



## **The Profile of Adaptive Physical Education Teachers in Indonesia: The Opportunity of Improving Adaptive Physical Education Status**

**Agus Mahendra, Didin Budiman, Mesa Rahmi Stephani, Andi Suntoda, Dian Budiana, Lukmanul Hakim Lubay, Suherman Slamet, Gano Sumarno, Ricky Wibowo, Wulandari Putri, Anira, Wildan Alfa Nugroho**  
Program Studi PGSD Pendidikan Jasmani, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia

### **Article Info**

Article History:  
Received : August 2020  
Accepted : September 2020  
Available Online : October 2020

*Keywords:*

*adaptive physical education, physical activity, physically active, special education.*

### **Abstract**

Concerns on children with disabilities in terms of their needs for moving and the level of physical activity have not been supported by a teacher supply system that is appropriate for their field of study, namely adaptive physical education teachers. This study was aimed at portraying profiles of Adaptive Physical Education teachers in special schools in Indonesia. The data collection was carried out through questionnaires and articulated with the descriptive approach. The result of the study revealed that the number of special teachers with physical education backgrounds was still inadequate, which was only around 38%, compared to those who graduated from Special Education Program, which was more than 60.5%. The majority of the teachers had never been given a chance to improve their PE teaching competency in the form of training (86,4%). It is recommended that there should be an openness from those working in special schools and the Ministry of Education and Culture regarding the urgent need for this Adaptive Physical Education teacher. The statement will encourage the evolve of national urgency and drive all the stakeholders to respond to the issue institutionally, for instance by opening the program for Adaptive Physical Education or at least to pave the way by initially offering a concentration for this Adaptive PE under the general PE program

## INTRODUCTION

The concern and apprehension for the physical activity level and quality of children and adolescents have begun to increase. This is shown by the presence of various non-profit organizations at the world level that fight for active and healthy children (Aubert, Barnes, & Tremblay, 2020). They, individually and simultaneously, strive to encourage children to be physically active, both by organizing webinars and by publishing guides that can be used as guidelines. Other efforts are conducted, including by setting a minimum limit of being physically active, for example, a minimum of 30-60 minutes a day, for 24 hours, 7 days a week (Guthold, Stevens, Riley, & Bull, 2020; WHO, 2019). Among these world organizations, WHO is one of the world organizations that actively campaigns for its guidelines on active life, which are directly linked to children's health (Evidence & Only, 2020). In addition, we also know the Active Healthy Kids Global Alliance (AHKGA) (Aubert et al., 2018), which has 51 members of countries (and still growing), that launches its global matrix and report card. Other important organizations playing important roles are the organizations called Sport for Life and the International Physical Literacy Association (IPLA) that also actively call for the need and importance of physical activity for children (Durden-Myers, Green, & Whitehead, 2018; Edwards, Bryant, Keegan, Morgan, & Jones, 2017).

In Indonesia, the conditions are somewhat different. The echo of this concern is less pronounced, because both government agencies and other organizations seem to be unaware over this issue. There is no concern on that the low physical activity in children will result in the decreased children's capacities (Hall et al., 2012; Lennartsson & Silverstein, 2001), both physically and cognitively and even mentally, as reported in the Indonesian GSHS 2015 by WHO. Data from this GSHS reveal that only about 12.9% of children aged 13-17 who are physically active for at least 60 minutes a day in total 7 days, while the rests are considered inactive (Kusumawardani, 2015). Most Experts link sedentary behavior with various health risks such as obesity, cardiovascular health, and effects on anti-social behavior and self-esteem (Gába et al., 2020). Sedentary is also symptomatic to the risk of diabetes mellitus and cancer (Kokkinos, 2012; WHO, 2019).

