

Students' Perception on the Physical Education Learning Process using the 2013 and KTSP Curriculums of Wonosobo Regency Middle Schools

Taufan Jannata¹, Awan Hariono¹

¹ Yogyakarta State University, Jl. Colombo No.1, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
Departement of Sport Science, Graduate School

Keywords: Curriculum, Students' Perception, Physical Education

Abstract: The learning process is the main key to transfer knowledge and value from teachers to students. Good and effective learning depends on methods and strategies which will lead to the smooth learning process in order to achieve the learning objectives that have been set. The purpose of this study was to determine the students' perceptions on physical education learning process using the KTSP and K13 curricula. The participants of this study are 120 students consisting of 30 students of SMPN 4 Kertek which applies KTSP Curriculum, and 30 students of SMPN 3 Kalikajar, 30 students of SMPN 2 Selomerto, also 30 students of SMPN 1 Wonosobo applying 2013 Curriculum. The data were analyzed by using quantitative descriptive technique. The findings of this study indicate that the students' perceptions on the Physical Education learning process using K13 curriculum is better because of the learning materials, time management, learning methods, and given learning motivation.

1 INTRODUCTION

The learning environment created by teachers is very influential on the learning process and learning outcomes achieved by students. To create conducive learning environment, teachers should consider learning facilities, students' motivation, learning time allocation, and learning objectives to be achieved. According to SDT (Ryan & Deci, 2000), competence, basic psychology, and autonomy are very important in improving performance and motivation in the physical education learning process at schools. Students have the right to develop and make choices in the learning process. In this case, Physical Education is one of the facilities in schools that aims to make students physically and mentally healthy (A, Packham, 2019).

In several researches of Stefanou, Perencevich, DiCintio, and Turner (2004) on teacher autonomy in class, there are three types of teaching choices to support the achievement of learning process, namely cognitive, organizational, and procedural processes. Cognitive process provides experience to students and opportunities to assess the learning outcomes that have been given to the students (Patall, Cooper,

and Wynn, 2010). Organizational process provides flexibility for students to choose partners in learning and to group students into small groups that will ease the delivery of the learning materials. Then, procedural process gives teachers opportunities to modify the learning according to the schools' condition.

In Xiang, Gao, and McBride's (2011) review conducted on high school students in Hong Kong, teachers provide cognitive, organizational, or procedural learning to students. The finding of these observations shows that the cognitive learning is the learning process which is most likely to be done. Then, the students are given a questionnaire to give an assessment related to the three learning processes.

Education in Indonesia is different from other countries. In Indonesia, education is regulated in Act No. 20 of 2003 on the national education system. In that act, education functions as a means of developing and forming the characters of students in order to educate the life of the nation to produce human beings who believe in God Almighty, and who are independent, creative, healthy, noble, and democratic. Education in Indonesia is also regulated in an educational curriculum. Indonesia has changed

the curriculum several times. For now, Indonesia adheres to the 2013 curriculum (K13) but there are still many schools adhering to the old curriculum, namely Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP) or the 2006 curriculum.

The term "curriculum" has several meanings, one of which is that curriculum is a tool used as a reference for conducting a learning program (Capuk, 2015). In the Curriculum Development book, Theory and Practice, it is explained that the curriculum, as a plan for learning, is something created and designed for students' learning. The curriculum is a container that will determine the direction of education, so the success or failure of a country's education depends on the applied educational policies and curricula. The curriculum is the spearhead for the implementation of education. Without a curriculum it is impossible for education to run well, effectively, and efficiently as expected. The curriculum is also implemented in order to get a change in behavior for better learners and obtain the triumph as expected (Haris, 2016). McDuffie (2018) indicates that the curriculum has certain characteristics, namely learning devices. Curriculum and learning process are two things that are closely related, and the curriculum is a comprehensive plan which includes activities and experiences providing experience to students.

KTSP stands for the Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan, which is developed in accordance with the potential of each region, school characteristics, social culture of the local community, and characteristics of students (E. Mulyasa, 2007). In the KTSP curriculum, teachers will be the center of the teaching and learning process, so students only receive the transferred knowledge and not the center of the teaching and learning process including in physical education lessons. In the KTSP curriculum, Physical Education lesson only gets a two-hour teaching allocation in one week. Some parties argue that this allocation is not enough to meet the goals of Physical Education lesson.

