
Journal Management of Sport

Volume 4 Number 1 (2025)

E-ISSN: 2963 – 8003

available online at <https://jurnal.stokbinaguna.ac.id/index.php/JSSB>

**COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION MANAGEMENT
IN SPORTS-BASED SCHOOLS AND REGULAR SCHOOLS IN FACING
THE DEMANDS OF THE 2025 CURRICULUM**

Galih Farhanto^{1*}, Marki Sandi², Donny Setiawan³

^{1,2,3} Universitas PGRI Banyuwangi, East Java, Indonesia

* Corresponding Author: galihfarhanto19@gmail.com

Information

Abstract

History:
Submitted; July 2025
Revised; August 2025
Accepted; September 2025

Keywords:
Physical Education;
Management;
Sports-Based Schools;
Curriculum.

The implementation of the 2025 Curriculum brings significant changes to the educational paradigm, including in Physical Education (PE) subjects. This curriculum emphasizes the development of holistic competencies, which include cognitive, motor, and affective aspects. This study aims to compare the physical education management models between sports-based schools and regular schools in East Java Province in facing the demands of this new curriculum. This research uses a qualitative approach with a comparative case study method. The research subjects consisted of teachers, principals, and physical education coordinators from two selected Sports-based schools and two Regular schools. Data were collected through in-depth interviews, participatory observation, and document analysis. It was found that Sports-based schools have advantages in terms of time allocation, teacher qualifications, and facilities. However, Regular schools showed flexibility in integrating the curriculum with other subjects. Both types of schools faced different challenges in terms of evaluation and parental involvement. Sports-Based Schools were better prepared in terms of infrastructure and human resources, while Regular schools showed better adaptation in holistic pedagogical approaches.

Copyright © 2025

Galih Farhanto – Marki Sandi – Donny Setiawan

INTRODUCTION

Physical Education (PE) has traditionally been recognized as a subject focused on physical development and motor skills. However, the role of PE has now expanded far beyond that. Modern PE is seen as an integral foundation for the holistic development of students, which includes physical, cognitive, social, and affective dimensions. Through physical activity, students not only improve their fitness, but also learn about sportsmanship, teamwork, emotional management, and mental resilience. This view places PE as a key element in character building and competencies relevant to life.

With the launch of the 2025 Curriculum, the education paradigm in Indonesia is undergoing a fundamental shift from a content-based approach to a competency-based approach. This curriculum requires schools to teach not only “what” but also ‘how’ and “why.” For physical education, this means that the focus is no longer merely on mastering basic sports techniques, but on developing movement literacy, understanding mental health, and internalizing noble values such as sportsmanship and cooperation. This change creates significant challenges for education managers, especially in the aspect of education management, which includes planning, organizing, implementing, and evaluating.

In East Java Province, the physical education landscape offers two models of schools that have fundamentally different approaches. The first model is sports-based schools, such as Special Sports Schools or schools that have excellent programs in athletics. These schools were established with the mission of producing accomplished athletes, so they intrinsically have a very strong focus on physical development and athletic competence. They tend to have more complete sports facilities, specialized coaching teams for each sport, and a much larger allocation of time for physical education outside of regular class hours.

The second model is regular schools, which are public schools that implement physical education as part of the national curriculum. In Regular Schools, physical education is a compulsory subject, but often has limited time allocation, generally only two hours per week. In addition, the available sports facilities tend to be minimal and not comparable to those at Sports-Based Schools. Human resources, in this case physical education teachers, may not have the same depth of specialization as coaches at Sports-Based Schools. These limitations place Regular Schools at a disadvantage in implementing the holistic demands of the 2025 Curriculum.

The fundamental differences in the management models of these two types of schools raise critical questions. Do the resource advantages of Sports-Based Schools, such as facilities and time allocation, automatically guarantee that they are better prepared to meet the demands of the 2025 Curriculum? Or does the flexibility of Regular Schools, despite its limitations, allow them to adopt a more creative and holistic approach? This comparative study is important to analyze and understand the strengths, weaknesses, and specific challenges faced by each school model in managing their physical education.

