Original Research Article

THE EFFECT OF TEACHING PERSONAL AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (TPSR) AND TEACHING GAMES FOR UNDERSTANDING (TGFU) MODELS WITH SELF-EFFICACY ON LEARNING OUTCOMES OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION, SPORTS, AND HEALTH

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the differences in the effect of the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (TPSR) and Teaching Games for Understanding (TGfU) Models with Self-Efficacy on Learning Outcomes of Physical Education, Sports, and Health. This study used an experimental method which was carried out at UPT SMA Negeri 4 Parepare, during the planned period, namely November to December 2022. The experimental method in this study was carried out on two existing student groups without changing the composition, while the research design used is factorial 2x2. The research sample was selected from UPT SMA Negeri 4 Parepare students in class X, class XI, and class XII for the 2021/2022 academic year. The material that will be taught during the experiment is volleyball game material. Collecting data in this study using questionnaires and tests. The data obtained is described according to each variable. The technique used to analyze the research data was a two-way analysis of variance (ANAVA) at the significant levels a = 0.05 and a = 0.01. The research results show that; (1) The group of students taught with the TGfU learning model has a higher average score than the group of students taught with the TPSR model, (2) There is no interaction between self-Efficacy variables and learning outcomes and learning models and (3) There is a significant difference the average score of student learning outcomes taught by the TGfU model with the TPSR model.

Keywords: Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (TPSR) Model, Teaching Games for Understanding (TGfU), Self-Efficacy, Learning Outcomes

INTRODUCTION

Education is one of the most important things to create quality human resources, smart and able to compete and can improve the welfare of Indonesian citizens. With education, humans can gain useful knowledge to develop their potential. This is in line with

SISDIKNAS Law No. 20 Article 1 Paragraph 1, (2003): "Education is a conscious and planned effort to create a learning atmosphere and learning process so that students actively develop their potential to have religious spiritual strength, self-control, personality, intelligence, noble character, and skills what he, society, nation and state need.

Physical education is an integral part of education as a whole as defined above. Therefore, physical education aims to develop aspects of physical fitness, movement skills, critical thinking skills, social skills, reasoning, emotional stability, moral action, healthy lifestyles and the introduction of a clean environment through selected physical activities that are planned systematically in order to achieve the goal. education (CDC, 2000; Disman, 1990; Pate and Trost, 1998). In line with the educational goals above, Johnson, T., & Turner, L., (2016) argues that Physical Education is an educational process that utilizes physical activity, healthy lifestyles, and character integration implemented in everyday life.

Physical education is a field of study/subjects that are in the curriculum and are presented in schools, starting from Elementary School (SD) to High School (SMA) and even Higher Education. Physical education materials are divided into two groups, namely subject matter and optional material. The subject matter is a subject that must be taught based on the applicable curriculum. While the selected material is sports activities outside of school hours in the form of sports extracurricular activities. In the Merdeka Curriculum, by studying physical, sports and health education for primary and secondary education levels students can:

1. Develop awareness of the importance of physical activity to achieve individual growth and development, as well as an active lifelong lifestyle.
2. Develop self-management knowledge and skills in an effort to improve and maintain physical fitness, personal well-being, and healthy lifestyle patterns.
3. Develop basic movement patterns (fundamental movement patterns) and movement skills (motor skills) based on the application of general concepts, principles, strategies and tactics.
4. Laying a strong foundation of moral character through internalizing the values of self-confidence, sportsmanship, honesty, discipline, responsibility, cooperation, self-control, leadership and democracy in carrying out physical activities.
5. Creating a recreational atmosphere that contains joy, social interaction, challenges, and self-expression.

6. Developing Pancasila Student Profiles who have faith and fear of God Almighty, are creative, work together, have global diversity, think critically, and are independent through physical activities. (https://bertema.com/download-struktur-kurikulum-sma-merdeka-belajar)

It is hoped that the goals of physical education are not just physical achievements, but to develop the personality as a whole, including physical, mental, emotional, intellectual, social, moral and aesthetic aspects. Besides that, the positive influence of physical education is expected to be able to ideally support the affective, cognitive, and psychomotor development of students.

