

Implementation of teaching physical education teachers apply mutual adaptation approach in junior high school in Makassar, Indonesia

Abdul Haris, Mohd Izam Ghazali

University Utara Malaysia, School of Education and Modern Languages, Sintok, Kedah, Malaysia

Abstract

The main objective of this study was to identify the views of teachers on Mutual Adaptation Approach in teaching physical education in junior high school in Makassar, Indonesia. This study uses the case study method to investigate the eight teachers who had taken physical education at eight different schools. Mutual Adaptation Approach development as a teaching in learning physical education in Junior High Schools. Mutual Adaptation Approach is one of the alternative of teaching and learning of physical education that could be taught to the students so that they did not feel bored when they studied in classess and it had a purpose to increase the student's ability of learning. The results of this study are (1) Mutual Adaptation Approach as approach teacher of model teaching. (2) The effectiveness of the Mutual Adaptation Approach could improve teacher teaching and teaching ability. It could be seen from the teacher improve teaching the learning of physical education. Results showed that, however, there are a small number of teachers cannot use the Mutual Adaptation approach in order to enhance learning during the implementation of the curriculum in schools. In addition, these findings suggest that the approach is appropriate Mutual Adaptation as a standard tool for the implementation of physical education curriculum for students. The conclusions of this study are 1) Mutual Adaptation Approach can be used well in the learning of physical education subject. 2) Mutual Adaptation Approach learning can increase teaching and learning ability effectively. 3) This model as Mutual Adaptation Approach is accepted in physical education.

Keywords: Curriculum implementation, mutual adaptation approach, physical education subject.

1. Introduction

The success of implementing the curriculum is strongly influenced by modifications which are run by teachers based environmental conditions. This case is parallel to that outlined by Berman (1980) ^[6], "policy to be modified and revised according to the unfolding interaction of the policy with its institutional setting" (p. 210). Without modifications in teaching will not see success as expected from the makers of the curriculum (Brandon, *et al.*, 2008) ^[9]. The curriculum is implemented to ensure the student's ability to master a lesson so as to achieve success. The curriculum is also implemented in order to get a change in behavior better learners and obtain the triumph as expected (Russell, 2007; Rifai, 2011) ^[51, 46]. Implementation of the curriculum in schools with sustainable organizations can improve the effectiveness and quality of education and be able to promote the glory of students (Mariani Md. Nor, 2002) ^[35].

Mutual Adaptation approach as stated by experts that based on empirical findings and on experience, real curriculum cannot be implemented as planned but had to be adapted to suit the needs of the school environment. Mutual Adaptation Approach is essentially a principle that is most important to implement the curriculum in schools (Berman & McLaughlin, 1976; Jackson, 1991; Snyder, Bolin & Zumwalt, 1992, Rusli & Navarret, 1986; Marsh and Willis, 2007; Durlak & DuPre, 2008) ^[7, 25, 58, 36, 50, 18]. Mutual Adaptation Approach through a curriculum adaptation can be achieved, but with no modifications allowed to ignore the lessons that have been outlined in the curriculum. This approach to designing instruction to try to understand what drives the success of a curriculum. Mutual Adaptation Approaches support and understanding is clear that to achieve the results outlined teaching the teachers need to

make modifications according to the environment. The main focus on Mutual Adaptation to understand and know the practices of a program that took place in reality (Cho, 1998; Marsh & Willis, 2007) ^[12, 36].

Curriculum development at the national level allows for schools to run and practice in order to achieve the aspirations of teaching. This refers to a territory has its own autonomy in the implementation of the curriculum in schools (Berman & McLaughlin, 1980; Beatty, 2011) ^[6, 51]. This approach provides an opportunity for teachers as implements in the field can plan lessons, conduct or assess learning with modifications in the curriculum to increase student participation effective (Eva & Rashida, 2009) ^[9]. Berman and McLaughlin (1976) ^[7], describes in his study also examined 293 samples in 18 provinces, the study was conducted in two stages, namely the first stage in 1973 up to 1975. A study for the second phase of the study with a total of 29 samples were carried out in 1975 to 1977, this study was conducted to see the curriculum is implemented effectively and quality. The study found that based on the environmental aspects of the renovation should be carried out. This was done because of the differences as well as their suitability for local but have the same goal.

The main contribution to the Mutual Adaptation Approach is a strong network of contacts in promoting to facilitate the implementation of teaching in the school curriculum (Kraatz, 1998). By McLaughlin (2004) ^[37]. "The process of implementation that is inherent in classroom organization projects was found to generally describe implementation. Especially, the change-agent study concluded the successful implementation is characterized by a process of mutual adaptation (p. 172) ". This approach can contribute to the understanding of the suitability of the environment in the

teacher's knowledge, experience and innovation of teachers in schools (Randall, 2011) ^[45]. Most of the approaches described above represent the various elements starting from teachers to plan, carry out the teaching and learning elements that paved the teacher assesses several elements to the acceptance PE subjects in the classroom environment. The approach in this study is the implementation of the curriculum approaches categorized by (Berman & McLaughlin, 1980; Synder, Bolin & Zumwalt, 1992; Mars and Willis, 2007; Samsudi, Rokhman & Nugroho, 2008) ^[6, 58, 36, 52].

