OPEN ACCESS

Research Article

Implementation of the Countenance Stake Model in Evaluating the Effectiveness of Text-Based Indonesian Learning in Junior High Schools

Nita Komarasari[1], Firmansyah Dlis[1], Erry Utomo[1]

[1]Universitas Negeri Jakarta. Indonesia

*Corresponding Author
Nita Komarasari

Abstract: Text-based learning in Indonesian Language subjects emphasizes more on students to understand various types of texts and requires students to be proficient in writing. This study aims to determine the Implementation of Countenance Stake Model in Evaluating the Effectiveness of Text-Based Indonesian Learning. The results of this study show that out of 202 junior secondary schools in Lebak Regency, 117 junior high schools have implemented the 2013 Curriculum, the remaining 85 junior secondary schools still carry out the 2006 Curriculum. This means that schools that have seriously implemented 117 new text-based learning middle class.
Keywords: Model Countenance Stake, Text Based Indonesian Language Learning, evaluation research.

INTRODUCTION

Language skills are important things to master. As a tool, language is used to appreciate thoughts and feelings. Suriasumantri revealed that without having the ability to speak, thinking systematically and regularly was not possible. Humans cannot develop a culture without language skills. In essence, in order to be able to think systematically and regularly, humans need good and correct language skills (Zulela, 2012; Zulela et al,2017).

The text-based learning model in learning Indonesian language is considered as a new thing, not least for teachers of junior high school level. As an effort to prepare for its implementation, the government organized various activities to equip teachers, both in the form of education and training, assistance, workshops, socialization and others. The government also issued teacher books and student books to support the implementation of learning. Unfortunately, many parties consider the briefing held by the government to be less than optimal, so that teachers are still confused for its implementation. The availability of books is also considered not enough to help teachers, some consider it as a limitation for creative teachers to innovate, others consider the book as the only basis for the implementation of learning.

The implementation of text-based learning is based on the idea that language units that contain meaning, thoughts, and complete ideas are text. The intended text can be in the form of written and oral language in both literary and non-literary forms. The application of text-based learning is in line with the opinion that the purpose of language teaching is not to make bilingual students but able to use language, which is able to express thoughts with clear and clear sentences, firm, not confusing, and logically explain factual matters and maton (Pangaribuan, 2008).

The application of text-based learning is also in line with the opinion of the need for learning materials. Learning material is the substance that will be conveyed in the teaching and learning process. Learning materials are divided into basic learning materials and supplementary learning materials. The main lesson material is the subject matter that involves the field of study held by the teacher in accordance with his profession (scientific discipline), while complementary or supporting learning materials are learning materials outside the disciplines that open up one's insight as supporting basic lessons (Sagala, 2010). Thus, in learning Indonesian, the text can be considered as the subject matter of the subject.

The text structure forms the structure of thinking so that each mastery of certain types of texts students will have the ability to think in accordance with the structure of the text they master. With a variety of texts that have been mastered, it means that students will be

---

Quick Response Code

able to have a variety of thinking structures, even one particular topic can be presented in different types of text and of course with different thinking structures (Nurgiyantoro, 2010; Sufanti, 2013). In addition, in broad outline the text can be divided into literary texts and non-literary texts. Literary texts are grouped into narrative and nonnarative texts. The non-literary texts are grouped into factual type texts in which there are subgroups of report and procedural texts and response texts that are grouped into subgroups of transactional and expository texts (Faizah, 2009; Santosa, 2008). By paying attention to the types of texts and the main elements that must be possessed by the text, one of them is the mode, which is the language tool used to package messages, thoughts, ideas, ideas conveyed through text, then through language learning based on text material literature and linguistic material can be presented (Zulela, 2012;Zulela et al, 2017).

In the development of Indonesian language learning Text-based Indonesian Language Learning is carried out by applying the principle that (1) language should be seen as text, not merely a collection of linguistic words or rules, (2) the use of language is the process of choosing linguistic forms to express meaning, (3) language is functional, namely the use of language that can never be released from the context because in the form of language it is reflected by the ideas, attitudes, values and ideologies of its users, and (4) language is a means of forming human thinking skills (Kemdikbud, 2013).

Based on the principles mentioned above, it is necessary to realize that in each text there are separate structures that are different from each other. Meanwhile, in the text structure reflected the structure of thinking. Thus, the more types of text mastered by students, the more the structure of thinking that can be used in later social and academic life. Only in that way can students then construct their knowledge through the ability to observe, question, associate, analyze, and present the results of the analysis adequately.