Besides that, Shields & Bredemeier (1995) stated that physical education can be a good catalyst for moral growth as well as for psychosocial development. This is stated in Permendiknas No.22 of 2006 Concerning Content Standards, that Physical Education, Sports and Health are media to encourage physical growth, psychological development, motor skills, knowledge and reasoning, appreciation of values (Attitude-Mental-Emotional-Sportsmanship-Spiritual-Social), as well as habituation to a healthy lifestyle which aims to stimulate the growth and development of balanced physical and psychological qualities.

The main problem with physical education in Indonesia today is the ineffectiveness of teaching physical education in schools, starting at the elementary school level and even up to the high school level. Where the quality of teaching physical education is of concern, this is caused by several factors, including the limited ability of physical education teachers and the limited resources used to support the process of teaching physical education, facilities and infrastructure, as well as supporting tools and media for teaching physical education to children (Soedijarto 1993; Toho Cholik Mutohir, 2019).

Another problem is that the quality of physical education teachers in secondary schools is generally inadequate. This is because the teaching methods and styles used by teachers in physical education practice are still less varied and tend to be centered on the teacher (teacher centered) where students carry out physical exercises/movement activities based on orders determined by the teacher (Metzler, 2005; Butler & McCahan 2005). In physical education learning there are those who use conventional methods and demonstration methods, where the demonstration method does not stimulate students to explore material received. Conditions like this result in a less than optimal function of teaching physical education as an educational medium in the context of developing the child's whole personality and not in accordance with the characteristics of elementary school-age children, where most of them tend to like to play. This is in line with the findings contained in the

Penjasorkes Academic Paper (2007), which says that; "All-motor behavior, does not include cognitive-reflective, socio-motor and affective elements in its scope, oriented towards a curriculum model that emphasizes mastery of basic techniques and sports skills. In terms of implementation, the following can be found; there is no visible enrichment of approaches, styles, methods, models and learning strategies. The learning process is no longer nurturing and teaching assignments are no longer based on Developmentally Appropriate Practices (DAP) ".

Learning physical education (hereinafter abbreviated as PE) has the goal of developing and providing as many opportunities as possible for students to be directly involved in the learning process both cognitively, affectively and psychomotorically. Physical education is a learning process that involves various elements of knowledge about various values and also various skills. There are still many problems that occur in society and among students, one of which is juvenile delinquency. This is due to the existence of learning that adheres to the dichotomy principle of separating the physical and spiritual. Suherman (2009:4) states, "This view of the human dichotomy empirically creates misunderstandings in formulating goals, implementing programs, and evaluating physical education." The reality on the ground still shows that the implementation of physical education still leads to strengthening the body, increasing physical skills, and only physical abilities. Thus it can be said that physical education learning has not succeeded in realizing education as a whole.Untuk mengatasi persoalan pendidikan jasmani, yang dalam pelaksanaannya kurang efektif dan hanya mengarah pada aspek psikomotorik semata serta mengabaikan pengembangan afektif dan kognitif (Kirk, D., & MacPhail A., 2002; Kirk, 2014; Barker, 2010).

So it is deemed necessary to create an educative and interesting physical education learning environment, so that it is fully capable of developing the affective, cognitive, and psychomotor aspects of students who are able to optimize students' learning interest in accordance with the goals to be achieved.

In learning physical education there is a specific learning model that can be used to develop personal responsibility, interaction and changes in social behavior. This model is the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (TPSR) model. This model has specific goals that emphasize personal development and student responsibility. The learning approach is more student-centered oriented, namely self-actualization and social reconstruction.

The Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (TPSR) model is a model designed by Hellison (1985, 2003, 2011) as an alternative approach to physical activity programs

whose purpose is to teach personal and social responsibility to students who are often placed at risk of social conditions such as poverty. , violence, drugs and family problems. The TPSR model has been applied in various classes in primary and secondary education, and in different contexts, during physical education classes as part of the academic curriculum and in extra-school sport and day-long programs (Hellison & Martinek, 2006).