2. Problem statement

In Indonesia, the implementation of teaching in the school curriculum in PE teachers of subjects showed a low quality (Maksum, 2009; Ministry of Education, 2012; Suherman, 2014) ^[32, 67, 62]. PE curriculum subjects are compulsory in teaching and should be observed by teachers with planning in schools completely. However the survey found that teachers PJ still lack skills, experience and not making the best possible plan as outlined in the curriculum (Chui & Lili, 2012; Dini, 2014) ^[13, 17]. This is because teachers are given the opportunity to taste the courses and training activities to make lesson planning (Narwanti & Somadi, 2012) ^[43].

Teachers entrusted with teaching PE, but teachers reported still less understanding of the methods, models and approaches used for the implementation of this curriculum (Mulyaningsih, 2009; Dwi & Agus, 2010; Musjoko, 2011; Triyanto, 2012; Margono & Mukholid, 2013; Bakhtiar, 2013; Mahendra, 2014) ^[40, 19, 42, 65, 34, 4, 31]. This is important for teachers include curriculum implementation approach in that they are more confident running the PE lessons at school well. Especially with regard to approach the Mutual Adaptation to make modification used in the implementation of curriculum PE (Samsudi, Rokhman & Nugroho, 2008; Mumpuniarti, 2011) ^[52, 41]. While Saryono (2008) ^[54], describes that a PE teacher is important in carrying out the renovation of the teaching curriculum in schools. This is in line with the national sports system number 3 in 2005 and the national education ministry regulation number 24 of 2007 on materials and equipment for teaching in schools.

Based on the description of the approach in the implementation of the curriculum PJ must now be carried out. Teachers should apply Mutual Adaptation Approach to open up more space in the production of teaching that is better suited to help increase the role of teachers in implementing the curriculum. Teachers need to continue to focus sufficient for the implementation of the teaching of PE curriculum in schools in Indonesia requires the modification (Supartono 2004; Saryono, 2008; Rithaudin, 2012; Center of Curriculum and books of the Ministry of Education and Culture, 2013) ^[64, 54, 48, 11].

Therefore, according to Rusli and Navarret (1986) ^[50], supported by Samsudi, Rokhman and Nugroho (2008) ^[52], this study should be conducted to identify the role of Mutual Adaptation Approach in making modifications during implementation of the curriculum in schools. This situation is causing researchers interested in reviewing the role of Mutual Adaptation approach in the implementation of curriculum PE lessons that can help teachers' skills in conducting environmental suitability in school. Because Snyder opinion, Bolin and Zumwalt (1992) ^[58], Marsh and Willis (2007) ^[36], suggest that the use of Mutual Adaptation Approach is a

teaching that is useful to equip teachers to implement the curriculum in schools. In implementing this approach allows modification of the curriculum or teachers according to their ability and suitability to provide a comfortable environment for teaching management to students (Margono, *et al.*, 2013; Anwar, 2015) ^[33, 1].

3. Research Objectives

Identify teachers' views on the role of Mutual Adaptation approach in the implementation of the teaching curriculum in junior high schools.

4. Research Questions

What are teacher views on the role of the Mutual Adaptation Approach in the implementation curriculum PE teaching at junior high school?

5. Literature review

According to a study of the history of Mutual Adaptation Approach starts with a study conducted in 1973 and 1977. The study named "*The Rand Change Agent*" in the federal "United State Office of Education," which is a public school in the United States with the aim to introduce and support innovation success in school practice in the United States. Its main focus is to assess a sample of national education, innovation programs funded by the federal government of the United States (Berman & McLaughlin, 1976; Snyder, Bolin & Zumwalt, 1992; Clandinin & Connelly, 1992; Marsh & Willis, 2007) ^[7, 58, 14, 36]. The study by "*The Rand Change Agent*" found various constraints faced by teachers in implementing the curriculum from the aspect of reality. Therefore, Mutual Adaptation Approach is used to determine the success of a curriculum. This because the fact that in implementing the curriculum are often faced with multiple problems (Fullan, 1982; Reiser, *et al.*, 2000; Haerens, Kirk & Cardon, 2010) ^[68-70]. While the extracurricular activities suggested around 80 percent of which are designed by teachers. This matter can adapt while preserving the essential principles that are used as a source of stimulation and inspiration (Shkedi, 2009) ^[56].

The Mutual Adaptation Approach can be designed by the teacher PE according to ability, needs and characteristics of students. Modifications can be made between teaching materials and teaching equipment, the size of golf or tennis, rules of the game and the school environment. A teacher professional when you can achieve success in a creative and able to teach a variety of skills and interact effectively with the environment. Teachers should be able to utilize the existing environment to the maximum so as to create a safe and stimulating students to attend lessons with joy (Ihsan & Hasmiyati, 2011) ^[24].

