



TEACHERS AND STUDENTS PERCEPTION ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CURRICULUM 2013

Nila Ayu Anggraeni

Post Graduate study, Universitas Muhammadiyah Purwokerto

Article Info

Article history:

Submitted October 29, 2019

Accepted November 10, 2019

Published December 12, 2019

Keywords:

Curriculum 2013

Perception

Teacher and students

ABSTRACT

This study aims know the students and teachers perception the English curriculum 2013 of SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Purwokerto. 25 students and 3 teachers was used as the subject of the reseach. the data was collected by two forms of a single questionnaire consisting of the same items for students and teachers. In order to find out answers to the questions of the research, the questionnaire was developed by the researcher in the frame of Stufflebeam's CIPP evaluation model principles. According to the responses to the scales representing English curriculum components such as context, input, process and product, we conclude that, mostly, teachers and students tend to support all four of these curriculum components. However, we noted significant and substantial differences in the support given to the four components of the curriculum. Some significant differences concerning some items of the context, input, process and product components of the curriculum were observed.

1. Introduction

This study aims to evaluate the English curriculum 2013 of SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Purwokerto. Evaluation serves to diagnose the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum before the implementation and determine the efficiency of the result of the implementation. The aim of collecting data related with the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum is to ensure the programmers to decide whether the curriculum should be revised, compared, continued or completed (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1988). Due to the diversity in curriculum development, it is not easy to suggest a single model for curriculum evaluation. In search of curriculum evaluation, researchers can choose the most appropriate model for their aims and conditions or develop a model benefiting from these models (Erden, 1995). It is crucial to be aware of the fact that the adopted evaluation model and accepted program planning model must comply with each other. Otherwise, there will be incongruity and distortion between these models (Kelly, 1999).

In this approach, the objectives of the program are not the focal point of evaluation. Stufflebeam has been the pioneer of management-oriented evaluation approach so as to help managers be able to make correct decisions about the program (Worthern, Sanders & Fitzpatrick 1997). His evaluation approach is known as Context, Input, Process, and Product Evaluation Model (CIPP). Since 1965, the CIPP evaluation model has been extensively developed and widely implemented (Candoli, Cullen, & Stufflebeam, 1997; Gally, 1984; Granger, Grierson, Quirino, & Romano, 1965; Guba & Stufflebeam, 1968; Nevo, 1974; Stufflebeam, 1969, 1995, 1997-a, 2003-b; Stufflebeam, Candoli, & Nicholls, 1995; Stufflebeam, Gullickson, & Wingate, 2002; Stufflebeam & Millman, 1995; Stufflebeam & Nevo, 1976; Stufflebeam, & Webster, 1988; Webster, 1975).

The aim of the CIPP model which attaches importance to process evaluation is to look into all of the strategies and components of evaluation and to seek the answers to these questions. Is

evaluation design functioning properly? Which points are possibly the problematic ones and how can these be solved? Are there more efficient ways to collect the data (Gilchrist & Roberts, 1974)? Stufflebeam (1973) suggests evaluators follow these steps, as a logical structure, to be used in designing each evaluation type: focusing the evaluation, a collection of information, an organization of information, analysis of information, reporting of information and administration of evaluation (Wiles & Bondi, 2002; Stufflebeam, 1973, e.g., Worthern, Sanders & Fitzpatrick 1997).

One of the strengths of CIPP model is, especially, that it is a useful and simple tool for helping evaluators produce questions of vital importance to be asked in an evaluation process. Evaluators can determine lots of questions for each component of the CIPP model. Harrison (1993) emphasizes that the CIPP model enables evaluators to intervene the evaluation process when needed, both before and during the program and it also gives the possibility of evaluation for only one component. The CIPP evaluation model has some weaknesses, too. A potential weakness of this model is the evaluator's occasional inability to respond to some significant questions or issues. In planning evaluation procedures, evaluators need to consider the resources and time available. If this model requires more time or resources that are available, another model may have to be considered. (Worthern, Sanders & Fitzpatrick 1997).

In this research, Stufflebeam's CIPP evaluation model has been implemented. The reason why this model has been preferred is that it is feasible in foreign languages curricula and involves various evaluation types such as context, input, process and product evaluation. Therefore, within this framework, answers to the following questions have been sought in this research: (1) Is there a significant difference between arithmetical means of the students' and teachers' opinions regarding the context of the curriculum? (2) Is there a significant difference between the arithmetical means of the students' and teachers' thoughts regarding the input of the curriculum? (3) Is there a significant difference between the arithmetical means of the students' and teachers' thoughts regarding the process of the curriculum? (4) Is there a significant difference between the arithmetical means of the students' and teachers' thoughts regarding the product of the curriculum? (5) Is there a significant difference between the arithmetical means of the students' and teachers' thoughts regarding the context, input, process, and product of the curriculum?.

