

## IMPLEMENTATION OF SCHOOL-BASED CURRICULUM AS PERCEIVED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

Chuzaimah Dahlan Diem<sup>1</sup>

Yusfardiyah<sup>2</sup>

Binti Koniaturrohmah<sup>3</sup>

Lismalayani<sup>4</sup>

Sriwijaya University Palembang<sup>1</sup>

SMPN 33 Palembang<sup>2</sup>

SMAN 10 Palembang<sup>3</sup>

SMAN 19 Palembang<sup>4</sup>

chuzaid@gmail.com

Article received: 25 February 2015

Final proof received: 21 January 2016

### Abstract

Information about Curriculum 2013 has seemed to make many EFL teachers feel anxious. This anxiety is assumed to happen due to the unwillingness of the teachers to implement the new curriculum because they have not yet even implemented the previous curriculum (KTSP) in their classrooms optimally. This study was aimed primarily at investigating the implementation of KTSP covering three important components: preparation, application, and evaluation by 107 secondary school teachers of English. To collect the data, "KTSP Implementation Questionnaire" was used. The data collected based on the teachers' own perceptions were analyzed in relation to their education level, teaching experience, certification status, and KTSP socialization involvement. The results showed that (1) 62% teachers confessed that they had not yet optimally implemented KTSP although all of them had been involved in its dissemination program done by the government; (2) there was no correlation between either education level or teaching experience and the implementation of KTSP. However, (3) there was a significant correlation between teachers' certification status and their (i) KTSP preparation, (ii) teaching experience, and (iii) involvement in dissemination program activities.

**Keywords:** Curriculum implementation, education level, school-based curriculum (KTSP)

Every nation has its own system of education which is in line with its ideal and needs. To increase the quality of life of the nation, the quality of education must firstly be enhanced through its school curriculum. In line with this, Ki Hajar Dewantara, an Indonesian education philosopher and the first education minister of Indonesia, (cited in Nuh, 2010) has long said that education cannot be enhanced without the development of character, intelligence, and civics. In addition, the Indonesian national education objectives as stated in the UUD 1945 (1945 Constitutional Law), section 31, verse 3 that, "the government carries out national education to increase the faith, piety, and noble character or morals in order to develop Indonesian citizens' lives as organized in the law." Then Section 31, verse 5 also shows that, "the government advances knowledge and technology by holding in high esteem the values of religions and unity of nation for the advancement of civilization and prosperity of human beings" (*Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia*, 2013). Meanwhile the Indonesian Act number 20 year 2003 about National Education System, Section 3 also states that the function of national education is to develop ability

and build character and civilization for human values whose aim is to sharpen Indonesian citizen's life. This aims at developing students' potential so that they become (1) religious and pious to one God, (2) self-behaved, (3) healthy, knowledgeable, capable, creative, independent, (4) democratic, and (5) responsible (*Kantor Pemerintahan Republik Indonesia*, 2003).

To fulfill the objectives of the national education above, the government has done several efforts, some of which are developing school curriculums, beginning from the Competence-Based Curriculum (2004), School-Based Curriculum (2006) to the Curriculum 2013 which has been implemented at the targeted schools in the academic year of 2013/2014. All of these curricula encourage that education is not only a means to develop students' academic competence but also characters or moral conducts (*Kantor Pemerintahan Republik Indonesia*, 2010). Therefore, since 2010, School-Based Curriculum has suggested that morals be the main factors to build in order to reach a safe and prosperous society and its implementation by the teachers must be firstly reviewed and studied (read also Megawangi, 2004).

### **The Development of KTSP**

The idea of developing KTSP has been started since the introduction of the Competence-Based Curriculum (KBK) in 2004. It was piloted for 2 years and after that, it was formally called KTSP in 2006. This curriculum focuses on genre-based approach and prioritized the use of multiple genres of texts, such as *transactional/interpersonal, short functional, descriptive, procedure or expository, recount, narrative, anecdote, etc.* In line with this, Diem, Ihsan, Purnomo, and Inderawati's study (2003) has previously found that the use of multiple genres of texts in the curriculum was effective in increasing high school students' study skills and reading comprehension and in developing their reading habit.

