MODEL OF CHARACTER EDUCATION LEARNING IN BASICS SCHOOLS BASED ON THE 2013 CURRICULUM

Sugiaryo, Universitas Slamet Riyadi Surakarta
Anita Trisiana, Universitas Slamet Riyadi Surakarta

ABSTRACT

This study aims to find a useful learning model for character education in low-grade elementary schools based on the 2013 curriculum. This learning model is expected to be able to specifically assist teachers in implementing character education learning in elementary schools, especially in the low class. The method used in this research is a descriptive-analytic method based on solving research development problems or known as Research and Development (R&D). This development research was carried out in two stages. The first stage reveals and analyzes the character education learning model that has been implemented in elementary schools, especially in the lower classes in Banjarsari District, Surakarta City. Then a draft design of a useful character education learning model is designed, especially for low-grade elementary schools. The method of this learning model is developed in consultation with two experts, namely character education experts and curriculum experts. Furthermore, in the second year before use, this learning model design was tested first. Then an analysis is carried out to see the existing weaknesses and then socialized.

Keywords: Learning Model, Character Education, Low-Grade Elementary School.

INTRODUCTION

Character is a person's character, character, morals, or personality which is formed from the internalization of various virtues that are believed and used as a basis for point of view, thinking, behaving, and acting. Character education in elementary schools is strategic, considering that in elementary schools, individual development is very much thought and is the beginning of laying the concept of knowledge in each subject area. It is at this elementary school age that a person will be easier to shape their character because they have not been affected by negative influences from outside. However, the problem is that the implementation of character education in every lesson is something new for elementary school teachers. So that it becomes an obstacle to the implementation of optimal character education.

In connection with the character education curriculum of the new the curriculum in 2013 is expected to shape the character of each student in accordance with the spirit of Pancasila. It was like that expressed by the former This is as defined by the former Deputy Minister of Education and Culture, Musliar Kasim, who said that the implementation of the curriculum in 2013 at the school has a very helpful attitude value for Indonesia fully human form, because in this curriculum contains some major attitude, man. Furthermore, Musliar Kasim explained this

attitude is spiritual, social, and skillful so that it will shape the character of Indonesian people as a whole

Given that the development of character education is significant for the sustainability and excellence of the nation in the future, this development must be carried out through good planning, appropriate approaches, and effective learning methods. In fact, in the learning process, various problems are often experienced by teachers. For handles multiple issues in learning, it is necessary to have learning models that can help teachers in the teaching and learning process.

Based on the description above, the authors feel the need to conduct research related to the character education learning model in the 2013 curriculum. The study will begin with an analysis of the implementation of character education in the 2013 curriculum that has been carried out by several elementary schools in Surakarta. Through this analysis, it hopes that the constraints of character education in the 2013 curriculum will identify so that later a useful character education learning model can be developed for elementary school students.

Suprijono (2011) defines a model as a form of accurate representation as an actual process that allows a person or group of people to try to act on the model. Syaiful Sagala (2005) argues that the learning model is a conceptual framework that describes a systematic procedure for organizing student learning experiences to achieve specific learning objectives and serves as a guide for learning designers and teachers in planning and implementing teaching and learning activities.

There are many learning models developed by experts to optimize student learning outcomes, including Contextual Learning Model (Nurhadi, 2003); Cooperative Learning Model (Amri & Ahmadi, 2010); Quantum Learning Model (Sugianto, 2009); Integrated Learning Model (Sugianto, 2009); Problem-based Learning Model PBLi (Sugianto, 2009); Direct Learning Model; Discussion Learning Model (Amri & Ahmadi, 2010).

Simon Philips (2008) argues that character is a collection of values that lead to a system, which underlies the thoughts, attitudes, and behaviors displayed.

David & Sweet (2004), character education is defined as follows: *"character educations is the deliberate effort to help people understand, care about, and act upon core ethical values. When we think about the kind of character we want for our children, it is clear that we want them to be able to judge what is right, care deeply about what is right, and then do what they believe to be right, even in the face of pressure from without and temptation from within"*. Meanwhile, Ramli (2003) explained that character education has the same essence and meaning as moral education and moral education. The goal is to shape the child's personality so that he becomes a good human being, a citizen, and a good citizen.

The 2013 curriculum is a refinement of the KBK curriculum (2004) and the 2006 Curriculum or what is known as KTSP. The improvement of the 2013 Curriculum is based on thinking about future challenges, public perceptions, developments in knowledge and pedagogy, future competencies, and emerging negative phenomena.

Character education in the 2013 curriculum integrates into every subject listed in the curriculum structure.