The latest curriculum in Indonesia is 2013 curriculum (K13). This curriculum is the development of a pre-existing curriculum, both a competency-based curriculum that was released in 2004 and an educational unit level curriculum (KTSP) in 2006 (M. Fadlillah, 2014).

There are four aspects of K13 which become the goals of education namely attitude, behavior aspects, skill, and knowledge. In K13, teachers play the role as facilitators during the teaching and learning process, so students are the center of the learning and teaching process. Physical education in K13 also

gets an additional time allocation which is three learning periods in one week.

Many schools in Wonosobo Regency are still implementing the KTSP curriculum, but some other schools have used the K13 curriculum. The curriculum used in the schools usually adapts to the ability to administer the teaching and learning process. The difference in the use of the curriculum causes differences in the materials and objectives given by the teachers to students.

In short, this study aims to determine students' perception on the physical education learning process using the 2013 and KTSP curricula.

2 METHOD

This research is a descriptive research that aims to determine students' perception on the physical education learning process using the 2013 and KTSP curricula. The most appropriate method used to describe data based on perception is descriptive research (E, Akdemir, 2015). The method used in this study is survey method and its data were obtained through questionnaires. Participants in this study consist of IX grade Junior High School students in Wonosobo Regency and then the samples were randomly selected using the random sampling system. They consist of four different junior high schools' students totally 120 students (30 students from each school).

Participants in this research follow the rules of the study, filling out questionnaires given without any assistance from the researcher. Students also fill in their personal data which consist of the place and date of birth, gender, class, and origin of school. The variables in this study consist of two types, namely the independent variable and the dependent variable. The independent variable in this study is the students' perception on the physical education learning process using the 2013 and KTSP curricula, while the dependent variable in this study is physical education physical education learning process using the 2013 and KTSP curricula.

The population is the whole subjects of research to be examined (Suharsini Arikunto, 2006). The population in this study consists of grade IX students of junior high schools in Wonosobo regency who took part in physical education learning using KTSP and 2013 curricula. Samples are parties or representatives of the entire population to be studied (Suharsini Arikunto, 2006). Then, the samples of this study were randomly selected using random sampling system. They consist of four different

junior high schools' students totally 120 students (30 students from each school). The four selected schools were SMP Negeri 1 Wonosobo, SMP Negeri 2 Selomerto, SMP Negeri 3 Kalikajar, and SMP Negeri 4 Kertek. Participants in the study followed the rules throughout the study, which is completing the questionnaire provided without any guidance or assistance from the researcher. Learners also fill in their personal data including the place and date of birth, gender, class, and school of origin.

The variables in this study consisted of two types namely the independent variable and the dependent variable. The independent variable in this study is the students' perception on the physical education learning process using the 2013 and KTSP curricula, while the dependent variable in this study is physical education physical education learning process using the 2013 and KTSP curricula.

This study uses a questionnaire instrument consisting of 20 questions whose answers begin by the words always, often, rarely, and never.

2.1 Data Collection

This study uses an instrument in the form of a questionnaire consisting of 20 questions about how teachers open physical education lessons, give materials, provide motivation for students, apply teaching methods, and manage learning time allocation. The assessment on the questionnaire ranges from 1 (never), 2 (rarely), 3 (often), and 4 (always).

The data in this study were collected through questionnaires given to the ninth grade students of SMPN 1 Wonosobo, SMPN 2 Selomerto, SMPN 3 Kalikajar, and SMPN 4 Kertek. The students were given an understanding to answer the questions truthfully without any intervention from any party. Each student was given thirty minutes to complete the given questionnaire.

2.2 Data Analysis

The data of this research were analyzed using quantitative descriptive analysis and then input to the SPSS application of independent sample t test. The independent sample t test is a comparative test or different test to find out whether there are differences in the values of the samples that have been studied. The steps include collecting and inputting the obtained data from the students' questionnaires, grouping the results of the students' questionnaires who take part physical education learning process using KTSP and 2013 curricula,

doing calculations in the SPSS application to find out differences in students' perception values, and describing the results of the numbers from the SPSS application to describe them.

