CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Study

In the field of education, Indonesia has experienced several times of changes on curriculum. These changes are due to the fact that Indonesia has lower levels of numeracy, literacy, and science than the world’s average level. Based on the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (2014), the result of Programme for International Students Assessment (PISA) 2012 shows that the world’s average standard of mathematics ability is 494, reading ability is 496, while science is 501. Shanghai-China has the highest scores in mathematics, reading, and science with the mean score for each 613, 570, and 580 in PISA 2012. Shanghai-China, Singapore, Hong Kong-China, Chinese Taipei, Korea, in descending order of their scores, are the top five performers in mathematics. Shanghai-China, Hong Kong-China, Singapore, Japan and Korea are the five highest-performing countries and economies in reading. For the top five performers in science are Shanghai-China, Hong Kong-China, Singapore, Japan, and Finland. Meanwhile, the position of Indonesia is number 64 from 65 countries in PISA 2012, and the mean score is still far from the world’s average, 375 for mathematics, 396 for reading, and 382 for science.

The 2013 Curriculum which was implemented as a whole at the beginning of the school year 2014-2015 tries to answer those concerns. This curriculum replaces the previous one, the 2006 Curriculum or School-Based Curriculum (KTSP). It is believed that the students were not used to think critically toward a problem (Khasali, 2012) because their mindset of learning purpose in the 2006 Curriculum was to be able to do the test questions (Juniarti, 2014). The density of materials in this Curriculum makes the students not understand the basic concepts. It is worsened by the worksheet (LKS), which is actually expected to overcome the problems, because it tends to be used for memorization of materials (Couto, 2013; Lismawati, 2010).
Different from the 2006 Curriculum, the 2013 Curriculum concept emphasizes three aspects of the learning purpose; they are knowledge, skills, and attitude. Learning activities in the domain of knowledge are retrieved through activity of knowing, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating. In the structure of this curriculum, elementary knowledge level weighs as much as 20% and 80% aspect of character, Junior High School knowledge has a weight of 40% and 60% aspect of the character, and the Senior high school knowledge level weighs 80% and 20% aspect of the character. In the skills aspects, the entire contents of the subject materials should encourage students to observe, ask, practice, reason, present, and create. Skills can be a matter of craftsmanship skills, work skills and project implementation, the skills to make the text, and skill in answering questions orally. In accordance with the aspects of attitude, all learning activities encourage students to undergo a number of activities of affection such as receiving, perform, respect, appreciate, and practice. This aspect is assessed by teacher in the daily journal, peers in a sheet value, and by students themselves.

Since the school year of 2013-2014, the 2013 Curriculum has been implemented in 6.221 schools and in all schools in the school year of 2014-2015 (Donnal, 2014). Meanwhile, the Government Regulation No. 159 year 2014 about the 2013 Curriculum evaluation was issued on October 14, 2014. It was three months after the 2013 Curriculum was implemented throughout Indonesia. The evaluation shows that many schools are not ready yet and have problems in the implementation the 2013 Curriculum. Based on this evaluation, the government made the decision to delay the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum at some schools. However, this curriculum cannot be automatically terminated or replaced with other curriculum because it has a strong legal foundation. The 2013 Curriculum is the mandate from the Government Regulation No. 32 year 2013 regarding the changes to national standards of education which later strengthen through eight ministerial regulations. This regulation also includes the basic framework and the structure of the curriculum which became the constructs of the 2013 Curriculum. Thus, the government decided to keep the 2013 Curriculum exists in some schools that have been running the 2013 Curriculum for the past
three semesters and gives instruction to the schools that have not used the 2013 Curriculum for three semesters to return to the 2006 Curriculum as stated in the Government Regulation No. 160 year 2014.

The pros and cons on the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum are caused by the differences in points of view towards the whole concept of its based curriculum. Some teachers appraise that the 2013 Curriculum do not only makes the students more active, critical, and creative (Ferdiansyah, 2013; Martini in Harahap, 2014), but also shapes the better character because the spiritual aspects and social attitude of the students are being assessed. By the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum, teachers can breakdown and guide learners to see their ability.

