



## The Difference of *KTSP* and *Kurikulum* 2013 Implementation, Family Environment Toward Career Choosing Readiness

Berta Dian Theodora<sup>✉</sup>, Haryanto, Siti Marti'ah

DOI: 10.15294/dp.v12i2.13564

Universitas Indraprasta PGRI, Jakarta, Indonesia

### History Article

Received 1 October 2017  
Approved 10 November 2017  
Published 31 December 2017

### Keywords

Kurikulum 2013; *KTSP*; Family Support; Career Choosing

### Abstract

This research aims to prove: 1) the differences of students' readiness in choosing a career in students in schools that apply *KTSP* curriculum with students in schools that apply kurikulum 2013; 2) the differences of the influences of supporting family environment with unsupporting family environment for students' career choosing; 3) the influence of curriculum that receives family support for students' career choices. The samples of the study were 355 students from 12 schools in Depok. Data analysis tool used two way anova with interaction. The prerequisite test used normality test and homogeneity test. The result of the research shows that: 1) there is no significant difference of curriculum used in school to the students' career choice readiness, 2) there are significant differences between students who have supporting family environment with students who have less supporting family environment to students' career choice readiness, 3) there is a significant difference when schools with curriculum work together with family environments to support students in choosing their careers.

### How to Cite

Theodora, Berta Dian, Haryanto, & Marti'ah, Siti. (2017). The Difference of *KTSP* and *Kurikulum* 2013 Implementation, Family Environment Toward Career Choosing Readiness. *Dinamika Pendidikan*, 12(2), 159-169.

© 2017 Universitas Negeri Semarang

<sup>✉</sup> Correspondence Author:

Jl. Nangka No. 58 C (TB. Simatupang), Tanjung Barat, Jagakarsa, RT.5/RW.5, Jakarta Selatan, Daerah Khusus Ibukota Jakarta 12530

E-mail: berta.dtos@gmail.com

p-ISSN 1907-3720  
e-ISSN 2502-5074

## INTRODUCTION

The world of work in the 21st century has changed rapidly, with globalization, hence a person's choice of work and career is more diverse and specific. This change is mainly influenced by the rapid changes in technology. According to Dumont, Stojanovska, and Cuyvers (2011) the data shown by IMF in 2007 shows that the highest investment in developing countries is in technology. Research and development in the field of technology is considered as a determinant to the economic growth rate of a State. Rapid changes and developments demand adjustments in education to be able to answer all the challenges. National education can be categorized as life because it has the nature to change. Both the educational objectives and its efforts have interconnectivity with strategic environment changes, such as politics, economics, social, culture, science, technology, religion, morality / ethics, art, population growth, and globalization (PH, 2014). The development of the world of education is now entering an era of marked by incessant technological innovation, thus demand the adjustment of the education system in line with the demands of the world of work (Windriyas, 2014).

Education is the first home in preparing students to be able to survive and adjust to the development of the era so that they become unique and skilled workforce in their career. The secondary education is held to continue and expand the elementary education and prepare students to become members of the community who have the ability to conduct a mutual relationship to the social, cultural, and natural environment and can develop further skills in the world of work or higher education (Triyanto, Anita, & Suryani, 2013). This is in line with the vision of the national education system in Indonesia contained in the Act no. 20 of 2003 on the National Education System of the Republic of Indonesia is the realization of an educational system as a strong social institution and authoritative to empower all Indonesian citizens to develop into a quality

human to be capable and proactively respond to the ever changing challenges of the age.

The education system in Indonesia is conducted through several channels, namely (1) formal education channel, implemented in schools; (2) nonformal educational channel, implemented in the course institutions; and (3) in-formal education that is education in the family environment and social environment. One of the main differences of formal education with other educational paths is the existence of a curriculum which is the education basis. Act No. 20 of 2003 mentioned that curriculum is a set of goals and plans, lesson content and materials and ways to be used for the implementation of the learning activities for the purpose. According to Anwar (2014) curriculum can be grouped in two senses, that are in a broad sense and in a narrow sense. In a broad sense, curriculum is a sustainable concept of the applied education system. While in a narrow sense, curriculum can mean a unit of several subjects, one subject, a clump of science, a program of learning plans, and so on, which describes the plan of a series of learning activities.