The lack of movement, cardiovascular and ergo system functions are hampered, so that the

physical and motor potentials of children are also stagnated. Children will experience a potential shrinkage as the result of more sitting, reading, doing assignments, watching TV, and having fun with gadgets (Mahendra, 2020). It is pointed out that, nowadays, more and more children prefer to stay and feel at home, sit at their house, play games, or just watch TV and play the cellphones (Kawada, 2016). Physical activity that generates the heart and lungs becomes the last choice due to the function changes of more public spaces lately that limit the children movement and activity outside the house. This condition is exacerbated by the outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic, which forces everyone to prolong the duration of time to stay at home (Zhao et al., 2020).

The concern on the trend of increasing sedentary behavior and lifestyle among children becomes increasingly accumulated when we turn our attention to children with disabilities (Maher, 2019). For this group, the tendency to be inactive and sedentary becomes increasingly evident because the attention of certain parties has not yet directed on them. It can certainly happen, both at home and at school (de Chaves et al., 2016). At home, their condition is truly limited because they are basically people with limited physical or cognitive abilities, while, at school, the condition is not much different because the schools have not been sufficiently equipped to stimulate them to move more actively. The concern given to this group of children with disabilities then triggers a desire to know one of the active supporting factors, namely the role of the teacher. Teachers, especially Adaptive Physical Education teachers (Collins & Staples, 2017), are a group of teacher that is responsible for the level of physical activity of children, including being responsible for providing a vehicle for an environment that stimulates children to move more (Seghers, de Martelaer, & Cardon, 2009).

The problem is, have teachers in special schools (SLB) had a good role and a role in improving children's activity and health? These are the main focal points of this manuscript, because the teachers' strategic positions and responsibilities are the corner stone of their profession and professional responsibilities. To investigate this aspect, along with the implementation of the Adaptive Physical Education Teacher Training conducted by the Elementary Physical Education Study Program through the Community Service program, the Adaptive Physical Education teacher profile measurement in

special schools throughout Indonesia had been carried out to interpret their professionalism in conducting the Adaptive PE and PA at schools. The interpretive conclusion through the descriptive approach was the new way of providing problem solution for the purpose of policy reformulation.

The purpose of this study was to measure the professionalism of teachers in relation to the educational background of teachers in special schools, as a determinant of whether the attention to physical activity of children in the school environment was considered adequately or not. The elaborated research questions were directed to the following questions: 1) Does the Adaptive Physical Education teacher have an educational background related to the scientific field that supports it? 2) Has the Adaptive Physical Education program become a program that fulfills children's needs for movement? 3) Has the Adaptive Physical Education program been seen as a priority need in special schools in Indonesia and become one of the subjects in a special field of study? and 4) Has the need for Adaptive Physical Education teachers been systematically prepared by the education system in higher education in Indonesia?

## METHOD

This study chose a descriptive approach (Hastie, 2017) and had an interest in describing the profile of Adaptive Physical Education teachers in special schools by studying at least three related aspects, namely educational background, level of readiness in carrying out tasks associated with teaching experience at school, and skill improvement and mastery of their field of expertise related to their participation in training or upgrading programs related to the scientific discipline they teach.

### Place and Time

This research was conducted in Bandung City by distributing questionnaires to all participants who registered for the Adaptive Physical Education Training for Indonesia Special School Teachers. Therefore, even though the location of the researchers was in the city of Bandung and its surroundings, this research actually covered all Adaptive Physical Education teachers in Indonesia.

### Participants

Participants of this study were Adaptive Physical Education teachers who served in special schools from various types of disabilities and possi-

bly from inclusive schools. There was no limit to the educational level. The study covered all educational levels from Elementary School, Junior High School, to Senior High School. Moreover, in general, SLB schools in Indonesia can span a wide range so that they accept students from elementary to high school levels.

The number of teachers was 345 people, consisting of 119 male teachers and 226 female teachers. The age range of teachers who participated in the study started from 22 to 56 year old, with teaching experiences ranging from 0 year to over 34 years.

