

Accuracy and the Consistency in Terminologies Used in an Elementary Textbook

Asep Nurjamin*

Indonesia Institute of Education

Garut, Indonesia

*asep5nurjamin@gmail.com

Abstract—This study is aimed to scrutinize the accuracy and the consistency of terms found in a Bahasa Indonesia thematic textbook for the fourth graders in elementary school level. To achieve this aim, content analysis is the framework of this study, by employing the analysis model from Busch consisting of five main stages; determining, checking, searching, analyzing, and drawing conclusion. Moreover, this study results in two conclusions. First, numerous terms are not properly used in the textbook. Second, there is inconsistency in using particular terms. These findings could beget the low readability of the contents. Therefore, it is suggested to the textbook writers to pay attention to aspects of "accuracy" and "consistency" in using the terms.

Keywords—accuracy; consistency; terminology

I. INTRODUCTION

Numerous elementary school teachers in Indonesia complain about the students' low ability to understand the contents of Bahasa Indonesia textbooks [1,2]. One indication of this incomprehension is that only a small percentage of students can answer questions and do assignments correctly. This issue is claimed as an inexplicable phenomenon since basically the ability of students to understand the contents of reading in other texts, outside the textbook, shows a fairly high ability.

To tackle the problems as mention above, any efforts have been done by many teachers. One of them was conducted by Sipriyatun, showing that texts in Bahasa Indonesia's textbook has low level of readability [3]. That factor brings about the difficulties encountered by the readers to comprehend the content of the textbook. As a consequence, the students' difficulties in understanding the contents of textbooks are an indication of learning difficulties [4,5]. Furthermore, it is safe to say that the problem in students' literacy does not solely on the low level of reading habit but also the low readability of the text source.

Out of the matters as found in the previous part, every textbook must be understood by students [6]; one of ways is by providing appropriate terminologies [7]. Specifically, it is said that the author of the text in the scientific work must try to use the term "right" and used in a "steady". In consonant with this, Vacca and Jo suggest that a writer must pay attention to the relationship between each term he chooses and the concept which is referred to [8]. This means that using other terms to refer to the same concept of meaning in the textbook,

especially for the primary level students potentially brings the readers to have misunderstanding as well as misinterpretation of the text [9,10].

Starting from the issue of textbook readability and the need to use appropriate terms in the textbook, this study is an attempt to investigate the appropriateness and the consistency of terminologies in one of Elementary School textbooks, addressed to fourth grade students.

II. METHOD

This research employs content analysis as the framework of the research design. This analysis was conducted to a textbook of Bahasa Indonesia for fourth grade students. The textbook was chosen purposively as the data source based on the main consideration [11]; that is, this textbook is a guided book from the government, peculiarly published by the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic in Indonesia. Hence, it is highly assumed that most of elementary schools in Indonesia use this book as the teachers' guidance.

As a short depiction, this textbook consists of one hundred and sixty-two pages, divided into three sub-themes, namely sub-theme 1 is given the title "Source of Energy", sub-theme 2 is titled "Energy Benefits", and sub-theme 3 is entitled "Alternative Energy". Each sub-section is divided into six lessons. Each learning is divided into several activities which are given the title "Come on". For example, "Lets Talk", "Let's Try", "and Let's Read" and so on. In addition, also found a section entitled "I Love Reading" which consists of 6 texts in the form of prose and poetry. Moreover, as the focus of analysis, this present study is limited to the sub-themes of one, two, and three learning because the three sub-themes are considered representative in representing the other sub-themes.

Furthermore, the data in this study were collected through some steps. First, read the entire contents of the book. Second, mark the words which are identified as terms that become keywords. Third, make a list of words in a table and write down the page where the terms found. Forth, look for other "terms" chosen by the author of the book to refer to the same section in the research sample book. Then, assess the exact or not use of the term. Furthermore, assess the consistency of the use of the term in the book that became the sample of this study.

As the follow up of the steps as mentioned in the preceding paragraph, the texts were analysed using the analysis framework popularized by Busch's [10]. This relational analysis is attained by fulfilling to identify the concepts to be examined in terms of "accuracy" in using terms. Lined up with this, there are five stages completed; they are (1) determining terms that become keywords in paragraphs by looking for answers to the principal discussed in the specified paragraph, (2) checking the accuracy of the use of the term in terms of its meaning and context. To determine "regularity" in using one term, the researcher (3) searching for the word in the relevant paragraph that refers to the same meaning as intended by the term written in the previous sentence. (4) Making interpretation of the keywords used in the texts (5) drawing conclusions of the terminology analysis.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This section elaborates the research findings and followed by the discussion part.