This research is designed to answer these questions by conducting an in-depth comparative study. Specifically, this study seeks to: (1) analyze how both types of schools manage the planning, organization, implementation, and evaluation of physical education; (2) identify the strengths and weaknesses of each management model; (3) explore how differences in facility availability, teacher qualifications, and time allocation affect curriculum implementation; and (4) formulate practical solutions and recommendations to optimize physical education management in both types of schools, in line with the vision of the 2025 Curriculum.

The results of this study are expected to make a significant contribution, both theoretically and practically. Theoretically, these findings will enrich the literature on educational management and curriculum implementation, particularly in the context of physical education. Practically, this research will serve as a valuable guide for school principals, teachers, and policymakers in East Java Province. With a better understanding of the challenges and opportunities that exist, they can design more effective and efficient strategies for managing physical education, ensuring that every student can achieve the competencies required by the 2025 Curriculum.

This research possesses critical urgency due to the fundamental paradigm shift introduced by the launch of the 2025 Curriculum in Indonesia. This new framework moves physical education beyond mere motor skills toward a competency-based, holistic approach, requiring schools to develop students' movement literacy, mental resilience, and social-affective dimensions. The comparative study is urgently needed now to analyze the capacity of existing management models to meet these heightened demands. Specifically, immediate analysis is required to determine how the two fundamentally different models' resource-rich Sports-Based Schools versus resource-limited Regular Schools are currently managing the core educational processes of planning, organizing, implementing, and evaluating the curriculum. Without this prompt comparative assessment in East Java Province, education managers risk applying outdated management strategies to a progressive curriculum, thus undermining the intended goals of holistic student development.

The findings hold profound significance for both practical application and policy formulation. The study will provide the first analytical basis for understanding whether resource advantages (facilities, time, specialization) in Sports-Based Schools automatically translate into superior readiness for the holistic 2025 curriculum, or whether the organizational flexibility of Regular Schools allows for creative adaptation despite their constraints. By identifying the specific strengths and weaknesses of each management model including the impact of variables like facility availability and teacher qualifications the research will generate precise, actionable data. This is crucial for policymakers and school leaders to design effective and efficient strategies for resource allocation and management, ensuring that every school model can successfully implement the new competency standards.

In the future, the research is poised to provide a lasting contribution by serving as a valuable guide and theoretical framework for educational management across the nation. The practical solutions and recommendations derived from analyzing East Java's diverse landscape will be transferable, allowing other provinces to optimize their physical education management. Theoretically, the study will enrich the limited body of literature on educational management specifically applied to the holistic demands of physical education curriculum implementation. Ultimately, the research ensures that the physical education system contributes optimally to character building and life competencies as envisioned by the 2025 Curriculum, guaranteeing that future students achieve the required physical, cognitive, social, and affective development regardless of their school type.

METHODS

This study uses a qualitative approach with a comparative case study method. This design was specifically chosen to enable in-depth exploration of the phenomenon of physical education management in two different contexts, namely sports-based schools and regular schools. By comparing these two models, researchers can identify similarities, differences, and the unique strengths and weaknesses of each in facing the demands of the 2025 Curriculum. This design is ideal for understanding the complexity and nuances of management practices in diverse educational environments, rather than simply measuring numerical impacts.

This study involved four schools in East Java Province, which were purposively selected to ensure that certain criteria were met. Two of them were Sports-based schools (coded Sports-Based Schools A and Sports-Based Schools B), and the other two were Regular schools (coded Regular Schools C and Regular Schools D). The criteria for selecting schools included (1) having implemented the 2025 Curriculum, (2) having a good reputation in physical education programs, and (3) being willing to participate fully in the research. In addition, for each school, key informants were carefully selected to ensure comprehensive data. They were the Principal, the Coordinator/Head of Physical Education, and two Physical Education Teachers. The role of these key informants is very important because they provide a multi-level perspective—from the managerial level to implementation in the field.

Data collection was carried out through triangulation of three main techniques to ensure the completeness and validity of the findings. First, in-depth interviews were conducted with key informants to explore detailed information about the planning, organization, implementation, and evaluation of physical education, as well as the specific challenges they faced in implementing the new curriculum. Second, participatory observation allowed researchers to directly observe the physical education learning process in the field, including interactions between teachers and students, the use of facilities, and management practices. Third, document analysis was conducted by reviewing various relevant documents, such as lesson plans, school curricula, and evaluation reports, to complement and verify the data obtained from interviews and observations.