The Indonesian curriculum has undergone ten changes, that are the 1947 Curriculum called the 1947 Lesson Plan (Rencana Pelajaran 1947), the 1952 Curriculum referred as the 1952 Described Lesson Plan (Rencana Pelajaran Terurai 1952), the 1964 Curriculum referred as the 1964 Educational Plan (Rencana Pendidikan 1964), the 1968 Curriculum, the 1975 Curriculum, the Curriculum 1984, the 1994 Curriculum and 1999 Curriculum Supplement, and Competency Based Curriculum in 2004, the last is the change of Curriculum 2006 with School-Based Curriculum (Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan/KTSP) into Curriculum 2013 (Kurikulum 2013). Curriculum which currently applied in Indonesia is Kurikulum-13 which is often known as kurtilas. K-13 curriculum is an adaptation of the previous curriculum, the School-Based Curriculum (KTSP).

School-Based Curriculum (KTSP) is implemented based on Government Regulasi-

on no.19 of 2005. School-Based Curriculum (KTSP) is considered to remain experiencing problems in its implementation. KTSP is considered not responsive to social changes that occur at the local, national, and global levels (Kemendikbud 2012). KTSP assessment standards were considered not leading to a competency-based assessment. This is contrary to the explanation of Article 35 of Act no.20 of 2003 that the graduate standards is a qualification for graduates' ability to include attitude, knowledge and skills in accordance with agreed national standards. The emerging education issues make the Ministry of Education and Culture (Kemendikbud) considers the need for a new curriculum development, which is the new Kurikulum 2013.

The development of Kurikulum 2013 is done due to internal challenges as well as external challenges (Kemendikbud, 2013). The internal challenge related to educational demands refers to the 8 National Standards of Education and the factor of Indonesian population development. External challenges relate to future challenges, future competencies, community perceptions, knowledge and pedagogical developments, and various negative phenomenon that arise. Changes are made to improve the quality and competitiveness of the nation, then re-adjusting is taken, to the graduate competency standards, process standards and assessment standards as well as curriculum reorganization. This change is known by the education community as the Kurikulum 2013 or kurtilas.

The application of Kurikulum 2013 receives pros and cons in many schools, until present day, not all schools have applied the Kurikulum 2013, such as in Depok City, from 13 state SMAs, nine schools use the Kurikulum 2013 and four schools use School-Based Curriculum (KTSP). The urgent time to implement the 2013 Curriculum, many schools feel unprepared, especially teachers who are required to change the learning styles that all these times are still teacher-oriented, into student-oriented learning method. Teachers should learn and change the learning met-

hod they have been using in accordance with the demands of the Kurikulum 2013. Teachers should familiarize students with observations, questions, experiments, analyzes and synthetics, and composing or making things in the learning process. This is still considered as difficult for teachers because they have long accustomed to the old curriculum that emphasizes teachers as the main learning resource.

One of the important concerns when preparing the curriculum is the demands of the world of work (article 36, paragraph 3 f) so that it is expected that the application of curriculum in school will provide information to students about future career opportunities. Students are the nation's future candidates who after graduate from their school will be faced with the option of continuing education at a higher level, as well as for work. The results of research by Budiman (2012) resulted that 90% of senior high school students in Bandung regency stated that they are confused in choosing a career for the future. In fact, high school students also can not achieve the task of career development. High school students are still hesitant and do not have the readiness to make the right career decisions for the future. This fact states that many teenagers are in doubt, unpreparedness and stress in career decision making. The lack of concern about careers, as well as the choice of following a friend, will have a negative impact if left unchecked. The consequences of such negative impacts are the random selection of further study, and the selection of work without accordance of talent, and without realizing the ability in the individual will lead to career failure.

Simamora (2011) explained that career planning is the process of self-realization of chances, opportunities, constraints, choices, and consequences, identifying career-related goals. Based on the opinion above, it can be concluded that career planning is a process of selection of career goals, by realizing the chances, opportunities, constraints, and career choices to achieve the desired career. Career motivation can be interpreted impulse that ari-

ses in a person to improve his personal ability in order to achieve a position or career better than before. If someone has a high motivation to improve his career, then in himself, will arise interest to realize his wish (Mahmud, 2008).

Winkel and Hastuti (2012) stated that the goals of career planning include long-range goals and short-range goals. The long-range goal is the goal of the future planning over the long term. Long-range goals are such as lifestyle to be achieved, and the values of life that to be realized in life. Short-range goals are objectives created by individuals to further strengthen the choices taken, such as finding more information about the field of majors and college, place of course or work in accordance with the majors that have been taken.

