

QUALITY OF STUDENTS' TEXTBOOK "HOTS SERIES" IN 2013 CURRICULUM GRADE IV OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

SUDIRMAN

Lecturer at Undergraduate Program, PGSD FKIP UNRAM, Mataram, Indonesia.
Email: sudirman_fkip@unram.ac.id

Abstract

Learning can be carried out well, if there are sufficient textbooks, story books, and other source books. Nevertheless, the quality of the book is a priority. The purpose of this study was to describe the quality of student textbooks in the HOTS series of 2013 curriculum for grade IV elementary schools, including: a) the quality of language standards according to the HOTS series; b) standard quality of presentation according to the HOTS series. This study used a qualitative-evaluative approach. Data were collected through library sources of thematic books for grade IV Elementary School 2013 Curriculum. The results showed that the quality of student textbooks for the 2013 curriculum HOTS series, namely: a) the standard quality of the HOTS series language was 91.32% very decent. The distributions are: (a) the suitability of student development is 91.66%; (b) the use of communicative language is 90.22%; and (c) the requirement for coherence and integration of the flow of thinking is 92.1%; and b) the quality of the standard presentation of the HOTS series when viewed from the cognitive domain is different. For themes 1-9 in the cognitive domain C1 is 25%; C2 is 24%; C3 is 14%; C4 is 13%; C5 is 18%; and C6 is 6%. If you look at the distribution, the cognitive domain is more dominant at the LOTS level, namely C1 and C2, while at the HOTS level, it is C5. This means that each cognitive domain is represented, so that the HOTS series of student textbooks is very suitable for use by fourth grade elementary school students.

Keywords: Language Standards, Presentation Standards; HOTS.

INTRODUCTION

The readability of a book can be seen from the attractiveness of the book being read, interesting in terms of language, and attractive in presentation (Maryansyah, 2016). A good book is a book that is able to answer the future needs of students (Keiler, 2018). Minister of Education and culture act No. 81 of 2013 concerning curriculum implementation states that the need for future competition requires Critical Thinking Skills, communication skills, and creativity. The application of textbooks to carry out learning should include critical thinking skills, providing opportunities for students to be able to face problems that occur in the future (Alfiandra et al., 2022). The demands of 21st century learning, and facing the development of technology 4.0 requires the government to have textbooks to answer the future needs of students (Lase, 2019). For this reason, textbooks must be interesting, the material answers the needs of students, and the language is easy to understand. Prastowo (2011) states that the elements of a textbook consist of the title of the book, basic competencies or subject matter, supporting information, and exercises (Alfiandra et al., 2022; Amini, 2020; Megawati & Zuchdy, 2020). The attractiveness of the title, quality material, and the use of language that is easy to understand, as well as the integration of a good line of thinking can improve high-order thinking skills (HOTS) (Astutik et al., 2020; Narayanan & Adithan, 2015). HOTS according to Tarigan and Tarigan (2009) that textbooks are textbooks in certain fields of study, which are standard books,

compiled by experts in that field for instructional purposes and objectives, which are equipped with the following facilities: teaching that is harmonious and easy to understand by the users in schools. In Permendikbud Number 8 of 2016, it is stated that textbooks are the main learning resources to achieve basic competencies and core competencies and were declared feasible by the Ministry of Education and Culture to be used in education units, as media and learning resources. Textbooks according to Afifa (2014), textbooks in certain fields of study that have standards, are prepared by experts with the intent and purpose of learning, easy to understand by users in schools and colleges. While Muslich (2010) states that a textbook is a book that contains descriptions of materials about certain subjects or fields of study, arranged systematically and has been selected based on certain objectives. Meanwhile, Prastowo (2011) states that the elements of a textbook consist of the title of the book, basic competencies or subject matter, supporting information, exercises, and assessments. The benefits of textbooks according to Government Regulation number 19 of 2005 article 20 that teachers are expected to develop learning materials. That is, textbooks do not have to be a specific benchmark in teaching and learning activities, but a teacher must be able to develop the subject matter being taught. Textbooks can be used as a store of knowledge because their contents have completeness in their presentation. Textbooks provide facilities for independent learning activities, both about the content and about the method. Teachers and students can use it as a learning resource so that the direction of learning objectives can be achieved properly. Learning activities become more focused, and students become more prepared in carrying out the learning process. With the existence of textbooks, it is hoped that it can foster students' interest in reading from an early age. The government through the National Education Standards Agency (BSNP) determines the quality of textbooks so that they can be used in learning.