After KTSP had been around for 6 years, then on behalf of the Department of National Education, the Center for Curriculum and Book Development (*Puskurbuk*) started to carry out the dissemination of the character education (cited in Merymaswarita, 2009) for the acceleration of the national development priority for the betterment of the curriculum and the promotion of student active learning to build character and establish competitiveness among students and graduates (*see also Kantor Pemerintahan Republik Indonesia* about president instruction (2010).

In addition to the president instruction 2010 above, Middle-Term-Development Plan (RPJMN) 2010-2014) (*Badan Perencanaan Nasional*, 2010) has also arranged and stated in its education sector several priorities of education development. Among others deal with, first, personal and social competencies, the love of own culture and language, and the use of teaching approach which is student-active learning (student centered).

The next priority deals with the reorganizing of school curriculum which consists of national and local (school) content are as so it will result in better graduates who could fulfill the needs of competent Indonesian human resources who could relate their competencies with the demands of the workforce (link and match).

Furthermore, in 2011 to 2012, some schools were involved as the participating schools in the "piloting project" to carry out Character-Based Education, either by integrating values of culture and national character in all of the documents of school curriculum (Documents 1 and 2), or by implementing them in all of the school stakeholders, prior to making school commitment. However, character education itself did not seem to be fully comprehended by most teachers as practitioners at schools because only very few schools, for example in Palembang, were involved in the piloting project (Dinas Pendidikan dan Olahraga Kota Palembang. (2010). Therefore, it is assumed that only the teachers of those participating schools who somewhat performed the character education in their

schools. With this condition, it is known that the contents about character education in KTSP are actually the stepping stone towards the main competency (core competence) promoted in the Curriculum 2013. Then in terms of student-centered approach, actually KTSP has already promoted this type of learning by offering Four Steps in Two Cycles (*oral and written cycles*) with *building knowledge of field (BkoF), modeling of texts (MoT), join-construction of text (JCoT) and independent construction of text (ICoT)*; Contextual Teaching and Learning (CTL), i.e. *Inquiry, Constructivism, Modeling, Questioning, Learning Community, Authentic Assessment and Reflection*. In general, as stated in the basic course outline of lesson plan development in KTSP, teachers must include activities, such as exploration, elaboration, and confirmation in the main procedure of teaching and learning process in the classroom (application part). Therefore, what is offered by the curriculum 2013 is not totally different from that of KTSP.

Knowing that the new curriculum 2013 has to be implemented beginning from 2013, many teachers in some schools, especially those in Palembang (South Sumatra Province) are anxious. Therefore, to see the extent of their anxiety and how much has KTSP been implemented by the teachers as it is stated in the standards of national education, this study was intentionally conducted.

School-Based Curriculum (SBC or KTSP) itself, according to the government regulation number 19 year 2005, article no. 15 (Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 2005), is the operational curriculum which is organized and implemented by every school at every level of education. It gives a full autonomy to the principal of the school with a full responsibility for the development of curriculum in accordance with the local condition and the authority and power to develop, create, and manage learning which is relevant to the students' needs priority.

Furthermore, the government has also encouraged educators and educational staff to increase their professionalism, so that they can have enough knowledge of any curriculum and implement it accordingly. The development of professionalism was done by doing several activities, such as socialization of the curriculum, in house training (IHT), subject matters teacher forum (MGMP), workshop, training, technical guidance, etc.

Above all, teacher is still the most important and influential factor in the teaching and learning process and eventually students' achievements and success in the future learning. Mulyasa (2007, p. 164) confirmed that the development of KTSP requires teachers' creativity in building students' individual competence, increasing the quality of learning, and in making KTSP effective when implemented.