2. Method

In this research, the opinions of teachers and students regarding the English curriculum 2013 were analyzed. Due to reflecting what really exists in the evaluation of four components of the curriculum in this research, as a research model the descriptive research model, which Karasar (1999) expresses as an explanation of an existing situation to give just a picture and Hovardaoğlu (2000) states as an explanation what the features of some events, beings, and groups of people are singly explained or how two or more of their attributes function on a relational level, was implemented.

The subject of this research was composed of teachers and students of English curriculum 2013. While choosing teachers' sampling group, since the number of the teachers was not enough, opinions of all of two teachers teaching in English classes were drawn upon. Therefore, the study was implemented in teachers' universe. While choosing students' sampling group, the method of cluster random sampling was used. In this research, schools were determined as clusters and the classes from all the faculties were chosen according to the rate of their representation of the universe composed of the students from different disciplines. The opinions of 25 students in these classes were used in this research.

In this research, the data was collected by two forms of a single questionnaire consisting of the same items for students and teachers. In order to find out answers to the questions of the

research, the questionnaire was developed by the researcher in the frame of Stufflebeam's CIPP evaluation model principles. The questions in the questionnaire were in the form of five-point Likert scale: (1) I definitely disagree, (2) I disagree, (3) I partly agree, (4) I agree, (5) I completely agree. In the questionnaires, there were 62 items concerning teachers' and students' opinions about the English curriculum 2013. The questionnaires were prepared to cover four components of CIPP evaluation model constituting sub-problems of the research

3. Result and Discussion

In Table 1, 2, 3, and 4, the students' and teachers opinions in terms of context, input, process and product factors of the English teaching learning process are mentioned.

Table 1. The means results of students' and teachers' opinions concerning context.

NO	Statement	X Student	X Teacher
1	School provides English and Supplementary books	3.64	0.28
2	The school environment supports an active English communication for students	1.96	0.16
3	The school environment creates a conducive atmosphere for students to learn English	3.6	0.24
4	School provides English Laboratory	3.92	0.08
5	Schools provides extra-curricular English activities	4,0	0.32
6	The school has vision and mission for the process of learning a good English	4,0	0.32
7	English lessons are available on a weekly to support the ability of English skill	5,0	0.08
8	Government teachers' book has fulfilled the needs of the process of learning English at class	3.6	0.24
	Average	3.71	0.21

As is seen in Table 1, It can be noted that the students' opinion in number seven is the highest means of all items in context. The students feel that English lessons are available on a weekly to support the ability of English skill. The lowest one is the school environment does not support an active English communication for students. But it is different from teachers' opinion. The teachers feel that they have lack of time to allocate the time in preparing and teaching materials for students in a week. However, the teachers are pleased with extra-curricular English activities at school the vision and mission of school for the process of learning good English. It means school provides all the facilities to support the students in learning English.

Table 2 . The means results of students' and teachers' opinions concerning Input.

NO	Statement	X Student	X Teacher
1	Teachers are from English graduates	5,0	0.4
2	The teachers have a minimum undergraduate education qualification	5,0	0.2
3	Students have an interest in learning English	3.04	0.36
4	Students have motivation to learn English	2.52	0.2

5	KI and KD English has been in accordance with students' English learning needs	3,0	0.24
6	2013 curriculum has been suitable with students need to pursue a higher level education.	2.48	0.2
7	School has a standardized English score in student acceptance.	1.96	0.16
8	The subject contains in the 2013 curriculum is able to make a positive impact on students skills.	3.52	0.24
9	Classroom learning activities have a positive impact on the language skills of students.	3,0	0.24
10	Classroom learning activities make students more motivated to learn English.	3.8	0.24
11	Teachers use learning media to make students happy to learn English.	3.72	0.24
12	Learning Activities can build a good communication between students and teachers.	3.04	0.24
13	The content of government textbooks is easily understood by students and teachers	3,0	0.24
14	The level of material difficulty in the KD is appropriate to the duration of the lesson.	1.96	0.16
	Average	3.21	0.24

Table 2 shows that, the students argue that the teachers are from English graduates. It means, the teachers have a minimum undergraduate education qualification. In another item, classroom learning activities make students more motivated to learn English. In addition, both the students and the teachers do not know about the standardization of English score in student acceptance.

Table 3. The means results of students' and teachers' opinions concerning Process.

NO	Statement	X Student	X Teacher
1	Teachers prepare learning tools	3.84	0.36
2	Teachers have no difficulty in applying scientific approach in learning English process at class	3.48	0.28
3	Teachers have no difficulty in understanding and applying the learning materials available in Master's books and Student's books from Government.	2.96	0.24
4	Teachers carry out learning in the classroom or outside the classroom.	2.48	0.2
5	Teachers also use library facilities for learning English.	2.48	0.28
6	Teachers use IT media and other media well.	3.52	0.28
7	Teacher performs evaluation in the form of cognitive test and practice test well	3.52	0.28
8	Teachers interact well with students	3.6	0.24
	Average	3.235	0.27

As it presented in Table 3, the students respond that the teachers prepare learning tools. It means the students give a good appreciation in using IT media and other media well. However, the

teachers do argue that the curriculum does not give properly time in delivering materials both inside or outside the classroom.

