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Abstract

It is widely known that textbook holds an important role as one of learning sources in education. Textbooks used in schools must be compatible with 2013 curriculum, the newest curriculum applied in Indonesia. But it is found that some teachers complained how the content of textbooks doesn’t fit the objectives specified in 2013 curriculum. Therefore, research regarding analysis of textbook content feasibility is crucial to be conducted to decide whether a particular textbook feasible to be used for academic purposes. In this research, the researchers chose “Joyful” English textbook for Primary Grade II as the research object. The analysis was based on BSNP textbook content feasibility rubric which includes the compatibility of materials with KI and KD, the accuracy of materials and supporting materials. The aim of this research is to know how “Joyful” English textbook for Primary Grade II fulfill the textbook content feasibility specified in 2013 curriculum. Qualitative approach was applied in this research. The
A. Introduction

Nowadays, it is a common knowledge for teachers and students that textbook is one of the important teaching media that supports the achievement of the learning objectives. As stated in Oxford Learner’s Dictionaries, textbook is a book that teaches a particular subject and that is used especially in schools and colleges. Oftentimes, teachers depend on textbook to deliver any material in their classes. A textbook used by the teachers should be relevant to the curriculum, which is 2013 curriculum, the newest curriculum in Indonesia for it to be suitable to be used. Yet, there are still many complaints about the incompatibility of the content contained in the textbook with the learning objectives set by the 2013 curriculum. Sometimes, the material contained in textbook is not relevant to the syllabus determined. Also, as stated by Harmer (2004), there are some teachers who have a very poor opinion of textbooks. They say textbooks are often inappropriate for the class in front of them. However, teachers still use them as they are already bought by the students and meant to be used in the class. Therefore, the researchers decided that feasibility analysis of the content in textbooks is crucial to support the occurrence of good learning activities based on 2013 curriculum.

There had been some relevant studies related to this issue. One of them was conducted by Yokie Prasetya Dharma & Thomas Joni Verawanto Aristo (2018). The research used qualitative approach by interviewing the teachers to find their reasons in using textbooks. The researchers also used document check list instrument to find the relevance of the textbook to the 2013 curriculum. It was found that the English textbook used wasn’t completely relevant to the 2013 curriculum.

Another related research had been done by Rani Arba’ati (2015). The research used qualitative approach and document analysis as the method to collect the data. It was found that not all of the themes and materials in every chapter are appropriate with the basic competence of 2013 curriculum. Of 13 themes of each chapters, 92,3% of the themes are appropriate with the basic competence of 2013 curriculum and 69,2% of the materials relevant to the basic competence of 2013 curriculum.

Based on the previous relevant studies above, since no research has been done to “Joyful” English textbook, the textbook that the researchers chose to be analyzed was “Joyful” English textbook for Primary Grade II. Another reason was because the textbook is used in SD Amir Hamzah Medan while other primary schools in Medan use other books. The English teachers in the school stated that they use 2013 curriculum based books but the researchers found some parts of the textbook don’t meet the criteria stated by BSNP (Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan) about the feasibility standard of a textbook specified in 2013 curriculum so it was decided that content analysis towards the content of “Joyful” English textbook for Primary Grade II is crucial to be conducted. According to BSNP, there are 4 aspects should be fulfilled to conclude that a textbook is suitable to be used. They are content feasibility, language feasibility, presentation feasibility and graphic feasibility. In this case, the researchers limited the scope to analyze the content feasibility of the textbook as it is the aspect that always be complained by English teachers. Therefore, the research question formulated as “How does the content in “Joyful” English textbook fulfill the textbook content feasibility requirements specified in 2013
curriculum?” The objective is to find the way “Joyful” English textbook fulfill the textbook content feasibility requirements specified in 2013 curriculum.