### School-Based Curriculum (KTSP) Implementation

Based on Ratri and Yuliana's study (2010), the implementation of KTSP in several regions in Indonesia has not been successful yet. They found that the teachers' knowledge of KTSP at one school in middle Java is still very low. They said that this fact was caused by teachers' not having enough exposure to it and if there were some kinds of socialization, they were also too short so that it was hard for the teachers to internalize the concept. In addition, the supervision and feedback to the implementation of KTSP in the classroom was also low. Furthermore, they confirmed that most teachers still lack of preparation and there were always discrepancies between what should be done and what have been implemented and practiced in real classrooms.

Teachers themselves have various understanding about KTSP because whenever there are trainings or workshops, those who are invited to join the activity are mostly the same persons. Therefore, many teachers feel that whether or not they use KTSP, it really depends on the individual teacher. They seem to practice whatever they have known and/or been familiar with. This seems to be true especially for senior teachers who have felt safe using the old methods or strategies of teaching without trying hard to be innovative by looking for materials and new strategies of teaching in relation to the advancement of science and technology. Radjab (2010) found that only 33% of the *lesson plans* written by the teachers of one SMKN (state vocational school) in West Java were based on the guidelines specific for the vocational schools. The level of implementation of the teaching and learning was only 52% and as a whole the competence of teachers' classroom management was 60%.

Furthermore, the results of the study done by Merymaswarita (2009) at one SMPN (state junior high school) in Palembang also showed that the implementation of KTSP was not yet in accordance with the criteria required in the KTSP guidelines. This indicates that KTSP is not used optimally, so that the activities of teaching and learning process in the classroom are still teacher-centered. If the process of learning is still dominated by the teacher, then it can be assumed that the objective of national education may not be fully achieved since the students are not trained to be active, creative, independent and responsible in facing and solving problems they face. On the other hand, teachers should give every student chances to actively give their opinions and creatively find solutions to the problems they have by themselves. In this case, teachers must function as facilitators who are ready to help and guide students at every stage of activities (preparation, application, evaluation) that has been organized in the lesson plan.

Different from the previous researchers, Riyanti (2010) in her research found that the

implementation of KTSP in biology instruction at state SMPs in Tegal Regency has run well as expected. For example, the development of syllabus was done together in the subject matters teacher forum focus-group discussion among younger teachers (Forum MGMP, 2013) while in the process of teaching and learning, these teachers have applied various methods and used different resources and teaching media. Then to see the performance of the students in terms of conceptual mastery and its application in the real world the evaluation was done using Class-Based Evaluation (PBK).

However, some teachers in Palembang still face difficulties in evaluating students' performance and in giving tasks related to life skills especially in using ICT in the classrooms. Kurniawan (2013) found that only 3.52% (using 5 scales) teachers had good knowledge about ICT, although 45% of them had already integrated ICT in their classrooms. He also found that the younger the age of the teachers, the higher the level of their ICT understanding and the more they used it in their teaching-learning activities. This seems to happen globally. A recent survey done by Hutchinson and Reinking (2011) in the United States also showed similar results that many teachers feel unprepared to integrate literacy and technology into their classrooms.

Finally, although negative correlation was found between teacher education level and students' achievement, and no correlation between teachers' ELT experience and students' achievement (Diem, 2004), the present study tries to see the correlation between both teachers' education level (EL) and teaching experience (TE) and teachers' implementation of KTSP for another reason. From 2013 to 2015, there were only 33 (3.37%) junior high schools and 41 (8.84%) senior high schools in South Sumatra using Curriculum 2013 (Kemdikbud, 2013). This means that the rests were still using KTSP.

All of the above facts have encouraged us to do a survey about the implementation of KTSP in the ELT classrooms of the teachers of English in Palembang City as the prior knowledge in anticipating the implementation of the new *Curriculum 2013* in relation to teachers' level of education, teaching experience, certification status, and KTSP dissemination activities.

### METHOD

This present study was aimed at investigating the implementation of KTSP which covers three important aspects: *preparation*, *application*, and *evaluation*. The main purpose was to see whether 107 teachers of English of junior (SMP) and senior high schools (SMA and SMK) in Palembang City had prior knowledge about KTSP and had implemented it in their teaching and learning process as measured by an instrument called *KTSP*

*Implementation Questionnaire (KTSP-IQ)* (Kristiana, 2011) and their perception in relation to their *educational level (EL)*, *teaching experience (TE)*, *certification status (CS)*, and *dissemination activities (DA)*.