There are two main research findings. First, it is found that there are some inappropriate terminologies in the textbook. As example, in the first sub-theme of learning, (1) The term "*diceritakan*" which is the key word of the question sentence, "*Apa yang diceritakan gambar tersebut?*" (P. 2). (2) The term "*tulisan*" which is the key word of the sentence, "*Buatlah tulisan dengan menggunakan jawaban-jawabanmu di atas?*" (P. 2). (3) The term "*membuktikan panas*" which is the key word of the sentence, "*Beni ingin membuktikan panas bahwa matahari sebagai sebagai sumber energi yang penting untuk kelangsungan makhluk hidup*" (p. 3). (4) The term *perbedaan antara benda-benda yang dijemur di bawah sinar matahari*" which is the keyword of the question sentence, "*Apakah ada perbedaan antara benda-benda yang dijemur di bawah sinar matahari dan yang diletakkan di tempat teduh?*" (P. 4). (5) The term "*peternakan*" which is the key word of the question sentence, "*Aku menanam biji-biji energi di sebuah ladang yang luas di peternakanku*" (p. 5). (6) The term "*permintaan*" which is the keyword of the question sentence, "*Apa yang terjadi apabila permintaan terhadap jagung tinggi?*" And (7) in the sentence "*Apa yang harus dilakukan agar permintaan terpenuhi?*" to be inaccurate in the use of terms. (8) The term "*amatilah*" which is the keyword of the sentence, "*Amatilah teks notasi angka 'Menanam Jagung'*" (p. 10). (2). (9) The term "*penggunaan*" which is the key word of the sentence, "*Siti ingin mengetahui penggunaan air bersih di rumah setiap minggunya*" (p. 16). (10) The term "*penaksiran*" which is the keyword of the sentence, "*Lakukan penaksiran untuk mempercepat menghitungnya*" (pp. 16-18).

In addition, (11) The term "*sampaikan*" which is the key word of the sentence, "*Sampaikan kepada orang tuamu pentingnya air bersih*" (p. 19). (12) The term "*diskusikan*" which is the key word of the sentence, "*Diskusikan apakah di keluargamu sudah menghemat air*" (p. 19). The third sub-theme of learning is found to be inaccurate use of the term (13) The terms "*lapangan*" and (14) "*bergerak*" which are the keywords of the sentence, "*Saat berada di lapangan, rambutku sering bergerak*" (p. 20). (15) The term "*bola besar*" which is the key word of the phrase, "*perlengkapan: bola besar*" (p. 20). (16) The term "*sumber energi*" which is the key word of the

phrase, "*Apa sumber energi kincir angin?*" (P. 25). (17) The term "*bagaimana*" is the key word of the sentence, "*Bagaimana kincir angin bisa berputar*" (P. 26). Another example of the term misuse. The use of the term "*diceritakan*" is the key word of the question sentence, "*Apa yang diceritakan gambar tersebut?*" (P. 29). This question is displayed below an image. When reading this sentence, the question arises, "*apakah gambar bisa berce rita?*" The answer, "*tidak.*" Obviously, the author uses the word "*diceritakan*" here in the connotative meaning. The author borrows the meaning of human habits because only humans can tell stories. The use of terms in the meaning of *kias* in scientific essays is intended for fourth grade students, almost students will fail to understand this question, it is probable that students will not be able to answer correctly, so students cannot answer the question not because they do not know the answer, but because they do not understand the question. Students in mastering the contents of the textbook.

In relation to this, the findings above are not parallel to the theory as proposed by Walk, that one of the prominent works of the textbook writers is providing the correct and proper vocabulary building [7]; including terminologies. In addition to this, this textbook also does not achieve the ideal criterion of a textbook as mentioned by Vacca and Jo [8]; that is, a textbook writer must pay attention on the relevance of terminologies with the context of the textbook content itself as well as the addressee, in this case, the readers. Obviously, the readers are elementary school students in grade four, which are approximately in the age of 9-10 years old. The classification of this students, as young learners, has to be prioritized by the textbook writers since young learners have unique characteristics, different from adult learners who have maturity in grasping more complex and abstract concepts [12].

