

Identification of the Obstacle Factors for 2013 Curriculum Implementation of Public Junior High Schools in Sleman District

Bobitya Adrina

*Master Program in Sport Sciences
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta
Yogyakarta, Indonesia
bobityadrina@gmail.com*

Wawan S. Suherman

*Faculty of Sport Sciences
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta
Yogyakarta, Indonesia
wansuherman@uny.ac.id*

Abstract—the background of the problem of this research is the 2013 curriculum which has not been fully implemented evenly in Junior High School in district Sleman 2017. This study aims to identify factors that have obstacles in the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum in State Junior High Schools in Sleman district, 2017. The factors consisted of teacher factors, student factors, factors of infrastructure, and policy factors. This study was a descriptive study. The method used was a survey using a questionnaire. The population in this study is a physical education teacher from the Junior High School who has already implemented the 2013 Curriculum Region Sleman number of 31 people spread across 19 schools. The data was analyzed using statistical analysis as a percentage. The results confirmed that the barriers to the implementation of the curriculum in 2013 in secondary schools throughout the district of Sleman in 2017 were teacher factors, student factors, factors of infrastructure, and policy factors which were categorized high.

Keywords—obstacles, implémentation, curriculum 2013

I. INTRODUCTION

The curriculum is designed systematically on the basis of prevailing norms which are used as guidelines in the learning process for the educational staff to achieve higher educational goals. Educators have a very important position in the developmental of student potentials. The teacher functions as a facilitator, motivator, stimulator, communicator, and evaluator.

Law Number 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System Article 1 item 19, describes the curriculum as a set of plans and arrangements regarding the objectives, contents, and learning materials as well as the methods used as guidelines for the implementation of learning activities to achieve certain educational goals. Since independence, the curriculum in Indonesia has experienced many transformations. The curriculum changes continuously due to the growing demands of the times. Currently, the curriculum used in Indonesia is the 2013 curriculum. This is a new curriculum created by the government to improve education in Indonesia. There are many pro and con discourses in the implementation of the 2013 curriculum. In the media, there are those who claim that the 2013 curriculum implementation is considered premature because the schools and teachers are

not prepared for it. However, the few who support the 2013 curriculum is not sufficient to quickly implement it.

The Minister of Education and Culture Regulation [2] of the 2013 Curriculum: a) Teacher-centered learning patterns to learner-centered learning. Students must have choices about the material learned to have the same competence; b) One-way learning patterns (teacher-student interaction) into interactive learning (interactive teacher-students-natural environment, sources / other media); and c) The pattern of passive learning becomes active-looking learning (active student learning is increasingly strengthened by the science approach learning model).

According to [3] the process of learning physical education is influenced by several factors. First, the formulation of teaching objectives that contain expectations about changes in expected behavior. Second is the material or substance of teaching. All three methods and strategies are in alignment with the material. Fourth, there is an evaluation that aims to find out the changes that occur in students. To achieve the learning objectives of the school, there needs to be support for related factors. Among other things teachers, students, policies and facilities and infrastructure.

II. RESEARCH METHODS

A. Types of Research

This research applies the survey research method. The descriptive method was used in this research. The descriptive method does not give treatment, manipulation, or alteration to the independent variable, but describes the condition as it is (McMillan and Schumacher, 2001). According to Sukmadinata (2010) the descriptive research aims to describe systematically and accurately, the facts and characteristics of the population or about certain fields. The collected data is analyzed and interpreted, to describe the conditions that occur within the research subject. In line with Sukmadinata, Subandi (2011) who explained that the descriptive method aims to provide a systematic and factual description of the research subject by producing descriptive data according to the actual situation.

B. Time and Place of Research

The research used the quantitative descriptive research method. The research instrument was in the form of a questionnaire distributed to 31 health educators with one shoot technique. Data collection technique by distributing questionnaires to the teachers then analysing the data using descriptive statistics with percentages.

C. Research Subject

A total of 31 state junior high school teachers who had implemented the 2013 curriculum in the Sleman Regency were the study subjects. So this research is quantitative research and population.