KTSP-IQ consists of three important components: *knowledge of preparation* (9 items—4 of them are stated negatively), *implementation* (32 items—10 of them are stated negatively), and *evaluation* (17 items—3 of them are stated negatively). Using Likert scale, the scoring system is categorized into five aspects: strongly agree—5, agree—4, neutral—3, disagree—2, and strongly disagree—1 if the statements are positive. However, if the statement is negative, then the score would be the opposite, that is strongly agree—1, agree—2, neutral—3, disagree—4, and strongly disagree—5. The reliability is .896 and all of them are valid with lowest correlation is  $> .1279$  for alpha level .05

In analyzing the data, first of all the demographic data as variables, such as *education*

*level*, *teaching experience*, *certification status*, and *times of joining KTSP dissemination* were correlated using Pearson Product-Moment correlation of SPSS latest version. To see whether there was a contribution of each of the demographic variables to the implementation of KTSP, regression analyses were used.

**RESULTS**

**Descriptive Statistics**

Most of the teachers of English in this study have their S1 degree (92.5%) and some of them have even graduated from graduate or *masters* program (7.5%) with English language teaching (ELT) experience for about 11 to 20 years (Mean = 15.15). In terms of certification and participation in KTSP dissemination program, most of them have been certified (84%) and many have had exposure to KTSP dissemination (62%) done by the government (See Table 1).

Table 1. Frequency and means of variables measured in relation to teachers' implementation of KTSP (N = 107)

VARIABLES	MEAN	FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE	STANDARD DEVIATION
Educational Level (EL)	1.07		2.64
a. S1		99 (92.5%)	
b. S2		8 (7.5%)	
Teaching Experience (TE)	15.15		8.09
a. 0 – 10 years		30 (28%)	
b. 11 – 20 years		51 (47.7%)	
c. >21 years		26 (24.3%)	
Certification Status (CS)	.84		3.67
a. Not yet		17 (15.9%)	
b. Yes		90 (84.1%)	
Involvement in Dissemination Activities (DA)	.62		.488
a. Not yet		41 (38.3%)	
b. Yes		66 (61.7%)	

In relation to the implementation of KTSP in the teaching and learning process in general, the results of the data analyses show that in the **preparation aspect** (knowledge of KTSP implementation), it was found that 100% teachers mentioned the importance of being exposed to the KTSP prior to its implementation in their school (item #1) regardless their having a chance to participate in the KTSP dissemination activities or not. However, it was detected that many of them still had difficulties in internalizing how to put the students' competency understanding into work in their teaching and learning process (item #5), such as integrating aspects of each English skill in their teaching so that the students could reach the competency needed in each lesson they teach (item #6).

In the **application aspect**, surprisingly, 100% teachers admitted that they had used various references as materials (item #30) to support their classroom instruction and 97% teachers also *agree*

to use various teaching media in their teaching and learning process (item #43). However, the fact showed that 44% of the teachers still used lecturing method in their classroom (item #33).

In the **evaluation aspect**, 97% teachers themselves determined the types of evaluation to be used and only 3% of them were not sure whether it was their responsibility to decide what type of assessment they had to give or just to use those available in the text book without matching them to the previously planned competency (item #51). In relation to this, unfortunately, 91% teachers confessed to their students did not know the criteria of the assessment given to them and only 9% of them did admit that their students had already known about them (item #55).

**Statistical Analyses**

The results of the statistical analyses show that there is no correlation between *implementation of KTSP as a whole variable (KTSP<sub>Total</sub>)* and either *KTSP*

dissemination activities (DA) or teachers' teaching experience (TE). However, teachers' preparation in the KTSP, the amount of time involved in DA, and TE are significantly correlated with the teachers'

status of being certified (*certification status--CS*) (R .217,  $p < .025$ ; R. 236,  $p < .014$ ; and R.437,  $p < .000$ ) respectively (See Table 2).