Context modification in the subject ever conducted by PJ "*appropriate development practice (DAP)*" reflects that the teaching should be student-centered according to their physical and psychological condition. This was to help students develop the knowledge and skills appropriate to their interests and the equipment used. PE curriculum implementation is carried out to develop the basic skills of students in general through the movement that has been modified according to circumstances, characteristics, physical and mental development of students (Ateng, 1992) ^[3]. Mutual Adaptation Approach runs by making modifications to give

students the freedom to learn movement skills. Modification can develop intelligence intended that every activity in the teaching process can be achieved. Approach Mutual Adaptation can give freedom to the students, since the modification of the rules, size, tennis and golf, materials and equipment that has been modified so the opportunities for those needs physical or physical, spiritual and psychology students (Sullivan, Slagle, Hapshie, Brevard & Brevard; 2014) [63].

By Bird (1986) that carries a teaching curriculum on the best approach is to use the Mutual Adaptation of teaching innovation, which they suggest can be modified according to the environmental conditions for the implementation of teaching in the school curriculum of a more vibrant and better. Mutual Adaptation Approach While this has been carried out by various previous studies, including research conducted as (Rusli & Navaret, 1986; Popkewiz, Tabachnick & Wehlage, 1981) [50, 44]. There are also studies on the teacher's perspective PE to 181 public secondary schools in the Southeast United States. These findings indicate the need for more time spent by students to enable them to meet the commitments of daily physical activity recommended by 60 minutes. The findings are significant opportunities for physical activity and facilities for teaching purposes (Furong, et al., 2010) [21].

Many studies carried out by one of the supports that approach Mutual Adaptation between planners and those who implement the curriculum contribute to the impact and success of a curriculum. Past research indicates that Mutual Adaptation Approach as a modification with no real purpose aside. Teachers are those who carry out teaching in the curriculum PJ responsible for making modifications at the same time (Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Siedentop & Mars, 2012) [72, 57]. The Activities contained in the subject PE is unique,

complex and dynamic, then the modification is easier to see the process of implementing the curriculum in a school (Rush, 2001; Lumpkin, 2011) [71, 30]. Modification of teaching materials and equipment, is one solution can not ignore the teachers with teaching as a priority in the title is intended curriculum. The Mutual Adaptation Approach is the ability to make a significant modification must belong to the teachers in conducting teaching PE (Saputra, 2010; Wilian & Hari, 2014) [53, 66].

Modification in the teaching of PE curriculum can be made as the following example, a) the size of the ring; the size of the ring must be adapted to the physical condition of the students, b) teaching equipment; equipment used must be in complete control of the size and weight of students like basketball should be easy to play, modified the target height by lowering down, c) the game time; to focus on the fun factor and students, the time can be made shorter so that students can devote full attention to the shortened period of the game, d) rules of the game; modifications to the rules of the games can develop skills and create excitement (Saryono, 2008) [54]. According to "The Australian Sport Commission" modification in the teaching of PE on aspects of the game and skills includes teaching equipment such as the size of the ball, the size of tennis and golf, target size and number of players. Therefore, modifications in the game can be done in a way; a) reduce the number of players in a team, b) reduce the size of the ring or out, c) reducing the time / duration of the game, d) shortening nets, basketball hoops or widen the net in football, e) makes it easy to score the ball, for example by or without raising the goal keeper, f) using equipment that is suitable and convenient for students like ball lighter, g) modify the rules of the game so that students can play as an example, play volleyball more than three times (Ateng, 1992) [3].

Traditional approaches / Conventional approaches	Mutual Adaptation / Renovation
Using equipment and the standard rule	The Mutual Adaptation /modification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Students gain skills difficult because the standard rules do not match their needs ○ Boring, make students afraid, and do not complicate student can master the skill Gradient skills in accordance with the capacity of students so that they can dominate and love lessons 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The level of difficulty of the skills appropriates to students' ability so that they can dominate and love lessons ○ Creating an atmosphere of cheerful, happy and competitive to trigger motivation to learn

Source: Adapted by Suharta (2007) [61]

One attempt to achieve a good quality of teaching PE is a teacher must be able to be a good designer. When the constraints of school, the teachers have to do with creative innovations which runs modification, modifying teaching content, modify the forms of the game and skills of the students (Saryono, 2008) [54]. Modification teaching equipment, teaching situation is a joint responsibility of a teacher and as a trust that must be implemented in schools (Khodadoost, Bashbarat, & Valizade, 2011) [26].

One purpose of this study with the assumption that the Mutual Adaptation approach is used because this approach is not intended to see to what extent the implementation of curriculum as outlined. However, the opposite approach with the assumption of Mutual Adaptation involves modification of various factors unforeseen and when there is the role of mutual adaptation approach successfully implemented. Lesson planning by teachers in implementing the curriculum can understand and ensure the success of a curriculum. These

things, through lesson planning by involving the modification of the subject content, teachers need to see your interests, aptitudes, skills and environment. The Creativity of the teacher should be conducted in a situation that required teachers to see the students' interest, tendencies and skills so that students do not feel tired, but otherwise looked forward while teaching (Snyder, Bolin & Zumwalt, 1992 Suharta, 2007) [58, 61]. Equipment limited teaching the teachers to plan in advance for physical fitness instruction with modification as an example of using cardboard for flexibility exercises (Supartono, 2004) [64].