Character Education Partnership (2003) has developed quality standards for Character Education as a self-evaluation tool, especially for school institutions. The instrument is a Likert

scale (0 - 4) which contains the following 11 principles, namely: Effective character education : promotes core ethical values as the basis of good character; defines "*character*" comprehensively to include thinking, feeling and behavior; uses a comprehensive, intentional, and proactive approach to character development; creates a caring school community; provides students with opportunities for moral action; includes a meaningful and challenging academic curriculum that respects all learners, develops their character, and helps them succeed; strives to develop students' self-motivation, engages the school staff as a learning and moral community that shares responsibility for character education and attempts to adhere to the same core values that guide the education of students; fosters shared ethical leadership and long-range support of the character education initiative; engages families and community members as partners in the character-building effort; assesses the character of the school, the school staff's functioning as character educators, and the extent to which students manifest good character (Character Education Partnership, 2003).

METHODS

The research method used in this research consists of two kinds, namely descriptive-analytic, based on problem-solving and analysis development.

The subjects of this study were low-grade elementary schools in Banjarsari Subdistrict, Surakarta City, which had implemented the 2013 curriculum. The primary schools that take consisted of favorite public elementary schools, ordinary public elementary schools, famous private elementary schools, and regular private elementary schools, with a total of respondents, were 36 teachers. The object of this research is the implementation of character education that is applied.

The data collection techniques used in this study was observation, interviews and questionnaires, and documentation. Comments make to explore matters related to character education and the 2013 curriculum. Questionnaires and interviews use to find out opinions, constraints, and input from teachers and school principals related to the implementation of character education in the 2013 curriculum. Meanwhile, documentation use to strengthen data taken from observations and questionnaires..

The data analysis technique in this study used qualitative data analysis techniques (Marshall and Rossman, 2011), which consisted of several stages, including Organizing the data; Grouping based on categories, themes, and answer patterns; Testing existing assumptions or problems with data; Finding Alternative Explanations for Data; Writing Research Results.

In this study, the researcher will develop a learning model for character education in the 2013 curriculum. The development model used is the Plomp Development model (1997), which was modified using four stages, namely: Preliminary investigation phase; Design phase (design); Realization/construction phase; Test, evaluation, and revision phase.

This research plan to conduct in two stages in the first year and the second year. In the first year, the implementation of character education that has been carried out by the research subject schools will analyze from the research in the first year, data related to the performance of character education in the 2013 curriculum will be obtained. Furthermore, armed with these data, in the second year, development research carried out. The development research aims to design a character learning model following the 2013 curriculum in low-grade elementary schools.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Result

1. Teachers understanding of the concept of character education are still not comprehensive. Of the 36 teachers who filled out the questionnaire, only nine teachers (25%) were able to explain the meaning of character education correctly.
2. Teachers do not have sufficient competence to integrate character values in the subjects they teach. Of the 36 teachers who filled out the questionnaire, only Twenty-four teachers (75%) did not find it challenging to integrate character education into subjects. And only 16 teachers were able to explain this method logically according to the 2013 curriculum.
3. Teachers have not been able to become role models for the character values they choose. Of the 36 teachers who filled out the questionnaire, only ten teachers answered by providing good examples to support character education outside of teaching activities.
4. The character values developed in schools have not been translated into representative indicators. Of the 36 teachers who filled out the questionnaire, only 20 teachers described the character values in the lesson plans before learning began.
5. Schools have not been able to choose character values that match their vision. Of the Thirty-six teachers who filled out the questionnaire, 32 teachers stated that the school had not been able to select character values that matched its vision.
6. Culture and habits in schools mostly do not support character education. Of the 36 teachers who filled out the questionnaire, 12 teachers stated that the culture in their school did not yet support character education.
7. There is a need for a character education learning model in elementary schools that is by the 2013 curriculum. Of the 36 teachers, 29 of them stated that there is a need for a character education learning model whose design and stages can integrate with the implementation of 2013 curriculum

Discussion

1. The teacher's understanding of the concept of character education is not yet comprehensive. It is because the character education program has not been well socialized to all teachers, so they do not understand it. Besides, teachers are less active in seeking information about character education.
2. Inadequate teacher competence to integrate character values in the subjects they teach is possible. It is related to character education training for the 2013 curriculum, which is still very limited for teachers to participate in so that they have difficulty integrating character values in the subjects they teach.
3. The teacher is not able to become an example of the character values he chooses; this is very understandable. Given the most severe problem is the role of teachers to be role models in realizing character values, specifically in accordance with the character values of subjects and general character values in schools. The teacher is a figure who is digugu (obeyed) and imitated (emulated), and character education in elementary school requires a real example.
4. The unexplained character values developed in schools according to representative indicators because teachers still find it difficult to describe these values in daily life. It is due to the lack of training held to outline character values in real life.
5. Not being able to choose character values by the vision, this is due to a large number of character values, both those provided by the Ministry of Education and Culture, as well as from other sources. Generally, schools have difficulty choosing which character values match the vision of the school. It has an impact on the character-building movement in schools to become less focused and focused so that monitoring and assessment are unclear.
6. Lack of support from schools in cultivating and accustoming character values is possible because the culture of character values in schools is rarely evaluated and monitoring. Therefore, school management needs to be reviewed by incorporating character education into it.