- a) Data Collection Techniques, Instruments and Data Analysis
This study applies a quantitative descriptive approach with data collection techniques using questionnaires as instruments.
- b) Research Instruments
This research instrument is a questionnaire. The data collection technique uses a closed questionnaire where as many as 31 respondents just put a check mark on the available column. The technique used is the one shoot technique.
- c) Data analysis technique
This study uses a quantitative descriptive approach with data collection techniques using questionnaires as instruments.

$$P = \frac{f}{N}$$

Ket:

P = Presentase

f = Frekuensi

N = Jumlah Peserta

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the analysis of the research data on obstacles to the implementation of the 2013 curriculum in public junior high schools throughout the sleman district in 2017 are presented as follows:




Fig. 1. Barriers to Implementation of 2013 Curriculum as a whole

This study aims to determine the factors which were obstacles to the implementation of the 2013 curriculum in public junior high schools in the sleman district in 2017. Some of the factors included teachers, students, infrastructure, and policies. Based on the results of the study, the general the obstacles to the implementation of the 2013 curriculum in state junior high schools in the sleman district in 2017 were in the category of "sufficient" which is equal to 58.06%. This is inseparable from the existing factors, namely teachers, students, infrastructure and policies.

From the result analysis, each statement item on the questionnaire about the teacher factor according to item number 3 statement, that in compiling a preliminary RPP that is in accordance with the 2013 Curriculum is still quite hindering for teachers. This is because the teacher's knowledge of the material coverage, the description of competencies, and knowledge of learning resources is still limited, so that it is categorized as quite inhibiting. The 2013 Curriculum Training is deemed necessary to make it easier for teachers to make RPPs and compile their own teaching materials.

Student factors were also categorized as "sufficient" in the analysis of the obstacles to the implementation of 2013 curriculum. From the results of the analysis, each statement item on the student factor questionnaire according to item number 13, students are still not fully ready partake in learning penjas which is in accordance with the 2013 Curriculum. In the previous curriculum (KTSP), learning was not student-centered, but rather the teacher centred, so, students had a more passive tendency. Presently, with the implementation of the 2013 curriculum, the learning centre is focused on students, so, students are required to actively participating in teaching and learning. To encourage students to be more active and independent, teachers must be creative in determining learning strategies.

Additionally, infrastructure facilities are categorized as "high" in the implementation of the 2013 curriculum in the sleman district in 2017. This is inseparable from the inequality of infrastructure available in State Junior High Schools throughout the Sleman Regency which have implemented the 2013 curriculum. The results of the factor analysis of the infrastructure facilities in the questionnaire about the availability, conditions and supporting media in accordance with the 2013 are many schools that have not been able to meet the criteria. Some schools cannot carry out theory hours optimally due to media limitations such as LCDs. In addition, the availability of facilities for practice is also not evenly distributed for it to influence the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum.

The results of this study are in line with the results of [1] the study entitled "barriers in physical education majors at MTs Ma'arif Daarusholihin Sumberadi Mlati Sleman" which stated with poor physical education conditions, such as lack of facilities and infrastructure that would reduce the effectiveness of the learning process.

Finally, policy factors that include socialization, workshops and facilitation are still categorized as "high". The lack of workshops from the education office will of course inhibit teachers who implement the training that is in accordance with the 2013 Curriculum. From the above factors, if one of the factors does not go well, it will hamper

the physical education learning process. If all of these factors go well, then the process of learning physical education and the implementation of the 2013 curriculum will be optimal.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study, it can be concluded that the general obstacle to implementing the 2013 curriculum is in the "enough" category. It has enough meaning that in implementing the 2013 curriculum, there are still sufficient obstacles from the factors revealed in the questionnaire. This is evidenced by the percentage of results of 58.06% (18 teachers).

REFERENCES

- [1] A. D. Nugroho, "Hambatan Siswa dalam mengikuti pembelajaran pendidikan jasmani di MTS Ma'arif Mlati Sleman". Yogyakarta, Fakultas Ilmu Keolahragaan UNY, Skripsi, 2016.
- [2] Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan nomor 68 tahun 2013. Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 2013.
- [3] R. Lutan, "Mengajar Pendidikan Jasmani". Jakarta, Depdiknas, 2001.