B. Literature Review

1. Textbook

It is widely known that textbook is an important source of learning activity. According to Awalludin (2017), in general, textbooks are teaching materials written by an author or author team based on the curriculum applied. Savides (2016) stated that there are 5 characteristics of a good textbook. They are:

a. Free Space
   This is important for young students. When they look at the book for the first time, they browse first before read. If the pages contain too many texts, it will reduce their motivation in reading or learning the textbook. Good textbook wouldn’t put too many texts in the pages. Instead, it put several texts and pictures to make it more interesting for young learners.

b. Visuals
   Good textbooks should have outstanding visuals for it to be interesting to be used and read. Some students with dyslexia who lack in reading might find it easier to understand books with good visuals.

c. Age-appropriate material
   Good textbook doesn’t contain inappropriate material for the target readers. It is impossible for primary students to understand syntax. And it is inappropriate for adults to have a textbook that teaches alphabet. Textbook should appropriate for the age and level of the readers.

d. Well-balanced textbook design
   Too much columns, too tiny or too big spaces might hurt the eyes of the students and it will reduce their motivation in learning. It is important for textbook to have a well-balanced design that makes readers easier in reading it.

e. Textbook storyline
   Textbook should be chronological and step by step. It should start from the easiest until the hardest one based on the syllabus and curriculum applied.

2. Curriculum 2013

Curriculum 2013 was started to be implemented by the governor since June 2013. As stated by Nurkhamidah (2017), curriculum 2013 is a set of learning activities plan which is used as a guide for teachers that includes the teaching content & teaching methods to facilitate the learning activities applied by the government in order to reach the national education goal. Every school in Indonesia is obligated to use this newest curriculum.

3. Content Feasibility Based on 2013 Curriculum

Textbook should be suitable to be used for both teachers and students. As this research focused on analyzing the content feasibility of the textbook, the researchers adopted the rubric created by Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan (BSNP). The rubric included 3 main aspects to be evaluated related to the content feasibility of a textbook. They are the compatibility of materials with KI (Kompetensi Inti) and KD (Kompetensi Dasar), the accuracy of materials and supporting materials. According to Madjid (2018), those aspects could be divided into:

1. The compatibility of materials with KI and KD, divided into:
   a. Material Completeness
      A textbook should include texts commonly used in English language such as interpersonal, transactional and functional texts. It also should include 4 language skills in English which are listening, speaking, reading and writing.
   b. Material in-depth
Textbook should leave a positive message to students, whether it is a social attitude message or spiritual attitude message. It also should be able to make students understand how a text is formed and they can produce spoken/written texts related to the context.

2. The accuracy of materials, divided into:
   a. Social function
      Textbook should make students able to achieve their social function in real life. Some texts those can make students to achieve social function are narrative text, descriptive text, recount text, etc.
   b. Generic Structure
      Textbook should have a good generic structure in its each word and sentence therefore students wouldn't be misled because of errors contained in the book.
   c. Language features
      Textbook should contain good and polite words without any context of inappropriate words such as words pornography and words those insult SARA (Suku, Agama, Ras dan Antargolongan) because students would mostly follow the words they read.

3. Supporting materials, divided into:
   a. Relevance
      Each part of the textbook such as the texts, pictures, or tables should be relevant to the topic discussed. It also has to be up-to-date with real life condition.
   b. Development of Life Skills
      Textbook must be able to encourage students to find and develop their own skills in real life such as the ability to recognize their potential, the ability to decide and solve problems in a wiser way and the ability to decide their future.
   c. Diversity Insight
      Textbook should develop students' diversity insight so they can understand that everyone is different and it is something to be accepted and appreciated. By that, they may also develop love in diversity.

C. Methodology

1. Research Design
   This research used qualitative research design. According to Bricki & Green (2007), qualitative research is characterized by its aims, which relate to understanding some aspect of social life, and its methods which (in general) generate words, rather than numbers, as data for analysis. Patton (2015) stated that qualitative research inquires, documents, and interprets the meaning-making process. And according to Hennink, et al. (2011), qualitative research is an approach that allows you to examine people’s experiences in detail, by using a specific set of research methods such as in-depth interviews, focus group discussions, observation, content analysis, visual methods, and life histories of biographies. In this research, the researchers used content analysis method, also called as document analysis. The research was conducted in Medan, North Sumatra, Indonesia. The focus in this research was to find how “Joyful” English textbook for Primary Grade II fulfill textbook content feasibility specified in the 2013 curriculum.