Student books are defined as books intended for students that are used as a guide for learning activities to make it easier for students to master certain competencies (Kemendikbud, 2013). Student books are designed to support students to take an active role in learning activities. So the student book is a book intended for students to make it easier for students to master a competency. The Ministry of Education and Culture (2013) describes several functions of student books including: (1) A guide for students in carrying out learning activities. Each sub-theme in the book contains an explanation of the activities that students must do in learning; (2) Liaison between teachers, schools, and parents. In each lesson there are activities that students must do together with their parents at home; (3) Student worksheets. The student book can function as a student worksheet at the same time because the student book contains various exercises that can hone students' abilities; (4) Scenario of learning steps. Teachers can use student books in carrying out learning steps. Each page of the student book has a standard presentation of activities, such as "Let's Sing", "Let's Tell a Story" and so on; and (5) communication media between teachers and students. Teachers can get to know students better through observing the results of student work that has been designed in such a way in each lesson. Student books can be used as a guide for students in carrying out learning activities, as a liaison between parents and teachers, as worksheets, assessing student achievement and student competency development. To improve students' critical thinking skills, the standard student textbooks are directed at increasing high order thinking skills or HOTS. The Ministry

of Education and Culture (2020) that the standards for being able to develop students' higher-order thinking are as follows: a) Transfer of one concept to another; b) Processing and applying information; c) Finding links from different kinds of information; d) Using information to solve problems; and e) Critically examine ideas and information. To measure the realm of critical thinking can use the cognitive domain according to Bloom's Taxonomy revised by Krathwohl (2001), namely C1 (remembering); C2 (understand); C3 (apply); C4 (analyze); C5 (rate); C6 (create). This measuring tool serves as a guide for measuring the quality of the HOTS series textbooks for fourth grade elementary school students.

METHOD

This study used a qualitative approach, more precisely evaluative-descriptive. The researcher evaluates the quality of the HOTS series of textbooks against the needs of students. The sources used are books, proceedings, and scientific articles. After that, the researchers conducted an analysis by calculating the percentage of the suitability of the textbooks with students' needs using a scoring technique, and formulas for the thematic book series HOTS class IV 2013 curriculum. The textbooks were in accordance with the demands of the curriculum, namely 9 (nine) themes, each theme has sub-themes and learning. Research findings are presented objectively and systematically with descriptive techniques. Drawing conclusions of the analyzed categories. The researcher interpreted the percentage descriptively.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The results of the analysis show that the language quality of the student textbooks in the HOTS series, the main focus is to see the quality of language from the development of students, the use of language, the coherence and integration of the flow of thinking in the presentation can be seen in the Table 1.

Table 1: Recap of Analysis of Language Standards for HOTS . series student textbooks

Tema	Suitability with student development (%)	Use of communicative language (%)	The use of language fulfills the requirements for coherence and integration of the flow of thinking (%)
1	91%	90%	95%
2	92%	92%	96%
3	92%	91%	92%
4	91%	90%	93%
5	93%	90%	92%
6	93%	89%	91%
7	92%	90%	90%
8	91%	90%	89%
9	90%	90%	91%
Jlh	91,66%	90,22%	92,1%
Σ%	91,32%		

The data above shows that the language standard in 9 (nine) themes is 91.32%. This percentage

comes from the development of students with a percentage of 91.66%; use of communicative language with a percentage of 90.22%; and the coherence of the flow of thought with a percentage of 92.1%. The quality of the language is in accordance with the development of students in all themes with an average percentage above 90%; while in the use of communicative language standards, only in theme 6 the percentage is only 89%; then, in the case of language coherence, only in theme 8, the percentage is only 89%. The data above shows that the language quality of the HOTS series student textbooks meets the category standards determined by BNSP (2017) with a very good category. Likewise, the percentage of the presentation quality of the HOTS series of student textbooks is also quite representative for students to use. This can be seen from the data on Table 2.