As the second finding; the consistency of the terms. In the first sub-theme of learning one is found in the use of terms. (1) the term "*matahari*" is displayed on pages one through page ten. On page one it is called "*panas matahari*", on page two called "*matahari*", on page three it is called "*panas*", on page four it is called "*sinar matahari*", on page four it is called "*panas matahari*", on page five it is called "*cahaya matahari*", On page five called "*energi matahari*", on page six is called "*energi panas matahari*", on page nine called "*sumber energi matahari*", on page ten called "*energi panas matahari*", on page ten it is called "*energi panas*". All the terms "*matahari*" and its derivatives, which are found in the sub-theme one lesson one above, based on the context, appear to refer to an understanding of "energy produced by the sun's heat". However, the author does not try to choose and use one term which according to his understanding will accurately represent the concept of what is to be conveyed, namely "energy produced by the sun's heat". The use of this term is not steady, alternating, it is feared that it will cause difficulties for the students who are readers of this book.

Moreover, another result as presented above is categorized as the weakness of the textbook. This is strengthened by Garinger and Busch that inconsistency in using terms in textbooks could hypothetically lead to misunderstanding and misinterpreting the notion/ concepts [9,10]. This is also further confirmed by Cunningsworth and Dalton-Puffer that the

problem in understanding the textbook will automatically cause the difficulties in learning process [4,5].

As the summing up of those two findings above, there are seventeen terms were found to be incorrect. These terms are defined as terms that are taxa meanings, tend to cause misunderstandings in students of book readers. In terms of the accuracy of the selection of this term we find a number that is very surprising. Of the twenty-six pages that were used as research samples, seventeen inaccuracies were chosen. This means that the author of this textbook does one comma fifty-three errors in choosing words on each page he writes. Second, the continued use of the term. From this point of view, the textbook writer has used different terms to refer to the same meaning. The inability to use this term which is one of the factors that makes the contents of textbooks difficult for students to understand. The author of the book has used various terms that reach eleven different terms.

IV. CONCLUSION

As the conclusion, the textbook has some problems in the readability level; particularly, in determining the accurate and consistent terminologies. Specifically, some terms are not appropriate to be understood by elementary school students. In addition, the various terms used to indicate one concept/notion are also found and it could potentially make students hard to comprehend what the terms are referred to. Therefore, it is necessary for the next textbook writers, especially who write elementary school level's books, to centre on the accuracy of terminology and its consistency, adapted to the characteristics of the students and young learners.

REFERENCES

- [1] A Firdaus, S Samhati, E Suyanto, Analisis kelayakan isi buku teks bahasa Indonesia. Bandung: Erlangga, 2014.
- [2] A Nurjaini, Kemampuan siswa sekolah dasar dalam memahami isi buku teks. Hasil Survey terhadap Guru-Guru Sekolah Dasar di Kecamatan Garut Kota, Kecamatan Tarogong Kidul, Kecamatan Tarogong Kaler, dan Kecamatan Cilawu. Tidak dipublikasikan, 2018.
- [3] A. Supriyatun, S. Raheni, "Kajian Buku Teks Pelajaran Bahasa Indonesia untuk Kelas X Sekolah Menengah Atas". *BASASTRA*, vol. 5(2), pp. 163-182, 2017.
- [4] A. Cunningsworth, *Choosing Your Textbook*. Great Britain, Oxford: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [5] P. Dalton, *Language use and language learning in CLIL classroom*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company, 2010.
- [6] Ph.G. Altbach, G.P. Kelly, *Textbooks in the Third World: Policy, Content and Context*. New York: Garland Publisher, 1988.
- [7] A. Wallwork, *English for Writing Research Papers*. London: Springer, 2011.
- [8] R.T. Vacca, A. Jo, *Content Area Reading: Literacy and Learning Across The Curriculum*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2002.
- [9] D. Garinger, *Textbook evaluation*. Available in <http://www.teflweb.j.org/v1n1/garinger.html>. (retrieved November, 2018), 2001.
- [10] C. Busch, D. Maret, S. Paul, T. Flynn, R. Kellum, S. Le, B. Meyers, M. Saunders, R. White, M. Palmquist, *Writing Guide Content Analysis*. Available in <http://writing.colostate.edu/guides/guide.cfm?guideid=61>. (retrieved on Februari, 18 2019), 2012.
- [11] J.W. Creswell, *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five approaches*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage, 2013.
- [12] B. Musthafa, "Teaching English to young learners in Indonesia: essential requirements". *Educationist*, vol. 4(2), pp. 120-125, 2010.