The phenomenon of students' failure in determining their career choice, is one form of failure of education in preparing students to answer the challenges that exist in the real world. The school curriculum should be able to support and direct students to be able to find an optimal pattern of self-development, either affectively, cognitively, or psychomotorically. So that after graduation or even before graduating from school, learners are already have a picture of their abilities, and career options to be set after graduating from school. The students' ability in career planning should begin with students' ability in taking career exploration from within themselves. According Purwanta (2012) Career exploration is an attempt to understand the characteristics of individual self and the characteristics of the career environment in a variety of career and cultural settings in which the career is located. The purpose of career exploration for students is to sort and choose various information about themselves and their environment so that students can make the right choice according to personality characteristics, which in turn, students will achieve their independence.

In addition to the formal environment, education can also be obtained through family, Hasbullah (2009: 38) stated that the family environment is the first educational environment, because in this family the child initially

get the education and guidance, even Clutter concluded that the family has influence in the decision made by individuals, but the existence of the family as a factor that affects students is still less concerned by the school, even the school often reject the idea to cooperate with family when discussing the choice of career students (Clutter.2010: 12), based on observations in school, the existence of the family as a factor that affects students are still less concerned by the school, even the school often rejects the idea to work with families when discussing the student's career options.

Harmonious parent relationships and good interactions between parents and learner are instrumental in helping the learner to make their career decisions. Career options are none other than continuation of studies to college or choose to work because of economic demands and other opportunities (Girianto, 2017). According Hartinah (2010), the process of adolescent career development process often experience barriers that can be caused by internal and external factors. Internal factors are individual's lack of confidence in ability to achieve a desired outcome or career choice, while external factors are the influence of the environment (family, school, or playmate). Thus it can be concluded that parental support is an important factor affecting the student's career choice.

Based on the phenomena and problems above, the issues to be studied in this research are: (1) is there any difference in the readiness of students in choosing career for students in schools applying KTSP curriculum and students in schools implementing Kurikulum 2013; (2) is there any difference in the readiness of students in choosing a career for students in a supportive family environment and students who are in a less supportive family environment; (3) is school curriculum that gets support from the family further improves the readiness of students in choosing a career.

## **METHODS**

The research was conducted at State Se-

nior High School (SMA) in Depok City. The research population is a class XII student, with the consideration of class XII has received curriculum-based learning for almost three years and XII class students are preparing for a career. Sampling method is purposive sampling. From the calculation results, it obtained 355 samples of students who come from 12 schools. The selected samples are then grouped into two groups: the group using KTSP Curriculum and the groups using Kurikulum 2013 with a balanced number of sample. The methods of collecting research data are by using literature review and interview by using questionnaires.

The research variables are curriculum, family environment and students' career choice. This type of research is a quantitative research. The data analysis tool is by using two way anova method with interaction, prerequisite test used is normality test and homogeneity test. The research hypotheses tested were: (1) There were significant differences in the readiness of career choice among students learning by using KTSP with students learning by using Kurikulum 2013; (2) There is a significant difference in career readiness between students who have a supportive family environment with students who have a less supportive family environment (3) There is an interaction between the curriculum and the family environment on the readiness of students' career choices.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Based on the calculation of research samples, obtained the number of samples as many as 355 students. In order to perform testing of the research hypothesis, prerequisite test is done in the form of normality and homogeneity test. Normality test is done by using Kolomogorov-Smirnov test, while homogeneity test is by using Levene's Test of Equality of Error. The normality test results showed that the significance of KTSP curriculum group is  $0.200 > 0.05$  and the Kurikulum 2013 group is  $0.085 > 0.05$ , which means that

the data in the curriculum group in Kurikulum 2013 and KTSP are normally distributed.

**Table 1.** Normality Tests Results

variabel	Kurikulum	Tests of Normality		
		Statistic	df	Sig.
Pilihan_	2013	.060	195	.085
karir	KTSP	.064	160	.200*

\*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Source: Processed Data (2017)

The second prerequisite test is a homogeneity test. Homogeneity test functions to know the variance of homogeneity or heterogeneous distribution data based on certain factors. The homogeneity test used is levene test. Based on levene test results, showing the significance result of  $0.003 < 0.05$  indicates that the data obtained is heterogeneous, which means that the research data can be used, with a note when answering the hypothesis using equal variance not assumed data.

