POSNER'S ANALYSIS ON INDONESIAN CURRICULUM 2013

Nyak Mutia Ismail[*] and **Ika Apriani Fata**

Syiah Kuala University, Banda Aceh, INDONESIA
[*]*Corresponding author:* nyakmutiaismail2010@gmail.com

Abstract

This research is aimed at analyzing the Indonesian curriculum 2013 (K13) using Posner's Curriculum Analysis Framework: Curriculum origin, curriculum proper, curriculum in use, and curriculum critique. The analysis process was carried out by employing qualitative method, mainly document analyses and interviews with teachers and parents. This study is expectedly considered as a bridge to a more trustworthy effort in K13's implementation, especially for teachers and parents in providing more supportive actions and behaviors pertaining to the youths' pedagogical provisions. The result depicts that the curriculum origin has been derived from the goal of better citizenship characters which are needed in imprinting the students' intellectual and psychological growth. K13 consists of Core competence and Basic competence for elementary, junior, senior high-school, and higher education in attempt to reach students' higher-order thinking skill enhancement. Concerning on its implementation as well as limitation, K13 emphasizes on technology use, knowledge, and skill from various stakeholders, such as from parents, schools, and policy-makers. In conclusion, the K-13 curriculum is a well-designed curriculum but in its implementation it needs further review.

Keywords: *Posner's analysis framework, Indonesian curriculum 2013, curriculum analysis.*

INTRODUCTION

Curriculum has become one of the success determinant factors in reaching the purposes of education. To this purpose, the government has arranged -the modified curriculum named *Kurikulum 2013* (K13) which is basically the revised version of the former Indonesian curriculum, *Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan* or School-Based Curriculum released in 2006. What differentiates between K13 and KTSP -is that K13 has supplementary considerations concerning the character-based education system, changing elements that include various standards such as graduation standards, content standards, process standards, and assessment standards. This curriculum is a *Process Model* curriculum since it engages students rather than teachers and accentuates on social and life skills (O'Neill, 2010).

In the search of K13's early implementation progress, the authors were determined to comply with the Posner's Curriculum Analysis which takes four fundamental elements into account; they are the curriculum origin, curriculum proper, curriculum in use, and curriculum critique (Posner, 2004). Curriculum Origin seeks the factors and histories behind the curriculum development and revision. All aspects concerning to philosophical, theoretical, empirical, and jurisdictional aspect of K13 are intertwined in this study. In addition, the Curriculum Proper clarifies the structure and content embraced in K13. Next, in the Curriculum in Use frame, the implementation process of K13 is

reckoned. The last to mention is the curriculum critique, where the limitations of the K13 are discussed based on the teachers' and parents' experiences during the K13 implementation.

METHODS

The method used in this study was qualitative approach where the authors adopted document analysis and interviews with teachers and parents. The document analysis was addressed to perceive the answer for framework one, two, and three; Curriculum Origin, Curriculum Proper, and Curriculum in use. While the interview with teachers was meant to discover the practical implementation of K13; and this again emerges as Curriculum in Use in the Posner's framework. Lastly, responses on the Curriculum Critique were obtained from the interview with both teachers and parents.

The documents used in this study were basically-K13 documents. These documents were obtained from the teachers as they were handed with those copies during trainings on the K13. The documents were originally developed by the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture (or *Kemendikbud*). The authors would like to look for the history behind the curriculum planning, the structure and contents it conceives and the implementation plans of the K-13. Regarding of Curriculum critique, there were six curriculum practitioners involved in the interview process, two were primary school teachers, two junior high-school teachers, and two senior high-school teachers. In addition, regarding parents' complicity, there were five parents who were invited to share the experiences and perceptions on the K13 implementation whose children are studying at different levels of education. The interviews were recorded and for the details on the questions, please see Appendix.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

There are four elements noted in this section as the result of this study; they are Curriculum origin, Curriculum proper, Curriculum in use, and Curriculum critique.

Curriculum Origin

Initially, to provide the elaboration about the Curriculum origin, the authors encountered the following rationales for the K13 development. The first thing that evokes into the curriculum perfection process is the jurisdictional principle, which is stated in Indonesian Constitution *UU.No.20/2003* that *"Strategi pembangunan pendidikan nasional dalam undang-undang ini meliputi: ..., 2. Pengembangan dan pelaksanaan kurikulum berbasis kompetensi* [The strategy of national education development in this constitution includes: ...., 2. the development and implementation of competence-based curriculum]". Further, the constitution implies that learning at school is not merely focusing on cognitive and knowledge alone, but also on character-buildings and skills. Indeed, these factors are gripped in the hand of science and strongly related to culture as Aikenhead (1997) also states that the goal of Western's Education is to achieve cultural transmission of solemn science content—knowledge, values, and skills. Just to mention, this fact unveils that there is no disparity coming forth in between Western and Indonesian (Eastern) educational purpose, unless it comes to each culture itself since there is a clearly distinctive counter-polation.

