



Contextual learning in the education unit level curriculum faces obstacles

Titus Do Amar¹, Sarma Haning²

¹Fakuldade Siensia Educaçã, Universidade Dili, Timor-Leste

²Fakultas Keguruan, Universitas PGRI Nusa Tenggara Timur, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received Sep 12, 2022

Revised Oct 11, 2022

Accepted Nov 09, 2022

Keywords:

Contextual teaching;
Contextual learning;
Education Unit Level Curriculum.

ABSTRACT

This study examined Indonesia's education unit level adoption of the Contextual Teaching and Learning approach and its supportive and limiting elements. In the Education Unit Level Curriculum, Contextual Teaching and Learning works well. To make learning more relevant and the Education Unit Level Curriculum implementation successful, implementation must be context-based. The Unit Level Curriculum must match students, educators, learning media, the environment, and their natural traits. Because this must follow the method to attain educational goals. Thus, Contextual Teaching and Learning depends on the Education Unit Level Curriculum. To support and balance each other, the Unit Level Curriculum socialization process for instructors must function properly. If the Education Unit Level Curriculum implementation goes successfully, the Contextual Teaching and Learning approach will be the same.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC license.



Corresponding Author:

Titus Do Amar,
Fakuldade Siensia Educaçã,
Universidade Dili,
Av. Presidente Xavier do Amaral, Mascarenhas, Dili, Timor-Leste
Email: titusdoamar@undil.tl

1. INTRODUCTION

Interests often conflict with political developments, impacting this country's education system. After ten years, teachers and students found the 1984 curriculum overly difficult due to the amount of subject matter and time available. Thus, in accordance with Law No.2 of 1989 on the National Education System, the 1994 curriculum simplified the 1984 curriculum. The instructional time distribution system changed from semester to quarter. The caturwulan method, divided into three phases per year, is intended to give pupils enough topic matter.

The Competency-Based Curricular was created because education quality is declining until it reaches the 12th level in 12 Asian countries. Only curriculum modifications can reverse this trend. The Competency-Based Curriculum empowers educational resources and plans competences and learning outcomes (Rae, 2007) (Dolmans et al., 2005) (Albanese, 2000). This constraint shows that the Competency-Based Curriculum was designed to teach children how to establish their cultural and national identity (Falender & Shafranske, 2007) (Seddon, 2001) (Puspita, 2004). The Competency-Based Curriculum expects graduates to have solid academic competence, skills to sustain adequate life, admirable moral development, strong character building, healthy living habits, a compact spirit of cooperation, and a high aesthetic appreciation of the world around them (Smith, 1999) (Jang & Kim, 2004) (Sutcliffe et al., 2005). The Competency-Based Curricular regularly faces challenges in the field that demand curriculum adjustments (Belasen & Rufer, 2007). Lack of socialization and teacher knowledge about the Competency-Based Curriculum, excessive material, inadequate facilities and

infrastructure, and other issues indicate that the objectives are not adequately accomplished (Mans, 2002). The 2004 curriculum was refined into the Education Unit Level Curriculum (Competency Based Curriculum) (RI, 2006)(Nawang Palupi et al., 2007). Each education unit/school develops and implements an operational curriculum. The Competency-Based Curriculum is prepared by the central government, in this case the Ministry of National Education, while the Education Unit Level Curriculum is prepared by each. Both are focused on competencies and student learning outcomes (BNSP) (Kurikulum & Nasional, 2007).

For this reason, the principal as a leader and other parties involved in implementing the Unit Level Curriculum at school, such as teachers, administrative staff, parents, the school environment, and the community around the school, must do many things to optimize the process. They must collaborate to meet national and institutional educational goals. Socialization and teacher knowledge of the subject are common issues with curriculum implementation in schools. Therefore, teachers must have professional knowledge and skills connected to learning activities to apply a curriculum at school, including producing learning units, or lesson plans. They must create learning plans based on pupils' basic skills. Teachers must help pupils discover their own knowledge by exploring their potential and talents. Teachers must also adapt. Students build and compile information by giving meaning and responding to previous knowledge in the Education Unit Level Curriculum. Thus, the instructor must plan the lesson to create a democratic and open classroom. To properly apply the Education Unit Level Curriculum, teacher professionalism in learning methodologies is one of many competences that must be acquired. In the process of generating and gathering knowledge, contextual teaching and learning practices in the classroom are crucial. Teachers don't understand this strategy. Finally, CTL is popular. Contextual approach (Contextual Teaching And Learning) is the "face" of the Competency-oriented Curriculum, and it may be used to build and implement the Education Unit Level Curriculum since students can provide learning experiences. Contextual Teaching and Learning helps teachers relate what they teach to students' real-world experiences and encourages students to use their knowledge as family and community members. This should enrich student learning. Student labor and experience are what teach students. Learning strategy trumps outcomes. Students must grasp learning, its rewards, their status, and how to accomplish it. They realize their education will benefit them. They require a guide.