Table 2. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients among variables measured (N = 107)

Vaiables	KTSP Implementation Total	KTSP - Preparation	KTSP - Application	KTSP - Evaluation	Education level	Teaching Experience	Certification Status	Socialization activities
KTSP implementation Total	1.000							
KTSP-Prepara-tion	-.080 .411	1.000						
KTSP-Application	-.071 .468	.437**	1.000					
KTSP-Evaluation	.151 .121	.003 .978	.236*	1.000				
Education level	.058 .553	.102 .295	.147 .131	-.128 .188	1.000			
Teaching experience	-.124 .204	.021 .826	-.148 .129	-.138 .155	-.080 .411	1.000		
Certification Status	.083 .397	.217* .025	.026 .791	.042 .668	-.071 .468	.437** .000	1.000	
Dissemination activities	.048 .625	.109 .265	.060 .542	-.031 .754	.151 .121	.003 .978	.236* .014	1.000

Notes:

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). \* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

When we look at every aspect of the three aspects of the implementation of KTSP, it was found out that there was a positive correlation between *preparation* and *application* (R.421;  $p < .000$ ), and between *application* and *evaluation* (R.787;  $p < .000$ ). However, interestingly to note,

there was no correlation between *preparation* and *evaluation* of KTSP implementation.

Based on Table 3 below, it can be seen that although there is a correlation between each of the independent variables (LE, TE, and CS) and the implementation of KTSP<sub>Total</sub>, the correlation is not significant.

Table 3. Summary statistics of the contribution of independent variables (educational level, teaching experience, certification status) to the dependent variable (implementation of KTSP<sub>Total</sub>)

Model	Variables	The Implementation of KTSP			
		R	R <sup>2</sup>	F	Sig.
1	Educational level	.058	.003	.355	.553
2	Educational level + Teaching Experience	.133	.018	.935	.396
3	Educational level + Teaching Experience + Certification Status	.203	.041	1.483	.224

Furthermore, when the combination of all of the four independent variables (EL, TE, CS and DA) was correlated with each of the aspects of the implementation of KTSP (preparation, application, and evaluation as the dependent variables), it was found that the combination of independent variables and each aspect of dependent variables did contribute but it was not significant. Their contribution to the preparation aspect is 7.1% (R= .267,  $R^2 = .071$ ;  $p < .106$ ), to the application aspect is 5.1% (R= .225,  $R^2 = .051$ ;  $p < .253$ ) and to the evaluation aspect is 4.2% (R= .204,  $R^2 = .042$ ;  $p < .358$ ) (See Table 4). However, when the data were analyzed using the stepwise regression

analysis it was found that only Certification Status (CS) did correlate with and contribute to the preparation aspect significantly for 4.7% (R= .217,  $R^2 = .047$ ;  $p < .025$ ).

## DISCUSSION

For the knowledge or preparation aspect of the implementation of KTSP, it can be said that most of the teachers still need to be exposed to KTSP in order to enable them to effectively implement it. For example, each aspect has its own terms which most of them were not familiar with. Therefore, it is understandable if they found difficulties in developing

Table 4. Summary statistics of the contribution of the combination of all independent variables (educational level, teaching experience, certification status, and dissemination program activities) to each aspect of KTSP implementation (preparation, application, evaluation)

Variables	Preparation		Application		Evaluation	
	R	R <sup>2</sup> /p<	R	R <sup>2</sup> /p<	R	R <sup>2</sup> /p<
Combination of four independent variables	.267	<b>.071</b> p<.106	.225	<b>.051</b> p<.253	.204	<b>.042</b> p<.358

their lesson plans (RPP), applying them, and eventually evaluating the outcomes because knowing the basic concepts is a must for a teacher of English to succeed in implementing any curriculum (in this case KTSP). This condition will be worse if they are still not aware of what to do in relation to the identification of, say, *objectives* and/or *indicators*, the two concepts which are needed to determine which competencies to be reached in one lesson unit.