2.3 Research Result

From the results of questionnaires which have been distributed to 120 students consisting of 60 students who attend schools using the KTSP curriculum and 60 students who attend school using the K13 curriculum, the results obtained are mean of 60.73; median of 60; mode of 56; Standard Deviation of 5.545; maximum score of 75; minimum score of 47.

Table 1: The Average Value of the Students' Perceptions.

No.	Question	Average Value on 2013 Curriculum	Average Value on KTSP Curriculum
1	No. 1	3,65	3,16
2	No. 2	3,56	3,26
3	No. 3	3,36	2,63
4	No. 4	3,58	3,25
5	No. 5	3,60	2,96
6	No. 6	3,30	3,28
7	No. 7	2,93	2,75
8	No. 8	2,40	1,75
9	No. 9	3,23	2,95
10	No. 10	2,80	1,81
11	No. 11	3,58	2,91
12	No. 12	3,63	2,96
13	No. 13	3,55	3,15
14	No. 14	3,28	3,31
15	No. 15	3,41	3,25
16	No. 16	3,41	3,30
17	No. 17	3,23	3,30
18	No. 18	3,18	3,18
19	No. 19	3,40	2,21
20	No. 20	3,30	3,18

From the table above, it can be seen that the K13 curriculum tends to be better. The average value is higher than another one.

Table 2: The average score and the criteria of the answer for question no. 1.

Students' perception on 2013 curriculum	Criteria	Students' perception on KTSP curriculum	Criteria
3,65	always	3,16	often

The average score of the students' perception on the teachers when giving examples of movements in the 2013 curriculum is 3.65 indicating that teachers always provide examples of movements. Meanwhile, their perception on the teachers in the KTSP curriculum scores 3.16 showing that the teachers often show examples of movements.

Table 3: The average score and the criteria of the answer for question no. 2.

Students' perception on 2013 curriculum	Criteria	Students' perception on KTSP curriculum	Criteria
3,56	always	3,26	often

The average score of the students' perception on the teachers about providing motivation to students in the 2013 curriculum is 3.56 indicating that the teachers always provide motivation to students. Meanwhile, their perception on the teachers in the KTSP curriculum scores 3.26 showing that the teachers often provide motivation to students.

Table 4: The average score and the criteria of the answer for question no. 3.

Students' perception on 2013 curriculum	Criteria	Students' perception on KTSP curriculum	Criteria
3,36	often	2,63	rarely

The average score of the students' perception on the teachers about paying attention to differences in students' interest in the 2013 curriculum is 3.36 indicating that the teachers often pay attention to differences in students' interests. Meanwhile, their perception on the teachers in the KTSP curriculum scores 2.63 showing that the teachers rarely see differences in students' interests.

Table 5: The average score and the criteria of the answer for question no. 4.

Students' perception on 2013 curriculum	Criteria	Students' perception on KTSP curriculum	Criteria
3,58	always	3,25	often

The average score of the students' perception on the teachers about telling the learning objective to the students in the 2013 curriculum is 3.58 indicating that the teachers always tell the learning objectives to be done. Meanwhile, their perception on the teachers in the KTSP curriculum scores 3.25 showing that the teachers often tell the purpose of learning.

Table 6: The average score and the criteria of the answer for question no. 5.

Students' perception on 2013 curriculum	Criteria	Students' perception on KTSP curriculum	Criteria
3,60	always	2,96	often

The average score of the students' perception on the teachers about conveying the steps of learning in the 2013 curriculum is 3.60 meaning that the teachers always explain the steps of learning. In another way, their perception on the teachers in the KTSP curriculum scores 2.96 indicating that the teachers rarely explain the steps of learning to the students.

Table 7: The average score and the criteria of the answer for question no. 6.

Students' perception on 2013 curriculum	Criteria	Students' perception on KTSP curriculum	Criteria
3,30	Often	3,28	Often

The average score of the students' perception on the teachers about reminding the subject matter of learning material in the 2013 curriculum is 3.60 whereas in KTSP curriculum is 3.28. This indicates that the teachers in both curricula often remind the subject matter of learning. However, the ones in the 2013 curriculum score better.

Table 8: The average score and the criteria of the answer for question no. 7.