In contextual classes, teachers help students achieve goals. Meaning, teachers focus more on strategy than information. Teachers must manage classes as a team to find something new for students. Something new from self-discovery, not guru advice (Sihono, 2004). Contextual Teaching and Learning is just a teaching strategy. Like other teaching strategies, Contextual Teaching And Learning is developed to make learning more productive and meaningful (Sihono, 2004) (Ritonga & Surya, 2003) (WULANDARI, 2007). Contextual Teaching and Learning can be implemented without changing curriculum or assessment (Sulistiyaningsih, 2016) (Nurhadi & Senduk, 2004).

To achieve educational goals, the Education Unit Level Curriculum must involve school principals, school committees, teachers, students, family environment, community, and other related parties, all of whom must support and work together (Farida, 2016). Without it, Contextual Teaching and Learning may not be implemented as envisioned in the Unit Level Curriculum (Saleh, 2016) (Berns & Erickson, 2001) (Boettcher & Conrad, 1999).

If we look at the implementation of the current Education Unit Level Curriculum, these elements can indirectly interfere with learning with the contextual approach and change the lesson plans and will be employed. Thus, studying with the Contextual Teaching And Learning technique in the Education Unit Level Curriculum and tailored to current conditions is crucial (Nasional, 2007)(Hidayati, 2007) (O'Sullivan, 2006) (Johnson, 2002) (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2007).

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This qualitative study seeks to explore the challenges of implementing Contextual Teaching and Learning in the Education Unit Level Curriculum. Creswell claims that natural experiences change the qualitative paradigm's assumptions about research language and design approach. Alternatively

"Bodgan and Taylor claim that qualitative research produces descriptive data in the form of written or spoken words from people and observed activities" (Brantlinger et al., 2005) (Choudhuri et al., 2004) (Anzul et al., 2003) (Levy, 2006). The author collects data using observation, interview, and documentation (Polkinghorne, 2005). Research Equipment Data was collected via a standardized questionnaire (Van der Vaart, 2004). I conducted face-to-face interviews to explore informants' information. I also saw the informants' reactions to the questions. Supporting data was collected using an outline of questions. The main and supporting informants' interviews were taped. Implementation Data collecting began in eastern Indonesia (NTT) schools. "Organizing varied data, sorting data into a manageable data unit, synthesizing it, looking for and identifying patterns, determining what is significant and what is learned, and deciding what to tell others" is qualitative data analysis. Reviewing all data from interviews, field notes, personal documents, official documents, photographic pictures, and so on begins the data analysis process. After reading, studying, and reviewing the data, abstractions reduce data. Abstraction summarizes the core, processes, and questions to keep them in it. Unitize next. Categorizing the units follows. Coding created categories. Validation concludes this data analysis. After this, everything is interpreted and concluded in clear, logical language based on the research (Selden & Selden, 2003) (Mantzoukas, 2005).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Teachers' education unit-level curricular knowledge.

Each education unit prepares and implements the Education Unit Level Curriculum. Interviews with numerous sources about the Education Unit Level Curriculum provided this definition. The Education Unit Level Curriculum is still general and the definitions I got from books on it, such as E. Mulyasa's essay "Education Unit Level Curriculum: A Practical Guide" and Masnur Muslih's "Unit Level Curriculum: Basic Understanding and Development". The informants didn't define the Education Unit Level Curriculum's broad definition, so they suggested I study the school's guidebook to gather the data I required. I did not follow this proposal since what I wanted was how informants understood the Education Unit Level Curriculum in theory and practice, not its concept or theory. With the suggestion to look at the school's Education Unit Level Curriculum guidebook, the informant's understanding of the curriculum concept, which includes education unit objectives, education calendar, curriculum structure and content, and more, is still limited to a definition. Informants should additionally describe the Education Unit Level Curriculum's aims, development base, characteristics, principles, and operational references, but they didn't. The informants may not understand the Education Unit Level Curriculum. However, during the socialization process, the school often provides knowledge about the Education Unit Level Curriculum from the principal directly and from a team of developers and assessors at the Ministry of National Education through deliberations attended by all related parties, including teachers and staff, parents through the school committee, and the education council. All teachers have received government-provided Unit-Level Curriculum training from the depdiknas, and all students are closed.