Likewise, second in curriculum origin, philosophical aspect plays a role, too. Again it is declared in the curriculum document that the Indonesian education system is absolutely rooted from Indonesian culture. The culture itself requires all of the Indonesian youth to intellectually and psychologically grow in the domain of religious beings, noble morality, healthy, smart, competent, independent, democratic, and responsible citizens (Kemendikbud, 2012). Third, Kemendikbud (2012) further clarifies the theoretical principle involved in the K13 development that Indonesia expects for higher graduation standard, and theories offered that this objective can only be achieved through the implementation of a curriculum that sets the focal point on competence—knowledge, values, and skills. Lastly, empirical aspect proved that Indonesian generation profoundly need to be prepared for the elevating economic growth, on one hand; and on the social and criminal issues that have awfully occurred across the country such as drug abuse, corruption, violation and etc. (Kemendikbud, 2012). Based on these four considerations, the government has run their policy on curriculum refinement that in no coincidence is undoubtedly withdrawn from Indonesian culture.

Curriculum Proper

The second noteworthy element of the analysis is the Curriculum proper pertaining the structure and content of K13 from which the data were still attained from the K13 documents mentioned earlier. The K13 curriculum core structures for all level of education in Indonesia are presented in the following table.

Table 1. K13 structure of curriculum in education adopted from Posner (2004).

Educational Level	Primary (SD)						Secondary (SMP)			High-school (SMA)		
Subject	Weekly time allocation (hour)											
	Thematic model											
Grade	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII
Group A												
Religion education	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3
Civics	5	6	6	6	6	6	3	3	3	2	2	2
Bahasa Indonesia	8	8	10	10	10	10	6	6	6	4	4	4
Mathematics	5	6	6	6	6	6	5	5	5	4	4	4
Science							5	5	5			
Social Science							4	4	4			
English							4	4	4	2	2	2
Arts and culture										2	2	2
Crafting										2	2	2
Physical education										2	2	2
Indonesian history										2	2	2
Group B (local content)												
Arts and culture	4	4	4	6	6	6	3	3	3			
Physical education	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3			
Crafting							2	2	2			
Total	30	32	34	36	36	36	38	38	38	23	23	23

The subjects in group A orient more on the intellectual and affective development rather than that of group B which focus on the development of affective and psychomotoric ability. Since it is unlikely to provide the complete content details on the K13 here, please see *Kompetensi Dasar Kurikulum or basic competence of K13* provided by *Depdikbud*. Unlike lower level school, the K13 requires senior high school students to enroll academic/vocational specialty subject; they are Math and Science, Social Science, and Language, with each specialty extends to some other elective subjects. These specialty programs require the SMA students to take minimum 41 hours for grade X, and 43 hours for both grade XI and XII. In total, SMA students automatically have more time allocation—64 hours for grade X, and 66 hours for grade XI and XII.

Curriculum in Use

The third aspect in Posner's analysis is the curriculum in use which seeks the implementation process of K13. Based on the document, it was found that there are involvements of various stakeholders and numerous efforts and planning on track. First of all, the government is responsible for preparing teachers and principals regarding the K13 implementation as well as gradual implementation process on all levels of education. Besides, the teacher and practitioner training programs had also been held from 2013 to 2015. Students' and teachers' progress books -were also handled during the timespan mentioned; and the monitoring and evaluation of the K13 implementation has been run since 2013 to 2016. Yet, this is the plan documented on the curriculum which has appeared distorted in reality condition due to most schools do not implement yet the K13 at the time this research was conducted.

Curriculum Critique

The last framework is the Curriculum critique which clarifies drawbacks of the K13. The data are the result on the withdrawn rooted from the interview with teachers and parents. The authors learnt that the teachers from private schools—with well-facilitated teaching environment—saw K13 as nothing to stumble their way, while those from public schools which are normally less-facilitated, definitely shoulder the confusion on the K13 procedure. As Yurekli (2012) implies that curriculum is more than books, courses, and contents, it relates to three essential points: students' needs, setting

needs (infrastructure and facilitation), and approaches. In addition, teachers with older age-span difference resent this curriculum more than they assume that K13 is rather impractical; teachers who are younger informed that, basically, K13 is quite easy to apply. Likewise, teachers from private schools and, also, younger teachers, understand the K13 when they were trained, apparently older teachers do not.