The TPSR model-based program suggests five levels of responsibility as follows: (1) respecting the rights and feelings of others; (2) effort and cooperation; (3) self-direction; (4) helping others and leadership; and (5) transfer outside the gym (Hellison, 2011). The five levels/levels have the following objectives; The aim of the first level is for students to learn empathy, self-control, and the ability to resolve conflicts peacefully. The aim of the second level is to develop the intrinsic motivation and interest in getting the job done well. At the third level, students are encouraged to manage their time, plan their own learning, and set short-term and long-term goals for themselves. The fourth level teaches students to help others and to be sensitive and responsive. At the fifth level, students are encouraged to apply their learning to different contexts. (Hellison, 2011).

In reaching the level above, the TPSR learning model has strategies that must be carried out, namely: 1) Counseling time, which is given to students to consult when experiencing difficulties. 2) Awareness talk, is an opportunity to remind students about their responsibilities. 3) The Lesson (learning), is the integration of the level of responsibility into learning physical education. 4) Group meeting (group meeting), is a short group meeting near the end of class so that students can express their opinions about how the class is running smoothly and how to make improvements. 5) Reflection time, closing the class with students and evaluating their personal and social responsibilities that day. (Hellison, 2003)

As proof of the effectiveness of the TPSR model, research has been carried out by Escarti, A., Gutierrez, M., Pascual, C., & Llopis, R. (2010), entitled Implementation of the Personal and Social Responsibility Model to Improve Self-Efficacy during Physical Education Classes for Primary School Children, where the participants in this study numbered 42 students aged between 11 and 12 years in Spain. The results of this study indicate that the TPSR model is an effective teaching instrument and helps teachers organize classes and promotes responsible learning by students.

Furthermore, Escarti, A., Gutierrez, M., Pascual, C., & Marin, D. (2010) again conducted a study entitled; 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, which in this study involved 30 students aged 13-14 years,

consisting of 23 boys and 7 girls. Then for the intervention group 12 male students and 3 female students, as well as the comparison group 11 male students and 4 female students. The results of the quantitative study showed a significant increase in students' Self-Efficacy for obtaining social resources and Self-Efficacy for independent learning. The qualitative results indicated an increase in participants' responsible behavior in the intervention group.

The conclusion from this research is that the TPSR model is an effective teaching instrument and helps teachers to organize classes and promotes responsible learning by students. This suggests that TPSR can be effective in enhancing the psychological and social development of at-risk students, and that physical education classes can be an appropriate arena for work. Besides that, TPSR is also a character building strategy that not only has implications for increasing student responsibility, but is able to create effective and conducive learning.

Furthermore, this research examines the increase in Self-Efficacy after being given treatment with the Teaching Games for Understanding (TGfU) learning model. The TGfU model is a comparison model for the TPSR model to ensure the results obtained. Teaching Games for Understanding (TGfU) was first introduced in 1982 by David Bunker and Rod Thorpe (Light, 2002) at Loughborough University in England (Mandigo, J., Butler, J., & Hopper, T. 2007; Kirk, D ., & MacPhail, A. 2002). TGfU is a learning center (Griffin, L.L, & Butler, J.I. 2005), a game-focused approach to teaching physical education and sports that can be used both in school settings and in extracurricular sports settings (Harvey, S., & Jarrett, K. 2014).

TGfU places an emphasis on students/players participating in the game to ensure that their needs are met, both instructionally and preparing an appropriate environment through modifying the adult version of the game to a game that is more appropriate for children, so that they can participate formally into the the game (Guadagnoli, M. A., & Lee, T. D. 2004; Sproule et al., 2011; Light, 2002a). TGfU as a tool for conceptualizing games teaching and learning. Game learning approaches prioritize the role of the teacher as a facilitator and the role of students to be active and involved in the learning process (Michael, 2011).

In TGfU learning follows the six steps as suggested by Bunker and Thorpe in 1982, which include; (1) Game, (2) Game Appreciation, (3) Tactical Awareness, (4) Making Appropriate Decisions, (5) Skill Execution, and (6) Performance (Werner et al., 1996; Kirk & MacPhail, 2002; Mandigo et al., 2007).