### Data Collection and Data Processing Methods

Data were collected through filling in a questionnaire arranged in Google Form that had been prepared and installed at the beginning of the training registration process so that participants were obliged to fill in the form or questionnaire provided, thus all participants were conditioned to fill in.

After the data were tabulated, they were sorted in the Excel Microsoft Office application. The selection process was also administered manually to avoid participants registering twice or more. In addition, through the sort format in Excel, participant data were separated into different sheets based on gender, type of school, length of teaching, level of education, educational background, training involvement, training providers, active participation in non-profit organizations such as BPOC, NPC, Adaptive Physical Education Association (in Indonesia, it is called ISAPE, stands for Indonesian Society of Adaptive Physical Education), or other kinds. The data were displayed and tabulated in one table for one type of data. The data were then calculated in percentage to get the analysis result and conclusion.

### Analysis and Conclusion Techniques

The data obtained in the form of numbers from each category were grouped in a table. At the same time, the percentage was calculated. The magnitude of this percentage was then concluded or interpreted by giving meaning to answer research questions and to see the trend and by giving meaning based on phenomenological interpretations (Brooks, McCluskey, Turley, & King, 2015).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of tabulated data and their percentages can be summarized in the Table 1.

**Table 1.** The Profile of Adaptif Physical Education Teachers

<b>Gender status</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>%</b>
Male Teachers	119	33.6
Female Teachers	226	65.5
<b>Teaching Experience</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>%</b>
0 - 5 Years	82	23.7
6 - 10 Years	85	24.6
11 -15 years	79	22.8
16 - 20 Years	53	15.3
21 - 25 Years	19	5.5
26 - 30 years	33	9.5
<b>Educational Qualification</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>%</b>
Senior High School	5	1.44
D3 (Diploma Degree)	3	0.86
S1 (Bachelor Degree)	301	87.2
S2 (Master Degree)	36	10.43
<b>Educational Background</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>%</b>
Non-PE and Special Education	60	17.3
PE and Sport Science	46	13.3
Special Education	209	60.5
Not listed	32	9.2
<b>Training Experience</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>%</b>
Training	47	13.6
Never	298	86.4
<b>Active in Organization</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>%</b>
Active	36	10.4
Non-active	308	89.2
Unclear	1	0,3

**Gender**

In terms of gender, we can see that Adaptive Physical Education teachers who worked in special schools were still unequalled. As shown in the Table 1, the number of male teachers was 33,6%, while the number of female teachers was 65,5%. Based on the data in Table 1, it can be concluded that the interest in becoming an Adaptive Physical Education teacher in special education is still dominated by women. It was most likely because they did not consider to be the physical education teacher, but more on choosing to become a special education teacher in general. However, because there was no Adaptive Physical Education teacher in special schools, those who were already teachers in special schools must also be willing to become Adaptive Physical Education teachers. This is inversely proportional to the tendency of gender domination in general Physical Education teachers, where general Physical Education teachers are still strongly dominated by male teachers. This condition explains why Physical Education in Indonesia is still highlighted prominently by the

nuances of sports. It might be because Physical Education is still dominated by men, the majority of whom still hold firmly to the belief that Physical Education is synonymous with sport.

**Teaching Experience**

Teaching experience shows the length of time a person is in charge of teaching the subject. The distribution of teachers, in terms of age, was still dominated by the junior teachers, represented by those who had been teaching at school under 10 - 15 years. The data show that the teachers in SLB / SDLB / SMPLB / SMALB were still supported by young teachers, so they were still able to enthusiastically carry out their duties as a teacher who lead children to exercise. Those who were still stressed ranging at almost 24%, followed by those with 6-10 years of experience at 24.6%. Meanwhile, seniors with working experience between 21-25 years consisted of only 5.5%, while those with above 25 years of working experience consisted of 9.5%.