**Table 2.** Homogeneity Test Result

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances <sup>a</sup>			
Dependent Variable: Career_choice			
F	df1	df2	Sig.
4.772	3	351	.003

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + Kurikulum + Family\_environment + Curriculum \* Family\_environment

Source: Processed Data (2017)

Prior to data processing to answer the research hypothesis, the study sample is grouped based on curriculum applied in school, family environment conditions, and career options. The family support variable is grou-

**Table 3.** Family Environment Variable Descriptive Analysis

Group	Highest Score	Lowest Score	Total Respondent	Total Score	Average Score
KTSP	63	45	160	8.621	53.88
Kurikulum 2013	65	27	195	9.435	50.19
Total			355		

Source: Processed Data (2017)

ped based on the student's average score. The description of research variable for the work environment is described in detail in table 3. The number of respondents from schools applying KTSP curriculum are as many as 160 students. For the category of supportive family environments group of students with curriculum KTSP, is the students with an average score above 53.88. While students who have an average score below 53.88 are categorized as students who have a less supportive family environment. The next group of respondents is respondents from schools that apply Kurikulum 2013. The number of respondents using Kurikulum 2013 is 195 students. Supportive family environments are students with an average score above 50.19, while students with less supportive family-environment categories are students with the average score below 50.19.

Another variable used in this research is career choice variable. The research data for this variable is obtained through questionnaire. Table 4 reflects the questionnaire results of career choice variable after being categorized according to the research design. From the results of the data, it is found that the average career choice with the category of supportive family environment is 136.49, while the average career choice with the category of less supportive family environment is 131.90. Students with a supportive family environment in the schools that implement Kurikulum 2013, have the highest career average by 137.33. While the average value of the lowest career choice is in the group of students in schools that implement the Kurikulum 2013 with a less supportive family environment. The average of career

choice score in the group of students which using the KTSP curriculum with a supportive family environment is 135.41, whereas in the less supportive family environment is 132.21.

**Table 4.** Career Choice Variable Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive Statistics				
Dependent Variable: Career_choice				
Curriculum	Family_environment	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
2013	Less_supportive	131.62	4.855	109
	Supportive	137.33	4.332	86
	Total	134.14	5.422	195
KTSP	Less_supportive	132.21	3.940	94
	Supportive	135.41	3.196	66
	Total	133.53	3.968	160
Total	Less_supportive	131.90	4.454	203
	Supportive	136.49	3.983	152
	Total	133.86	4.824	355

Source: Processed Data (2017)

The research hypothesis testing is by using two way anova with interaction. The test results are described in detail in table 5. Based on table 5, it can be seen that the comparison between the kurikulum 2013 and KTSP tested on the readiness of students' career choice has an Fcount of 2,215 with a significance value of 0.146, while the value of Ftable is 2.099. Since the value of Fcount is smaller than the Ftable value and the significance value is 0.146 grea-

ter than 0.05 (alpha) it is concluded that there is no difference in the career choice readiness of students in school using the Kurikulum 2013 and School-based curriculum (KTSP) (hypothesis 1 is rejected). Thus the curriculum applied in schools has not been able to support students in determining career choices. This is contrary to the special purpose of secondary education that is preparing learners to be able to choose a career, tenacious and persistent in compete, adapt in the work environment and develop a professional attitude in the field of expertise in the field of interest.

According to Anwar (2014), the emphasis of Kurikulum 2013 development aims to encourage students or students to be better able to observe, question, reason, and communicate (present) what they have gained or knew after receiving learning materials at school. Through this approach students are expected to have a much better attitude, skills, and knowledge competence. They will be more creative, innovative, and more productive, so that later on they will be successful in dealing with the problems and challenges of their time, entering a better future. Or in other words, the theme of curriculum development 2013 is to produce productive, creative, innovative and affective Indonesian people through strengthening attitude (knowing why), skills (know how), and knowledge (know what) in an integrated way (Anwar, 2014)..