As another example of modifications in content, teaching athletics in the long jump among other things, a) students know and can do all sorts of capers, b) students can perform the basic movements down effective, c) students can use a prefix comfortable and convenient to make the leap, d) students can use the appropriate style to be used when jumping and e) the ability of students to know that they have

done compared to the standard it should be. This corresponds to that expressed by Rusli and Suherman (2000) ^[50], teachers can also undertake modifications when they found barriers and constraints to the success of teaching in schools.

Among other examples in the modification of which is clothing for students in the subjects of PE should consult with school sports uniforms that have been defined. However, when students do not have school uniforms can then use other appropriate clothing such as shirts, T-shirt and Tracksuit pants though not the same color. Because while attending the PE teaching activity is an important and key to student comfort, movement and safety of students while attending PE class activities (Darst & Pangrazi, 2006) ^[73]. Implement curriculum PE by using a Mutual Adaptation Approach following key features in the conduct of teaching in schools, involving modifications based on the actual situation, the needs and demands of success, teaching facilities, teaching methods, student participation as well as the source and completeness of teaching that comfortable for students (Furong, *et al.*, 2010) ^[22]. As an example, although the problems experienced such hardship locations and share them with other teachers so that PJ can do better again in teaching (Mumpuniarti, 2011) ^[41]. Other examples of modifications made in terms of objectives in the implementation, such as the game more difficult to make the game easier to achieve the desired students to master the skills and game (Sherrill, 2004) ^[55].

Mutual adaptation approach in the assessment includes modifications in aspects of the game and skills, elements of movement and fitness in PE by taking into account the priorities in teaching title (Samsudi, Rokhman & Nugroho, 2008) ^[52]. Modification can assist in the assessment of student performance that is expected to deal with changes in their environment. Customization can be done with a variety of contexts and a limited scope and get more feedback from students. For example, teachers take turns to other teachers who use the ground to carry out the assessment. Because of its limited field and also is the only location suitable for carrying out assessments in schools (Susan, 2011) ^[74]. Another example of modifying stick wood-ball to help run the games and teaching skills to prepare students on assessments carried out in schools (Rithaudin, 2012) ^[48]. Both students and teachers alike must be enabled to enact modifications or specific practices which may affect challenging activities (Berman, 1980; Lopata, 1993; Rink, 2014) ^[6, 29, 47]. The Mutual Adaptation approach is more appropriate and more convenient to see the process implemented in the school curriculum. The Mutual Adaptation approach is an important aspect in the success of a curriculum (Berman & McLaughlin, 1976; Snyder, Bolin & Zumwalt, 1992, Marsh and Willis, 2007) ^[7, 58, 36]. Therefore, this is the approach that will be carried out in this study.

6. Research Methodology

The research methodology is to propose a method used by researchers in research data collection (Arikunto, 2010) ^[2]. The purpose of this study was to examine the depth implementation of the physical education curriculum at the Junior high school level Makassar, Indonesia. The study design was undertaken using a qualitative approach, which aims to describe in depth the implementation of physical education curriculum in junior high school (SMP). That is, a

qualitative approach does not involve the use of words and symbols of numbers or algebra (Brannen, 1997) ^[10]. Qualitative research has been selected to elaborate on the implementation of the physical education curriculum in the subjects among teachers. Merriam (2009) ^[38], stated that the qualitative research focused experience and knowledge, discoveries and insights and views of research participants can give a great contribution to the world of education. A qualitative approach can explain the experience and knowledge in depth and thorough regarding Mutual Adaptation Approach.

When Strauss and Corbin (1998) ^[60], argues that a qualitative approach is the best approach used to understand something that is not widely known phenomenon common. Qualitative approach used to obtain new insights and also obtain extensive and in-depth information that may be difficult to run with a quantitative approach. Opinions Stake (1978) ^[59], Lincoln and Guba (1985) ^[28], says that only a qualitative approach can explain the views of teachers and get more understanding and information about the situation to be studied extensively, detail and depth.

6.1. Interview Data

Strauss and Corbin (1998) ^[60], argues that a qualitative approach is the best interview approach used to understand something that is widely known phenomenon. Interview in the qualitative approach used to obtain new insights and also obtain extensive and in-depth information that may be difficult to run with a quantitative approach. Stake (1978) ^[59], Lincoln and Guba (1985) ^[28], says that only an interview using a qualitative approach can explain the views of teachers and get more understanding and information about the situation to be studied extensively, detail and in depth. Therefore, the researcher will provide a detailed explanation of the research findings so that readers can compare the truth with their condition. According to this aspect of alternative generalization, the findings of this study may be applied to other conditions of the readers to be on the condition that (Creswell, 2005).

6.2. Examining the Validity of Interview

In an attempt to verify the validity of the interview instruments, the content validity was employed with the expert in physical education curriculum. This validity is compulsory to ascertain whether the instrument used can accurately measure the concept (Creswell, 2011) ^[16]. Thus, this study utilized the content validity to determine which items were suitable to measure the lesson plan in the implementation of physical education curriculum. Accordingly, the expert checks the items related to their sentence structures, focus and terminologies.