The problem is Adaptive Physical Education is not always synonymous with sports, but should be seen as a tool to open up and provide opportunities that enable students to participate in physical activities that they like and enjoy. “Quality Health and Physical Education opens a world of sport, physical activity, recreation and lifelong health to our children. It is not about creating champions and elite level athletes (Shelton, 2020). The more senior a teacher is, the more they are away from teaching Physical Education duties and choose to play more non-physical tasks and functions. This can be seen from the decreasing proportion of senior teachers.

**Education Level**

In term of education level, the data were displayed in the Table 1. The majority of the teachers were graduated from bachelor degree (in Indonesia called Sarjana).

This means that in accordance with the demands of the Teacher and Lecturer Law regarding teacher qualifications, which must be equivalent to a Bachelor's Degree and or Diploma IV, teachers in special schools in Indonesia had started to meet the minimum educational qualification requirements of S1. There was no doubt that, in term of education level, the qualifications of teachers were no longer in doubt because 87% of them were already qualify for Bachelor degrees. Even the strength of this qualification had been strengthened by those who were already qualify for S2, as much as 10.43%. This

indicates that the education level of special school teachers has been strong enough and meets the requirements.

### **Educational Background**

As the main focus of this study, the profile of teachers with relevant academic-educational backgrounds was slightly overarched. The teachers were dominated by teachers with Special Education background. Only a small portion of teachers came from Sport and Physical Education background, made it looks inferior even when it is compared to non-PE and SE educational backgrounds. With a very wide range of variations, the educational backgrounds of teachers are indeed quite diverse. But if it is grouped in general, the educational background of these special school teachers came from two faculties, namely the Faculty of Education (FIP) and the Faculty of Sports and Health Education (FIK / FPOK). It is quite surprising that Adaptive Physical Education teachers coming from general physical education backgrounds were very low, only 13.5%. Meanwhile, the majority of them had a background in special education (PLB), reaching 60.5%. Within the wider population, it is strongly believed that this proportion is even more concerning. This shows that not many Physical and Sport Education graduates have been absorbed by SLB. Secondly, it shows that the dominance of special education graduates is indeed very strong. It seems as if they do not need Adaptive Physical Education teachers because all lessons can be handled by themselves. This is rather concerning in the midst of the discourse on the importance of increasing physical activity of children, so it needs to be supported by the government responsible for this special education.

### **Adaptive Physical Education Training Experience**

The above worrying-apprehensive condition from the point of view of teacher education background was again worsen by the fact that only a few of teachers who had been involved in a kind of pre- and in-service training in the related discipline as Adaptive Physical Education.

The data above show that only around 13.6% of special education teachers had attended training related to Adaptive Physical Education during their careers as special education teachers. Meanwhile, a large percentage of teachers (86.4%) had never attended Adaptive Physical Education training. Thus, it can be concluded that, so far, Adaptive Physical

Education in special schools and children with disabilities had not received an adequate attention.

### **Involvement in Related Organizations**

The involvement of teachers in professional or community organizations or associations is something that needs to be connected with the additional experience and academic competence gain as a professional. However, the data in the Table 1 show that it was not the case. The data show that teachers involved in adaptive physical education professional organizations or handicapped sports such as NPC (National Paralympic Committee), YPAC, BPOC, and similar associations with distinctive disabilities such as Soina, Porturin, etc., were still very small, only 10,4% of all cohorts surveyed. The majority of the teachers, 89.2%, were not involved and were not active in the concerned organization. With the results, the next step is to answer the research questions that were asked at the beginning of the chapter. There are four questions to be answered in this study, namely (1) Does the Adaptive Physical Education teacher have an educational background related to the scientific field that supports it? (2) Has the adaptive physical education program become a program that meets the child's need for movement? (3) Has the Adaptive Physical Education program been seen as a priority need in special schools in Indonesia and become one of the subjects in a special field of study? (4) Have the needs for Adaptive Physical Education teachers been prepared in a systematic manner by the education system in Indonesian tertiary institutions?. Answering the four questions above is indeed crucial and will be an effort to formulate our common problems and needs going forward. For this, let us describe one by one.