Table 2: Result of the Quality Analysis on Presentation of Thematic books on HOTS Series

Theme	Presentation Quality						Sum
	(C1)	(C2)	(C3)	(C4)	(C5)	(C6)	
1	16	17	15	8	17	4	78
2	14	27	13	7	18	3	82
3	15	22	18	5	18	3	84
4	11	24	14	5	18	2	74
5	21	20	13	6	17	6	88
6	31	26	15	22	15	7	116
7	33	28	16	10	18	6	118
8	34	20	11	27	18	3	113
9	41	27	8	18	18	14	135
Sum	216	211	123	108	157	48	
Percentage	25%	24%	14%	13%	18%	6%	

The table above shows that the quality of textbooks for the HOTS series IV elementary school students is still dominated by LOTS, which is 63%, while HOTS, which is 37%. This percentage appears mainly in themes 1 to 6, while in themes 7-9, the tendency of HOTS quality is quite balanced. For more details, below is presented in the form of percentage data per theme

Table 3: Recapitulation of the Percentage of Quality of HOTS . Series Student Textbook Presentation

Tema.	Percentage Presentation Quality					
	Recalling (C1)	Understanding (C2)	Applying (C3)	Analyzing (C4)	Valuing (C5)	Creating (C6)
1	21%	22%	19%	10%	22%	5%
2	17%	33%	16%	9%	22%	4%
3	19%	27%	22%	6%	22%	4%
4	15%	32%	19%	7%	24%	3%
5	25%	24%	16%	7%	20%	7%
6	27%	22%	13%	19%	13%	6%
7	30%	25%	14%	9%	16%	5%
8	30%	18%	10%	24%	16%	3%
9	33%	21%	6%	14%	14%	11%
Σ%	25%	24%	14%	13%	18%	6%

The results of the analysis of presentation standards on all themes are different. Standard presentation according to student needs, in theme 1 the number of cognitive domains presented is 78, with a distribution of C1=16; C2=17; C3=15; C4=8; C5=17; and C6=4. In theme 2 the number of cognitive domains presented is 82, with a distribution of C1=14; C2=27; C3=13; C4=7; C5=18; and C6=3. In theme 3 the number of cognitive domains presented is 84, with a distribution of C1=15; C2=22; C3=18; C4=5; C5=18; and C6=3. In theme 4 the number of cognitive domains presented is 74, with a distribution of C1=11; C2=24; C3=14; C4=5; C5=18; and C6=2. In theme 5 the number of cognitive domains presented is 88, with a distribution of C1=21; C2=20; C3=13; C4=6; C5=17; and C6=6. In theme 6 the number of cognitive domains presented is 116, with a distribution of C1=31; C2=26; C3=15; C4=22; C5=15; and C6=7. In theme 7 the number of cognitive domains presented is 118, with a distribution of C1=33; C2=28; C3=16; C4=0; C5=18; and C6=6. In theme 8 the number of cognitive domains presented is 113, with a distribution of C1=34; C2=20; C3=11; C4=27; C5=18; and C6=3; and In theme 9 the number of cognitive domains presented is 84, with a distribution of C1=41; C2=27; C3=8; C4=18; C5=18; and C6=4. When viewed from the percentage, the cognitive domain of LOTS is greater, which is 63% compared to HOTS, which is 37%. The distribution of the LOTS cognitive domain is C1=25%; C2=24%; C3=14%, while the HOTS cognitive domain is C5=18%; C4=13%, and C6=6%. This percentage shows that the quality of textbooks for the HOTS series IV elementary school students is still dominated by LOTS, which is 63%, while HOTS, which is 37%. This percentage tends to appear in the initial themes, namely themes 1 to 6, while themes 7 to 9 tend to be HOTS, especially at C5 = 18%. Themes 1 to 6 have met the BSNP (2017) standard. The results of the analysis carried out on this aspect indicate that the messages conveyed in each theme can be understood.

Based on the analysis that the quality of the HOTS series of student textbooks for the 2013 curriculum is: a) the standard quality of the HOTS series language is 91.32% with a very decent category. The standard distributions are: (a) suitability for student development is 91.66%; (b) the use of communicative language is 90.22%; and (c) the requirement for coherence and integration of the flow of thinking is 92.1%; and b) the quality of the standard presentation of the HOTS series when viewed from the cognitive domain is different. For themes 1-9 in the cognitive domain C1 is 25%; C2 is 24%; C3 is 14%; C4 is 13%; C5 is 18%; and C6 is 6%. If you look at the distribution, the more dominant cognitive domain is at the LOTS level, namely C1 and C2, while at the HOT level it is C5. However, each cognitive domain is represented, it's just that the percentage of LOTS is higher than HOTS. So it was found that the HOTS series of student textbooks currently used had a smaller percentage of HOTS than LOTS. However, the HOTS series student textbooks are still of sufficient quality to be used by fourth grade elementary school students according to the ones in To measure the critical thinking domain, one can use the cognitive domain according to Bloom's Taxonomy revised by Krathwohl (2001), namely C1 (remembering); C2 (understand); C3 (apply); C4 (analyze); C5 (rate); C6 (create).

