



## Curriculum Innovation: a Comparasion Between the Goals and the Facts on 2013 Curriculum Implementation at Madrasah Aliyah in Kabupaten Tolitoli

Hamka<sup>1</sup>, Muhammad Nur Asmawi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Universitas Islam Negeri Datokarama Palu, Indonesia,

<sup>1</sup>hamxaid@gmail.com, <sup>2</sup>abaayyad74@gmail.com

---

### Abstract

Keywords:  
Education;  
Innovation;  
curriculum 2013.

Curriculum 2013 (K13) is one form of innovation in the field of education initiated by the Indonesian government. It is necessary to explore adopters' perceptions of this innovative product as a top-down innovation model. The adoption of an innovative product is strongly influenced by, among others, the adopter's perspective on the product's relative advantage, compatibility, and complexity. This study examines the influence of these three factors on the decisions of teachers (adopters) in adopting or implementing K13 in their learning practices. This problem is studied using a mixed-method, quantitative method as the primary approach and supported by a qualitative approach. The regression analysis test results show a combined effect of the relative advantage, compatibility, and complexity factors on implementing K13 with a correlation of 18.2%. Still, partially there is no influence between the factors of advantage and complexity on the implementation of K13. This shows that the adoption of K13 innovation is more widely accepted as a necessity, not because of a positive perception of K13 itself. Their lack of knowledge of K13 influences the adopter's perception of K13 at the concept and implementation techniques level. The results of this study recommend the need for intensive training for teachers in optimizing the implementation of K13 as expected.

---

### Abstrak:

Kata Kunci:  
Pendidikan; Inovasi;  
kurikulum 2013.

*Kurikulum 2013 (K13) merupakan salah satu bentuk inovasi di bidang pendidikan yang digagas oleh pemerintah Indonesia. Sebagai sebuah inovasi top down model, sangat perlu ditelusuri persepsi adopter terhadap produk inovasi ini. Adopsi sebuah produk inovasi sangat dipengaruhi antara lain perspektif adopter terhadap faktor keuntungan relatif, kompatibilitas dan kerumitan yang dimiliki oleh produk tersebut. Penelitian ini mengkaji pengaruh dari ketiga faktor tersebut terhadap*

*keputusan para guru (adopter) dalam mengadopsi atau menerapkan K13 dalam praktek pembelajaran mereka. Permasalahan ini dikaji dengan menggunakan mix method, metode kuantitatif sebagai pendekatan utama dan didukung dengan pendekatan kualitatif. Hasil uji analisis regresi menunjukkan adanya pengaruh secara bersama-sama faktor keuntungan relatif, kompatibilitas dan kerumitan terhadap implementasi K13 dengan korelasi sebesar 18,2%, namun secara parsial tidak ditemukan adanya pengaruh antara faktor keuntungan dan kerumitan terhadap implementasi K13. Hal ini menunjukkan bahwa adopsi inovasi K13 lebih banyak diterima sebagai sebuah keharusan bukan karena persepsi positif terhadap K13 itu sendiri. Persepsi adopter terhadap K13 dipengaruhi oleh minimnya pengetahuan mereka terhadap K13, baik pada tataran konsep maupun teknik implementasinya. Hasil penelitian ini merekomendasikan perlunya pelatihan secara intensif bagi para guru dalam mengoptimalkan implementasi K13 sebagaimana yang diharapkan.*

Received : 10 February 2022; Revised: 28 June 2022; Accepted: 24 July 2022

<http://doi.org/10.19105/tjpi.v17i1.5921>

© Tadris Jurnal Pendidikan Islam  
Institut Agama Islam Negeri Madura, Indonesia



This is an open access article under the [CC-BY-NC](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) license

## 1. Introduction

In the past few decades, the innovation trend has been increasing and is an essential factor in global economic competition.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, in recent years innovation has spread to the public sectors, including education.<sup>2</sup> Innovation is defined as something new or renewal resulting from human creation. Innovation, can also be called as discovery, is an idea, item, event, or method that is felt or observed as something new to achieve certain goals or solve a certain problem.<sup>3</sup>

As in other fields, there are two models of innovation and change in education: the “bottom up” model and the “top down” model.<sup>4</sup> The bottom-up model is an innovation initiated and developed from below to improve the implementation and quality of education. While the top-down model is an educational innovation created by certain parties as leaders or superiors that is applied to subordinates, for example, educational innovations carried out by the government through the Ministry of Education and Culture. One part of educational innovation is curriculum innovation responding to existing social changes. In Indonesia, curriculum innovation generally uses a “top-down” model, for example, the Education Unit Level Curriculum (KTSP) and the 2013 Curriculum (K13), which are currently being implemented.