The results of Gubacs-Collins' research (2007) entitled; Implementing a tactical approach through action research, involving 18 pre-service departments at PETE, 10 women and 8 men ranging from freshmen to seniors. shows that the TGfU learning model can help students develop Self-Efficacy in their skills and decision making.

The results of Robertson, S.'s research (2016) entitled; Investigating the Relationship between Teaching Games for Understanding and High School Physical Education Students' Enjoyment, Self-Efficacy, and Intentions to Enrol, involving 3 ninth grade physical education teachers and 71 ninth grade students in a western Ontario school, shows that there is a relationship between TGfU and pleasure, Self-Efficacy, between pleasure and participation in sport or physical activity. The conclusion from this research is that the TGfU learning model can help students develop Self-Efficacy in their skills and decision making. In addition, the TGfU learning model relates to fun, self-efficacy, and participation in sports or physical activity.

In addition to the two physical education learning models described above, it is no less important that the teacher must pay attention in the teaching and learning process is Self-Efficacy. Bandura (Feist & Feist, 2010) Self-Efficacy is a belief in influencing the actions chosen to be taken, and trying their best so that they can survive obstacles and failures, as well as resilience when facing setbacks.

According to Bandura (1997), Self-Efficacy is built by four main sources, namely: 1) experience of mastering something. Successful experiences build strong beliefs in one's Self-Efficacy. 2) social modeling. Self-Efficacy increases when we observe the achievements of others who have equal competence. 3) social persuasion. Words of persuasion from others can increase or decrease Self-Efficacy. 4) physiological and emotional conditions. The physiological and emotional states of each person are part of assessing deficiencies, strengths, traits and vulnerability to impaired functioning (especially with regard to physical condition).

Physical education has been an integral part of the curriculum for more than 100 years. Although the focus over the last century has changed, the main goal has remained relatively constant, namely to give someone the knowledge, skills, abilities, attitudes and confidence (Sallis et al., 2018). The main goal of various forms of physical education activities is not only the development of the psychomotor domain alone, but education as a whole which includes character, moral, cognitive, mental, spiritual, social and psychomotor development. Therefore, to achieve the goals of physical education as a whole, the role of a teacher is very important in determining and implementing appropriate learning models and according to the current needs of students. Therefore, the researcher chose the TPSR and

TGFU learning models to increase Self-Efficacy and student learning outcomes at UPT SMA Negeri 4 Parepare. The researcher found that some students still had low self-confidence, this was of particular concern to researchers as teachers of physical education subjects, for example, it was found that a student lacked enthusiasm to practice the material being taught because he considered himself unable/successful in practicing the material, there were even students who felt lack of confidence/ashamed to move Another problem that was found was that the behavior of students when participating in learning was less enthusiastic and less serious. During the lesson, there were some students who still paid little attention to the instructions from the teacher, and there were even students who sat and chatted with their friends. Teachers are required to be able to package learning materials in the form of effective and efficient learning media according to the characteristics and provisions of the applicable curriculum, so that students are interested in participating in the learning provided by the teacher. Existing phenomena, by searching several journals, researchers found that Self-Efficacy can contribute to improving student learning outcomes by providing intervention learning models, namely the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (TPSR) and Teaching Game for Understanding (TGfU) models.

Overcoming this problem, it is necessary to apply a learning model that can increase student responsibility. The TPSR model makes students successful individuals in their social environment by having to learn to be responsible for themselves and others by incorporating strategies that allow them to exercise control over their lives. (Escartí, Gutiérrez, Pascual, and Marín. 2010)

Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (TPSR) built by Hellison (1985), individuals who have responsibility are individuals who have a desire to learn something new, can learn or work independently, create and carry out programs that are made to improve self-quality.

Research conducted by Escarti, et.al. (2010) that with the TPSR model teachers learn to use teaching strategies which are indicated to increase Self-Efficacy, (with peer modeling, giving freedom of opinion to students, providing feedback on their performances, encouraging independence and strengthening their efforts to achieve objective). As well as the results of research by Gubacs-Collins (2007) & Robertson, S. (2016) stating that the TGfU learning model can help students develop Self-Efficacy in their skills and decision-making, and the TGfU learning model is related to fun, Self-Efficacy, and participation in sports or physical activity.