Students' perception on 2013 curriculum	Criteria	Students' perception on KTSP curriculum	Criteria
2,93	often	2,75	often

The average score of the students' perception on the teachers about giving questions to the students in the 2013 curriculum is 2.93 whereas in KTSP curriculum is 2.75. This indicates that the teachers in both curricula rarely give questions to the students. However, the ones in the 2013 curriculum score better.

Table 9: The average score and the criteria of the answer for question no. 8.

Students' perception on 2013 curriculum	Criteria	Students' perception on KTSP curriculum	Criteria
2,40	Rarely	1,75	Rarely

The average score of the students' perception on the teachers about using instructional media in the 2013 curriculum is 2.40 whereas in KTSP curriculum is 1.75. This indicates that the teachers in both curricula rarely use instructional media for teaching and learning process. However, the ones in the 2013 curriculum score better.

Table 10: The average score and the criteria of the answer for question no. 9.

Students' perception on 2013 curriculum	Criteria	Students' perception on KTSP curriculum	Criteria
3,23	often	2,93	rarely

The score 3.23 for the 2013 curriculum in this point indicates that the teachers often link the students' background knowledge on the old materials to the new ones. Meanwhile, the teachers rarely do so in the KTSP curriculum proven by its score 2.93.

Table 11: The average score and the criteria of the answer for question no. 10.

Students' perception on 2013 curriculum	Criteria	Students' perception on KTSP curriculum	Criteria
2,80	often	1,81	rarely

The question number ten refers to the willingness of the teachers to associate physical education learning materials to the other learning materials. For 2013 curriculum, the average score is 2.80 indicating that the teachers often associate physical education learning materials to the other learning materials. On the other hand, in the KTSP curriculum, the teachers rarely do so. It can be seen from its score 1.81.

Table 12: The average score and the criteria of the answer for question no. 11.

Students' perception on 2013 curriculum	Criteria	Students' perception on KTSP curriculum	Criteria
3,58	always	2,91	often

The question number eleven refers to the willingness of the teachers to give freedom to the students. For 2013 curriculum, the average score is 3.58 showing that the teachers always give freedom to the students. On the other hand, in the KTSP curriculum, the teachers often do so. It can be seen from its score 2.91.

Table 13: The average score and the criteria of the answer for question no. 12.

Students' perception on 2013 curriculum	Criteria	Students' perception on KTSP curriculum	Criteria
3,63	always	2,96	often

The score 3.63 for the 2013 curriculum in this point indicates that the teachers always use certain learning methods in delivering materials to the students. Meanwhile, the teachers often use the methods too in the KTSP curriculum proven by its score 2.96.

Table 14: The average score and the criteria of the answer for question no. 13.

Students' perception on 2013 curriculum	Criteria	Students' perception on KTSP curriculum	Criteria
3,55	always	3,15	often

By this point, it can be seen that in the 2013 curriculum, the teachers always play the roles as facilitators not the center of the learning. This conclusion is drawn by score 3.55. Meanwhile, the

score 3.15 for the KTSP curriculum indicates that the teachers often play the roles as learning facilitators, but sometimes sometime still as the center of learning.

Table 15: The average score and the criteria of the answer for question no. 14.

Students' perception on 2013 curriculum	Criteria	Students' perception on KTSP curriculum	Criteria
3,28	often	3,31	often

The average score of the students' perception on the teachers about modifying learning activities in the 2013 curriculum is 3.28 whereas in KTSP curriculum is 3.31. This indicates that the teachers in both curricula often modify the learning activities i.e. by employing some games. However, the ones in the KTSP curriculum score better.

Table 16: The average score and the criteria of the answer for question no. 15.

Students' perception on 2013 curriculum	Criteria	Students' perception on KTSP curriculum	Criteria
3,41	often	3,25	often

The average score of the students' perception on the teachers about adjusting the learning materials to the students' basic ability in the 2013 curriculum is 3.41 whereas in KTSP curriculum is 3.25. This indicates that the teachers in both curricula often adjust the materials to the ability of the students. However, the ones in the 2013 curriculum score better.

Table 17: The average score and the criteria of the answer for question no. 16.