First, the question related to 'do Adaptive Physical Education teachers have an educational background related to the supporting scientific fields? It seems that it needs to be preceded by a consideration, what is needed by the teacher about children characteristics or more in the direction of content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge? (Ward & Ayvazo, 2016). If this can be answered firmly, then it can be answered firmly too. At present, the majority of Adaptive Physical Education teachers in Indonesia are still filled with educators who come from and master special science. This means that teachers who act as class teachers on a daily basis also act as Adaptive Physical Education teachers. This means that, so far, the prevailing view is that adaptive Physical Education instructions are

carried out by teachers with strong educational backgrounds in terms of their children's characteristics knowledge. But of course, they can be considered weak in terms of content knowledge that is specific to its imprint. This is where the dilemma begins. In the context of the current trend, in which awareness of physical movement and activity is closely related to the health and capacity development of children in all aspects, is it still appropriate to maintain the belief that for children with special needs, the program is still carried out by special education graduates? This is, surely, no longer correct. The conclusion is, ideally, Adaptive Physical Education teachers should be professionals who especially know about content knowledge and educational aspects. Therefore, they are expected to maximize children's potentials in various aspects through the integrity of the concept of body and soul unity supported by a strong monism philosophy. The answer to the first question can be answered explicitly that the educational background of the majority of Adaptive Physical Education teachers in Indonesia is not in accordance with the scientific fields that support it.

Second, the answer for the question related to "whether the adaptive physical education program has become a program that meets the child's need for movement," is of course predictable. Because the majority of Adaptive Physical Education teachers in Indonesia are still carried out by teachers who do not have a relevant scientific education background, then the programs organized cannot be called fulfilling children's needs for movement and physical activities in accordance with their minimum demands. Therefore, this should be a mutual concern among the various parties involved, especially those in decision-making positions, who are expected to be able to make decisions that favor the needs of the child.

Third, the question related to "whether the Adaptive Physical Education program has been seen as a priority need in special schools in Indonesia and has become one of the subjects for a special field of study," the answer is quite clear, namely that Adaptive Physical Education has not been seen as an important field of study, so that of course it is also not prioritized. The characteristic that it is prioritized is if the Adaptive Physical Education lesson is seen as a special field of study, such as in public schools, so that the needs of the assistant teachers need to be specially prepared. It seems that the need for Adaptive Physical Education teachers, in addition to being held by teachers with the status of classroom

teachers (PLB teachers), is also being filled in by General Physical Education teachers (a term that is forced to call non-specialist Physical Education teachers for Adaptive Physical Education) graduate from various study programs such as Physical Education Health and Recreation, Sports Coaching, Sports Science, or Elementary Physical Education. However, it can be said that they are not comprehended as specialist teachers, because their scientific insight is still lacking. In this case, they may only be seen as a savior position before the presence of Adaptive Physical Education teachers who are specially prepared in institutions that are institutionally recognized in universities.

Fourth, the question related to "has the need for Adaptive Physical Education teachers been prepared systematically by the education system in higher education in Indonesia," can be answered firmly that this has not happened. Maybe, it still takes a long step until the decision to establish an Adaptive Physical Education Study Program can be realized. It should be supported by the real necessity figures regarding the need for Adaptive Physical Education teachers as Adaptive Physical Education Field teachers in special schools, which of course must be voiced by both the PMPK Directorate at the Ministry of Education and Culture and the Heads of SLB schools throughout Indonesia. By voicing these needs, universities in Indonesia will try to fulfill the need through the establishment of a study program, called the Adaptive Physical Education study program, as an effort to meet the national needs. Without it, there will be no urgency related to its stance. Certain parties must create its own concerns and concerns. Maybe, just patchwork steps that can be done, as carried out by the Physical Education Study Program at FPOK UPI. The study program, so far, has provided a group of adaptive physical education electives in its curriculum, consisting of 16 credits plus the introductory course, which is worth 2 credits, so that it includes 18 credits in total. However, the number of students who are interested in the Adaptive Physical Education is still low, so as not to say that they are not at all interested.