Thus, the Unit Level Curriculum could provide learning solutions for effective, productive, and excellent schools. The Education Unit Level Curriculum allows each education unit to manage resources, financing sources, and learning resources according to priority needs and is more sensitive to local demands. This is reflected in teachers' independence in defining core competences for lesson plans and school principals' independence in making decisions about the education calendar and funding needs. The principle also hires based on skills, not experience. However, the current issue is how to optimally execute the Education Unit Level Curriculum, therefore all aspects must work together, starting with the principal as the leader of all activities and ending with the teacher as the implementer and determinant in the field.

Informants also struggle to execute the Education Unit Level Curriculum at school and determine educational outcomes. They don't grasp learning management, which entails planning, implementing, and managing (evaluation), knowing students' abilities, interests, potential, and

characteristics, the local community's socio-culture, methods, media, and evaluation. These must be mastered to maximize educational goals. However, practice differs.

Informants use lesson plans to plan learning management. Informants cover cognitive, emotional, and psychomotor competencies in lesson plans. The learning plan also sets objectives, time, and materials for pupils. The difficulty is that the informant develops the Learning Plan for the same class, time, and students, thus he utilizes it in numerous classes. Why? Because each class is distinct, each student's interests, abilities, potential, and socio-culture are different, and one lesson plan cannot cover it all. Because circumstance and conditions affect learning achievement, the morning class may receive more material than the afternoon session due to the time of delivery. The informant is reluctant to create it again because it takes a long time, especially if he teaches eight hours a day with varied lesson ideas.

In classroom management, informants usually lecture and sometimes demonstrate prayer material, like the teacher. The problem is that the informant sees, guides, and directs students through demonstration. Students should follow the informant's demonstration. The informant demonstrated the prayer without utilizing the *dimushalla*. Thus, if the informant only needs a few people in class, this is ineffective and not contextual. Remember that all pupils must be able to attain the basic competencies, unlike in the *mushalla*, where all students can practice it. and context-appropriate. Then, in classroom management, the informant only sometimes allowed students to ask questions and respond to content that was still unclear, and addressing student queries sounded complex, even if the informant answered as needed. Select pupils can inquire, answer, and respond. All pupils can receive, ask, and react without discrimination. In addition, informants mostly use and utilize existing learning media, but they also try/make their own other learning media if the media is not available at school even though the media is very important. For example, when the informant presents material about Hajj and Umrah, the informant first provides the theory, which is assisted by visualization in the form of power points or compact discs. During *led al-adha*, the practice is implemented. On Eid al-Adha, all students must gather to pray and butcher student-raised animals. The next day, classes that received Umrah material must do *tawaf* together with 3x4-meter school-made media. Students are instructed on the *tawaf* method, direction, and attire. Existing media relevant to the topic delivered is still useless since it is not contextual. Students neglect Eid prayer and *tawaf*. Informants cannot directly instruct students due to insufficient numbers. Thus, instructional designs fail to meet basic competency objectives. Visualization media can help students learn more than just theory. In my opinion, the material about Hajj and Umrah is not in accordance with the characteristics of students because the material is quite extensive and media is needed that is really in accordance with the context to achieve optimal learning objectives, one of which is going directly to Makkah, where people perform Hajj and Umrah, which is not possible for all schools. This topic could be eliminated from primary and secondary education or simplified.

Because there are multiple-choice and essay questions on student worksheets, informants' classroom evaluations largely work on them. Informants use student worksheets more to assess competency. Student worksheets solely evaluate cognitive abilities, not affective or psychomotor ones. To attain educational goals, pupils should practice, work in groups, or do anything else in addition to worksheets. Informants evaluate pupils in class and through midterm and final semester tests administered by the central government, in this instance the Ministry of Education. Each education unit administers the midterm exam.

Infrastructure for implementing the Education Unit Level Curriculum with Contextual Teaching and Learning.