2. Respondents, Population and Sample
   The respondents in the research were the researchers themselves. In qualitative research, it is the researchers themselves that answer the research questions based on personal views or previous studies. In order to answer the research questions, the researchers adopted BSNP instruments about textbook feasibility content characteristics. The object of the research was the “Joyful” English textbook itself. The researchers used simple random sampling technique to decide the sample. The researchers did some steps as follows.

   1. Define the population. The population was 6 units of the textbook.
   2. Decide the sample size. It is decided that 3 units would be taken as the sample.
3. Assign numbers to the units. The researchers assigned a number from 1 until 6 for each unit of the textbook.
4. Find the random numbers. To find random numbers, the researchers used Random Number Generator application published by UX Apps. The result showed that number 3, 1, and 2 were chosen.
5. Select the sample. The random numbers chosen were 3 (unit 3), 1 (unit 1) and 2 (unit 2). Therefore, it was decided that unit 1, unit 2, and unit 3 were the sample of the research.

3. Technique of Data Collection

The most common data collection techniques used in qualitative research are interview, focus group discussions, observation and document analysis. In this research, the researchers used document analysis data collection technique because document analysis is based on existing sources like articles, government reports or books. Because the researchers used textbook as the source of data, the data collection would be document analysis taken from 3 units as the sample of total 6 units of the textbook.

4. Instruments

In this qualitative research, the researchers were the instrument. Besides the researchers, another instrument was a rubric created by BSNP to analyze the content feasibility of a textbook. The rubric used Likert scale to fit the research. Likert scale is designed to know how strong someone agree or disagree towards something. The data for the research was the content of “Joyful” English textbook for Primary Grade II which was used in SD Amir Hamzah Medan. In this case, the researchers only use 3 units of the textbook as the sample to be the data.

5. Technique of Data Analysis

The data in the research would be analyzed by using document checklist through the textbook content feasibility rubric created by BSNP that included:

1. The compatibility of materials with KI and KD
   The compatibility of materials with KI and KD is divided into material completeness and in-depth.
2. The accuracy of materials
   The accuracy of materials is divided into the social functions, element and structure of meaning, and linguistic feature.
3. Supporting materials
   Supporting materials should involve the relevance, development of life skills, and development of diversity insight.

The procedures done by the researchers in analyzing the data were:

- Used the rubric created by BSNP and adjusted it into Likert scale to make the data easier to be analyzed. The rubric used was only the textbook content feasibility rubric. The researchers only took 3 units of the textbook as the sample.
- Analyzed the data. The data analysis result was presented numerically in tables and descriptively in paragraphs. The researchers focused on the points included in the textbook content feasibility rubric created by BSNP and evaluated it by giving scores as 1(poor), 2(enough), 3(good), and 4(very good). The reason of each scores explained descriptively in the form of paragraphs.
- Interpreted the data gained. The interpretation need to be done in order to answer the research question about the feasibility content of “Joyful” English textbook for primary grade II in 2013 curriculum. The researchers present the interpretation in quantitative output by using the formula suggested by Sudjiono (2005) which can be seen as follow.

\[ P = \frac{S}{N} \times 100\% \]

Note:
\[ P \] : percentage
The formula was used to make it easier to find the percentage of content feasibility in the textbook.

D. Findings and Discussion

After the researchers analyzed the data, the findings could be seen as follows.