CONCLUSION

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that the quality of the HOTS series textbooks used by students today is in a very suitable category for use by fourth grade elementary school students. This can be seen from: (1) The standard quality of the HOTS series of student textbooks for 9 (nine) students is 91.32% with a very decent category. The standard distributions are: (a) suitability for student development is 91.66%; (b) the use of communicative language is 90.22%; and (c) the requirement for coherence and integration of the flow of thought is 92.1%; (2) The standard quality of the presentation of the HOTS series when viewed from the cognitive domain is different. For themes 1-9 in the cognitive domain C1 is 25%; C2 is 24%; C3 is 14%; C4 is 13%; C5 is 18%; and C6 is 6%. If you look at the distribution, the cognitive domains at the LOTS level, namely C1 and C2, are more dominant than the HOTS level, with a higher percentage at C5 and C4. However, each cognitive domain is represented, so this textbook is still very suitable for use by fourth grade elementary school students.

References

1. Alfianra, Yusuf, S., & Barlian, I. (2022). Improving Students' Critical Thinking Skills Through Case Based Learning Oriented Textbook. *Jurnal Penelitian Dan Pengembangan Pendidikan*, 6(3), 440–449. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jppp.v6i3.56179>
2. Amini, R. (2020). Textbook development on character-based active learning strategy using tournament type for elementary School student. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1567(4). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1567/4/042036>
3. Arief, S., & Sadiman. (2012). *Media Pendidikan: Pengertian dan Pengembangan, dan Pemanfaatannya*. Depok: Rajawali Pers.
4. Arikunto, (2010). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: RinekaCipta.
5. Arikunto, S., (2010). *Prosedur Penelitian*. Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta.
6. Arsyad, (2014). *Media Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers
7. Astutik, S., Mahardika, I., Indrawati, Sudarti, & Supeno, S. (2020). HOTS student worksheet to identification of scientific creativity skill, critical thinking skill and creative thinking skill in physics learning. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1465, 12075. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1465/1/012075>
8. Awalludin, (2017). *Pengembangan Buku Teks Sintaksis Bahasa Indonesia*.
9. Cresswell, J.W., (1994). *Research Design: qualitative, quantitative and mixedmethod approaches*, London: SAGE Publications.
10. Irsyada, R., (2016). Analisis Isi dan Kelayakan Penyajian Buku Sekolah Elektronik (BSE) Mata Pelajaran Penjasorkes Kelas 2 Sekolah Dasar. *Journal of Physical Education Health and Sport*, 3 (2). Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
11. Keiler, L. S. (2018). Teachers' roles and identities in student-centered classrooms. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 5(1), 34. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-018-0131-6>
12. Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content Analysis : an Introduction to its Methodology*.
13. Lase, D. (2019). Education and Industrial Revolution 4.0. 10, 48–62. <https://doi.org/10.24114/jh.v10i1>

14. Majid. (2014). Pembelajaran Tematik Terpadu. Bandung: PT Remaja.
15. Maryansyah, Y. (2016). An Analysis On Readability Of English Reading Texts For Grade Ix Students At Mtsn 2 Kota Bengkulu. *Premise Journal*:ISSN Online: 2442-482x, ISSN Printed: 2089-3345, 5. <https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v5i1.416>
16. Megawati, I., & Zuchdy, D. (2020). The Compatibility between Philosophy Basis of ‘English in Mind’ Textbook and Curriculum 2013. *VELES Voices of English Language Education Society*, 4(2), 163–176. <https://doi.org/10.29408/veles.v4i2.2555>
17. Mendikbud. (2013). Modul Pelatihan Guru Materi Implementasi Kurikulum 2013 SMP/ MTs Ilmu Pengetahuan Alam. Jakarta: Kemendikbud.
18. Narayanan, S., & Adithan, M. (2015). Analysis Of Question Papers In Engineering Courses With Respect To Hots (Higher Order Thinking Skills). *American Journal of Engineering Education (AJEE)*, 6(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.19030/ajee.v6i1.9247>