involvement of students in the learning process, small groups working together and peer teaching rather than only learning with the teacher can take an active role and oriented to practice or repetition in the process of learning skills (Siedentop, 1998; Romar et al., 2016). SEM learning is designed to involve all students in the learning process based on competition where students have peer competitor that fits with their development and learning material given (Siedentop et al., 2011).

Based on observation from 20 schools from various levels of education in Makassar, it reveals that almost all sport teachers are still using classical or traditional learning models by means as teacher-centered and oriented to practice and repetition in the process of learning skills. This shows that majority of teachers in Makassar is not accustomed to perform Sport Education Model (SEM) in the learning process where students apply learning by competing with all active students with various roles.

Previous studies have shown results that most students or players who were given SEM could take their own roles in accordance with their knowledge and they share instruction to peers (Romar et al., 2016). This also links to the research (Perlman & Karp, 2010; Perlman, 2011) Sport Education Model (SEM) that fully helps for facilitating student competencies to enable them determining their role in learning. Moreover, Sport Education Model (SEM) can offer plenty of benefits to the process of sport education using SEM such as developing physiological needs, achievement and sportsmanship in sport education in school rather than the traditional learning model (Méndez-Giménez et al., 2015). A number of sports learning studies applied Sport Education Model (SEM) has not specifically investigated on increasing students' motivation that is leading to students' participation after being given a *Sport Education Model* (SEM) in learning sports.

In an effort to increase student participation to be more active in sports learning demonstrated by *Sport Education Model* (SEM) teacher is considered to be effective and appropriate to be used in learning sports and to involve all students (Hastie, 1998). The use of *Sport Education Model* (SEM) in sport learning can provide some advantageous for students, such as increasing motivation, minimizing the potential of passive students in learning activities. A research conducted by (Ntoumanis et al., 2004) reveals that students who are not active in learning,

want to be given the opportunity to engage and participate directly in learning activities because it is more fun for them.

Through observing strength and weakness of each model used in sport learning, therefore, the purpose of this study is (1) to examine how effective the *Sport Education Model* (SEM) applied by teachers in learning sports, (2) to determine how much students' motivation after learning sports using the *Sport Education Model* (SEM). It is expected that the *Sport Education Model* (SEM) applied in the sports learning in class can be a reference for teachers in managing learning that makes students involved in sport activities in the classroom.

II. METHODOLOGY

This research was conducted using the *Nonequivalent Control Group Design*. In this design both the experimental and control groups were compared, however both groups were selected and placed without going through a randomization. Samples in the research were students of class XI of SMA Negeri 5 Makassar (a state high school) that consisted of 50 students using random sampling techniques, while data were analyzed through ANOVA to measure level of students' participation. Independent variable (*Sport Education Model* vs Traditional Model), and dependent variable (motivation in physical education).

Assessing students' motivational responses to comfort, performance, and perceptions of competence in physical education learning programs specifically on futsal material was another focus of this research. We asked students to perform an assessment of what is done throughout this research by using an questionnaire from the version of Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (IMI) (Ryan, 1982). *Intrinsic Motivation Inventory* (IMI), is an instrument that aims to assess motivation in a variety of situations and contexts and is rooted in *Self Determination Theory*. IMI requires participants to respond to 18 items that assess the four dimensions that underlie intrinsic motivation: feeling of comfort, performance, perception of competence, and pressure in competition. Scores for perceived comfort, performance, and perceived competency were calculated as the average of responses for each item from each subscale. Previous studies have shown adequate validity and reliability of the scale when used with adolescents in physical education (Mitchell, 1996; Goudas et al., 1995).

III. RESULTS

In the table 1 depicts descriptive statistics related to the pre-test and post-test steps to compare the conditions before treatment and. After treatment.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics to Measure Motivation

Components of measurement motivation	Model used	Pre-test		Post-test	
		M	SD	M	SD
Model comfort	Sport Education Model	4.51	1,21	5,60	0,75
	Traditional	5.25	0.93	5.13	0.89
Perception of Competition	Sport Education Model	4,82	0,84	5.45	1.04
	Traditional	4.76	1.30	4.81	1.15
Performance	Sport Education Model	4.82	0.84	5.45	1.04

	Traditional	5.62	0.74	5.45	1.03
--	-------------	------	------	------	------

From the table above, it can be concluded that it can be seen components of measurement before and after given treatments do not show a significant difference between the *sport education model* (SEM) compared to traditional learning, furthermore T test was done and showed that there was no significant change between score before and after treatment were given, this revealed that standard deviation in students' sense of comfort, performance, and perceptions of competition for sport education models and traditional group learning models