In principle, in the education world, the curriculum is not a static thing. On the contrary, the concept of the curriculum can be changed and regulated following technological and scientific developments and the orientation of community needs. Therefore, in actual curriculum development, factors that influence it are

<sup>1</sup> Charles Edquist and Bjorn Johnson, “Institutions and Organizations in Systems of Innovation,” in *Systems of Innovation: Technologies, Institutions and Organizations*, ed. Charles Edquist, vol. 31 (London and New York: Routledge, 1998), 8.

<sup>2</sup> OECD, *Innovating Education and Educating for Innovation: The Power of Digital Technologies and Skills* (Paris: OECD Publishing, 2016), 13.

<sup>3</sup> Muhammad Rasyidi, “Inovasi Kurikulum Di Madrasah Aliyah,” *Al Qalam: Jurnal Ilmiah Keagamaan dan Kemasyarakatan* 13, no. 1 (2019): 33–50.

<sup>4</sup> See. Gerard H. Gaynor, “Innovation: Top down or Bottom Up,” *IEEE Engineering Management Review* 41, no. 3 (2013): 5–6.

always considered, such as philosophical, sociological, and psychological factors and applied theories and patterns of curriculum organization.<sup>5</sup>

The generation that is growing today is the post-millennial generation, commonly referred to as the “Z” generation or “iGeneration”, with very different characteristics from the previous generation.<sup>6</sup> Dealing with such students certainly requires a curriculum design different from the conventional curriculum. On this basis, educational institutions need innovation, how to develop a curriculum taking into account the existing situation and conditions, as well as so that the process does not have obstacles and disturbances both internal and external concerning the institution and the surrounding environment.<sup>7</sup>

In response, the Ministry of Education and Culture has innovated the curriculum and created the 2013 Curriculum (from now on abbreviated as K13). Sociologically, the Ministry of Education and Culture views that education is rooted in the nation's culture to build the nation's life today and future. This view makes K13 developed based on Indonesian cultural diversity, directed to create the life of the present and to build the basis for a better life for the nation in the future. Therefore, preparing students for future life is the central vision of a curriculum concept. This implies that the curriculum is an educational design to prepare the lives of the nation's young generation. Thus, preparing the nation's young generation becomes the main task of a curriculum.

One of the main characteristics that animate K13 is a concern for developing learning experiences that provide broad opportunities for students to master the competencies needed for life in the present and future and simultaneously continue to develop their abilities as heirs of the nation's culture and people. The learning approach used in K13 is a scientific approach and authentic assessment in measuring student learning outcomes.<sup>8</sup>

Many educational institutions in the country have implemented this curriculum and responded positively. Research conducted by Sri Budiani et al., regarding the implementation of K13 in Mandiri School shows that the implementation of K13 in this school is going very well with the support of national education standards and teachers who have good motivation, creativity, and performance.<sup>9</sup>

However, not all schools can adopt this K13. On a national scale, the level of adoption of this curriculum innovation is still low, even resulting in some controversies. For example, a year after the launch of K13, the Indonesian Corruption Watch (ICW) criticized the lack of supporting infrastructure for implementing this curriculum and advised the Government to cancel it.<sup>10</sup> Another obstacle that is also a problem in adopting this K13 innovation is the readiness of

---

<sup>5</sup>Inga Bostad and Aled Dilwyn Fisher, “Curriculum and Social Change in Education for a Sustainable Future?,” in *Human Rights in Language and STEM Education*, ed. Babaci-Wilhite Z (Rotterdam: SensePublishers, 2016), 71–90.