## CONCLUSION

Attention to the children with special needs in terms of the need for movement and the level of physical activity has not been supported by a teacher supply system that is appropriate for their field of study, namely Adaptive Physical Education teachers. Not a single study program has been established so

far.

A search of the profiles of Adaptive Physical Education teachers in special schools revealed that the number of teachers with a general Physical Education background was still very low, which was only around 38%, compared to the teachers from Special Education (PLB), which was more than 60.5%. Thus, this also confirms that there were no teachers who were specially prepared. As far as it can be said, an effort to increase the competence to strengthening the pedagogic and professional competences of Adaptive Physical Education teachers was only a training program or an upgrading program. But recently, this training program or debriefing had long disappeared, so that the majority of teachers teaching Adaptive Physical Education in SLBs throughout Indonesia had not received the added touch of official in-service training programs. The issue and discourse on the establishment of the Adaptive Physical Education Study Program, to date, have never been rolling fast, for related reasons that are quite sensitive. It seems that there has not been openness from the special schools or from the Directorate of Special Education Community Education (PMPK) at the Ministry of Education and Culture, that voiced an urgent need against the presence of this Adaptive Physical Education. This encourages us to continue to think about how to solve the deadlock, whether by compromising that the preparation of Adaptive Physical Education teachers can be provided by two parties, including the Faculty of Education which is given the opportunity to open an Adaptive Physical Education study program juxtaposed with general special education teachers or the Sports Science Faculty (FIK / FPOK) to open the Adaptive Physical Education study program under the Physical Education Department. Time will tell, where this trend tendency will lead us to.

## REFERENCE

- Aubert, S., Barnes, J. D., Abdeta, C., Nader, P. A., Adeniyi, A. F., Aguilar-Farias, N., Tremblay, M. S. (2018). Global Matrix 3.0 Physical Activity Report Card Grades for Children and Youth: Results and Analysis from 49 countries. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 15(Suppl 2), S251–S273. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jpah.2018-0472>
- Aubert, S., Barnes, J. D., & Tremblay, M. S. (2020). Evaluation of the Process and Outcomes of the Global Matrix 3.0 of Physical Activity Grades for Children and Youth. *Journal of Exercise Science and Fitness*, (xxxx). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesf.2020.01.002>
- Brooks, J., McCluskey, S., Turley, E., & King, N. (2015). The Utility of Template Analysis in Qualitative Psychology Research. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 12(2), 202–222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2014.955224>
- Collins, K., & Staples, K. (2017). The Role of Physical Activity in Improving Physical Fitness in Children with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 69(September 2016), 49–60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2017.07.020>
- de Chaves, R. N., Bustamante Valdívía, A., Nevill, A., Freitas, D., Tani, G., Katzmarzyk, P. T., & Maia, J. A. R. (2016). Developmental and Physical-Fitness Associations with Gross Motor Coordination Problems in Peruvian Children. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 53–54, 107–114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2016.01.003>
- Durden-Myers, E. J., Green, N. R., & Whitehead, M. E. (2018). Implications for Promoting Physical Literacy. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 37(3), 262–271. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2018-0131>
- Edwards, L. C., Bryant, A. S., Keegan, R. J., Morgan, K., & Jones, A. M. (2017). Definitions, Foundations and Associations of Physical Literacy: A Systematic Review. *Sports Medicine*, 47(1), 113–126. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-016-0560-7>
- Evidence, D., & Only, F. O. R. C. (2020). Evidence Profiles Prepared For The 2020 Who Guidelines On Physical Activity A Nd Sedentary Behaviour For Children And Adolescents, Adults And Older Adults DRAFT Evidence profile-FOR CONSULTATION ONLY 2 DRAFT Evidence profile prepared for the WHO Guideline.
- Gába, A., Pedišić, Ž., Štefelová, N., Dygrýn, J., Hron, K., Dumuid, D., & Tremblay, M. (2020). Sedentary behavior patterns and adiposity in children: A Study Based on Compositional Data Analysis. *BMC Pediatrics*, 20(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12887-020-02036-6>
- Guthold, R., Stevens, G. A., Riley, L. M., & Bull, F. C. (2020). Global Trends in Insufficient Physical Activity among Adolescents: a Pooled Analysis of 298 Population-based Surveys