Students'	Criteria	Students'	Criteria
-----------	----------	-----------	----------

perception on 2013 curriculum		perception on KTSP curriculum	
3,41	often	3,30	often

The average score of the students' perception on the teachers about giving emphasis and repetition for the learning materials in the 2013 curriculum is 3.41 whereas in KTSP curriculum is 3.30. This indicates that the teachers in both curricula equally often emphasize and repeat the learning materials. However, the ones in the 2013 curriculum score better.

Table 18: The average score and the criteria of the answer for question no. 17.

Students' perception on 2013 curriculum	Criteria	Students' perception on KTSP curriculum	Criteria
3,23	often	3,30	often

The average score of the students' perception on the teachers about giving appreciation to the students in the 2013 curriculum is 3.23 whereas in KTSP curriculum is 3.30. This indicates that the teachers in both curricula often give appreciation to the students. However, the ones in the KTSP curriculum score better

Table 19: The average score and the criteria of the answer for question no. 18.

Students' perception on 2013 curriculum	Criteria	Students' perception on KTSP curriculum	Criteria
3,40	often	2,10	rarely

There is a significance difference between the students' perception on the 2013 curriculum and the KTSP one regarding the assignments given by the teachers. The score 3.40 in the 2013 curriculum indicates that the teachers often give assignments to the students. Meanwhile, the teachers rarely do so in the KTSP curriculum shown by its score 2.10.

Table 20: average score and the criteria of the answer for question no. 20.

Students' perception on 2013 curriculum	Criteria	Students' perception on KTSP curriculum	Criteria
3,30	often	3,18	often

The average score of the students' perception on the teachers about managing the learning time allocation is 3.30 whereas in KTSP curriculum is 3.18. This indicates that the teachers in both curricula often manage the learning time well. However, the ones in the 2013 curriculum score better.

3 DISCUSSION

Based on the data analysis above, it can be seen that physical education learning using the 2013 curriculum is better than physical education learning using the KTSP curriculum according to the perceptions of the appointed students. The followings are the influencing factors: (1) Learning materials, Learning materials given in the KTSP curriculum are mostly not related to the students' daily life and other learning materials. On the other hand, in K13 curriculum, the provided learning materials are more varied because they relate to other learning materials. In addition, they are also provided thematically; (2) Time Management, Proper time management is key to success in learning (K, B, Nadinloyi: 2013). In the KTSP curriculum the time allocation given is only 2 learning periods. This greatly affects the teaching and learning process. Whereas in the K13 curriculum the given time allocation is 3 learning periods, so that learning process takes place more effectively. Added to this, good time management will help someone to maximize the activities to be carried out (S, A, Malkoc: 2019); (3) Learning methods, Learning methods used by teachers must be adapted to the conditions and characteristics of the students (Y, Li: 2019). In the KTSP curriculum, the learning given uses the teacher-centered method so that if the teachers do not deliver the learning materials effectively, the students will not understand the material well. The learning process in 2013 curriculum uses a scientific and student-centered method, so that the students are more active in learning and the learning materials can be delivered in effective ways. Researchers (N, A, M, Mokmin: 2015) have proven that students learn best when there is a personalization in learning; (4) Giving Motivation, The research shown that students' learning motivation will affect on the students' learning outcomes. In the KTSP curriculum the teachers do not seem to motivate students to increase their motivation and interest in learning (M, V, Harsel 2019). Whereas in the K13 curriculum learning process is more manageable and

giving motivation becomes an important part so that students are more interested in the materials provided by the teachers. Providing motivation during the learning process greatly affects the learning interest of students (L, Harvey, 2017).

To achieve a good, effective, and efficient learning process in accordance with the objectives of national education there are several factors, namely the factors of learning goals, teachers, students, teaching activities, materials and evaluation tools, facilities and infrastructures, and school environment. Teacher delivery methods are also one of the factors in the success of physical education learning in schools (Forey, G, 2019).

The first factor is learning goals. The goal here is the target to be achieved in teaching and learning activities. Learning objectives are a description of abilities or competencies students will have after joining the learning process. Learning objectives are usually found in the lesson plans which have been made by the teachers. In those lesson plans, it is also explained to achieve the objective, the process should be carried out through learning activities created and planned by the teachers too. The purpose of a learning material is always related to the overall learning objectives. The purpose of learning is the main key to how learning will be implemented (M, Lee, 2019)

The optimal learning outcomes, learning objectives must be made and studied in such a way that they are very specific (Arikunto 2008). However, the fact shows that many teachers only copy the learning objectives from other teachers. Therefore, the purpose of education is very difficult to achieve, because learning objectives are specific and cannot be equated for each school.

