

Teaching Personal Social Responsibility and Cooperative Learning Models on the Students Responsibility in Physical Education

Dupri Dupri and Rices Jatra

*Prodi Penjaskesrek, Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan, Universitas Islam Riau
dupri@edu.uir.ac.id*

Keywords: Physical Education.

Abstract: The purpose of this research is to determine the effect of Teaching Personal Social Responsibility with Cooperative Learning Model in improving student's responsibility on learning Physical education. The method used in this research was Quasi Eksperiment with nonequivalent control group design. The sampling technique was cluster random sampling. The instrument for collecting the data was responsibility questionnaires and the data was analyzed using Paired Samples Test and Independent Samples Test. The result showed that there is significant influence of Teaching Personal Social Responsibility model on students' responsibility and there is also significant influence of Cooperative Learning on students' responsibility and there is significant difference between Teaching Personal Social Responsibility and Cooperative Learning models in improving students' responsibility in physical education.

1 INTRODUCTION

There has been a great development in the affective domain of physical education learning. To mention, there are Teaching Personal Social Responsibility (TPSR) from Hellison (2003), physical education model from Siedentop (2004), Cooperative learning from Dyson (2001), Teaching Values from Lumpkin (2008) and Teaching Respect from Selltice (2006) and so on.

One of the character building at school is through physical education. In learning physical education at school also inculcates the same value as said from some literature, there are at least six moral values that need to be possessed by individuals, namely: respect, responsibility (Lickona, 1991); caring, honesty (YMCA of the USA, 2004); fairness, and citizenship (Martens, 2004).

Teaching Personal Social Responsibility model was designed by Donald Hellison in the 1970s, with the aim of making youth with the risk of social exclusion experience support and development of their personal and social responsibility skills both in sports and in life (Escartí et al. 2005; Hellison et al., 2000; Hellison, 2011).

Relating to the effectiveness of Teaching Personal Social Responsibility model that may change attitudes and responsibilities. previous studies have found that Teaching Personal Social Responsibility model contributed to children and youth positive

development (responsibility, social skill, social environment status development and etc) Caballero, Delgado, Escartí. (2013:433). In terms of helping others, teamwork and cooperation (key elements of social responsibility), improvements have been identified in several studies (Georgiadis, 1990; Hayden, 2010; Hayden et al., 2012; Martinek et al., 1999, 2001; Mulaudzi, 1995; Schilling, 2001; Walsh, 2007).

Based on the some literatures, the learning model that is considered to develop the students' stages, among others, is a cooperative learning model. This is in accordance with the opinion of Cotton 2001; in *Exquisite Learning*, 2001: 2 which suggests that some class strategies and program designs are likely to improve responsibility and pro-social behavior. Cotton's recommended activity that can be united as part of learning in *Exquisite Learning* is cooperative learning. Through cooperative learning, students work with other group members with different races, gender and learning competences. As a result, students gave more respects to other and have more responsibilities in their learning. Students can also develop more experienced skill to view from other people's perspective.

The level of attitude development in Teaching Personal Social Responsibility model is Level 1: Respect, Level 2: Participation and Effort, Level 3: Self-direction, Level 4: Caring and Helping Each Other, Level 5: Outside Of the Gym (Hellison, 2011).

The Cooverative Learning model always meets the five conditions of Cooverative scenes: 1) positive dependence, 2) student interaction, 3) individual and group responsibilities, 4) interpersonal relationship skills, and 5) group processing (Roger and David in Rusman, 2012: 212)

2 METHODS

The method used in this study was quasi experimental. The treatment administered to the research sample includes:

Group A was the group that use Teaching Personal Social Responsibility model and Group B was with Cooperative Learning.

The research design was Quasi Experimental design with Nonequivalent control group which is almost similar to pretest-posttest control group design. in this case, the control and experimental groups were not selected randomly. The decision in choosing the current design was that each group was determined based on its own characteristics. As a result, this study fails to be a true experimental study which in turn has led this study to be Nonequivalent control group design. Teaching Personal Social Responsibility and cooperative learning model were the independent variables and responsibility as the dependent variable.

The population of the study was the students of SMA Pintar Teluk Kuantan consisting of: The sample is described in table 1.