Furthermore, calculation was conducted using ANOVA by revealing the t-test with paired samples shows that *sport education model* had significantly increased comparing before treatments were given of students' comfort, $t(25) = -3,11$, $p < 0,05$ -> which compared to t value with 0,05 or value Sig. in SPSS with 0,05 and the efforts made, $t(25) = -2,94$, $p < 0,005$. On the contrary, groups that were given using the traditional learning model did not show significant changes before and after the treatment was given to the students' comfort, $t(25) = 0,61$, $p > 0,005$; Performance, $t(25) = 0,79$, $p > 0,005$; or perception of competence, $t(25) = -21$, $p > 0,005$.

The purpose of this study is to determine the increase of students' motivation after conducting learning process using *sport education model* (SEM) and traditional learning model. From this current research, it used *Sport Education Model* (SEM) and compared to traditional learning model based on students' participation in terms of feeling comfort, perception of competition and efforts made, the difference between the *Sport Education Model* (SEM) group and the traditional learning model group was not significant before the given treatment, in the *Sport Education Model* (SEM) group, there was an increase before and after being give treatment in terms of student comfort, performance and competency perception. On the opposite, the traditional learning model groups did not have a significant change in the three measuring instruments for student participation. Basically, all learning models can provide a crucial impact for student development, however, we need to understand how time and situations change rapidly that impacts the needs of change in students' learning model. In this study, *Sport Education Model* (SEM) provides a positive change and impact on students' perceptions in understanding sport education comprehensively.

The findings in this study reveals that there is a sense of comfort in students during learning activities that applied SEM. It is seen from the involvement of all students in each learning activity, these findings were in line with (Ginanjari et al., 2019), that reports the students tend to increase their motivation in learning because learning process using SEM is a learning model based on play theory through competing with peers and the results of the competition will depend on skills and strategies. Meanwhile, for increasing the enthusiasm and comfort of students in sports education by using SEM learning (Wallhead & Ntoumanis, 2004), (Siedentop, 1998; Nur, Giyartini, & Sumardi, 2020) emphasize that the feeling of comfort felt during the learning activity process on students' perceptions was triggered them to like sports learning using SEM instead of using traditional learning model.

Another finding in this study is the perception of performance, this suggests that almost all students involved in the learning process using SEM that they really enjoyed the model because the learning presented was not only in the form of understanding of skills but more on personal and social skills. This is in line with (Perlman &

Karp, 2010) which states that the SEM learning model provides more space for students to interact more socially and understand the shared skills together. Meanwhile (Bryan & Solmon, 2012; Karisman & Friskawati, 2020) SEM model learning provides a shift in meaning where students are not only learning sports skills but also encourage to work in groups to be more cooperative to foster enjoyable experiences for students. Research from (Méndez-Giménez et al., 2015) encourage that sports education teachers can utilize the SEM model especially as a tool to promote the development of student learning, values and social attitudes.

As a recommendation for future research using the *Sport Education Model* (SEM) to continue and expand the existing literature. This is because the sport education curriculum faces long time constraints, it will be very important for teachers to use the most effective teaching approaches to increase student motivation. In the learning process the teachers can adopt a learning model that may depend on the desired results of sports learning. For example, a traditional learning model might be very useful if the aim of learning is to develop the specific skills of each branch of sport that is expected.

IV.CONCLUSION

Sport Education Model (SEM) is truly effective to be used in sports learning because this model is able to actively involve all students. Apart from that, SEM presents competition in the learning process so that this will trigger high motivation among students hence the learning process will be very competitive. The learning model using SEM can cause high motivation among students because they want to show their abilities accompanied by adequate skills and help each other if there are group members who cannot perform a basic skill.

SEM learning models used in the learning process should have some innovation in the learning process, this is useful in order to create a continuous that is not monotonous for students. For instance, giving rewards to students from a variety of roles taken, this emphasizes that each role taken by students is equally important in the learning process and the exchange of roles taken by students also needs to be observed because the number of students involved requires more attention from teacher so that every student gets the same rights and the same approach from the teacher. For further research, it is suggested to analyze more deeply related to the use of SEM for individual sports learning material such as athletics, gymnastic and others. Therefore, the SEM model used in learning can be applied in individual sports learning materials and not just in groups.