6.3. Sample and Population

The sample of the population for this research consists of physical education subject teachers who teach in junior schools in Makassar, Indonesia, a total of 8 physical education teachers were identified as a population. The researchers had gone to all the above-mentioned schools and met face to face with all 8 probable respondents. There were only 8 respondents who were willing to cooperate and agreed to become subjects for this study. Therefore, the researcher interviewed the 8 respondents for the data collection purpose.

Eight respondents managed to complete all the given interview and therefore become respondents for this study. With a total of completed instruments, the researchers acquired 8 of the whole sample of the district's Physical Education teachers. This proportion is sufficient to represent the total population in Makassar. As stated by Creswell (2005) [15], the minimum sample obtained from a qualitative study is, at least one of the total number of research population.

Sampling procedure as mentioned above, this study had also employed purposive sampling to choose the sample of this study. This type of purposive sampling was chosen since its easily manageable nature and fulfills the requirement of the research sampling method (Jones, Brown & Holloway, 2013) [75]. This sampling method can also be used on respondents who are willing to cooperate with the researchers. In essence, the sample is also considered as homogeneity of respondents that consisted of similar teachers who are into a physical education subject.

7. Result

The opinion R1 on Mutual Adaptation Approach on running teaching although it does not have arenas and fields as well as the location of the school is very narrow. R1 still has the ability to implement in accordance with laid down by the national curriculum. For example, R1 makes modifications to fit the assigned curriculum.

If the narrow field limited modified eee ... yes ... if you just play against if forced yes, there are far out in the field, but there was nice slant haha ... ha ... so inclined. Indeed, his name sloping field, there is volleyball, but the kids prefer balls yes. I also give regular eee ... let alone the long jump, run only dial or relay (interview / R1).

Problems encountered regarding facilities and infrastructure in the school to enjoy unlimited run instruction so R1 make modifications. According, R1 at school (SMP.23) have a lot to make modifications to the view of the interest, motivation and state school students.

Problems encountered in the physical education curriculum are the main I think this means much less SMP 23 field what ... eeee ... minimal, very limited, so most of my modification, clay interest eee ... motivation, situation (interview / R1).

For example, R1 makes modifications in the long jump with using the mattress as a field. R1 make modifications to the means to be especially suitable in carrying out the teaching.

This long jump, I modification again, exercise mat ... just so the sand can be thinking oooo ... This mat can be sanded. I told the children ... told to hold 4 people ordered to sit there, the technique alone is not an achievement. Anyway, she moves, she moves main, if you want to enter the club or extracurricular achievement. Yes, appropriate modifications, according sometimes ... sometimes not, eeee ... because of what, how well ...I used for example, why not concentrating... is' appropriate (interview /R1).

In view of R2, it is necessary for Mutual Adaptation Approach in carrying out the teaching of the PE that can provide opportunities for students to apply the skills they have learned in a real situation. For example, R2 makes modifications concerning teaching material such as a modified shot put this teacher from newspaper/paper.

Well, I think at least the first approach as a tool for example is if my appliance paper. Examples could have been shot put

like I said earlier that there was no bullet reject the thinking goes without saying that the child's shot put or what light why once, when we were making of paper (interview/ R2).

In carrying out the teaching of PE, R3 modifying equipment and teaching model in the appropriate circumstances for students.

Thus, modification of infrastructure or any modification of it depends on the teacher. Sometimes there are people like, because I like to modify as a hobby might have an effect on her teacher, so it depends on the teacher. If all this I modified the model of learning models (interview / R3).

R4 view that the practice of Mutual Adaptation teaching approach should give priority to the safety of students. In addition, in order to modify teach students the basic movements in the game.

In the teaching, so that modifications to basically see motion, but we must also consider the safety of children if the instrument is not fulfilled as it was to (interview / R4).

R5 views that make modifications to the circumstances of the school. R5 frequently attend training courses and always backed up by his view that the importance to implement the Mutual Adaptation Approach. Involvement and participation of students in making modifications can help improve teacher practice and creativity indispensable.

Approach Mutual Adaptation or modification actually makes it eee ... depending on the circumstances of the school itself. Because in the syllabus itself, it's not there the emphasis in terms of Mutual Adaptation Approach was only in training activities often delivered to the physical education teachers. If only the tools or support at school was not complete eee ... that is where the importance of attacking creativity of teachers to be able to modify the learning. both in terms of the method and the tools needed for learning (interview/ R5).

R6 does not have an understanding of Mutual Adaptation Approach implement or make modifications in PE. While materials such as volleyball limited to the purpose of the implementation of the curriculum and the teaching cannot be reached.

But if the ball is directly volleyball restricted many people will be trained. We can actually passing exercises such as volleyball one-on-one passing down, but longer, sir a limited time, so we do not give any modification or Mutual Adaptation Approach and is not achieved (interview/ R6).

R7 views of Mutual Adaptation Approach in carrying out the teaching that is only using real materials and equipment. R7 does not have the ability to meet and conduct in accordance with that outlined by the national curriculum. The teachers do not make modifications in teaching components that can be carried out in accordance with athletic skills envisaged in the high jump as examples that do not have a mattress. The equipment in need of modification, but R7 do not have the skills to run beside it was always afraid of the dangers.