Table 1. The research sample distribution.

No	Class	Gender		Total
		M	F	
1	X A	15	10	25
2	X B	12	13	25
Total		27	23	50

The instrument of this study was questionnaire in the forms of likert-scale statements. After the validity and reliability test, the total number of statement used was 43 statement. T test analysisi using Excel and SPSS 20 was used to perform the t test in order to analyze the difference between independent and dependent variables.

3 RESULTS

Table 2: Paired Sampel Test Model Teaching Personal Social Responsibility.

	Mean	t	df	Sig. (2 tailed)	Corelation
Pretest-Posttest	4.36	9.842	24	.000	.959

From the descriptive statistics, the means score in Teaching Personal Social Responsibility model group was higher than the experimental group. The means score on the experimental class posttest is 117,680 while the means in the Pretest Teaching Personal Social Responsibility model is 113.320. It means that there are different students' responsibility before and after the implementation of Teaching Personal Social Responsibility model in physical education learning.

On the other hand, the result from paired sample test is described in table 2 stating that the significance value was 0.000 which is lower than $\alpha = 0.05$. The result indicatesd that there is a Responsibility improvement in the students as a result of the implementation of Teaching Personal Social Responsibility model.

While to prove Teaching Personal Social Responsibility model influence students' responsibility, It can be seen in column correlation Table 2. The value is 0.959 with sig. 0.000 and the influence is 91.9% so the conclusion is that H0 is rejected. There is significant influence of TPSR model on student responsibility attitude through physical education.

Table 3: Paired Sampel Test Cooverative Learning Model.

	Mean	t	df	Sig. (2 tailed)	Corelation
Pretest-Posttest	1.96	4.439	24	.000	.807

From the descriptive statistics, the means score in Cooperative Learning model group was higher than the experimental group. The means score of Cooperative Learning model posttest was 111,320 and the means for the pretest was 111,360. It means that there is a responsibility difference as a result of the implementation of Cooperative Learning model in physical education.

On the other hand, the result from paired sample test is described in table 3 stating that the significance value was 0.000 which is lower than $\alpha = 0.05$. The result indicatesd that there is a Responsibility improvement in the students as a

result of the implementation of Cooperative Learning model.

While to prove Teaching Personal Social Responsibility model influence students' responsibility, It can be seen in column correlation Table 3. The value is 0.807 with sig. 0.000 and the influence is 65.12% so the conclusion is that H₀ is rejected. There is significant influence of Cooperative Learning model on student responsibility attitude through physical education.

Table 4: Paired Sampel Test Cooverative Learning Model.

F	Sig	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
9.034	.004	4.122	48	.000

The result of the Independent Samples test in table 4 showed that the gain of Teaching Personal Social Responsibility and Cooperative Learning models was 0,000 The (sig.) was 0,000 and $\alpha = 0,05$. The sig. value was higher than $\alpha = 0,05$. It means that H_a was accepted and H₀ was rejected. It can be concluded that there is significant difference between TPSR and Cooperative learning model in improving students' responsibility in physical education.

The descriptive statistic indicates that the means of Teaching Personal Social Responsibility model outscore that of cooperative learning. It leads to the conclusion that H_a was accepted Further, it can be concluded that Teaching Personal Social Responsibility model outperformed Cooperative Learning in improving students' responsibility in physical education.

4 DISCUSSION

The finding of the study has revealed that students' responsibility with Teaching Personal Social Responsibility model outperformed those with cooperative learning model. As a result, Teaching Personal Social Responsibility model may be used as an alternative learning model in physical education in order to improve students' responsibility. Character building is not a process of discovering a variety of settings and good qualities, but a process that requires changes in cognitive structure and stimulation of the social environment (Martens, 2004; Lickona, 1991 in Winarni 2012: 265). This result is also in line with the assertion that a person's character is formed not only because it mimics through observation, but can also be taught through sporting situations, exercises, and physical activities

(Weinberg and Gould, 2003: 533). Thus, participating in sporting activities does not in itself constitute individual values as the views of the theory of internalization, but what are regarded as the values of the characters must be organized, constructed and transformed into the basic structure of the reasoning of the individuals who participate in it (Stornes and Ommundsen, 2004 ; Stuntz and Weiss, 2003 in Winarni, 2012: 266).