The collected data were analyzed using the interactive model of Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014). This process began with data reduction, in which raw data from interviews, observations, and documents were simplified, focused, and synthesized into key themes. Next, data presentation was carried out by presenting the reduced information in the form of matrices, charts, and descriptive narratives. This step aims to facilitate understanding and pattern identification. The final stage is drawing conclusions, where researchers gradually formulate findings, identify relationships, and draw valid and accountable conclusions from the analyzed data.

To ensure the scientific quality of the research, the validity and reliability of the data are carefully maintained. This is achieved through triangulation. Source triangulation is carried out by comparing data from various informants (principals, coordinators, teachers) and method triangulation is carried out by comparing data obtained from interviews, observations, and documents. In addition, research ethics are upheld throughout the process. The researchers ensured the confidentiality of the identities of all informants and participating schools. All participants were given clear information about the purpose of the research and their rights, and consent was given voluntarily. By maintaining ethical and validity standards, this research can make a credible and useful contribution to the literature on physical education management.

RESULTS & DISCUSSIONS

Results

The research findings clearly indicate significant differences in the management of physical education (PE) when comparing sports-based schools and regular schools. These disparities were not marginal but rather pervasive, affecting crucial elements across the management cycle, including planning, organization, implementation, and evaluation. Specifically, the resource advantage held by the sports-based model characterized by superior facilities, specialized coaching staff, and extensive time allocation led to a management structure that prioritized athletic competence and intensive physical development. Conversely, regular schools, constrained by limited time and resources, were found to adopt a management approach focused on curriculum coverage and essential compliance, often struggling to integrate the holistic, competency-based demands of the 2025 Curriculum efficiently. This fundamental divergence in resource availability directly resulted in distinct strategic priorities, operational procedures, and ultimately, different outcomes regarding the comprehensive development of student competencies.

Planning Aspects

Planning at Sports-based schools is more detailed and specific. They have an internal curriculum that is adapted to the 2025 Curriculum, but with a strong emphasis on athletic development and sports specialization. Physical education time allocation is longer, often reaching 4-6 hours per week, outside of the extracurricular training schedule. Lesson plans are prepared by a team of teachers with input from coaches. Planning in Regular schools is more general and follows national curriculum standards. Physical education time allocation is only 2 hours per week, which is often considered inadequate. Physical education teachers tend to work

individually in developing lesson plans, with a focus on mastering basic material according to the syllabus.

Organizational Aspects

Sports-Based Schools has a clearer organizational structure for physical education, with a physical education coordinator who has authority and autonomy. Physical education teachers often specialize in sports and collaborate closely with the coaching team. They have a special budget for the procurement of equipment and maintenance of facilities. The physical education organizational structure in Regular schools is often less structured. Physical education teachers generally hold multiple positions or work alone. The procurement of facilities and equipment depends on the school's overall budget, which is often limited.

Implementation Aspects

The implementation of learning in Sports-based schools is highly structured and intensive. Learning emphasizes targeted physical practice and training. Teachers use a student-centered approach, but still with clear athletic competency targets. The implementation of learning in Regular Schools is more varied. Teachers often face facility and time constraints, so they often use simple lecture or demonstration methods. The holistic approach required by the 2025 Curriculum is difficult to implement due to limited resources.

Evaluation Aspects

Evaluation at Sports-Based Schools includes the assessment of motor, cognitive, and affective competencies. Motor assessment is very detailed, covering physical tests, match performance, and statistics. However, affective assessments such as sportsmanship and teamwork are still tending to be subjective. Evaluation at Regular Schools is dominated by cognitive assessment (theory tests) and a small amount of practical assessment. Affective and social assessments are often neglected due to the lack of clear instruments and time constraints.

Strengths and Challenges

The strengths lie in human resources (specialist teachers), complete facilities, and time allocation. The main challenge is the integration of the curriculum with the non-motor aspects required by the 2025 Curriculum and the potential pressure on students to achieve. The strengths are flexibility in curriculum adaptation and a focus on all students, not just the gifted. The challenges are limited facilities, uneven teacher qualifications, and minimal time allocation.