So that there is a tool that I tried to give it all in the sport. Yes sir, eee ... I tried it sir, no modification is then given eee ... explained his theory problem. It's nothing like the high jump me right there mattress thick eee ... no my pole. It can be hard, but if any sir, wear it ... yes sir children now do not ... danger because rather loud (interview/R7).

R8 cannot understand the role of teaching equipment modifications even a limited, but comprehensive school location. R8 is always eager to understand the Mutual Adaptation Approach in accordance with aspects of teaching

facilities, but do not have an understanding and experience on the subject.

Do not have enough experience and knowledge so that it cannot implement the Mutual Adaptation approach, carry out and assess learning with a component corresponding to the environment, interests and abilities of students (interview/R8).

8. Conclusion and Implication

This research is expected to provide benefits to the Indonesian government, in accordance with the objectives contained in the philosophy of the Indonesian national education (Law on National Education System, 2003), the study is important for improvement, especially in knowing the things that lead to curriculum subjects physical education reportedly some the teacher does not apply Mutual Adaptation Approach or make modifications as expected by the curriculum. The Results of this study can be used for consideration and improvement of teaching physical education curriculum. The results of this study are also expected to give an explanation to improve the quality of teaching that still do not know how to implement of Mutual Adaptation Approach of teacher physical education curriculum in Indonesia.

Based on the results, the Mutual Adaptation Approach in the curriculum implementation helped what appeared to be a very challenging task and still difficult within the grasp of her students. The Mutual Adaptation Approach helped make explicit the new task demands for explanation and evidence and helped teachers succeed in implementing teaching. Some of the teachers believe that the Mutual Adaptation approach will help a good job in their class in the teaching physical education curriculum in their class.

9. Reference

1. Anwar M. Pembelajaran yang menyenangkan pada mata pelajaran pendidikan jasmani olahraga dan kesehatan. E-Buletin Lembaga Penjamin Mutu Pendidikan Sulawesi Selatan. ISSN 2355-218E, 2015.
2. Arikunto S. Prosedur penelitian. Rineka Cipta, Jakarta, 2010.
3. Ateng AK. Asas dan landasan pendidikan jasmani. Jakarta: Direktur Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 1992.
4. Bakhtiar S. The implementation of dynamic system theory and the principles of growth in physical education of elementary school. Canadian Center of Science and education. Asian Social sciences, 2013; 9(12).
5. Beatty B. The dilemma of scripted instruction: comparing teacher autonomy, fidelity, and resistance in the froebelian kindergarten, Montessori, direct instruction, and success for all. Teachers College Record, 2011; 3(113):395-430.
6. Berman P. Thinking about programmed and adaptive implementation: Matching strategies to situations. Dalam H. Ingram & D. Mann (Eds.), why policies succeed or fail. Sage Publications, Inc, 1980.
7. Berman P, McLaughlin MW. Implementation of educational innovation. Educational Forum, 1976; (40):347-370. Doi: 10.1080/00131727609336469.
8. Bird T. Mutual adaptation and mutual accomplishment: Images of change in a field experiment. Dalam A. Lieberman (Eds.). Rethinking school improvement: Research, craft and concept. New York, 1986.
9. Brandon PR, Donald BY, Shavelson RJ, Rachael J, Ayala CC, Ruiz-Primo, Yue Yin. Lessons Learned from the Process of Curriculum Developers' and Assessment Developers' Collaboration on the Development of Embedded. Taylor & Francis Group, LLC. 2008; 21:390-402.
10. Branen J. Mixing method. Qualitative and quantitative research. England. Avebury-Asgate Publishing Limited. 1997.
11. Center of Curriculum and books of the Ministry of Education and Culture. Kurikulum SMP/M.Ts: Silabus pendidikan jasmani, olahraga & kesehatan. Tim Penyusun Silabus, Jakarta, 2013.
12. Cho J. Rethinking curriculum implementation: Paradigms, models, and teachers' work. A paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Diego, California (Document Reproduction Service No. (ED3421767), 1998.
13. Chui M, Lili Ng. Meningkatkan kemampuan guru yang telah disertifikasi dalam menyusun rencana pelaksanaan pembelajaran melalui bimbingan berkelanjutan pada sekolah binaan di Sambas. Jurnal Visi Ilmu Pendidikan (J-VIP), 2012, 2(1).
14. Clandinin DJ, Connelly FM. Teacher as curriculum maker. Dalam P. W. Jackson (Eds.), Handbook of research on curriculum. New York: Macmillan, 1992.
15. Creswell JW. Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative approaches to research (2th.ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education, 2005.
16. Creswell JW. Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative approaches to research (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, 2011.
17. Dini R. Perencanaan pembelajaran dalam pendidikan jasmani dan kesehatan. ALFABETA. Bandung, 2014.
18. Durlak J, DuPre E. Implementation matters: A review of research on the influence of implementation on program outcomes and the factors affecting implementation. American Journal of Community Psychology. 2008; 41:327-350. doi: 10.1007/s 10464-008-9165-0.
19. Dwi M, Agus S. Model pembelajaran pendidikan jasmani berbasis kompetensi. Jurnal Pendidikan Jasmani Indonesia. 2010; 7(2) JPJI.
20. Eva H, Rashida B. Understanding curriculum modifications and embedded learning opportunities in the context of supporting all children's success, 2009. American Speech-Language- Hearing Association.
21. Furong Xu, Jepkorir CT, Wenhao Liu, Robert Schmidlein. Association between social and environmental factors and physical activity opportunities in middle schools, 2010. sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav.
22. Furong Xu, Jepkorir CT, Wenhao Liu, Robert Schmidlein. 2010 Association between social and environmental factors and physical activity opportunities in middle schools, 2010.

- sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav.
23. Guba EG, Lincoln YS. Fourth generation evaluation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1989.
 24. Ihsan A, Hasmiyati. Manajemen pendidikan jasmani olahraga dan kesehatan. Cetakan Pertama, Badan Penerbit Univeritas Negeri Makassar. Kampus UNM Gunungsari Baru, 2011.
 25. Jackson PW. Handbook of research on curriculum. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1991.
 26. Khodadoost M, Bashbarat ZD, Valizade R. A comparison of educational adaptation in Iranian male and female undergraduate students of physical education. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 2011; 15:2172-2175.
 27. Kraatz MS. Learning by association? Interorganizational network and adaptation to environmental change. *Academic of management jurnal*. 1998; 41(6):621-643.
 28. Lincoln YS, Guba EG. *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc, 1985.
 29. Lopata CL. The cooperative implementation of information technology: A process of mutual adaptation. Disertasi yang tidak dipublikasikan. University Microfilms International A Bell & Howell Information Company. MI, 1993, 48106-1346. USA.313/761-4700800/521-0600.
 30. Lumpkin A. Introduction to physical education, exercise science, and sport study (8th ed.). The McGraw-Hill Companies, inc. America, New York, 2011.
 31. Mahendra A. Telaah Kritis terhadap Program PGPI (Pendidikan Guru Pendidikan Jasmani) di Indonesia. *Jurnal Kajian Pendidikan*, 2014; 4(2). ISSN 2088-1290.
 32. Maksun A. Paradoks guru pendidikan jasmani. *Jurnal Pendidikan Olahraga FPOK-UPI (Fakultas Pendidikan Olahraga dan Kesehatan-Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia)*, 2009; 1(1).
 33. Margono A, Mukholid A. Modul pendidikan dan latihan profesi guru (PLPG): Workshop SSP Pendidikan jasmani dan kesehatan. Panitia Sertifikasi Guru Rayon Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta, 2013, 113.
 34. Margono A, Mukholid A, Purnama SK, Satyawan B. Modul pendidikan dan latihan profesi guru (PLPG) pendalaman materi penjas. Konsorsium sertifikasi guru (KSG). Modul PLPG Pendidikan jasmani dan kesehatan. UNIMED, 2013.
 35. Mariani Md Nor. Kepimpinan psikologi dalam organisasi sekolah: Kesedaran psikologi dalam kepimpinan sekolah. Dalam Sufean Husin (Eds.). *Inovasi dasar pendidikan: Perspektif sistem dan organisasi*. Penerbit Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, 2002.
 36. Marsh C, Willis. *Curriculum alternative approaches, ongoing issues* (4th ed). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2007.
 37. McLaughlin MW. Implementation as mutual adaptation: Change in curriculum. Dalam David Flinders & Stephen J. Thorton. *The curriculum studies reader* (2nd ed.). Great Britain, Routledge Falmer 270 Madison Avenue New York. 2004.
 38. Merriam SB. *Qualitative research and case study applications in Education: Revised and Expanded from case study research in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 2009.
 39. Ministry of National Education. Sertifikasi guru dalam jabatan Tahun, Badan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia Pendidikan dan Penjamin Mutu Pendidikan, Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. Jakarta. 2012.
 40. Mulyaningsih F. Inovasi model pembelajaran pendidikan jasmani untuk penelitian tindakan kelas (PTK). *Jurnal Pendidikan Jasmani Indonesia*. 2009, 6(1).
 41. Mumpuniarti. Adaptasi proses pembelajaran anak berkebutuhan khusus. Disampaikan pada Diklat Peningkatan Profesional Pendidik dan Tenaga Kependidikan dalam Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan Inklusi Tanggal, Di Hotel Matahari jalan Parangtritis 123 Yogyakarta, 2011.
 42. Musjoko IL. Implementasi kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan (KTSP) (Studi kasus dalam pengembangan dan pelaksanaan KTSP di sekolah rendah (SD) Negeri 6 Subulussalam). Tesis yang tidak dipublikasikan: Sekolah Pascasarjana Univenitas Negeri Medan, 2011.
 43. Narwanti S, Somadi. Panduan menyusun silabus dan rencana pembelajaran (konsep, implementasi, dan penelitian). Familia, Yogyakarta, 2012.
 44. Popkewitz T, Tabachnick R, Whlelage. *The myth of educational reform: A study of school responses to a program of change*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1981.
 45. Randall TF. *Effective early childhood teaching in public schools*. Disertasi Doctor of Philosophy yang tidak diterbitkan. Walden University, 2011.
 46. Rifai M. *Sejarah pendidikan nasional: Dari masa klasik hingga modern*. Ar-Ruzz Media. Jogjakarta, 2011.
 47. Rink JE. *Teaching physical education for learning* (7th.ed.). Boston: Mc Graw Hill, Companies Inc, 2014.
 48. Rithaudin A. Modifikasi stik dalam permainan woodball untuk pembelajaran target games. *Jurnal Healts & Sport*. 2012; 5(1). ISSN: 2086-9983.
 49. Rusli L. *Asas-asas pendidikan jasmani: Pendekatan pendidikan gerak di sekolah dasar*. Direktorat Jenderal Olahraga, Depdiknas, Jakarta. 2001.
 50. Rusli L, Navarret C. The process of mutual adaptation: A study of an innovative program. San Francisco, CA: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 1986.
 51. Russell J. Controlling core knowledge: Conditions for the ascription of intentional states to self and others by children. *Synthese*. 2007; 159:167-196.
 52. Samsudi, Rokhman Fatur, Nugroho. Model pengembangan dan implementasi kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan (KTSP) berbasis dukungan stakeholder's pada jenjang pendidikan dasar dan menengah. Universitas Negeri Semarang, 2008.
 53. Saputra YM. *Pendidikan jasmani dan olahraga*. Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, 2010.
 54. Saryono. Prinsip dan aplikasi dalam modifikasi sarana dan prasarana penjas. Jurusan Pendidikan Olahraga Fakultas Ilmu Keolahragaan Universitastas Negeri Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Pendidikan Jasmani*. 2008; 3(3):0216-1699.
 55. Sherrill C. *Adapted Physical Activity, recreation, and sport: Crossdisiplinary and lifespan* (6th.ed.). McGraw-Hill Companies, 2004.