The second factor is related to educators or teachers. A teacher is a professional teaching staff whose job is to educate, train, teach, guide, and evaluate students (Law No.14 of 2003). Apart from the above assignments, teachers must be able to become a role model for students. Teachers are professionals who are experienced in the scientific field they are engaged in. With the knowledge and abilities possessed, teachers are expected to be able to make students knowledgeable and have good personalities. In addition to the obligation of teachers to educate students and form students' good personalities, good teachers are able to transfer knowledge and transfer value. The education level of the teacher is a learning success factor (E, H, Kwon, 2017).

The next factor is related to students. Students are the ones who intentionally learn at school by

following a predetermined administrative procedure. The characteristics of students are very different. There are those who are quiet, jovial, talkative, actively creative, and they have different intelligence. Each student has a favorite subject (Z, Chen, 2019). Usually students have subjects that are liked and disliked. This will greatly affect the learning outcomes achieved by students. The lack of students in each class will also influence a success in learning. Students have different characteristics and motivation to learn, and it is not possible for all students to like physical education (L, Y, Li, 2017). The teacher must have a strategy in order to optimize the abilities of the students.

The fourth factor is about teaching activities. The success of learning is also strongly influenced by learning activities. Good teachers usually have learning strategies and methods, so that the learning process will be attractive and make students enthusiastic about the learning materials provided by the teacher. Many teachers nowadays do not master good teaching methods and teaching strategies. In fact, they only provide one-way learning or using command methods, so students are not given the opportunity to be active in the learning process. In the 2013 curriculum, the teachers are expected to be facilitators of learning not as the center of learning. The center of learning in the 2013 curriculum is the students.

The fifth factor is about materials and evaluation tools. The evaluation in learning will greatly influence the achievement of the students. To get a good evaluation tool, it must contain the principles of being comprehensive, comparative, continuous, objective, based on valid criteria, and functional. In the KTSP curriculum, the learning evaluation is seen from the final results obtained by students not the process that has been undertaken by students. In the 2013 curriculum, the evaluation and assessment are based on three aspects, namely attitudes, knowledge, and skills. In physical education learning, the assessment is more on the aspect of skills, but in the 2013 curriculum the assessment is not oriented towards the final results of the students but the progress or process experienced by students.

The next factor is about facilities and infrastructure. Learning facilities and infrastructure are very important in achieving learning objectives. Adequate facilities and standard infrastructure will make the teaching and learning process effective and will make students more enthusiastic and motivated to take part in learning. The reality in the field is that there are still many schools lacking in infrastructure.

The teacher is expected to be able to optimize the infrastructure available even if it is not in accordance with the prescribed standards. Many teachers who are creative make learning fun even though using makeshift facilities and infrastructure, but there are still many teachers who cannot maximize existing infrastructure in schools.

The seventh last factor is the school environment. A conducive school environment will lead to the achievement of educational goals and the success of national education. The school environment is considered conducive based on whether or not the school atmosphere supports to organize the teaching and learning process, the habits of teachers and students in schools, and the community around the school.

All the factors above are closely related to the implementation of learning process to achieve educational goals. Teachers must pay attention to the factors which influence the success of learning and learning objectives. Success in learning does not come by itself but with careful planning and alignment between schools, students, teachers, and parents of students. All of them will be very influential in achieving learning goals and overall educational goals

4 CONCLUSION

Based on this research, it can be concluded that physical education learning using the K13 curriculum is more effective because of several factors. In this curriculum, the teachers master the materials more; the learning process is carried out adjusting to other learning; more time allocation is provided, teachers play the roles of facilitators; and teaching media are used properly and effectively.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author would like to thank all the coaches of some martial arts college in West Kalimantan involved and contribute to this preliminary study. The authors also thank the faculty and the students of sports science at the Graduate Program, Yogyakarta State University