Anwar (2014) stated there are several problems in the implementation of Kurikulum 2013 which may prevent students in the careers selection are: (i) the content of the curriculum is still too crowded, this is indicated by the number of subjects and the many materials that the extent and level of difficulty are beyond the level of development of the learner's age; (ii) not yet fully competence-based in accordance with the demands of national education function and objectives, (iii) the competencies have not yet holistically depicted the attitudes, skills and knowledge domain; some competencies are required in accordance with the development needs (eg character education, active learning met-

hodology, soft skills and hard skills, entrepreneurship) has not been accommodated in the curriculum; (iv) have not been sensitive and responsive to social change at the local, national, and global levels; (v) the standard of the learning process has not yet describe the detailed learning sequence so as to open up diverse interpretive opportunities and lead to teacher-centered learning; (vi) assessment standards have not led to a competency-based assessment (process and outcome) and have not explicitly required regular remediation; and (vii) by KTSP requires a more detailed curriculum document in order to avoid multiple interpretations.

High school students in Depok City have not been able to explore the competencies they have and have not been able to determine the career options to be chosen after graduating from school. Students are still faced with concerns about mistakes in decision making. Students are worried that the choice chosen will not be in accordance with the wishes of parents. Development of curriculum that is intended to assist students in exploring their potentials, has not been enough to help students in determining their future choices. Students who have been processed in such a way in school to be more creative, innovative, have a high sense of reason, are not necessarily have the confidence to be able to determine career options to be selected. Although school students are still in the studying age, but early career planning is important. Because when students are failing in career planning, they will become unemployed after graduating school. Careful career planning at school can help a person to better recognize and understand his or her own talents and interests (Atmaja, 2014).

The second hypothesis in this study is that there are significant differences in career readiness between students who have a supportive family environment with students who have a less supportive family environment. Based on the results of the data in table 5, it is found that the value of  $F_{count}$  is 95.463, greater than the value  $F_{table}$  by 2.099, with

**Table 5.** Hypothesis Test Result

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects						
Dependent Variable: Career_choice						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	1991.349 <sup>a</sup>	3	663.783	37.289	.000	.242
Intercept	6179355.974	1	6179355.974	347134.776	.000	.999
Curriculum	37.828	1	37.828	2.125	.146	.006
Family_environment	1699.332	1	1699.332	95.463	.000	.214
Curriculum * Family_environment	134.724	1	134.724	7.568	.006	.021
Error	6248.161	351	17.801			
Total	6369762.000	355				
Corrected Total	8239.510	354				

a. R Squared = .242 (Adjusted R Squared = .235)

Source: Processed Data (2017).

a higher significance value than 0.05 (alpha) that is equal to 0.000. Thus it can be concluded that there is a difference between the student's career choice readiness from the supportive family with the students' career choice readiness from the less supportive family (H2 accepted). The results of the second hypothesis support Hasbullah (2009) statement that the family environment is the first educational environment, so that it will have an impact on every decision taken by the learner later, even Clutter (2010) through his research concludes that the family has an influence in the decisions made by individuals. The results of this study are also in line with the findings of Pappas and Kounenoua (2011) who found that parents who engage themselves more intensely in career plans, providing psychosocial support, caring, tolerant, stimulative, and open parenting support will influence the readiness of the child in doing career planning.

Sudjani (2014) found that factors influencing career maturity of vocational high school students in Bandung showed that family environment was the biggest percentage determining the career maturity of vocational students compared to other aspects namely society, work insight, information seeking effort, teacher involvement in schools, infrastructure

support and attitudes towards job conceptions. The high maturity of the students' career is influenced by the positive support of parents. The form of parent support that is able to support the career choices of learners for example, parents provide information about the career to the child, fulfilling all the facilities needed by the child in supporting the career, giving the child a chance to learn, , sharing experiences, motivating, rewarding, giving consent, giving attention, understanding the circumstances experienced by the child, and parents giving positive emotional stimulation and negative emotional recognition related to the child's effort in making future career decisions, is very needed in planning career (Herin & Sawitri, 2017). The results of this study contradict the results of Hussain (2013) study; Joseph (2012) found that parents' expectations and support had no effect on students in setting career options. Parental support and parenting styles do not support students in deciding career choices after graduate from school.

The third hypothesis in this study is that there is an interaction between the curriculum and the family environment on the readiness of students' career choices. Based on the results of data process, it obtained the value of interaction between the curriculum and

**Table 6.** Career Selection Readiness Between Students Using *KTSP* and *Kurikulum 2013* Independent Test Result

		Independent Samples Test				
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
F		Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
Pilihan	Equal variances assumed	16.772	.000	1.181	353	.239
karir	Equal variances not assumed			1.216	348.670	.225

Source: Processed Data (2017).

family environment, the value of  $f_{count}$  7.568 greater than the  $f_{table}$  value of 2.099 with a significance value of 0, .006 smaller than 0.05 (alpha) so it can be concluded that when the school which is a formal education through curriculum it used collaborate with family as a place of informal education hence there will be difference in readiness of career choice of student (H3 accepted). The results of this study aligned with Palos and Drobot (2010) who found that the role of schools involving parents and community in school programs is very influential on students in determining career choices.