Some research shows that young leaders, among other aspects, increase their own likelihood of confidence, improve their social skills and ability to help others, acquire skills to resolve conflicts, increase motivation to continue learning and to continue training they acquired the didactic experience to teach and apply the Teaching Model Personal Social Responsibility (Cutforth and Puckett, 1999; Hammond-Diedrich and Walsh, 2006; Martinek et al., 2001, 2006; Schilling et al. 2007; Walsh, 2007, 2008) in (Caballero and Escartí 2013: 433). Along the same line, Caballero, (2012): Escart'et al, (2010b); Llopis-goig et al, (2011); Pascual et al,(2011) a; Vizcarra, (2004) said that the hellison model is also capable of developing the development of autonomy, empathy and social skills.

Teaching Personal Social Responsibility model is actually a model that initially developed personal and social responsibility. The phenomenon of research findings that occur among current students is the disfusion of responsibility. For example, when students are instructed to strap the ropes on the net of the volley and attach the hoop to the rope. Actually, two people were willing to do, despite the fact that 34 students were in the class. Lack of help is attributed to the diffusion of responsibilities. The fact that there are many people who potentially help there encourages individuals to feel the loss of personal responsibility (Rogers and Eftimiades, 1995; Rosenthal, 2008 in (Feldman, 2012: 384).

Another study in the cooperative model has demonstrated the effectiveness of physical education packed with individual, competitive and cooperative objectives in measuring the four components of physical fitness and social interaction in children (Grineski, 1996). This study showed that students who participated in cooperative groups showed an increase in physical fitness and showed higher levels of positive social interaction of students who participated in individual and group groups. In another study, co-operative physical education activity resulted in more positive social interaction than individual activity in children 8-12 years with emotional irregularities and behavior (Grineski,

1996). Similarly, yoder (1983, in Grineski, 1996) reported using cooperative learning in dance can enhance group work, social interaction and learning for all.

5 CONCLUSIONS

Character building on students through physical education learning needs an appropriate strategy in applying the process in situ. This research found that Teaching Personal Social Responsibility and Cooperative Learning Models are able to improve student's responsibility attitude but in this case Teaching Personal Social Responsibility Model is better in improving student responsibility.

REFERENCES

- Caballero, Delgado, Escartí. 2013. Analysis of Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility model-based programmes applied in USA and Spain. *Journal of Human Sport & Exercise*.
- Escartí A, Pascual C, Gutierrez M. 2005. *Responsabilidad personal y social a través de la educación física y el deporte*. Barcelona: Gra.
- Feldman Robert S. 2012. *Pengantar Psikologi Understanding*. Psikologi. Jakarta.
- Weinberg and Gould, 2003. *Foundation of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 3rd Edition*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Georgiadis, N. 1990. Does basketball have to be all W's and L's? An alternative program at a residential boys' home. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 8, 42-43.
- Grineski, Steve. 1996. *Cooperative Learning In Physical Education*. Champaign Illinois. Human Kinetics.
- Hellison D. 2011. *Teaching responsibility through physical activity (3er ed.)*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hellison DR. 2003. *Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility Through Physical Activity*. Second Edi. Champaign: Human Kinetics.
- Lickona, T. 1992. *Educating For Character, How Our Schools Can Teach Respect and Responsibility*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Martinek, T., McLaughlin, D., Schilling, T. 1999. Project Effort: teaching responsibility beyond the gym. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 70, 59-65.
- Marten, R. 2004. *Successful Coaching*. USA: Human Kinetic
- Rusman. 2012. *Model-Model Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Siedentop, D. 2004. *Sport Education, Quality PE Through Positive Sport Experience*. USA: Human Kinetics.
- Winarni Sri, 2012. *Model Cooperative dan Individual Learning dalam Pendidikan Jasmani untuk Mengembangkan Empati dan Toleransi*. Bandung. UPI
- Walsh, D. 2007. Supporting youth development outcomes: An evaluation of a responsibility modelbased program. *The Physical Educator*, 64, 48-56.
- YMCA of the USA, 2004.