- with 1.6 million participants. *The Lancet Child and Adolescent Health*, 4(1), 23–35. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642\(19\)30323-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642(19)30323-2)
- Hall, W. J., Zeveloff, A., Steckler, A., Schneider, M., Thompson, D., Pham, T., ... HEALTHY Study Group. (2012). Process Evaluation Results from the HEALTHY Physical Education Intervention. *Health Education Research*, 27(2), 307–318. <https://doi.org/10.1093/her/cyr107>
- Hastie, P. A. (2017). Revisiting The National Physical Education Content Standards: What Do We Really Know about Our Achievement of the Physically Educated/Literate Person? *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 36(1), 3–19. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2016-0182>
- Kawada, T. (2016). Long TV Watching Time and The Risk of Physical, Mental and Psychiatric Disorders. *International Journal of Cardiology*, 223, 764–765. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcard.2016.08.328>
- Kokkinos, P. (2012). Physical Activity, Health Benefits, and Mortality Risk. *ISRN Cardiology*, 2012, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.5402/2012/718789>
- Kusumawardani, N. (2015). Global School-Based Student Health Survey: Indonesia 2015 Fact Sheet. <http://www.cdc.gov/gshs>
- Lennartsson, C., & Silverstein, M. (2001). Does Engagement with Life Enhance Survival of Elderly People in Sweden? The Role of Social and Leisure Activities. *Journals of Gerontology - Series B Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 56(6), 335–342. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/56.6.S335>
- Mahendra, A. "Covid-19 dan Bonus Demografi." Artikel Opini. Harian Umum Cetak "Pikiran Rakyat." Selasa, 19 Mei 2020. Hal. 5.
- Maher, A. J. (2019). The Self Stepping into The Shoes of The Other : Understanding and Developing Self-Perceptions of Empathy among Prospective Physical Education Teachers through a Special School Placement, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X19890365>
- Seghers, J., de Martelaer, K., & Cardon, G. (2009). Young People's Health as a Challenge for Physical Education in Schools in The Twenty-First Century: the Case of Flanders (Belgium). *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy*, 14(4), 407–420. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17408980902729347>
- Shelton, Hilary. Is it PE or is it Sport? Achper Victoria. [https://achper.vic.edu.au/public/news/news-items/Is-it-PE-or-is-it-sport.aspx?fbclid=IwAR2a6Mk6neDinfGYK9pkP\\_82krxREzei8AN5-UaXYTbjlvj1-Z4UArMvc8](https://achper.vic.edu.au/public/news/news-items/Is-it-PE-or-is-it-sport.aspx?fbclid=IwAR2a6Mk6neDinfGYK9pkP_82krxREzei8AN5-UaXYTbjlvj1-Z4UArMvc8)
- Ward, P., & Ayzazo, S. (2016). Pedagogical Content Knowledge: Conceptions and Findings in Physical Education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 35(3), 194–207. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2016-0037>
- WHO. (2019). *WHO Guidelines on physical activity, sedentary behaviour*. World Health Organization. Retrieved from <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/325147/WHO-NMH-PND-2019.4-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y%0Ahttp://www.who.int/iris/handle/10665/311664%0Ahttps://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/325147>
- Zhao, A., Li, Z., Ke, Y., Huo, S., Ma, Y., Zhang, Y., ... Ren, Z. (2020). Dietary Diversity among Chinese Residents During the COVID-19 Outbreak and its Associated Factors. *Nutrients*, 12(6), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu12061699>