To prove the result of hypothesis testing, t-test is done to perform independent test. Table 6 below shows different test results for career readiness among students learning by using *KTSP* and *Kurikulum 2013*. Based on prerequisite testing, it is known that the distribution of data variants is heterogeneous, so the test will use data on the equal variances not assumed group. From the result of independent test for the curriculum group, it obtained the value of  $t_{count}$  of 1,216 is smaller than  $t_{table}$  by 1.649, it means there is no significant difference between student in school by using *KTSP* and *Kurikulum 2013* and readiness of career selection. The absence of significant difference in the readiness of career options, probably because these two curriculums are not different curriculums, but the same curriculum with adjustments. Curriculum change is needed in order to follow the development

of knowledge in order to improve the quality and competitiveness of the nation.

The results of this study contradict what Anwar (2014) said that the theme of curriculum development in 2013 is to produce productive, creative, innovative and affective Indonesians through strengthening the attitude (know why), skills (know-how) and knowledge (know what) integratively. It was hoped that through the implementation of *Kurikulum 2013*, students will be better prepared and have attitude to face the challenges in the future. Students' skills in choosing a career is a skill every student should have after graduating from college. So this skill should have to get the attention of the school to be planned in such a way into the curriculum. Students' skills in career planning will determine the future success of the students.

The next hypothesis testing is the test of choice of career students by viewing at the background of the family environment. By using data on group equal variances not assumed in table 7, it is known that the value of  $t_{count}$  is -10,063 smaller than  $t_{table}$  1.649 which means there is a significant difference of career choice readiness among the students who have less support family environment with readiness of career choice among the students who have family support environment. A negative  $t_{count}$  score means that the average value of the less supportive family environment is less than the average value of the supportive family environment. This difference is

**Table 7.** Career Selection Readiness Between Students in a Supporting Family Environment and Less Supporting Family Environment Independent Test Result

Independent Samples Test						
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
F		Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
Pilihan_	Equal variances assumed	1.997	.158	-10.063	353	.000
karir	Equal variances not assumed			-10.225	341.993	.000

Source: Processed Data (2017).

seen in table 4, that the average value of the less supportive family environment is 131.62 < 137.33 the mean value of a supportive family environment.

The results of this study are consistent with the results of Rogers, Creed, and Praskova (2016) research which states that it needs for interaction between parents and students in determining career choices. Parents who have higher education, higher expectations, greater involvement in their lives, will influence the development of a child's career (Hou & Leung, 2011). The results of this study are in accordance with developmental theories on ecological approaches and contextual developments which suggest that families as contextual variables are important in influencing the development of adolescents and their careers. Likewise with family system theory that emphasizes family rules and myths that serve to influence child's career decision making.

Parents with higher level of education will have broader insights, and a more complex perspective in directing children to make career choices. Parents will have more experience to share experiences as well as provide useful inputs in children's development. In addition financial support is also required of students in their career development process. Parents who have more financial ability, will send their children to informal education to support the improvement of children's skills.

## CONCLUSION

The study was conducted on 355 students as the sample and concluded that 1) there is no significant difference in the difference of curriculum used in school towards the students' career selection readiness, 2) there are significant differences between students who have a supportive family environment with students who have a less supportive family environment towards students' career selection readiness, 3) there is a significant difference when schools with curriculum work together with family environments to support students in choosing their careers.

## REFERENCES

- Anwar, R. (2014). *Hal-Hal yang Mendasari Penerapan Kurikulum 2013*. Humaniora, 5(1), 97-106.
- Atmaja, T. T. (2014). *Upaya Meningkatkan Perencanaan Karir Siswa Melalui Bimbingan Karir dengan Penggunaan Media Modul*. PSIKOPEDAGOGIA, 3(2), 58-67.
- Budiman, A. (2012). Manajemen Bimbingan Karir pada SMU di Kabupaten Bandung. *Jurnal Psikolog Pendidikan dan Bimbingan*, 2(2), 259-266.
- Clutter, C. (2010). *The Effects of Parental Influence on Their Children's Career Choices*. Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas.

