

REAL CURRICULUM ADAPTATION IN INDONESIA

Balqis Azzahra, Sekar Galuh Wahyu Vernanda, Rika Maisyah, Fillah Pertiwi Imansari

^{1,2,3,4} English Language Department, Teacher Training & Education Faculty, Esa Unggul University

Abstract

The various learning models in Indonesia that are best known to the Indonesian people are the unit level curriculum (KTSP) and the 2013 curriculum, which are aimed to helping progress of education in Indonesia in the 12 years of compulsory education. This research carry out the discovery of real effect of the implementation of learning method in Indonesia namely, the education unit level curriculum (SBC) and curriculum in 2013 to knowing comparison between curriculum 2006 to 2013 from several viewpoints of students and teachers within the scope of quality as well as how to learn student with social and character. This activity also aims support the opinions that already exist on the curriculum 2013 and 2006 curriculum in the poin of view of the students and the other in some aspects such as time, learning and teaching, social skills and contextual learning materials quantity and quality. This research was conducted through virtual communication via cell phones as well as social media and in person as interviews with a total of 50 students and teachers in Indonesia. The essence of this finding is that there are more individuals agreeing to KTSP with a total of 32 students and teachers compared to the 2013 curriculum with a total of 17 students.

Keywords: Curriculum, active student, learning, study method, character

INTRODUCTION

As the development of the turn over period of governance lot of things also come to change even appear. The replacement of the Minister of Education and Culture brought innovations in new learning methods that made the view of the general public towards active student learning (CBSA) more complicated in complaints about 'what else makes technical learning many kinds and varied'. That is because system learning which is said to be a the curriculum has change. Unit Level Curriculum (SBC) or 2006 Curriculum is designed to have purpose common to give em powerment to the unit of study is independent. In the year 2013, the 2006 changed its curriculum into curriculum 2013 where students presented to more sociable and active in obtaining teaching materials over many because of the comparison between the curriculum in 2006 to 2013 of the most prominent is a way of learning the students everyday. " Education should be able to answer all the problems of people's life, be it economic, social, cultural and character " (Perdana, 2013a, p. 66). In this statement, you can imagine the impact of the 2013 curriculum and the 2006 curriculum, which are more pointed towards social and character.

Benefits execution of research this is to know the comparison between the curriculum in 2006 to 2013 in the scope of quality as well as ways of learning of students with social and character they are . The reason to do research is to support many unsure arguments on the curriculum in 2013 and the Curriculum 2006 in the point of view of the students and the other in some aspects such as time, learning and teaching, social skills and contextual learning materials quantity and quality . This activity aims to clarify and support the benefits and rationalization of the activities of this research which are expected to be certain about the curriculum as a way of learning or an educational model that pays more attention to the results in the quality of each individual student . With this, the plan of solving the problems existing in the shadow of the impact of the curriculum 2006 and curriculum 2013, which can be taken based on the results of research from the perspective of the students of elementary school, junior high school and senior high against time, learning and social environment which is here by It can be concluded for the results of the social context and characteristics towards providing support for the use of learning methods or educational models with the best curriculum to be applied which can be through petitions.

METHOD

Participants

This research was conducted through virtual communication via cell phones with social media and directly as interviews with 50 students in Indonesia. This research is supported based on the experiences and opinions of 13 active students and alumni of elementary school (SD) 16 active students and alumni of junior high schools (SMP) and 16 active students and alumni of high schools (SMA) and 3 teaching staff at the high school about the curriculum. 2006 and 2013 curriculum as a school learning model for learning quality including study time, learning outcomes or values and the scope of friendship as their social and character. The description of the number of participants in this study were 6 active elementary school students, 7 elementary school alumni students, 8 junior high school students, 8 junior high school alumni students, 8 high school active students, and 8 high school alumni students from various schools in Indonesia.

Research Questions

The study seeks answers as problem solving oriented to the following research questions:

1. What is a summary of the reasons for their agreement with the outcome of their social context and characteristics?
2. How accurate are the KTSP 2006 and curriculum 2013 in developing individual quality study theory?
3. How accurate are the KTSP 2006 and curriculum 2013 in developing individual skill in practice and social interaction?