Text can be broken down into types, such as descriptions, recounts, procedures, reports, explanations, expositions, discussions, letters, advertisements, diaries, negotiations, pantun, fairy tales, anecdotes, and historical fiction. All types of text can be grouped into story texts, factual texts, and response texts. The last two groups are non-literary texts, each of which can be further divided into report texts and procedural texts as well as transactional texts and expository texts. Meanwhile, story text is a type of literary text that can be broken down into narrative story texts and non-narrative story texts (Narasimhan, Kulkarni, & Barzilay, 2015; Cook, 2016)

Based on the statement above, it is very important to conduct research on the implementation of the countenance stake model. In evaluating the

effectiveness of text-based Indonesian learning in junior high schools. The evaluation of the text-based Indonesian language learning program in this paper uses the Fidelity approach because the criteria developed come from the characteristics of the program itself. The Countenance Stake model consists of two matrices, namely the description matrix and consideration matrix. The description matrix consists of the intended and observation matrix categories, while the consideration matrix consists of standard matrices and matrix judgment. On each matrix there are three important focuses based on thought (Stake), that a formal evaluation must pay attention to the situation before an class activity takes place (antecedent), when class activities take place (transactions), and connect with various forms of expected results (outcomes) (Hasan, 2008).

METHOD

This study aims to implement the Model Countenance Stake in evaluating the effectiveness of text-based Indonesian learning in State Junior High Schools. This study uses evaluative research methods in which text-based Indonesian language learning is considered as an activity, while junior secondary schools are considered as units. As evaluative research, this evaluation study will rest on the results of qualitative research with descriptive methods, hereinafter referred to as qualitative descriptive methods.

Qualitative descriptive methods have a lot in common with quantitative descriptive methods, because qualitative descriptive can also be called quasi qualitative or pseudo qualitative design. This means that this design is not truly qualitative because it is still influenced by quantitative traditions, especially in placing theory on the data obtained. Curriculum evaluation procedures follow the steps of the study and as different things in them are in the final stages of preparing reports intended for decision makers. Qualitative evaluation requires evaluation problems as a result of observation, participation, and interaction with curriculum implementers and is carried out when evaluators are in the field or before going to the field. General procedures are procedures that evaluators must do regardless of the philosophical and theoretical views used. When certain steps pertain to methodological steps, the evaluator follows the methodological steps. Determination of methodology is a logical consequence of evaluation objectives, desired data types, and data sources.

The Countenance Model Stake is grouped into qualitative groups according to Stake's view as the originator. In applying qualitative methods, data sources are obtained from natural settings, the assessor collects data based on observations of a reasonable situation, as it is without being intentionally influenced, entering the field directly related to the situation and the respondent

being assessed. Hasan stated, if the desired data already exists in the reality of everyday life, then manipulation is not needed and thus evaluators must use methods other than experimentation. In other words Hasan stressed that evaluation must be related to curriculum activities that occur in reality, and the method used is a non-experimental method.

Based on these explanations, in the implementation of the Countenance Stake Model in the evaluation of text-based Indonesian language learning in junior high schools, researchers used non-experimental methods. The researcher will only use documents that are available for analysis, as well as ongoing processes for observation. As explained by Arikunto (2004), researchers only record conditions that have existed or are happening, and do not intentionally bring up data, or in other words intentionally generate new data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
The description of the process of implementing text-based learning at the education unit level can be photographed through various perspectives, both directly and indirectly. Indirectly, the condition can be assessed through the activity of filling in quality data by almost all parts of the school, both PTK and students.

The implementation of text-based learning in the 2013 Curriculum began with a socialization process through various activities carried out in stages starting in 2014 until 2019. The socialization activities in the form of technical guidance (bimtek) were carried out with different mechanisms for each year of implementation. At the beginning of the bimtek implementation through the stages by preparing national resource persons (NN) who were tasked with assisting national instructors (IN). IN is tasked with assisting provincial instructors (IP) whose existence is spread across several regions of Indonesia as the region. At the provincial level, IP accompanied district instructors (IK) who had the task of assisting the target teachers (GS). This target teacher is the spearhead of the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum in schools.

The school where the GS is in charge is an educational unit that is assigned as the target school (SS) implementing the 2013 Curriculum. Each SS sends 10 GS students from various subjects which become the curriculum content at the junior high school level to join the bimtek. This means that not all teachers are involved in bimtek activities, only teachers are designated as GS who obtain direct information about how the 2013 Curriculum is implemented.

In the bimtek activity, the content of the study material was focused on class VII content, not touching all levels in junior high school. To overcome the lack of socialization of the 2013 curriculum for teachers of class VIII and class IX, the GS was asked to disseminate. Unfortunately, this dissemination activity is rarely carried out for reasons of reluctance or others. Meanwhile, to overcome the problems that have not been discussed in class VIII and class IX, teachers are asked to study it as a pattern that has been socialized to class VII teachers.

The description of the outreach activities above confirms that it has not even been possible to get information directly about the process of implementing the 2013 Curriculum. In addition, because the process is gradual, not all schools, what happened in the early years has not implemented the curriculum. 2013. Even schools that have been selected as SS in their implementation have responded to the implementation of the 2013 curriculum in various ways. There are SS who carry out 2013 Curriculum simultaneously for all levels in their schools, not only class VII, but at the same time with classes VIII and IX. However, there is also an SS that prefers to focus on class VII only, while class VIII and IX survive with the 2006 Curriculum. This raises the issue of dualism of the curriculum in each education unit.