Based on this phenomenon, it is an empirical study for the author as a teacher of physical education, sports and health subjects at UPT SMA Negeri 4 Parepare for the 2020/2021 academic year, by observing class XII students it shows that the quality of Self-Efficacy and physical education learning outcomes This is concerning, this is caused by several factors, including the limited ability of students to understand the substance of physical education and sports education material, even though they are actually different, so students seem to be waiting for instructions.

Another factor is the emergence of a lack of confidence by some students when teaching materials require students to practice them personally. The teaching material is contained within the scope of Physical Education, Sports and Health.

In addition to the TPSR approach, a learning model approach that can demonstrate the movement process properly and properly in accordance with the demands of the curriculum is Teaching Games for Understanding (TGfU). Physical education learning with the TGfU (Teaching Games for Understanding) approach can be used as an effort so that students can be enthusiastic and actively participate in physical education learning. TGfU in PE focuses on teaching students tactical understanding before dealing with skill performance, thus TGfU offers a tactical approach to teaching performance in playing skills in PE. This implies that the experience of playing games to approach teaching game tactics to skills. The tactic approach to learning emphasizes the role of the physical education teacher as a facilitator and the role of students to be active and involved in the learning process. The TGfU approach is a game tactic to understand. As a first introduction, students must know why and when these skills are needed in the context of the game, the technical implementation of playing skills.

The TGfU model has the potential: (1) to facilitate the development of technical skills and tactical knowledge; (2) empowering children to learn independently and be responsible; (3) to assess tactical transfers throughout play; and (4) to increase the fun and enjoyment of playing games (Wang & Ha, 2013). Based on the results of Yudha, Artanayasa, & Spyanawati's research (2017) that the TGfU learning model has a significant effect on improving student learning outcomes of basic football passing control techniques. And this learning model can be used as an alternative learning that can be applied. The results of Nathan's research (2017) added showed that TGfU is a useful approach for game play to increase intensity and cardiac output.

Based on the background above, this study was to find out whether or not there was a difference in the mean scores of students taught using the TGfU model and the TPSR model.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study uses the experimental method, the experimental method is the best step to determine the causal relationship between research variables. This research was conducted at UPT SMA Negeri 4 Parepare, within the planned period, namely November to December 2022. The experimental method in this study was carried out on two groups of existing students without changing the composition, while the research design used was factorial 2x2, which is a research design used to examine the effect of two or more independent variables on the dependent variable. The first independent variable is the Learning Model (TPSR and TGfU), the second independent variable is Self-Efficacy (SE) and the dependent variable is PJOK learning outcomes.

The population used is all students of UPT SMA Negeri 4 Parepare class X, class XI, and class XII for the 2021/2022 academic year. While the research sample was selected from this population which was adjusted to the material or Basic Competencies that would be taught during the experiment. The material that will be taught during the experiment is volleyball game material.

Collecting data in this study is using questionnaires and tests. Questionnaires are used to gather information about the level of Self-Efficacy possessed by students, while tests are used to measure student learning outcomes before and after learning with the TPSR and TGfU models. The collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. The data obtained is described according to each variable. The technique used to analyze the research data was a two-way analysis of variance (ANAVA) at the significant levels a = 0.05 and a = 0.01. If the results of the analysis show that there are differences and interactions, then the analysis is continued with the Tuckey test.

RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the results of processed descriptive statistics, information is obtained as in the following table:

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of TGfU and TPSR Learning Outcomes

		Learning Result TGfU	Learning Results TPSR
N	Valid	30	30
	Missing	0	0
Mean		166,6333	145,2667
Median		169,0000	143,5000
Mode		169,00[a]	143,00
Std. Deviation		10,25026	12,62983
Variance		105,068	159,513
Skewness		-,721	,304
Std. Error of Skewness		,427	,427
Kurtosis		,154	-,392
Std. Error of Kurtosis		,833	,833
Range		40,00	48,00
Minimum		144,00	124,00
Maximum		184,00	172,00
Sum		4999,00	4358,00

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

In Table 1 above it can be seen that the mean value of student learning outcomes with the TGfU learning model is 166.6333. This average is greater than the average student learning outcomes with the TPSR learning model, namely 145.2667. The median value of student learning outcomes with the TGfU learning model, namely 169.0000, is also greater than the median value of student learning outcomes with the TPSR learning model, namely 143.5000. These results indicate that student learning outcomes with the TGfU learning

model tend to be greater than student learning outcomes with the TPSR learning model in the subjects of Physical Education, Sports and Health.