7. The teacher needs a character education learning model that is by the 2013 curriculum. The 2013 curriculum combines several subjects, is put together, and tied into themes and sub-themes. The material is presented in the form of stories related to daily activities. With developments in each lesson, the material can be delivered more interestingly. For this reason, the character education learning model in research has a design that is in line with the story. The character education learning model in this study uses fairy tales. With fairy tales, not only the material conveyed but also mental and character education.

Learning Model of Storytelling in Character Education in Elementary School

The storytelling learning model was chosen because this model can convey the subject matter as well as contain the characters that students must have. The storytelling model is also in line with the 2013 curriculum, which combines subject matter into stories with specific themes. The steps for implementing the storytelling learning model are as follows:

1. Choose sub-themes and look at achievement indicators. The teacher chooses the sub-themes that will be carried out in the storytelling model. After that, the teacher checks the achievement indicators of each subject. From these indicators, it can be seen that the material and message of the fairy tales will be made.
2. Outline a fairy tale. Based on the material and the message of a fairy tale, a fairy tale framework can be made. To make it easier to develop, the framework for the fairy tale can be arranged in the form of a concept map. In addition to the concept map, it can also be prepared by asking, "*Who?" "Where?" "When?" "Why?" "How?"* Of course, in this framework, the material to be discussed and the mandate or characters to be conveyed includes.
3. Develop the framework into fairy tales. Furthermore, the framework was developed into fairy tales. In the development process, it is necessary to pay attention to the choice of words and language styles according to student development. For example, fairy tales for grade 1st uses more straightforward language than fairy tales for grade 3rd of Elementary School.
4. They are making Learning Implementation Plans and evaluation plans. It is imperative for teachers; that is, before carrying out learning, they must first compile a Learning Implementation Plan. They were compiled based on the syllabus, with a learning model storytelling. In addition to the Learning Implementation Plan, the teacher must also prepare evaluation to determine the level of student achievement. The review is guided by the material presented and harmonized with the storyline.
5. Prepare the media for storytelling. So that students are more interested in paying attention to fairy tales, it is necessary to have storytelling media. These media can be in the form of pictures, finger puppets, hand puppets, wooden puppets, puppets, and so on. Also, teachers also need to prepare media that supports the delivery of concepts from the subject matter. For example, the teacher needs to prepare a broomstick to illustrate unity, or the teacher needs to prepare kentongan and mobile phones to deliver material on technological developments.
6. Carry out learning. In carrying out learning, it must pay attention to the Learning Implementation Plan that has been made. The teacher opens the class and gives apperception. Furthermore, the teacher provides an overview of the material to be studied. Continued by the teacher's storytelling with the prepared media. During storytelling, the teacher always builds interactions with students. The teacher ends the story and gives a conclusion in the form of a mandate for shaping student character.
7. Conduct evaluation. After finishing learning by storytelling, the teacher conducts an assessment. The assessment is in the form of a written test on the subject matter. The test is carried out immediately after learning.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Conclusion

Based on the results of research and discussion, the following conclusions can be made;

1. The understanding of most of the low-grade elementary school teachers in Banjarsari District about the concept of character education is still deemed inadequate.
2. The inadequate understanding of teachers about the concept of character education results in the ability of teachers to integrate character values in the subjects they are teaching is also not sufficient.
3. Most of the teachers are also not able to show exemplary to realize the values of character education in front of students.
4. The culture and habits of teachers in schools mostly also do not support character education.
5. To realize character education in schools, especially for low-grade elementary school students in the Banjarsari district, a useful learning model is needed.
6. The learning model that is felt to be helpful in the context of realizing character education in SD Banjarsari is a storytelling learning model.

Recommendation

1. The government, especially local governments, needs to provide sufficient budget to organize character education training, especially in elementary schools in the Banjarsari sub-district.
2. The need for an operational explanation of the character values developed in elementary schools, especially in the Banjarsari sub-district.
3. To teachers, especially elementary school teachers in the Banjarsari sub-district, to realize character education, it is recommended to apply a storytelling learning model.

REFERENCE

Amri, S., & Ahmadi, I.K. (2010). *Construction development learning.* Jakarta: Prestasi Putrakarya.
Character Education Partnership. (2003). *Character education quality standards.* Washington: Character Education Partnership.
David, E., & Sweet, F. (2004). *How to do character education*. Retrieved from http://www.goodcharacter.com/Article_4.html/
Marshall, D., & Rossman, D. (2011). *Designing qualitative research.* New Delhi: SAGE Publication India Pvt. Ltd.
Nurhadi. (2003). *Contextual approach*. Jakarta.
Ramli, T. (2003). *Character building.* Bandung: Angkasa.
Sagala, S. (2005). Concepts and meanings of learning to help solve problems of learning and teaching. Alfabeta: Bandung.
Sugianto. (2009). *Innovative learning models*. Surakarta: Mata Padi Presindo.
Suprijono, A. (2011). *Cooperative learning.* Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.