The Education Unit Level Curriculum must be implemented with assistance from educators, students, and the students' environment. The number of rooms, room size, labs, libraries, and other supporting facilities in school buildings are crucial to optimizing the Education Unit Level Curriculum.

My research school had complete and enough facilities to support the Education Unit Level Curriculum. This school has most supporting amenities, except for few that are only used sporadically.

However, with these supporting facilities, informants sometimes feel difficult because they coincide with other informant friends who will use the media or tools, so the provision of facilities and infrastructure is not only limited to fulfilling it but must be adjusted to the needs and number of teachers who teach.

Thus, if BNSP-standardized supporting facilities are sufficient but constrained, student accomplishment and implementation can operate well but not optimally. Education and school operational help from the local government provide the necessary facilities. Informants' awareness and expertise of these supporting facilities can cause complications and slow deployment. Informants sometimes need to adjust supporting facilities and must have special skills with new equipment/facilities, such as computers, Lcd infocus, OHP, so they rarely use them even though they are available, so sometimes the existing supporting facilities become weathered. Even though these facilities are very supportive and can add and facilitate the process of delivering material to students, informants should make the best use of existing supporting facilities and special skills or knowledge are needed to use them. Informants must learn how to use these supporting facilities properly. To execute the curriculum, I show the school below.

4. CONCLUSION

The author finds that the Education Unit Level Curriculum is poorly implemented at the research object based on the following rationale. Several factors contribute to poor Education Unit Level Curriculum implementation: The criteria for implementing and developing the Education Unit Level Curriculum do not match instructors' academic and practical knowledge of it. Lack of Unit Level Curriculum socialization or a less supportive school atmosphere may cause this. Teachers struggle with teaching material and contextualizing it. Supporting facilities and infrastructure are underutilized because teachers lack the knowledge and skills to use them. The Education Unit Level Curriculum may also be affected by materials with poor supporting facilities. Thus, the Education Unit Level Curriculum in the research object is not effectively implemented, hence the Contextual Teaching and Learning approach is not optimally implemented. The Contextual Teaching And Learning technique works better when the Education Unit Level Curriculum is implemented on the research object.

REFERENCES

- Albanese, M. (2000). Problem-based learning: why curricula are likely to show little effect on knowledge and clinical skills. *Medical Education*, 34(9), 729-738.
- Anzul, M., Ely, M., Freidman, T., Garner, D., & McCormack-Steinmetz, A. (2003). *Doing qualitative research: Circles within circles*. Routledge.
- Belasen, A. T., & Rufer, R. (2007). BUILDING A COMPETENCY-BASED MBA FROM THE GROUND UP: CURRICULUM DESIGN AND PROGRAM DELIVERY. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2007(1), 1-6.
- Berns, R. G., & Erickson, P. M. (2001). *Contextual Teaching and Learning: Preparing Students for the New Economy. The Highlight Zone: Research@ Work No. 5*.
- Boettcher, J., & Conrad, R.-M. (1999). *Faculty guide for moving teaching and learning to the web*.
- Brantlinger, E., Jimenez, R., Klingner, J., Pugach, M., & Richardson, V. (2005). Qualitative studies in special education. *Exceptional Children*, 71(2), 195-207.
- Choudhuri, D., Glauser, A., & Peregoy, J. (2004). Guidelines for writing a qualitative manuscript for the Journal of Counseling & Development. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 82(4), 443-446.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (2007). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Dolmans, D. H. J. M., De Grave, W., Wolfhagen, I. H. A. P., & Van Der Vleuten, C. P. M. (2005). Problem-based learning: Future challenges for educational practice and research. *Medical Education*, 39(7), 732-741.
- Falender, C. A., & Shafranske, E. P. (2007). Competence in competency-based supervision practice: Construct and application. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 38(3), 232.
- Farida, R. (2016). *Upaya peningkatan keterampilan membaca siswa kelas II Madrasah Ibtidaiyah Nurul Ahsan kota Depok melalui penerapan contextual teaching and learning*. Fakultas Ilmu Tarbiyah dan Keguruan UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta.
- Hidayati, A. N. (2007). *Studi komparasi metode pembelajaran problem based learning (pbl) dan contextual teaching and learning (ctl) terhadap pencapaian prestasi belajar ekonomi siswa kelas XI SMA Muhammadiyah 2*