Table 4. The means results of students' and teachers' opinions concerning Product.

NO	Statement	X Student	X Teacher
1	By using a scientific approach, teachers are able to improve students' English skills well.	4.48	0.24
2	Students feel excited and motivated to learn English independently in final	3.48	0.2
3	Students show good character after following English lesson.	3.88	0.2
4	95% of the total number of students has reached above the KKM.	3,0	0.24
5	Learning English has been able to improve students' literacy skills.	4.2	0.2
6	Students do not feel reluctant to communicate in English with their teachers and friends in Final.	1.96	0.16
	Average	3.5	0.20

As it displayed in Table 4, the students together with the teachers think that teachers are able to improve students' English skills well by using a scientific approach. It means, students show good character after following English lesson. In contrast with the students, the teachers argue that the students still feel reluctant to communicate in English with their teachers and friends in final.

4. Conclusion

The result showed that the students feel that English lessons are available on a weekly to support the ability of English skill. The lowest one is the school environment does not support an active English communication for students. But it is different from teachers' opinion.

The teachers feel that they have lack of time to allocate the time in preparing and teaching materials for students in a week. The means results of students' and teachers' opinions concerning context give the best response of curriculum 2013. The students argue that the teachers are from English graduates. It means, the teachers have a minimum undergraduate education qualification. In another item, classroom learning activities make students more motivated to learn English. In addition, both the students and the teachers do not know about the standardization of English score in student acceptance. .

The means results of students' and teachers' opinions concerning Input need to have special attention to curriculum 2013. The students respond that the teachers prepare learning tools. It means the students give a good appreciation in using IT media and other media well. However, the teachers do argue that the curriculum does not give properly time in delivering materials both inside or outside the classroom. The means results of students' and teachers' opinions concerning Process have to look at students' needs and support in teaching and learning process in school. The students together with the teachers think that teachers are able to improve students' English skills well by using a scientific approach. It means, students show good character after following English lesson. In contrast with the students, the teachers argue that the students still feel reluctant to communicate in English with their teachers and friends in final. The means results of students' and teachers' opinions concerning Product that students should be encouraged to acquire habit in speaking regarding to curriculum 2013...

References

- Candoli, I. C., Cullen, K., & Stufflebeam, D. L. (1997). *Superintendent performance evaluation: Current practice and directions for improvement*. Boston: Kluwer.
- Erden, M. (1995). *Eğitimde program değerlendirme*. Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.
- Gally, J. (1984, April). The evaluation component. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Guba, E. G., & Stufflebeam, D. L. (1968). Evaluation: The process of stimulating, aiding, and abetting insightful action. In R. Ingle & W. Gephart (Eds.), *Problems in the training of educational researchers*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Granger, A., Grierson, J., Quirino, T. R., & Romano (1965). *Training in planning, monitoring, and evaluation for agricultural research management: Manual 4–Evaluation*. The Hague: International Service for National Agricultural Research.
- Hovardaoğlu, S. (2000). *Davranış bilimleri için araştırma teknikleri*. Ankara: VE-GA Yayınları.
- Karasar, N. (1999). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kelly, A. V. (1999). *The curriculum*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing Limited.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (1969). Evaluation as enlightenment for decision-making. In A. Walcott (Ed.), *Improving educational assessment and an inventory of measures of affective Behavior*. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., & Nevo, D. (1976, Winter). The availability and importance of evaluation information within the school. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 2, 203-9.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., & Webster, W. J. (1988). Evaluation as an administrative function. In N. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 569-601). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (1995). Evaluation of superintendent performance: Toward a general model. In A. McConney (Eds), *Toward a unified model of educational personnel evaluation*. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University Evaluation Center.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., & Millman, J. (1995, December). A proposed model for superintendent Evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 9(4), 383-410.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., Candoli, C., & Nicholls, C. (1995). *A portfolio for evaluation of school superintendents*. Kalamazoo: Center for Research on Educational Accountability and Teacher Evaluation, The Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (1997-a). *Strategies for institutionalizing evaluation: revisited*. Occasional Paper Series #18. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University Evaluation Center.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (2003-b). Institutionalizing evaluation in schools. In T. Kellaghan & D. L. Stufflebeam (Eds.), *The international handbook of educational evaluation* (Chapter 34). Boston: Kluwer.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., Gullickson, A. R., & Wingate, L. A. (2002). *The spirit of Consuelo: An evaluation of Ke Aka Ho‘ona*. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University Evaluation Center.
- Wiles, J. and Bondi J. (2002). *Curriculum development-A guide to practice-*. New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Worthern, B. R., Sanders J. R. and Fitzpatrick J. L. (1997). *Program evaluation – Alternative approaches and practical guidelines-*. New York: Longman, Inc.