REFERENCES

1. Bryan, C. L., & Solmon, M. A. (2012). Student Motivation in Physical Education and Engagement in Physical Activity. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 35(3), 267–285.
2. Ginanjar, A., Suherman, A., Juliantine, T., & Hidayat, Y. (2019). SPORTS ORIENTATION DURING LEARNING TEAM OR INDIVIDUAL SPORTS USING A SPORT EDUCATION MODEL. *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 38(2), 377–386. <https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v38i2.24021>
3. Goudas, M., Biddle, S., Fox, K., & Underwood, M. (1995). It ain't what you do, it's the way you do it! Teaching style affects children's motivation in track and field lessons. *The Sport Psychologist*, 9, 254–264.
4. Hastie, P. (1998). Applied Benefits of the Sport Education Model. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 69(4), 24–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.1998.10605530>
5. Karisman, V. A., & Friskawati, G. F. (2020). Strike and Fielding Games on Fundamental Movement Skills. *JUARA : Jurnal Olahraga*, 5(1), 75–82. <https://doi.org/10.33222/juara.v5i1.710>
6. Kirk, D., & Macdonald, D. (1998). Situated Learning in Physical Education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 17(3), 376–387. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.17.3.376>

7. Méndez-Giménez, A., Fernández-Río, J., & Méndez-Alonso, D. (2015). Modelo de educación deportiva versus modelo tradicional: efectos en la motivación y deportividad / Sport Education Model Versus Traditional Model: Motivational and Sportsmanship Effects pp. 449-466. *Rimcafd*, 59(2015), 449–466. <https://doi.org/10.15366/rimcafd2015.59.004>
8. Metzler, M. W. (1999). *Instructional models for physical education*. Needam Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
9. Mitchell, S. A. (1996). Relationships between perceived learning environment and intrinsic motivation in middle school physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 15, 368–383.
10. Ntoumanis, N., Pensgaard, A. M., Martin, C., & Pipe, K. (2004). An idiographic analysis of amotivation in compulsory school physical education. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 26(2), 197–214. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.26.2.197>
11. Nur, L., Giyartini, R., & Sumardi, S. (2020). Gross Motor Skills: Outbound Activities in Elementary Students. *JUARA : Jurnal Olahraga*, 5(1), 93–99. <https://doi.org/10.33222/juara.v5i1.781>
12. Perlman, D. J. (2011). Examination of self-determination within the sport education model. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education*, 2(1), 79–92. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18377122.2011.9730345>
13. Perlman, D., & Karp, G. G. (2010). A self-determined perspective of the Sport Education Model. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 15(4), 401–418. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17408980903535800>
14. Ramadan, G., Mulyana, N., Iskandar, D., Juniarti, Y., & Hardiyanti, W. E. (2020). Physical Education for Early Childhood: The Development of Students' Motor in Athletics Basic Motion. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Sport Science, Health, and Physical Education (ICSSHPE 2019)*. Paris, France: Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/ahsr.k.200214.023>
15. Roberts, S., & Fairclough, S. (2011). Observational analysis of student activity modes, lesson contexts and teacher interactions during games classes in high school (11–16 years) physical education. *European Physical Education Review*, 17(2), 255–268. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X11420222>
16. Romar, J. E., Sarén, J., & Hastie, P. (2016). Athlete-centred coaching using the sport education model in youth soccer. *Journal of Physical Education and Sport*, 16(2), 380–391. <https://doi.org/10.7752/jpes.2016.02060>
17. Ryan, R. . (1982). Control and information in the intrapersonal sphere: An extrinsic of cognitive evaluation theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 450–461.
18. Siedentop, D., Hastie, P. A., & van der Mars, H. (2011). *Complete guide to sport education* (2 ed). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
19. Siedentop, D. (1998). What is Sport Education and How Does it Work? *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 69(4), 18–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.1998.10605528>
20. Wallhead, T. L., & Ntoumanis, N. (2004). Effects of a Sport Education Intervention on Students' Motivational Responses in Physical Education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 23(1), 4–18. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.23.1.4>
21. Gidado, Abubakar, Korawinwich Boonpisuttinant, Suthamas Kanjanawongwanich, and . "Anti-cancer and Anti-Oxidative Activities of Nigerian Traditional Medicinal Plants/Recipes." *Journal of Complementary Medicine Research* 10 (2019), 200-211. doi:10.5455/jcmr.20190731050619
22. Buch, N., Goyal, J., Kumar, N., Parmar, I., Shah, V., Charan, J. Prevalence of hypertension in school going children of Surat city, Western India (2011) *Journal of Cardiovascular Disease Research*, 2 (4), pp. 228-232. DOI: 10.4103/0975-3583.89807