Discussions

The findings of this study provide a clear picture of the differences between the physical education management models of Sports-Based Schools and Regular Schools. Sports-Based Schools, with its organized management structure and adequate resources, is naturally better prepared to meet the technical and physical demands of the 2025 Curriculum. Longer time allocations and specific teacher qualifications enable them to provide in-depth and intensive learning. However, a strong focus on athletic achievement can be a double-edged sword. There is a risk that holistic aspects of the 2025 Curriculum, such as character education through sportsmanship and mental health development, may be neglected or become mere add-ons. This is in line with research by Hodge, et al. (2018), which found that sports-based schools often face challenges in balancing athletic development and comprehensive education.

On the other hand, Regular Schools shows a different adaptation. Despite facing facility and time constraints, they demonstrate greater potential for flexibility in integrating physical education with general educational goals. The lack of specialization forces teachers to be more creative in designing learning that does not only depend on facilities but also on pedagogical approaches. However, these resource constraints are a major obstacle. Teachers often feel frustrated because they cannot implement comprehensive programs. This problem is exacerbated by the lack of support from school management and parents who still view physical education as a secondary subject. These findings are consistent with literature highlighting the challenges of curriculum implementation in regular schools, where resources are often the main obstacle (Tjokro, 2021).

The finding that Sports-Based Schools risk neglecting holistic development due to their intense focus on athletic achievement aligns directly with existing literature. Research by Hodge, et al. (2018) highlighted that specialized athletic institutions frequently encounter significant internal conflicts in balancing the demanding schedules and performance pressures required for elite athletic development with the mandates of comprehensive education. Their study found that while these schools excel at skill acquisition and fitness metrics, the explicit focus on competitive outcomes often leads to the marginalization of non-technical curriculum components, such as character development, mental health literacy, and affective learning, which become relegated to secondary importance or superficial "add-ons," confirming the potential "double-edged sword" effect identified in the present research.

The observation that Regular Schools face significant management obstacles due to resource limitations is a well-established theme in educational policy and management research. Tjokro (2021), in a study on curriculum implementation across diverse Indonesian school contexts, precisely documented that the lack of adequate time allocation, suitable facilities, and specialized budget support were the primary sources of teacher frustration. This systemic constraint forces physical education teachers to compromise the comprehensiveness of their programs, focusing on basic compliance rather than the holistic and experiential learning demanded by a competency-based curriculum. Tjokro's findings reinforce the conclusion that, for Regular Schools, resource deficiency remains the single largest impediment to effective management and program delivery.

The analysis regarding differential evaluation systems where Sports-Based Schools prioritize motor skills assessment while Regular Schools struggle with authentic evaluation—is supported by studies on assessment standards. Research by Hardy & Cale (2016) emphasized that achievement-oriented environments naturally drift toward easily quantifiable performance metrics (e.g., speed, strength, distance). This tendency, while providing objective data on motor skill development, creates a deficit in assessing essential affective and social competencies, such as cooperation or resilience. The need for both school models to develop more comprehensive and authentic evaluation instruments, focusing on process over mere results, is thus critically affirmed by the existing body of literature on pedagogical assessment.

The suggested solution for Regular Schools increasing teacher professional development is justified by research on curriculum adaptation. Dewi (2019) argued that in schools with limited facilities, the quality and creativity of the teacher become the primary leverage points for successful curriculum implementation. Dewi's work showed that teachers who receive targeted training in pedagogical creativity, facility-independent learning design, and blended-learning methodologies are significantly more flexible and effective in delivering holistic physical education. This confirms that for resource-constrained schools, investing in human capital through specialized training offers a more immediate and scalable solution than waiting for large-scale infrastructure upgrades.

The recommendation to provide Sports-Based Schools with special training to integrate affective and social aspects into their achievement-oriented curricula is corroborated by policy-focused research. A study by Choi and Kim (2020) on sports academies found that external intervention focusing on ethical decision-making curricula and mandatory psychological training modules was effective in shifting the institutional culture away from a purely win-at-all-costs mindset. Their findings suggest that integrating affective learning cannot be left to chance but requires dedicated, policy-mandated training for coaches and teachers on how to embed character education and mental health development directly into intensive technical training sessions, validating the specific intervention strategy proposed by the current research.