However, others judge that the 2013 Curriculum is ineffective because the learning model applied in scientific approach is not understood by teacher very much. Thus, learning activities undertaken by teachers in the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum are not in accordance with the construction. The facts show that the teachers find it difficult to leave the teacher-centered learning model. It happened because in the training-of-trainers session, the trainers did touch upon scientific approach but at the very general level and the illustrations given were mainly those related to the teaching of science (Agustien, 2014, p. 57). Besides, assessment aspects also become the problem of the 2013 Curriculum. In a classroom activity, there are only three aspects assessed, namely attitude, knowledge, and skills. It is certainly confusing because there are four core competences that must be achieved and evaluated based on the formulation of the core competences. Assessment aspects of religiosity were overlaid with an attitude assessment. In fact, religiosity and behavior are two different things. It is difficult to assess the level of one's faith.

Another thing that is still bothering some teachers related to the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum is a matter of textbook, especially English textbook. There is a significant difference between the previous English textbook of the 2006 Curriculum and the English textbook of the 2013 Curriculum. In the 2006 Curriculum, English textbook concerns on the language skills as the point to
deliver the competences in English such as listening, speaking, reading, and writing. It is completely different from the 2013 Curriculum which uses integrated skills concept (Nahrowi, 2013). The English textbook of the 2013 Curriculum is no longer divided based on the skill competence, but based on the types of texts or genres. Hence, integrated thematic student book which emphasizes on the sustainability of attitude, knowledge, and skills has been designed.

In the 2013 Curriculum, the government standardizes the materials for every school. The Ministry of Education and Culture has provided students’ and teachers’ textbook as stated in Government Regulation No. 71 (2013). It is different from the previous curriculum in which each school in Indonesia has its own authority to develop the materials based on the students’ needs (Nahrowi, 2013). As a result, there are so many books and students worksheets from various publishers that must be purchased without knowing its’ quality. Meanwhile, the quality of the textbook should be guaranteed because the textbook holds a fundamental role in the education as stated in the curriculum. According to Richards (2001), the textbook functions primarily as a supplement to the teacher's instruction because it is used as a main component to deliver the material framework designed in the curriculum. A survey conducted by Richards, Tung, & Ng (1992) reports that the textbooks are one of the primary sources of teaching materials. In other words, the textbook is an important part of the teaching and learning process, because it can serve as a guide or tutorial for teachers to teach the material based on the curriculum and the needs of students. However, Williams (1983) states that not all of the textbooks can reflect the materials well.

Based on the explanation above, the quality of English textbook published by the Ministry of Education and Culture for the 2013 English language Curriculum is questioned. Some researches had been conducted to evaluate the English textbook of the 2013 Curriculum. The result shows that the 2013 Curriculum English textbook for Junior High School has good conformity to the basic competence of the 2013 Curriculum (Reswari, 2014). According to Anindyakirana (2014), the book also reflects the aims and objectives of the 2013 Curriculum. However, Reswari (2014) found that the book does not reflect the
graduate competences. In the teaching and learning process method, the scientific approach elements can be readily seen in the pages of the textbooks, but the instructions are unclear (Agustien, 2014; Khumairoh, 2014; Reswari, 2014). Besides, for evaluation standard, the book does not have clear evaluation for the attitude, knowledge, and skill domain (Reswari, 2014).

Viewed from the material, including opening and closing of the book, the publisher has organized it well (Anindyakirana, 2014; Reswari, 2014). The topics and cultural values are also presented in the materials (Anindyakirana, 2014; Khumairoh, 2014). The design and layout of the book including the font and the pictures encourage the students to use the book (Reswari, 2014; Khumairoh, 2014). However, the language skills are not in balance because the limitation of materials’ explanation. The book has too many pictures which actually can be replaced by the text for reading skill (Anindyakirana, 2014). It is supported by Agustien (2014) that the book does not mention the text explicitly. In addition, there is no grammar or other knowledge because the pages are filled with the expressions (Agustien, 2014). Furthermore, the book does not provide activities and materials that reflect the scientific approach and the materials for attitude domain are very limited (Reswari, 2014).