In addition, in the statistical value column for student learning outcomes with the TGfU learning model, it can also be seen that the median value is greater than the average value. These results indicate that more than 50% of students in the TGfU learning model obtain learning outcomes above their average value. This result is reinforced by the skewness value which is negative which indicates that in general students obtain learning outcomes above the average value. Different results can be seen in the statistical value column of student learning outcomes with the TPSR model. In that column, the median value is smaller than the mean value which indicates that more than 50% of students in the TPSR learning model obtain learning outcomes below the average value. Thus, it can be stated that student learning outcomes with the TGfU learning model tend to be better than student learning outcomes with the TPSR learning model.

Furthermore, testing the interaction of moderating the Self-Efficacy variable on learning outcomes is carried out using a Two-way Anava as shown in the following table.

Tabel 2. Results of Two-way Anava Analysis

Dependent Variable: Learning outcome

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	7394,983[a]	3	2464,994	19,372	,000
Intercept	1459224,150	1	1459224,150	11467,595	,000
Modpemb	6848,017	1	6848,017	53,816	,000
SelfEff	390,150	1	390,150	3,066	,085
Modpemb * SelfEff	156,817	1	156,817	1,232	,272
Error	7125,867	56	127,248		
Total	1473745,000	60			
Corrected Total	14520,850	59			

a. R Squared = ,509 (Adjusted R Squared = ,483)

In Table 2 above it can be seen that the Self Efficacy Variable has no effect on student learning outcomes. This is indicated by the F value of 3.066 with a Significance Value of 0.085 which is greater than 0.05. In addition, it can also be seen that there is no interaction of the Self Efficacy variable with the two learning models. This is indicated by the F value of 1.232 with a significance value of 0.272 which is greater than 0.05. Thus, it can be stated that the Self Efficacy Variable is not a moderation in improving student learning outcomes. Meanwhile, what influences student learning outcomes is the learning model with an F value of 53.816 with a Significance value of 0.000 which is less than 0.05.

Next, testing the differences in learning outcomes between groups of students taught by the TGfU learning model and the TPSR learning model is as shown in the following table.

Tabel 3. Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Hasil_Belajar	Equal variances assumed	1,339	,252	7,195	58	,000	21,36667	2,96974	15,42209	27,31124
	Equal variances not assumed			7,195	55,644	,000	21,36667	2,96974	15,41672	27,31661

In Table 3 above it can be seen that the F value is 1.339 which corresponds to a Significance value of 0.252 which indicates that the two sample groups have a homogeneous variance. In addition, the T value is 7.195 with a Significance value of 0.000 which is less than 0.05, indicating that there is a difference between the average learning outcomes of students taught using the TGfU learning model and the TPSR learning model. The T value is

positive indicating that the average learning outcomes of students who are taught with the TGfU learning model are higher than the average learning outcomes of students who are taught with the TPSR learning model.

The results above are in line with the opinion of Griffin, L.L, & Butler, J.I. (2005), that TGfU is a game-focused approach to teaching physical education and sports that can be used both in school settings and in extracurricular sports settings (Harvey, S., & Jarrett, K. 2014). TGfU places an emphasis on students/players participating in the game to ensure that their needs are met, both instructionally and preparing an appropriate environment through modifying the adult version of the game to a game that is more appropriate for children, so that they can participate formally into the the game (Guadagnoli, M. A., & Lee, T. D. 2004; Sproule et al., 2011; Light, 2002a). TGfU as a tool for conceptualizing games teaching and learning. Game learning approaches prioritize the role of the teacher as a facilitator and the role of students to be active and involved in the learning process (Michael, 2011). In TGfU learning follows the six steps as suggested by Bunker and Thorpe in 1982, which include; (1) Game, (2) Game Appreciation, (3) Tactical Awareness, (4) Making Appropriate Decisions, (5) Skill Execution, and (6) Performance (Werner et al., 1996; Kirk & MacPhail, 2002; Mandigo et al., 2007).