Basically teachers of English in the study did not have any objection in adopting KTSP in their classroom teaching and learning process. This shows that before implementing a new curriculum, the teachers have participated in socialization about it so that they are supposed to be aware of both the contents and the approach how to implement the curriculum in their real classroom. Otherwise, the implementation would not be optimally done and to do their duties as teachers they would go back to their old ways that they have long been familiar with.

That the preparation and evaluation components were not correlated may be because we, the researchers, did not have enough data for predicting what will result in appropriate outcome since the teachers did not directly imagine or predict the real application of KTSP through the questionnaire. In addition there probably was a constraint in terms of the time allocated during the process of teaching which results in teachers' not having the chance to present the whole materials which have been prepared.

The same is true for the testimony of the teachers about using various resources in the learning process which still needs verification in an evaluation study by looking at their lesson plans and what they really do based on the plans during the teaching and learning process in the classrooms.

In addition, the above findings may also have happened probably because the teachers who have already joined the workshop, in-house training, or technical guidance were not fully well informed due to the duration of the dissemination was sometimes very short. Furthermore, if the facilitators were from the office of National Education Department (not the practitioners), the contents being delivered tended to be only theoretically-based. As a result, the participants, in this case teachers remained confused.

Another possibility is that some of the teachers

were not serious in joining the dissemination activities, because they might feel that they did not need to develop their own sets of teaching preparation documents anymore due to the availability of the readymade syllabi, lesson plans, and books labeled KTSP offered by publishers.

Ideally, teachers should have read and understood the Document 1 of KTSP (background, school vision and mission, objectives, learning load, extra-curricular activities, local content, promotion/graduation criteria, academic calendar, etc.) which has been developed by the School Curriculum Development Team (*Tim Pengembang Kurikulum Sekolah*) prior to developing and applying Document 2 which consists of competency mapping, syllabus development (in one semester or year), minimum criteria of learning mastery (KKM), and lesson plan. Above all, the teachers have to comprehend the basic course outlines of KTSP itself, including the four standards in national standards of education, i.e. content, process, evaluation, and promotion/graduate competency (BAN-S/M, 2009).

That most of the teachers agreed to use teaching media in the teaching and learning process, does not guarantee that they used them in their classroom. Unfortunately, there were still 44% teachers using lecturing method in their teaching and learning activities. This probably happened because using the media sometimes needs more time allocation, especially in preparing the electronic media, i.e. computer, multimedia, etc. Sometimes the previously-scheduled teacher does not use his/her teaching hour properly (is not disciplined), so that the next teacher would have difficulties to organize the time left. This is why the teachers then tend to go back to lecturing method in presenting the material, which is different from what has been written in their lesson plan.

For the evaluation aspect of KTSP, it seems that most teachers had realized that they should know various kinds of assessments, and which assessment type was suitable to use in assessing certain competencies. However, it is a little bit weird that most teachers admitted that their students were not well informed about the criteria of what to assess. Is not that their responsibility to make the students know about the competencies to achieve? Therefore, we believe that these teachers may think that it was not necessary to expose the students to the criteria of what to be assessed and to be

achieved, such as the minimum mastery criteria (KKM) and the passing grade standards (SKL) because they believe that it was the teachers' own right not the students'. This is unfortunately very unfair to the students.

Furthermore, that (1) teaching experience and certification status, (2) dissemination of KTSP activities and teacher certification, (3) preparation and application, and (4) application and evaluation of KTSP were significantly correlated were somewhat proper or natural as they should be. However, some factors described below go beyond these findings.

1. Higher education and the implementation of KTSP<sub>Total</sub> (as a whole) were not correlated, which can be assumed that having S1 (undergraduate, 4 years after senior high school) degree for most of the teachers is only for the project of the government in order to increase the number of S1 graduates to teach at the school level as required by the Act Number 20, 2003 about the National Education System. Therefore, the quality of the teachers as educators does not go hand in hand with their activities in the classroom as required by the National Standards of Education (Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 2005).
2. Teaching experience also did not correlate with the implementation of the KTSP<sub>Total</sub>. This probably shows that the length of becoming teachers of English does not guarantee that they would be qualified in implementing what KTSP required them to do during the process of teaching and learning. Therefore, the present study is not in line with what Haimson (2011) found in his survey done across the USA about how teaching experience makes a difference. There must be other things that relate to and influence the quality of teachers in implementing the English curriculum.
3. Certification also did not correlate with KTSP<sub>Total</sub>. This can be interpreted that the purpose of having teacher or educator certification was only for getting professional status and having additional monthly payment or salary but not for fulfilling the performance standard.