However, most of researchers done in analyzing the content of the 2013 Curriculum English textbook are concerned in the level Junior High School. As a result, in the 2014 the government has released the second edition of students and teacher English textbook for Junior High School as revised edition (Tohir, 2014). Meanwhile, there is no revised edition for students and teacher English textbook for Senior High School. This first edition of English textbook is still used in all schools as a main guideline in language teaching. Furthermore, the researcher has not found yet the evaluation of the 2013 Curriculum English textbook for Senior High School. It can be inferred that there is a gap in content analysis study to know the quality of the 2013 Curriculum English textbook for level Senior High School. Recognizing this gap and urgency, the researcher conducts content analysis study under the perspective of textbook evaluation to find out whether the book reflects the 2013 English Curriculum and categorized as a good textbook.
B. The Formulation of the Problems

The general research problem of this study is “Does the 2013 Curriculum English textbook for SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Year X Semester 1 published by Ministry of Education and Culture meet the requirements of a good English Textbook based on the criteria of textbook evaluation?”. This general question is elaborated into several specific research problems as follows:

1. Does the 2013 Curriculum English textbook for SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Year X Semester 1 published by Ministry of Education and Culture contain the core competences and basic competences of the 2013 Curriculum?

2. Does the 2013 Curriculum English textbook for SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Year X Semester 1 published by Ministry of Education and Culture reflect the approach and method of the 2013 Curriculum?

3. Does the 2013 Curriculum English textbook for SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Year X Semester 1 published by Ministry of Education and Culture have authentic materials?

4. Does the 2013 Curriculum English textbook for SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Year X Semester 1 published by Ministry of Education and Culture meet the requirements of good English textbook in terms of language?

5. Does the 2013 Curriculum English textbook for SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Year X Semester 1 published by Ministry of Education and Culture meet the requirements of good English textbook in terms of graphic/layout?

C. The Objectives of the Study

The general objective of this study is to find out whether the 2013 Curriculum English textbook for SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Year X Semester 1 published by Ministry of Education and Culture meets the requirements of a good English Textbook based on the criteria of textbook evaluation. In line with the general objective of the study, there are five specific objectives that must be fulfilled in this research. They are:

1. To find out whether the 2013 Curriculum English textbook for SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Year X Semester 1 published by Ministry of Education
and Culture contains the core competences and basic competences of the 2013 Curriculum.
2. To find out whether the 2013 Curriculum English textbook for SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Year X Semester 1 published by Ministry of Education and Culture reflects the approach and method of the 2013 Curriculum.
3. To discover whether the 2013 Curriculum English textbook for SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Year X Semester 1 published by Ministry of Education and Culture has authentic materials.
4. To find out whether the 2013 Curriculum English textbook for SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Year X Semester 1 published by Ministry of Education and Culture meets the requirements of good English textbook in terms of language.
5. To find out whether the 2013 Curriculum English textbook for SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Year X Semester 1 published by Ministry of Education and Culture meets the requirements of good English textbook in terms of graphic/layout.

D. Limitation of the Study

In order to achieve the objectives that had been mentioned above, the researcher made a limitation of this study. The book analyzed was the 2013 Curriculum English Textbook for SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Year X Semester 1 published by Ministry of Education and Culture. This study investigated the quality of the book in terms of the conformity to the core competences and basic competences, approach and method, authenticity of material, language, as well as graphic/layout.

E. Significance of the Study

1. Theoretical aspect

The result of this study provides a perspective of the strengths and weaknesses of the English textbook in terms of the conformity to the core competences and basic competences, approach and method, authenticity of
materials, language, as well as graphic/layout. Thus, it can be used as reference to examine and evaluate the quality of the book used.

2. Practical aspect
   
   This study has contribution for the following parties:

   a. Teachers
      
      This study helps the teacher to know how much the 2013 Curriculum English textbook for Senior High School meets the requirements of good English textbook based on the evaluation criteria. The evaluation result helps teachers to understand what areas of the textbook need further modification, or to what extent adaption of other new teaching materials is necessary.

   b. Publisher
      
      This study helps the Ministry of Education and Culture as the publisher to evaluate the 2013 Curriculum English textbook for Senior High School. The evaluations results reveal the strengths and the weaknesses of the textbook, so it can help the publisher to know which areas of the textbook need further revision.

   c. Other researchers
      
      The other researchers can take the benefit from this study as a reference for future study on the similar or related topic.