Concerning the students' books and teachers' guide books, the teachers informed that the books are helpful since the books are arranged to serve the needs of K13 implementation. The books provided for *SD* are confusing since they apply thematic learning model, however. Thereunto, an *SD* teacher should be capable of teaching various subject(s) beyond their mastery all at once, this point particularly burdens the *SD* teachers. And worse for SD students that even the father of Multiple Intelligence theory, Howard Gardner himself, claims that students are lacking capacity of applying one certain knowledge to another completely different setting (Kelting-Gibson, 2013). They do not understand how to conform between Math and Physical education. Next, the time allocation demanded by K13 extends in the level of SMA where they have specialty subjects *(Peminatan).* The teachers considered that the allocation time is not matter of challenge. For the equipment and infrastructure available at the schools, they are fulfilled in private schools but they are not in public schools whereas technological equipment helped learners generate, develop, and communicate their ideas through various designs; and decently informing technologies can enhance the performance of lower ability students (Barlex & Welch, 2001). Furthermore, Yusop (2013) confirmed that learning through media and technology exposes students to employ their critical thinking and problem solving skills.

Next, it is about the teachers' contribution in the implementation of K13. The teachers from all levels clarified that they would support any projects that the government host for educational necessities and improvements as long as all parties can cooperatively solve any possible problems and head to the sturdy decisions; which further means, it is not only in teachers' and schools' duty, but also politicians', business corporations', parents', and society's in general (Nurhidayati*, et al.,* 2016). The last two questions demanded the explanation of K13 on both students and teachers. The teachers admitted that actually they should teach more soulfully since K13 requires the value/character assessment which cannot be presented in numerical values, so that the teachers should definitely keep an eye on every student all semester long.

In regard to parents' perception, generally they acknowledged that they need to assist their children studying at home. This condition insists on their having knowledge expansion whether on intelligence, values, or parenting psychology. Mostly, the parents confessed that they do not have enough time to take care of the children's stuff from school—it would evidently lead to another condition for parents with more than one child. Concisely, parents are constantly willing to collaborate but they cannot promise a whole assistance without supports from the school, the teachers, and other governmental officials. This condition is directly supported by Looney (2007) that, merely, Posner's curriculum conscience only compromises with ideological surface but appears rather impractical to its implementation.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, although Curriculum 2013 has the most-noble objectives to achieve Indonesian education quality enhancement, this program absolutely cannot be carried out by one single party. Developing well-coordinated cooperation would seemingly be more helpful, especially public supervision and parenting debriefing as maintenance of social understanding. It is also one of key features of good curriculum.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

Aikenhead, G. S. (1997). Toward a first nation cross-cultural science and technology curriculum. In W. W. Cobern (Ed.). *Culture and comparative studies* (pp. 217-238). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Barlex, D., & Welch, M. (2001). Educational research and curriculum development: the case for synergy. *The Journal of Design and Technology Education, 6*(1), 29-39.

Hussain, A., Dogar, A. H., Azeem, M., & Shakoor, A. (2011). Evaluation of curriculum development process. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 1*(14), 263-271.

Kemendikbud. (2012). *Dokumen kurikulum 2013*. Kementerian pendidikan dan kebudayaan, Jakarta.

Kelting-Gibson, L. (2013). Analysis of 100 years of curriculum design. *International Journal of Instruction, 6*(1), 39-58.

Looney, A. (2007). Curriculum as policy: some implications of contemporary policy studies for the analysis of curriculum policy, with particular reference to post-primary curriculum policy in the Republic of Ireland. *The Curriculum Journal, 12*(2), 149 – 162.

Nurhidayati, Komariah, E., Yasin, B., & Fata, I. A. (2016). Investigating students' language exposure in achieving their knowledge of collocation. *Proceedings of the First Reciprocal Graduate Research Symposium between University Pendidikan Sultan Idris and Syiah Kuala University* (pp.10-19). February 26-28, Universitas Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Tanjong Malim.

Yurekli, A. (2012). An analysis of curriculum renewal in EAP context. *International Journal of Instruction, 5*(1), 49-68.

O'neill, G. (2010). *Overview of curriculum models*. Retrieved from www.ucd.ie/teaching.

Posner, N. (2004). *Analyzing the curriculum* (3ʳᵈ Edition). New York: McGraw Hill.

Yusop, F. D. (2013). Curriculum and design analysis of a mathematics-based educational television program: a case study of cyber chase animated television series. *The Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Technology, 1*(2), 8-18.