1. Unit 1 (Getting to Know Others)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The compatibility of materials with KI and KD</td>
<td>Completeness</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-depth</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The accuracy of materials</td>
<td>Social functions</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generic Structure</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic feature</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting materials</td>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of life skills</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of diversity insight</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Compatibility of Materials with KI and KD.

a. Completeness
In this unit, the alphabet of people’s names and introduction are mostly taught. Therefore, the topic is about alphabet. The unit is complete with interpersonal and transactional texts as could be seen on page 1, 4, 7, 8, 9, and 11. But there wasn’t a single functional text because the conversation and texts are just mainly about asking how to spell names and introducing each other. Besides, not as what 2013 curriculum book usually is, there is no core competency and basic competency stated at the beginning of the unit so it is confusing what goal should be reached in the unit. However, 4 language skills such as listening, speaking, reading and writing are completely included inside unit 1. Therefore, the researchers gave score 2 for the completeness.

b. In-depth
An introduction structure is provided on page 10, which lets students know what should be said first and last during introduction. It also leaves a message that we should know our friends. There is also a guide to pronounce each alphabet. Therefore, the researchers gave score 4 for the in-depth.

B. The Accuracy of Materials

a. Social functions
Descriptive text is included to help students achieve their social function. It was provided with a guide so students won’t find it hard to follow since they can follow the guide and example provided. Therefore, the researchers gave score 4 for the accuracy of materials.

b. Generic Structure
The unit uses simple present tense and the structures of the text are mostly correct as it follows the formula and rules of simple present tense. However, there is a sentence as could be seen on page 7 stated that “I go to school at Teladan Elementary School” which the researchers found to be ineffective. It should be “I go to Teladan Elementary School” or “I go to study at Teladan Elementary School” because the word “I go to school at Teladan Elementary
School” might produce misunderstanding that the subject went to school while he was already in a school. The sentence is repeatedly stated in the unit as could be seen on page 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11. Therefore, the researchers gave score 3 for the generic structure.

c. Linguistic Feature
The researchers didn’t find any inappropriate words that is impolite of insult any religion or race. The texts are normative and suitable for children. Therefore, the researchers gave score 4 for the linguistic feature.

C. Supporting Materials
a. Relevance
Each part of the unit including the text, pictures, exercise and songs are considered relevant to the topic which is about alphabet and introduction. Therefore, the researchers gave score 4 for the relevance.

b. Development of Life Skills
As many parts of the unit encourage students to speak, it develops students’ ability to talk in confidence to their friends. Therefore, the researchers gave score 4 for the development of life skills.

c. Diversity Insight.
While asking each other to introduce themselves, students may gain an understanding that they are different from their friends. However, this might not enough to let students accept and appreciate difference since there is no dialogue or text that shows how friends accept their differences. Therefore, the researchers gave score 3 for the diversity insight.

Based on the findings above, it could be concluded that most of unit 1 aspects fit the content feasibility of 2013 curriculum book. It could be seen that 5 items from the total 8 items scored 4 (very good) while other 3 items haven’t met the requirements of 2013 curriculum textbook’s content feasibility.

2. Unit 2 (Playing with Friends)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The compatibility of materials with KI and KD</td>
<td>Completeness</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-depth</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The accuracy of materials</td>
<td>Social functions</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generic Structure</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic feature</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting materials</td>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of life skills</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of diversity insight</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Compatibility of Materials with KI and KD
a. Completeness
At the beginning of the unit, there was no core competency and basic competency stated as should be included in 2013 curriculum book. Because the unit mainly focuses on vocabulary and grammar, there is only functional text included without interpersonal and transactional texts those should also be included as the requirement of a 2013 curriculum textbook. Therefore, the researchers gave score 1 for the completeness.
b. In-depth
Instead of letting students know the difference between “there is” and “there are” by definition, this unit let them know by example as could be seen on page 24 which the researchers found as ineffective. It would be better if it provided the definition, the formula, and then example. Therefore, the researchers gave score 1 for the in-depth.