- Dumont, M., Stojanovska, N., & Cuyvers, L. (2011). "World Inequality, Globalisation, Technology and Labour Market Institutions". *International Journal of Manpower*, 32(3), 257-271.
- Girianto, A. (2017). Hubungan Dukungan Sosial Keluarga dan Keraguan Karier Siswa SMA dalam Pemilihan Studi Lanjut di Perguruan Tinggi. *Jurnal Riset Mahasiswa Bimbingan dan Konseling*, 3(9), 485-491.
- Hartinah, S. (2010). *Pengembangan Peserta Didik*. Bandung: PT Rafika Aditama.
- Hasbullah. (2009). *Dasar-dasar Ilmu Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo.
- Herin, M., & Sawitri, D. R. (2017). Dukungan Orang Tua dan Kematangan Karir pada Siswa SMK Program Keahlian Tata Boga. *Jurnal Empati*, 6(1), 301-306.
- Hou, Z.-J., & Leung, S. A. (2011). Vocational Aspirations of Chinese High School Students and Their Parents' Expectations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79, 349-360.
- Hussain, S. (2013). Parental expectation, career salience and career decision making. *Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, 23(2), 62.
- Joseph, L. L. (2012). *The Impact Of Family Influence And Involvement On Career Development*. Doctor of Education (Ed.D.), University of Central Florida, niversity Retrieved from <http://purl.fcla.edu/fcla/etd/CFE0004391>
- Mahmud, A. (2008). Pengaruh Motivasi terhadap Minat Manasiswa untuk Mengikuti Pendidikan Profesi Akuntan. *Dinamika Pendidikan*, 3(1), 21-44.
- Palos, R., & Drobot, L. (2010). *The Impact of Family Influence on The Career Choice of Adolescents*. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Science*, 2, 3407-3411.
- Pappas, T. S., & Kounenoua, K. (2011). *Career Decision Making of Greek Post Secondary Vocational Students: The Impact of Parents and Career Decision Making Self Efficacy*. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Science*, 15, 3410-3414.
- PH, S. (2014). *Politik Pendidikan Indonesia Dalam Abad Ke-21*. Cakrawala Pendidikan, XXXIII(3), 324-337.
- Rogers, M. E., Creed, P. A., & Praskova, A. (2016). Parent and Adolescent Perceptions of Adolescent Career Development Tasks and Vocational Identity. *Journal of Career Development*, 45(1), 34-49.
- Simamora, H. (2011). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Yogyakarta: YKPN.
- Sudjani. (2014). *Faktor-faktor yang Mempengaruhi Kematangan Karir Siswa Sekolah Menengah Kejuruan Negeri di Kota Bandung*. Paper presented at the Konvensi Nasional Asosiasi Pendidikan Teknologi dan Kejuruan (AP-TEKINDO) ke 7, Bandung.
- Triyanto, E., Anitah, S., & Suryani, N. (2013). Peran Kepemimpinan Kepala Sekolah Dalam Pemanfaatan Media Pembelajaran Sebagai Upaya Peningkatan Kualitas Proses Pembelajaran. *Jurnal Teknologi Pendidikan*, 1(2), 226-238.
- Windriyas, W. N. (2014). Analisis Pencapaian Kompetensi Peserta Didik SMK Kelas X Diklat Keahlian Bisnis dan Manajemen dalam Pengembangan Kurikulum 2013 di SMK Widya Praja Ungaran. *Economic Education Analysis Journal*, 3(3), 594-602.
- Winkel, & Hastuti, S. (2012). *Bimbingan & Konseling di Institusi Pendidikan*. Yogyakarta: Media Abadi.
- Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan no 69 tahun 2013 Tentang Kompetensi Dasar Dan Struktur Kurikulum SMA-MA.
- Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional No. 24 Tahun 2006 tentang Pelaksanaan Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional No. 22 Tahun 2006 dan No. 23 Tahun 2006.
- Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia nomor 32 tahun 2013 tentang perubahan atas peraturan pemerintah nomor 19 tahun 2005 tentang standar nasional pendidikan.
- Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia nomor 16 tahun 2007 tentang Standar Kualifikasi Akademik dan Kompetensi guru.
- Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia nomor 19 Tahun 2005 tentang Standar Nasional Pendidikan.