Another interesting finding is that the number of teachers following the dissemination activities about KTSP had no correlation with the KTSP implementation. This shows that joining the teacher development programs did not guarantee better performance or innovation in ELT practices. This probably indicates that teachers follow the training or dissemination about KTSP not for the purpose of improving professional performance but only for fulfilling the requirements of portfolio assessment which is formally the main aspect measured for having teacher certification.

## CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results and discussion above, it is concluded that being anxious about the new curriculum is natural for teachers of English as a foreign language. However, this study leaves some problems that need to be solved by investigating the teaching and learning process in the real classrooms to see whether the implementation of KTSP in non-targeted or the new curriculum 2013 in the targeted schools really works. Further researchers need to **review** the teachers' lesson plans (RPP) and situate themselves in such a framework to **observe** teachers implementing the plans by making various opportunities, such as expanding their ELT to include multimodal experiences with multiple texts for the learners, and finally **evaluate** teachers' teaching outcomes in relation to the students' achievements.

Teachers as the focal point in curriculum implementation must be optimally ready, especially in the digital era where teachers must integrate ICT as the media in ELT. Therefore, again as the "man behind the gun", teachers have to be comprehensively exposed by (1) including them in workshops whose facilitators are real practitioners; (2) supervisors, principals, and main instructors (master teachers) sent to the first-hand workshops conducted by the government should sit together so that they will have relatively the same comprehension and perception about the content and the way how to implement the curriculum in class (the teachers) and to supervise them in the field (principals and supervisors); (3) duration and frequency of dissemination must be enough and continuous.

Finally, the implementation of either KTSP or the new Curriculum 2013 is very much dependent on teachers' individual professionalism. If they still do not have a clear idea of KTSP, how can they be ready to implement the new Curriculum 2013?

## REFERENCES

- Badan Akreditasi Nasional--Sekolah/Madrasah (BAN-S/M). (2009). *Instrumen pengumpulan data dan informasi pendukung akreditasi SMP/MTs*. Retrieved from [http://www.ban-sm.or.id/uploads/3\\_DATAPendukung\\_SMP-MTs.pdf](http://www.ban-sm.or.id/uploads/3_DATAPendukung_SMP-MTs.pdf)
- Badan Perencanaan Nasional. (2010). *RPJMN 2010-2014*. Jakarta: Bappenas.
- Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan (2006). *Panduan penyusunan kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan dasar dan menengah*. Jakarta: BSNP.
- Diem, C. D. (2004). Students' age at which EFL is introduced in schools and educational outcomes. *TEFLIN*, 15(1), pp. 42-57.
- Diem, C. D., Ihsan, D., Purnomo, M. E., & Indrawati, S. (2003). Pengembangan model