B. The Accuracy of Materials
a. Social functions
The social function found in the unit is only to gain information about amount of something as could be seen on page 22. Therefore, the researchers gave score 3 for the social functions.

b. Generic Structure
Simple Present Tense is used in the unit. The researchers didn’t find any grammatical error in the texts included in the unit. Therefore, the researchers gave score 4 for the generic structure.

c. Linguistic Feature
The researchers didn’t find any inappropriate words those are impolite of insult any religion or race. The texts are normative and suitable for children. Therefore, the researchers gave score 4 for the linguistic feature.

C. Supporting Materials
a. Relevance
It is stated at the beginning of the unit that unit 2 is going to talk about games, toys for games, numbers 11-40 and the use of “there is” and “there are”. Each part of the unit completely relevant towards the topic issued. Therefore, the researchers gave score 4 for the relevance.

b. Development of Life Skills
The unit encourages students to define plural and singular and this is useful for their real life as they will be faced with many numeric-related situations such as when they buy something or when they want to count their savings. So this unit could develop their counting skill. Therefore, the researchers gave score 4 for the development of life skills.

c. Diversity Insight.
As the unit focuses on the vocabulary of games, toys and numbers, it doesn’t develop the understanding that each person is different and doesn’t encourage students to accept and appreciate diversity. Therefore, the researchers gave score 1 for the diversity insight.

Based on the findings above, it could be concluded that only half of unit 2 aspects fit the content feasibility of 2013 curriculum book. It could be seen that 4 items from the total 8 items scored 4 (very good) while another 4 items haven’t met the requirements of 2013 curriculum textbook’s content feasibility.

3. Unit 3 (I Enjoy Art Class)

Table 3. Content Feasibility in Unit 3 “I Enjoy Art Class”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completeness</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-depth</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The compatibility of materials with KI and KD</td>
<td>Social functions</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generic Structure</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic feature</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting materials</td>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of life skills</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of diversity</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>insight</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Compatibility of Materials with $KI$ and $KD$
   a. Completeness
      At the beginning of the unit, there was no core competency and basic competency stated as should be included in 2013 curriculum book. The researchers also didn’t find any interpersonal text which should at least added in 2013 curriculum book. However, transactional and functional texts were found inside. Therefore, the researchers gave score 2 for the completeness.
   b. In-depth
      The researchers found clues and guides were provided to let students easier to understand and construct sentences as could be seen on page 36, 38 and 39. Formulas were also provided on page 32. Therefore, the researchers gave score 4 for the completeness.

B. The Accuracy of Materials
   a. Social functions
      Social function about asking what other people is currently doing is useful for students to gain information and identify activities or things in their real life. Therefore, the researchers gave score 4 for the social functions.
   b. Generic Structure
      The researchers didn’t find any grammatical error as the texts are written correctly following the rules of Simple Present Tense. Therefore, the researchers gave score 4 for the generic structure.
   c. Linguistic Feature
      The researchers didn’t find any inappropriate words those are impolite of insult any religion or race. The texts are normative and suitable for children. Therefore, the researchers gave score 4 for the linguistic feature.

C. Supporting Materials
   a. Relevance
      It is stated at the beginning of the unit that unit 3 is going to talk about equipment for art classes, kinds of art, the use of “this”, “that”, “these”, “those” and the way to ask what someone is doing. Each part of the unit including the texts, pictures, activities, exercise and puzzle completely relevant towards the topic issued. Therefore, the researchers gave score 4 for the relevance.
   b. Development of life skills
      Unit 3 encourages students to identify what other people is doing that it could develop students’ awareness towards their surroundings. Therefore, the researchers gave score 3 for the development of life skills.
   c. Diversity Insight
      This unit encourages students to know what others are doing but it doesn’t develop students’ diversity insights as it doesn’t encourage students that each person is different and that they have to accept and appreciate the diversity among them. Therefore, the researchers gave score 1 for the diversity insight.