56. Shkedi A. From curriculum guide to classroom practice: teachers' narratives of curriculum application. *Journal Curriculum Studies*. 2009; 41(6):833-854.
57. Siedentop D, Mars HV. *Introduction to physical education, fitness, and sport* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill Companies, inc. Americas New York, 2012.
58. Snyder J, Bolin F, Zumwalt K. Curriculum implementation. Dalam P. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1992.
59. Stake RE. The case study method in social inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 1978; 7(2):5-8.
60. Strauss A, Corbin J. *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc, 1998.
61. Suharta A. Pendekatan pembelajaran bola voli mini sebuah gagasan konseptual. *Jurnal Iptek olahraga Kementerian Pemuda dan Olahraga, Jakarta*. 2007; 9(2).
62. Suherman A. Implementasi kurikulum baru tahun mata pelajaran pendidikan jasmani (studi deskriptif kualitatif pada SDN Cilengkrang). *Jurnal Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia*, 2013-2014; 1(1).
63. Sullivan T, Slagle C, Hapshie TJ, Brevard D, Brevard V. *Build it so they can play : affordable equipment for adapted physical education*. ISBN-13: 978-0-7360-8991-3. United States: Human Kinetics. 2014.
64. Supartono. Studi implementasi kurikulum berbasis kompetensi (KBK) dan model pembelajaran melalui pendekatan modifikasi dalam pendidikan jasmani di sekolah dasar (SD). *Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar*. 2004; 5(1):22-23.
65. Tryanto. Improving teacher professionalism through certification program: An Indonesia case study. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 2012; 6:07-27. waset.org/Publication/10368.
66. Wilian D, Hari AR. Modifikasi model pembelajaran sport education berbasis kejuaraan untuk guru penjas SMP. *Jurnal Keolahragaan*. 2014; 2(1).
67. Ministry of Education. *Sertifikasi guru dalam jabatan Tahun Badan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia Pendidikan dan Penjamin Mutu Pendidikan, Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan*. Jakarta. 2012, 39
68. Fullan M. *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press. 1982.
69. Reiser BJ, Spillane F, Sorsa D, Carney K, Kyza E. Investigating the mutual adaptation process in teacher design of technology-infused curricula. Dalam B. Fishman & S. O'Connor-Divelbiss (Eds.). *Fourth Process Conference of the Learning Science*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. 2000.
70. Haerens L, Kirk D, Cardon G. Motivational profiles for secondary school physical education and its relationship to the adoption of a physically active lifestyle among university students. *European Physical Education Review*. 2010; 16(2):117-139.
71. Rusli L. *Asas-asas pendidikan jasmani: Pendekatan pendidikan gerak di sekolah dasar*. Direktorat Jenderal Olahraga, Depdiknas, Jakarta. (it is not Rush as stated in text). 2001.
72. Guba EG, Lincoln YS. *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications. 1994.
73. Darst PW, Pangrazi RP. *Dynamic Physical Education for Secondary School Students* (5th Ed.). Pearson: Boston. 2006.
74. Susan C. An examination of current adapted physical activity provision in primary and special schools in Ireland. *European Journal Physical Education*. North West Counties Association. 2011.
75. Jones I, Brown L, Holloway I. *Qualitative research in sport and physical education*. Sage, Los Angeles. 2013.