Procedures

The process of collecting data for research questions through virtual communication and directly as interviews. Virtual communication is carried out in the search for social media accounts by searching for social media application users who are on the official accounts of schools and universities in Indonesia. Direct communication was made with the interviewer's closest relatives by complying with health protocols during the pandemic.

Data Sources (Sources of data & analysis procedures)

Sources of data in this study were obtained from interviews or direct and virtual communication via social media, text messages on cell phones. The data sources were collected based on the benefits and reasons for conducting this research which were summarized by the opinions of the research participants as interview material to support the research questions. All interview results were combined according to groups of student types based on the experiences of each individual student with the learning methods applied in their respective schools.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Based on the data obtained, the comparison between the 2006 and 2013 curriculum can be described as follows, with participants, namely 6 active elementary school students, 7 elementary school alumni students, 9 junior high school alumni students, 8 junior high school alumni students, 8 high school active students, and 9 high school alumni students and 3 High school teacher.

KTSP	Curriculum 2013
7 elementary school alumni students	6 active elementary school students
6 active junior high school students	3 active junior high school students
5 junior high school alumni students	3 junior high school alumni students
5 active high school students	3 active high school students
6 high school alumni students	3 high school alumni students
3 High school teacher	-

From the table data above, we can conclude that they prefer KTSP more than the 2013 curriculum. They argued that the 2013 curriculum is more complicated than the 2006 KTSP, because the 2013 curriculum emphasizes that students must be active in learning and have the initiative to ask questions and lack of material provision. towards students, students are required to study independently and the need for students to have hard and soft skills and not all students are able to apply this theory. And also students found it difficult because of changes in the way of learning that is very different from before, students have difficulty adapting to the 2013 curriculum that was previously KTSP 2006, and the 2013 curriculum is not based on an evaluation of the implementation of the 2006 Education Unit Level Curriculum (KTSP) so that implementation confuses teachers and education stakeholders. and many teachers who do not understand well the 2013 curriculum comprehensively, both the concepts and practices in the field and the lack of socialization of the 2013 curriculum that has not been implemented thoroughly. From the quality of student learning and social, 20 out of 29 students who chose to agree to KTSP and experienced the 2013 curriculum admitted that they had a much better quality of learning in KTSP than when using the 2013 curriculum. The rest of the students who chose 2013 curriculum mostly said that the 2013 curriculum is good for developing social system and build up the further work preparation. For students who had never experienced KTSP, 6 students admitted that the 2013 curriculum maximal enough in creating effective learning as provisions for the next school level such as hard and

soft skills and also good interaction as working together with others, but not very effective in terms of mastering the material in theory.

CONCLUSION

Many students of all the participant prefer KTSP more than the 2013 curriculum. They argue that the 2013 curriculum is more complicated than the 2006 KTSP, because the 2013 curriculum emphasizes that students must be active in learning and have the initiative to ask questions and lack of material provision. towards students, students are required to study independently and the need for students to have hard and soft skills and not all students are able to apply this theory. And also students find it difficult because of changes in the way of learning that is very different from before. In the other hand, the 2013 curriculum maximal enough in creating effective learning as provisions for the next school level such as hard and soft skills and also good interaction as working together with others, but not very effective in terms of mastering the material in theory.

REFERENCES

Journal Article

Ilham, D., 2013. Kurikulum Dan Pendidikan Di Indonesia: Proses Mencari Arah Pendidikan Yang Ideal Di Indonesia Atau Hegemoni Kepentingan Penguasa Semata. *Jurnal Pemikiran Sosiologi*, 2(1):63-73.

Wahyuno, E., Ruminati, and Sutrisno. 2014. PENGEMBANGAN KURIKULUM PENDIDIKAN INKLUSIF TINGKAT SEKOLAH DASAR. *Sekolah Dasar 1(1)*:77-84