Based on the findings above, it could be concluded that most of unit 3 aspects fit the content feasibility of 2013 curriculum book. It could be seen that 5 items from the total 8 items scored 4 (very good) while other 3 items haven’t met the requirements of 2013 curriculum textbook’s content feasibility.

In order to know the content feasibility from the book altogether, the researchers combined all of the scores from the sample into a table that could be seen as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Compatibility of Materials with $KI$ and $KD$</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Completeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. In-depth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. The Accuracy of Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Social functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Generic Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Linguistic Feature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Supporting Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Development of life skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Diversity Insight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the findings above, it could be concluded that most of unit 3 aspects fit the content feasibility of 2013 curriculum book. It could be seen that 5 items from the total 8 items scored 4 (very good) while other 3 items haven’t met the requirements of 2013 curriculum textbook’s content feasibility.

In order to know the content feasibility from the book altogether, the researchers combined all of the scores from the sample into a table that could be seen as follows.
Table 4. Content Feasibility in Unit 1-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The compatibility of materials with KI and KD</td>
<td>Completeness</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-depth</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The accuracy of materials</td>
<td>Social functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generic Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting materials</td>
<td>Linguistic feature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of life skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of diversity insight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total frequency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total score (total of score*frequency)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4+4+12+56) = 76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the textbook content feasibility table above, it could be seen that from the 3 units as the sample of "Joyful" English textbook, there are 8 items evaluated with total 24 items of 3 units altogether and analyzed by the researchers and it was found that only 14 items have a very good textbook content feasibility according to BSNP based on 2013 curriculum with the total score of 56. 4 items were considered poor, 2 items considered enough and 4 items considered good. Item that was scored the lowest was material completeness because all the units in the book don't include core competency and basic competency as what 2013 curriculum should at least have. Item that scored the highest was linguistic feature and relevance because it was found that almost all texts are correct in grammatical structure and relevant to the topic issued in each chapters. Combining all scores together, it was found that the total score of the textbook was 76 out of 96. To find out the percentage of “Joyful” English textbook content feasibility, the researchers applied the formula as follow.

\[ P = \frac{76}{96} \times 100\% \]

\[ P = 79,17\% \]

The researchers categorized textbook feasibility content as follows.

0%-20%: Very not feasible
21%-60%: Not feasible
61%-80%: Feasible
81%-100%: Very feasible

Based on that, it could be concluded that “Joyful” English textbook is feasible to be used by teachers and students. This answer the research question that was formulated as “How does the content in "Joyful” English textbook fulfill the content feasibility requirements specified in 2013 curriculum?”. The result showed that “Joyful” English textbook for Primary Grade II fulfills the textbook content feasibility requirements specified in 2013 curriculum by 79,17%. However, there are some items those still don’t meet the requirement of textbook content feasibility which are the completeness and diversity insight therefore the textbook isn’t fully feasible, but it is still alright to be used.

E. Conclusion

Based on the findings above, “Joyful” English textbook for Primary Grade II fulfills the textbook content feasibility requirements specified in 2013 curriculum with the percentage of 79,17% which is considered as feasible. However, there are still some items those don’t meet the requirements of textbook content feasibility such as material completeness and diversity insight.
Therefore, to cover the weaknesses, it is suggested for English teachers to find another trusted and dependable teaching source relevant to the topic specified for Primary Grade II students.

For the publishers, it is hoped that this research can be a new point of view and encourage all publishers to analyze the textbook content feasibility specified in 2013 curriculum before distributing it to the schools. It is hoped that the textbook publishers can publish feasible textbooks only and distribute them to schools to be used.

For another researcher, it is hoped that this research can become a reference for those who are interested in the same research field. As this research might appear to still be imperfect, it is suggested to other researchers to do further research regarding the same research field by improving the methods, approaches or procedures for a better result.

Lastly, because there is no guarantee that textbooks used in schools by teachers are 100% feasible, it is suggested to always pay attention to the characteristics of feasible textbooks before we buy and use it.
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