A significant limitation of this comparative study is its narrow geographical focus and the corresponding constraints on external generalizability. The research was confined solely to East Java Province, and the two models analyzed—Sports-Based Schools and Regular Schools—represent specific local interpretations of educational management and resource allocation.

Consequently, the findings regarding the strengths, weaknesses, and adaptability of these models may not be directly transferable to schools in provinces with vastly different administrative structures, cultural contexts, or levels of resource disparity. Future studies would require a multi-provincial scope to confirm whether the identified managerial differences and curriculum implementation challenges are regionally specific or reflective of a broader national pattern within the Indonesian education system.

The methodological scope, while systematic, presents limitations in fully capturing the complex interplay of factors. The research primarily focuses on the management structure (planning, organizing, implementation, and evaluation), which is typically reflected through administrative documents and managerial perceptions. This focus may inadvertently overshadow the actual, lived experiences of both teachers and students. Specifically, the study may lack detailed insights into the pedagogical efficacy within the classroom—for instance, the quality of teacher-student interaction or the students' genuine attainment of affective and social competencies. A richer analysis would necessitate the integration of extensive ethnographic observations or student-level outcome assessments beyond the management framework to fully validate the curriculum's holistic implementation.

A third limitation concerns the static nature of the resource analysis. The study examines facility availability, teacher qualifications, and time allocation as fixed variables at a single point in time. This approach fails to account for the dynamic changes in resources and management decisions that occur throughout an academic year. For instance, the utilization efficiency of facilities in Sports-Based Schools (e.g., whether specialized facilities are frequently booked or underutilized) or the rate of teacher professional development in Regular Schools may fluctuate. Analyzing these resources as static inputs prevents a deeper understanding of management as a continuous, adaptive process, potentially overlooking creative solutions or persistent resource bottlenecks that are only revealed through a longitudinal perspective.

The study's findings carry significant policy implications for education managers and governmental bodies in East Java Province. The primary implication is the necessity for a differentiated policy approach tailored to the specific management model of each school type. For Sports-Based Schools, policy must shift focus from solely maximizing athletic output to ensuring mandatory integration of the affective and social dimensions of the 2025 Curriculum. This requires allocating professional development funds specifically for coaches and teachers to receive training on incorporating character-building modules and mental health literacy into high-intensity training schedules. Conversely, for Regular Schools, policy must address the chronic resource disparity. This involves advocating for increased time allocation for physical education within the weekly schedule and securing targeted budgetary support for facility upgrades or, alternatively, for establishing community collaboration models that grant access to external sports facilities, thereby overcoming the physical constraints hindering holistic curriculum implementation.

The research dictates a clear action plan aimed at optimizing physical education management across both school models. For Sports-Based Schools, the immediate step is to develop and pilot holistic evaluation instruments that rigorously assess affective competencies (e.g., sportsmanship, teamwork) alongside motor skills, ensuring their commitment to the curriculum is auditable. For Regular Schools, the action plan focuses on teacher empowerment. This involves designing compulsory teacher professional development programs that emphasize innovative, facility-independent teaching methodologies. These programs should equip teachers with creative pedagogical skills necessary to integrate movement literacy and socio-emotional learning effectively, even within minimal resource environments. The goal of this plan is to minimize the management gap between the two school types and ensure universal fidelity to the 2025 Curriculum's vision.

As a crucial follow-up measure, future research must be commissioned to validate the efficacy of the recommended interventions and ensure program sustainability. Longitudinal

studies are needed to track the implementation of the new policies and professional development programs over a period of three to five years, assessing the long-term impact on student competency attainment across both school models. Furthermore, research should explore the development of a scalable management toolkit that synthesizes the best practices identified from both high- and low-resource environments. This toolkit could then be piloted across different provinces to test its external validity. Such efforts are essential to establish a sustainable and optimized framework for physical education management nationwide, ensuring the success of the 2025 Curriculum and its holistic goals for all students.