- Surakarta tahun ajaran 2006/2007.
- Jang, S., & Kim, N. (2004). Transition from high school to higher education and work in Korea, from the competency-based education perspective. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 24(6), 691–703.
- Johnson, E. B. (2002). *Contextual teaching and learning: What it is and why it's here to stay*. Corwin Press.
- Kurikulum, P., & Nasional, D. P. (2007). *Naskah Akademik Kebijakan Kurikulum Mata Pelajaran*. 1–32.
- Levy, D. (2006). Qualitative methodology and grounded theory in property research. *Pacific Rim Property Research Journal*, 12(4), 369–388.
- Mans, M. (2002). Playing the Music—Comparing Performance of Children's Song and Dance in Traditional and Contemporary Namibian Education. In *The arts in children's lives* (pp. 71–86). Springer.
- Mantzoukas, S. (2005). The inclusion of bias in reflective and reflexive research: A necessary prerequisite for securing validity. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 10(3), 279–295.
- Nasional, D. P. (2007). *Naskah Akademik Kajian Kebijakan Kurikulum Mata Pelajaran Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial (IPS)*. Jakarta: Badan Penelitian Dan Pengembangan Pusat Kurikulum.
- Nawang Palupi, M., Hatta, M., Pramowardhany Nilla, E., Widiarti, E., Tsani, N., Ratnasari, R., H Matanggui, J., Widiyanto, G., Ghozi, A., & Nugroho, T. (2007). Ekspresi: media komunikasi dan informasi, 2007. In *Ekspresi* (Vol. 9, Issue V, pp. 1–47). PPPPTK Bahasa.
- Nurhadi, B. Y., & Senduk, A. G. (2004). *Pembelajaran kontekstual dan penerapannya dalam KBK*. Malang: Universitas Negeri Malang Pres.
- O'Sullivan, M. (2006). Lesson observation and quality in primary education as contextual teaching and learning processes. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 26(3), 246–260.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (2005). Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52(2), 137.
- Puspita, D. (2004). Designing a set of English instructional listening materials for the first semester students of first grade of senior high school based on the competency-based curriculum. *Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma*.
- Rae, D. (2007). Connecting enterprise and graduate employability: challenges to the higher education culture and curriculum? *Education+ Training*.
- RI, D. P. N. (2006). Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP). *Bahan Sosialisasi*.
- Ritonga, M. Z. F., & Surya, E. (2003). *Meningkatkan Kemampuan Pemecahan Masalah Matematika Siswa Dengan Menggunakan Model Pembelajaran Kontekstual*. December.
- Saleh, A. (2016). *Peningkatan Hasil Belajar Siswa Dengan Menggunakan Model Contextual Teaching and Learning (Pada Mata Pelajaran PKn Kelas V) SDIT YASFI*. Fakultas Ilmu Tarbiyah dan Keguruan UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta.
- Seddon, T. (2001). National curriculum in Australia? A matter of politics, powerful knowledge and the regulation of learning. *Pedagogy Culture and Society*, 9(3), 307–331.
- Selden, A., & Selden, J. (2003). Validations of proofs considered as texts: Can undergraduates tell whether an argument proves a theorem? *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 34(1), 4–36.
- Sihono, T. (2004). Contextual Teaching and Learning (CTL) sebagai model pembelajaran ekonomi dalam KBK. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Pendidikan*, 1(1).
- Smith, S. R. (1999). AMEE guide no. 14: outcome-based education: part 2—planning, implementing and evaluating a competency-based curriculum. *Medical Teacher*, 21(1), 15–22.
- Sulistiyarningsih, E. (2016). *Upaya Meningkatkan Hasil Belajar Matematika Dengan Strategi Pembelajaran Inkuiri Pada Siswa Kelas V MI Asy-Syifa Pamulang Timur*. Fakultas Ilmu Tarbiyah dan Keguruan UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta.
- Sutcliffe, N., Chan, S. S., & Nakayama, M. (2005). A competency based MSIS curriculum. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, 16(3), 301–310.
- Van der Vaart, W. (2004). The time-line as a device to enhance recall in standardized research interviews: A split ballot study. *Journal of Official Statistics*, 20(2), 301.
- WULANDARI, F. (2007). *PENGARUH MODEL PEMBELAJARAN CONTEXTUAL TEACHING AND LEARNING DALAM PEMECAHANMASALAH MATEMATIKA TERHADAP PRESTASI BELAJAR SISWA* Eksperimen Pembelajaran matematika kelas I SLTP N 2 TRUCUK. Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.