The results of this study are also in line with the results of Gubacs-Collins' research (2007), entitled; Implementing a tactical approach through action research, involving 18 pre-service departments at PETE, 10 women and 8 men ranging from freshmen to seniors. shows that the TGfU learning model can help students develop Self-Efficacy in their skills and decision making. The results of Robertson, S.'s research (2016) entitled; Investigating the Relationship between Teaching Games for Understanding and High School Physical Education Students' Enjoyment, Self-Efficacy, and Intentions to Enrol, involving 3 ninth grade physical education teachers and 71 ninth grade students in a western Ontario school, shows that there is a relationship between TGfU and pleasure, Self-Efficacy, between pleasure and participation in sport or physical activity. The conclusion from this research is that the TGfU learning model can help students develop Self-Efficacy in their skills and decision making. In addition, the TGfU learning model relates to fun, self-efficacy, and participation in sports or physical activity.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of data analysis, the following conclusions are obtained:

1. The group of students taught with the TGfU learning model has a higher average score than the group of students taught with the TPSR model
2. There is no interaction between self-Efficacy variables with learning outcomes and learning models
3. There is a significant difference in the mean scores of students taught using the TGfU model and the TPSR model. The mean scores of students taught using the TGfU model were significantly higher than the TPSR model in the subjects of physical education, sports and health.

Based on the conclusions above, it is suggested to teachers of physical education, health and sports subjects to be able to apply the TGfU learning model, especially in game sports.

REFERENCES

Agus Pujianto(2014). Persepsi Guru Pendidikan Jasmani Terhadap Model Teaching Games for Understanding (TGFU). *Journal of Physical Education, Health and Sport* JPEHS 1(2). http://journal.unnes.ac.id/nju/index.php/jpehs

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy, The Excercice of Control. USA:* W.H. Freeman and Company

Barker, D. (2010). Physical education futures. *Sport, Education and Society*, *15*(3), 383–385. doi:10.1080/13573322.2010.494011

Butler, J.I., & McCahan, B.J. (2005). Teaching Games for Understanding as a Curriculum Model. In L.L. Griffin & J.I. Butler (Ed.), *Teaching games for understanding: theory, research and practice* (pp. 33-54). Windsor, ON, Canada: Human Kinetics.

Center for Disease Control and Prevention. (2000). *Guidelines for School and Community Program to Promote Lifelong Physical Activity among Young People.* [Online]. Tersedia: http://www.cdc.gov. [12 November 2018] https://www.dosenpendidikan.co.id/hasil-belajar/

Escarti, A., Gutierrez, M., Pascual, C., & Llopis, R. (2010). Implementation of the Personal and Social Responsibility Model to Improve Self-Efficacy during Physical Education Classes for Primary School Children. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy.* Vol.10, No. 3, pp. 387-402.

Escarti, A., Gutierrez, M., Pascual, C., & Marin, D. (2010). Application of Hellison's Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility Model in Physical Education to

Feist, J. & Feist, G. J. (2010) *Teori Kepribadian*. Jakarta : Salemba Humanika

Guadagnoli, M. A., & Lee, T. D. (2004). Challenge point: a framework for conceptualizing the effects of various practice conditions in motor learning. *Journal of Motor Behavior, 36*(2), 212–224. doi:10.3200/JMBR.36.2.212-224

Gubacs-Collins, K. (2007). Implementing a tactical approach through action research. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 12(2),* 105-126.

Griffin, L.L., & Butler, J.I. (2005). Preface. In L.L. Griffin, & J.I. Butler (Ed.), *Teaching games for understanding: theory, research, and practice* (pp. vii-ix). Windsor, ON, Canada: Human Kinetics.