Whatever the process, over time the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum went smoothly. Initially the target was completed in 2019, the implementation of all schools in Indonesia is planned to be completed in 2018. So, it is certain that by 2018 all schools have implemented the 2013 Curriculum.

Of the 202 Junior high school in Lebak Regency, 117 junior high schools have implemented the 2013 curriculum, the remaining 85 junior high schools still carry out the 2006 curriculum. This means that schools that have seriously implemented new text-based learning 117 junior high schools. Schools planned for 2013 Curriculum will not receive bimtek in 2018, so it is certain that this year all Junior high school in Lebak Regency will implement the 2013 Curriculum.

In its implementation, text-based learning has not been fully implemented in Lebak Regency. This is illustrated by the results of observations on several Indonesian language learning activities in the following junior high schools;
1) In the preliminary activities, educators have not been able to provide stimulation to students. Apperception and brainstorming activities have not converged on efforts to direct students to reach material targets. The introduction has not led students to conditions that require readiness in achieving the competency target. Conditioning activities that are in accordance with efforts to achieve the competency target have only reached 36.77%.
2) Learning resources / learning media have not varied, educators and students are still limited to the use of textbooks. The use of other learning resources that are in accordance with the target of achieving new

material ranges from 13.87%. The teacher has not been able to develop and utilize learning resources, so that the literacy process that is the specialty of text-based Indonesian learning is not maximal.

3) Students are still passive, learning is still dominated by the activity of educators as facilitators of learning. Active students only reached 27.33%. As a result, educators have difficulty using a variety of learning models that vary due to the passive role of students in learning.

4) Utilization of available time allocations has not been effective in accordance with the planned achievement targets. Passive learning in participating students, and less varied learning models used, make learning activities tend to be boring and less meaningful. The effectiveness of learning time has only reached 35, 64%.

5) Educators still have not been able to follow up on learning activities for various activities. The closing activity cannot be done optimally during learning. Only 23.36% of educators have carried out the closing activities accordingly.

6) Learning evaluation activities have not been carried out thoroughly. This is due to the incomplete learning appraisal document. Educators have difficulty when determining which parts will be the focus of the assessment. Learning assessment activities are out of sync with learning planning. This is possible because of the difficulty of educators in carrying out basic competency analysis. Availability of assessment documents and compliance with the target assessment with basic competency has only reached 32.16%.

CONCLUSION

Educators are found to be weak in developing the Competency Achievement Indicator (GPA). Teachers have not been able to develop and utilize learning resources, so that the literacy process that is unique to text-based Indonesian learning has not been maximized.

Learning evaluation activities have not been carried out thoroughly. This is due to the fact that the learning assessment document has not been completed. Educators have difficulty in determining which parts will be the focus of assessment. Learning assessment activities are out of sync with learning planning. This is possible because of the difficulty of educators in analyzing core competencies and basic competencies. Availability of assessment documents and conformity

of assessment targets with new KI / KD reaching 32.16%.

REFERENCE
1. Arikunto, S., & Jabar, C. S. A. (2004). Evaluasi program pendidikan. *Jakarta: Bumi Aksara*, 1-2.
2. Cook, V. (2016). *Second language learning and language teaching*. Routledge.
3. Faizah, U. (2009). Keefektifan cerita bergambar untuk pendidikan nilai dan keterampilan berbahasa dalam pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia. *Cakrawala Pendidikan*, (3).
4. Hasan, S. H. (2008). *Evaluasi kurikulum*. Sekolah Pascasarjana Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia dengan PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
5. Kemdikbud,. (2013). Buku Guru Bahasa Indonesia Wahana Pengetahuan .Jakarta, Politeknik Negeri Media.
6. Narasimhan, K., Kulkarni, T., & Barzilay, R. (2015). Language understanding for text-based games using deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.08941*.
7. Nurgiyantoro, B. (2010). *Penilaian Pembelajaran Sastra Berbasis Kompetensi*. Yogyakarta: BpFE.
8. Pangaribuan, T. (2008). *Paradigma Bahasa*. Graha Ilmu.
9. Sagala, S. (2010). Konsep dan makna pembelajaran untuk membantu memecahkan problematika belajar dan mengajar. *Bandung: Alfabeta*.
10. Santosa, P. (2008). Materi dan Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia SD. *Jakarta: Universitas Terbuka*.
11. Sufanti, M. (2013). Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia Berbasis Teks: Belajar dari Ohio Amerika Serikat.
12. Zulela, M. S. (2012). Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia Apresiasi Sastra di Sekolah Dasar. *Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya*.
13. Zulela, M. S., Rachmadtullah, R., & Siregar, Y. E. Y. (2017). Strategi Guru Meningkatkan Pemahaman Bacaan Melalui Pendekatan Savi Pada Siswa Kelas V Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar*, *8*(1).
14. Zulela, M., Siregar, Y. E. Y., Rachmadtullah, R., & Warhdani, P. A. (2017). Keterampilan Menulis Narasi Melalui Pendekatan Konstruktivisme Di Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar*, *8*(2), 112-123.