CONCLUSION

This comparative study shows that both sports-based schools and regular schools in East Java Province have unique strengths and weaknesses in managing Physical Education (PE) to meet the demands of the 2025 Curriculum. Sports-Based Schools excel in terms of resources, time allocation, and teacher qualifications, which enable the implementation of structured and intensive Physical Education. However, they face challenges in balancing the focus on athletic achievement with the holistic aspects of the new curriculum. Conversely, Regular Schools demonstrate flexibility in their pedagogical approach, but are severely hampered by limitations in facilities, time, and support. It can be concluded that there is no single perfect management model. Sports-Based Schools must learn to integrate character education and non-motor skills more deeply, while Regular Schools requires strategic intervention to improve resources and teacher capabilities. The main recommendation is for local governments and schools to work together to design policies that support both models, ensuring that every student, regardless of school type, can reap the maximum benefits of comprehensive physical education in line with the spirit of the 2025 Curriculum.

REFERENCES

- Bao, S. (2019). The new sports education curriculum: A case study of an implementation in China. *Journal of Physical Education and Sport Management*, 6(2), 112-125. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jpsem.2019.06.02.012>
- Choi, J., & Kim, Y. (2020). The effect of ethical decision-making curriculum on moral behavior in specialized sports academies. *Journal of Sports Ethics and Education*, 14(3), 155-170.
- Côté, J., & Erickson, S. D. (2015). A critical review of sports development research. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 27(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2015.1051939>
- Dewi, A. S. (2019). Teacher professionalism and curriculum implementation in resource-constrained schools. *International Journal of Educational Research and Reviews*, 4(2), 101-115.
- Hardy, L., & Cale, L. (2016). Evaluation practices in physical education: Examining the shift towards holistic and authentic assessment. *European Physical Education Review*, 22(4), 487-505.
- Hodge, K., Lonsdale, C., & Rose, E. A. (2018). The value of holistic coaching and sport psychology in youth sport. *Sport, Education and Society*, 23(3), 297-311. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2016.1187428>
- Hodge, S. R., Docheff, D. M., & Murata, N. M. (2018). The balancing act: Challenges in integrating comprehensive education and elite athletic training in sports-focused schools. *The Physical Educator*, 75(5), 757-778.
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (2025). *Pedoman Kurikulum Pendidikan Jasmani, Olahraga, dan Kesehatan 2025*. Jakarta: Kemendikbud.
- Kirk, D. (2010). *Physical education: The challenge of change*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203875329>
-

- Lonsdale, C., & Smith, M. D. (2017). An examination of motivational climate, self-determination, and psychological well-being in physical education. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 39(4), 289-302. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2016-0157>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Panggabean, S. A., & Widyaningrum, R. A. (2022). Peran manajemen pendidikan jasmani dalam meningkatkan kompetensi guru. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan*, 11(2), 154-168.
- Sardiman, A. M. (2019). *Manajemen pendidikan: Teori dan implementasi*. PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Sato, T., & Jones, A. B. (2020). The effect of school environment on physical education outcomes. *International Journal of Sport Science and Coaching*, 15(2), 123-135. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1747954120904221>
- Subiyanto, H. (2021). Tantangan guru pendidikan jasmani dalam implementasi kurikulum berbasis kompetensi di Indonesia. *Jurnal Pendidikan Jasmani dan Olahraga*, 6(1), 45-58.
- Tjokro, B. (2021). Resource challenges and teacher efficacy in implementing the national physical education curriculum in regular Indonesian schools. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan*, 12(3), 201-215.
- Tjokro, Y. (2021). *Manajemen kurikulum pendidikan jasmani*. UNESA University Press.
- Tupolo, R. (2018). Comparison of physical education curriculum management in urban and rural schools. *Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 5(3), 211-225. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jci.2018.05.03.021>
- Wahyudi, S., & Pratama, A. (2023). Analisis kesiapan sekolah menghadapi kurikulum baru: Studi kasus di sekolah dasar Jawa Timur. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar*, 15(1), 89-102.
- Zaini, M. (2017). Keterbatasan sarana prasarana dan implikasinya terhadap pembelajaran Physical Education. *Jurnal Olahraga dan Kesehatan Masyarakat*, 3(1), 22-35.