Harvey, S., & Jarrett, K. (2014). A review of the game-centred approaches to teaching and coaching literature since 2006. *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy, 19*(3), 278–300. doi:10.1080/17408989.2012.754005

Hari Amirullah Rachman (2008). *Teaching Games for Understanding* (TGfU): Memahami Pendekatan Taktik Sebagai Model Pembelajaran Dalam Pendidikan Jasmani. Jurnal Pendidikan Jasmani Indonesia Volume 5, Nomor 2, November 2008.

Hellison D. (1985). *Goals and strategies for teaching physical education*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Hellison D. (2003). *Teaching responsibility through physical activity* (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Hellison D. (2011). *Teaching Responsibility through Physical Activity*. 3rd ed. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics

Hellison D & Martinek T (2006). Social and individual responsibility programs. In D Kirk, D Macdonald, & M O'Sullivan (Eds.), *The handbook of physical education* (pp. 610-626). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

https://bertema.com/download-struktur-kurikulum-sma-merdeka-belajar. Diakses 24 Juni 2022

Johnson, T. G., & Turner, L. (2016). The Physical Activity Movement and the Definition of Physical Education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 87:4, 8-10, https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2016.1142192

Kirk, D., & MacPhail, A. (2002). Teaching games for understanding and situated learning: rethinking the bunker-thorpe model. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 21*

(2), 177–192.DOI:10.1123/jtpe.21.2.177. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/44164225

Kirk, D. (2014). A defining time for physical education futures? Exploring the legacy of Fritz Duras. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education*, *5*(2), 103–116. doi:10.1080/18377122.2014.906055

Light, R. (2002). Engaging the body in learning: promoting cognition in games through TGfU. *ACHPER Australia Healthy Lifestyles Journal*, *49*(2), 23-26. *ISSN: 1445-8918*

Mandigo, J., Butler, J., & Hopper, T. (2007). What is Teaching Games for Understanding? A Canadian perspective. *Physical & Health Education Journal, 73*(2), 14–20.

Metzler, M.W. (2005). Implications of model based instruction for research on teaching: A focus on teaching games for understanding. In L.L. Griffin & J.I. Butler (Ed.), *Teaching games for understanding: theory, research and practice* (pp. 183-198). Windsor, ON, Canada: Human Kinetics.

Michael. W. M., (2011). *Instructional model physical education*. Third edition. Holcomb Hathaway: USA

Naskah Akademik Penjasorkes. (2007). Depdiknas. Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan Pusat Kurikulum

Permendiknas No. 22. (2006). *Standar Isi, SK-KD Pendidikan Jasmani Olahraga dan Kesehatan*. Jakarta: DEPDIKNAS

Robertson, S. (2016). *Investigating the Relationship between Teaching Games for Understanding and High School Physical Education Students' Enjoyment, Self-Efficacy, and Intentions to Enrol*. Faculty of Applied Health Sciences,Brock University,St. Catharines, Ontario

Shields D. L. L., and Bredemeir B. J. L. (1995) *Character Development and Phisical Activity*. Human Kinestic, P.O.Box 5076, Champaign, IL 61825-5076. (800) 747-4457. ISBN; 0-87322-711-5.

Soedijarto. 1993. *Menuju Pendidikan Nasional Yang Relevan Dan Bermutu*, Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.

Sproule, J., Ollis, S., Gray, S., Thorburn, M., Allison, P., & Horton, P. (2011). Promoting perseverance and challenge in physical education: the missing ingredient for improved games teaching. *Sport, Education and Society, 16*(5), 665–684. doi:10.1080/13573322.2011.601149

Tite Juliantine dan Urai Ramadhani. (2018) *Development Of Students Social Behavior And Responsibility Through TPSR Model In Physical Education.*DOI: 10.5614/sostek.itbj.2018.17.3.2

Undang-undang Sisdiknas No. 20 Pasal 1 Ayat 1. (2003). *Sistem Pendidikan Nasional.* Jakarta: Direktorat Pendidikan Menengah Umum.

Werner, P., Thorpe, R., & Bunker, D. (1996). Teaching games for understanding: Evolution of a model. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 67*(1), 28–33.