- program membaca untuk meningkatkan Kemampuan membaca dan keterampilan belajar. *Linguistik Indonesia*, 21(2), pp. 203-227.
- Dinas Pendidikan dan Olahraga Kota Palembang. (2010). *Sekolah sasaran pendidikan karakter di kota Palembang*. Palembang: Disdikpora.
- Forum MGMP. (2013). *FGD MGMP-bahasa Inggris SMP-SMA se-kota Palembang*, Palembang.
- Kantor Pemerintahan Republik Indonesia (Government Office of Republic of Indonesia). *Undang-Undang No. 20 tahun 2003 tentang system pendidikan nasional. (The Act No 20 Year 2003 about national education system)*. Jakarta: Biro Hukum dan Organisasi Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Haimson, L. (2011). *How teaching experience makes a difference*. Retrieved from <http://www.parentsacrossamerica.org/how-teaching-experience-makes-a-difference/>
- Hutchinson, A., & Reinking, D. (2011). Teachers' perceptions of integrating information and communication technologies into literacy instruction: A national survey in the United States. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 46, pp. 312–333. doi: 10.1002/RRQ.002
- Kantor Pemerintahan Republik Indonesia (Government Office of the Republic of Indonesia). (n.d.). *Undang Undang Dasar 1945*. Jakarta: Biro Hukum dan Organisasi Pemerintahan R. I.
- Kantor Pemerintahan Republik Indonesia (Government Office of the Republic of Indonesia) (2010). *Instruksi Presiden Republik Indonesia no. 1 tahun 2010 tentang pendidikan karakter (The Instruction of the President of Republic of Indonesia year 2010 about character building)*. Jakarta: Kemendikbud.
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia (Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia). (2013). Retrieved from (<http://kurikulum.kemdikbud.go.id>)
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia (Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia). (2012). *Bahan uji publik kurikulum 2013*. Jakarta: Puskurbuk.
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia (Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia). (2005). *Peraturan Pemerintah No. 19, tahun 2005 tentang Standar Nasional Pendidikan (Government regulation no. 19/2005 about the standards of national education)*. Jakarta: Kemendikbud.
- Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia (Ministry of National Education of the Republic of Indonesia). (2004). *Kurikulum berbasis kompetensi (KBK).(Competence-based curriculum 2004)*. Jakarta: Puskurbuk.
- Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia (Ministry of National Education of the Republic of Indonesia). (2006). *Kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan (KTSP).(School-based curriculum 2006)*. Jakarta: Puskurbuk.
- Kristiana. (2011). *Keterlaksanaan kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan (KTSP) pada pembelajaran matematika SMP Negeri di Kecamatan Kertek Wonosobo*. Retrieved from <http://staff.uny.ac.id/sites/default/files/132304798/KTSP%20SMA10.pdf>
- Kurniawan, D. (2013). *Teachers' ICT qualification and ICT integration into ELT as perceived by teachers themselves in 10 state senior high schools in Palembang*. (Unpublished graduate thesis), Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University, Palembang, Indonesia.
- Megawangi, R. (2004). *Pendidikan karakter*. Cimanggis: Heritage Foundation.
- Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia. (2013). *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Nomor 54 tahun 2013 tentang Standar kompetensi lulusan pendidikan dasar dan menengah*. Jakarta: Biro Hukum dan Organisasi Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Menteri Pendidikan Nasional, Republik Indonesia. (2005). *Peraturan pemerintah Republik Indonesia no. 19 tahun 2005 tentang standar nasional pendidikan (The government regulation no. 19/2005 about national education standards)*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.
- Merymaswarita. (2009). Implementasi kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan (KTSP) di SMP Negeri 8 Palembang. Retrieved from <http://merymaswarita.wordpress.com/>
- Mulyasa, E. (2007). *Standar kompetensi dan sertifikasi guru*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Nuh, M. (2010). *Sambutan menteri pendidikan nasional pada peringatan hari pendidikan nasional tahun 2010*. Retrieved from <http://www.uny.ac.id>
- Radjab, U. S. (2010). *Evaluasi implementasi KTSP pada aspek kompetensi pengelolaan pembelajaran di SMK*. Retrieved from <http://hipkin.or.id/evaluasi-implementasi-ktsp-pada-aspek-kompetensi-pengelolaan-pembelajaran-di-smk/>
- Ratri, S.Y., & Yuliana, L. (2010). *Implementasi kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan (KTSP) di SMA negeri 10 Yogyakarta*. Retrieved from <http://staff.uny.ac.id/sites/default/files/132304798/KTSP%20SMA10.pdf>



Riyanti, D. (2010). *Implementasi Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP) pada pembelajaran biologi di SMP negeri se kabupaten Tegal.*

Retrieved from  
[lib.unnes.ac.id/6759/1/8144\\_A.pdf](http://lib.unnes.ac.id/6759/1/8144_A.pdf)