REFERENCES

- Akdemir, E., Karameşe, E. N., & Arslan, A., 2015. *Descriptive Analysis of Researches on Curriculum Development in Education. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 174, 3199–3203.
- Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2006. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*, Rineka Cipta, Jakarta
- Arikunto, Suharsimi., dkk. 2008. *Penelitian Tindakan Kelas*. Bumi Aksara, Jakarta
- Chen, Z., * Liu, Y., 2019. The different style of lifelong in China and the USA based on influencing motivations and factors. *International Journal of Educational Research*. 95, 13-25.
- Fadlillah, M., 2014. *Implementasi Kurikulum 2013 Dalam Pembelajaran SD/MI, SMP/MTS, dan SMA/MA*, Ar-Ruzz Media, Yogyakarta.
- Forey, G., & Cheung, L. M. E., 2019. *The benefits of explicit teaching of language for curriculum learning in the physical education classroom. English for Specific Purposes*, 54, 91–109.
- Haris, A., & Ghazali, M. I., 2016. Implementation of teacher learning in physical education curriculum at the junior school in makassar, Indonesia. *Journal of Physical Education and Sport*, 16(1), 683–687.
- Harsel, M. L., & Hoogerheide, V., 2019. *Effects of Different Sequences of Examples and Problems on Motivation and Learning. Contemporary Educational Psychology*. 58, 260-275.
- Harvey, L., 2017. *Language learning motivation as ideological becoming. System*, 65, 69–77.
- Kwon, E. H., & Block, M. E., 2017. Implementing the adapted physical education E-learning program into physical education teacher education program. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 69, 18–29.
- Lee, M., & Bong, M., 2019. *Relevance of Goal Theories to Language Learning Research. System*, 102122.
- Li, L.-Y., & Tsai, C.-C., 2017. *Assessing online learning material: Quantitative behavior patterns and their effects on motivation and learning performance. Computers & Education*, 114, 286–297.
- Li, Y., Zhang, T., Sun, S., & Gao, X., 2019. *Accelerating flash calculation through deep learning methods. Journal of Computational Physics*.
- Malkoc, S. A., & Tonietto, G. N. , 2019. *Activity versus outcome maximization in time management. Current Opinion in Psychology*, 26, 49–53.
- Mokmin, N. A. M., & Masood, M., 2015. *The Development of Self-Expressive Learning Material for Algebra Learning: An Inductive Learning Strategy. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 197, 1847–1852.
- Mulyasa, E., 2007. *Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan Sebuah Panduan Praktis*, PT Remaja Rosdakarya, Bandung.
- Nadinloyi, K. B., Hajloo, N., Garamaleki, N. S., & Sadeghi, H., 2013. *The Study Efficacy of Time Management Training on Increase Academic Time*

- Management of Students. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 84, 134–138.
- Packham, A., & Street, B., 2019. *The Effects of Physical Education on Student Fitness, Achievement, and Behavior. Economics of Education Review*.
- Patall, E.A., Cooper, H., & Wynn, S.R., 2010. The effectiveness and relative importance of choice in the classroom. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102, 896–915.
- Republik Indonesia., 2003. *Undang-Undang No.14 Tahun 2003 tentang Martabat Guru dan Dosen*: Lembaran Negara RI Tahun 2003, No. 14. Sekretariat Negara. Jakarta.
- Republik Indonesia., 2003. *Undang-Undang No.20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional*: Lembaran Negara RI Tahun 2003, No. 20. Sekretariat Negara. Jakarta.
- Roth McDuffie, A., Choppin, J., Drake, C., & Davis, J. , 2018. *Middle school mathematics teachers' orientations and noticing of features of mathematics curriculum materials. International Journal of Educational Research*.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L., 2000. Self determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68-78.
- Stefanou, C.R., Perencevich, K.C., DiCintio, M., & Turner, J.C., 2004. Supporting autonomy in the classroom: Ways teachers encourage student decision making and ownership. *Educational Psychologist*, 39, 97–110.
- Suat, Capuk., 2015. *ICT Integration Models Into Middle And High School Curriculum in The USA. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*.191. 1218-1224.
- Xiang, P., Gao, Z., & McBride, R.E., 2011. Student teachers use of instructional choic in physical education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 82, 482–490.