<sup>6</sup> Tentang karakteristik generasi Z dapat dilihat: George Beall, “8 Key Differences between Gen Z and Millennials,” last modified 2017, accessed January 20, 2018, [https://www.huffingtonpost.com/george-beall/8-key-differences-between\\_b\\_12814200.html](https://www.huffingtonpost.com/george-beall/8-key-differences-between_b_12814200.html).

<sup>7</sup> Rasyidi, “Inovasi Kurikulum Di Madrasah Aliyah.”

<sup>8</sup> Lihat: Badrun Kartowagiran et al., “Evaluation of The Implementation of Curriculum 2013 Vocational High School In Indonesia,” in *International Conference on Educational Research and Innovation*, 2017, 814–815.

<sup>9</sup> Sri Budiani, Sudarmin, and Rodia Syamwil, “Evaluasi Implementasi K 13 Di Sekolah Pelaksana Mandiri,” *Innovative Journal of Curriculum and Educational Technology* 6, no. 1 (2017): 45–57.

<sup>10</sup> “ICW Kritik K 13,” *Republika*, August 29, 2014, <http://www.republika.co.id/berita/koran/didaktika/14/08/29/nb23g85-icw-kritik-kurikulum-2013>.

Human Resources (HR), especially teachers.<sup>11</sup> The results of research reinforce this by Neti Budiwati et al. at SMA Bandung Raya, which shows that teachers' competence, commitment, and creativity are still below the ideal score of the expected standard in implementing the K13.<sup>12</sup> A similar conclusion was also found in Ruja and Sukamto's research at junior high schools in East Java.<sup>13</sup>

Theoretically, an innovation has varying levels of adoption among adopters. This is influenced by the adopter's perception of the characteristics of the innovation, which include: advantage, compatibility, complexity, testability, and observability.<sup>14</sup>

As quoted by Dadan Suhardan, Peter Drucker defines innovation as a change that creates a new dimension in performance.<sup>15</sup> Meanwhile, Ibrahim defines innovation as an idea, item, event, or method which is felt or observed as something new for a person or group of people (society), either in the form of invention or discovery. Innovation is held to achieve specific goals.<sup>16</sup>

In a more practical sense, Suharsaputra explained that innovation in principle is the application of new things in a task as the application of knowledge; New things in innovation can be ideas, practices, processes, services, ideology, or business strategies or objects. Innovation is a change and or the implications of evolution as a result of the application of new things.<sup>17</sup>

Thus, the keywords of innovation are: novelty, applicable, and bringing about change. The novelty here can mean new findings that have not existed before, and can also mean new in the applied community, although it is not new to other communities. Meanwhile, in terms of type, innovation can be in the form of materials (tools, media, etc.) or concepts (ideas, strategies, methods, etc.).

Does every innovation always produce goods or services? Not, because the innovation itself can be divided into four categories, namely:

- a. Product innovation: introducing a new or significantly improved product or service concerning the desired characteristic or use. This category includes significant improvements in technical specifications, components, and materials, incorporated software, or other functional characteristics.
- b. Process Innovation: adoption of new or significantly improved production or delivery methods. This category includes significant changes in techniques, equipment and or software.
- c. Marketing innovation: adopting new marketing methods that involve significant changes in product or packaging design, product placement, product promotion, or pricing.
- d. Organizational innovation: application of new organizational methods in business practice, workplace organization or external relations.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Kunandar, "Menakar Keberhasilan Implementasi K 13," *Kompasiana*, December 2015.

<sup>12</sup> Neti Budiwati, Sumartini, and Ani Pinayani, "Tantangan Profesionalisme Dan Kesiapan Guru Mengimplementasikan K 13," *Jurnal Ekonomi Pendidikan dan Kewirausahaan* 4, no. 1 (2016): 92–100.

<sup>13</sup> I Nyoman Ruja and Sukamto, "Survey Permasalahan Implementasi Kurikulum Nasional 2013 Mata Pelajaran Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial Sekolah Menengah Pertama Di Jawa Timur," *Jurnal Sejarah dan Budaya* 11, no. 2 (2015): 193–199.

<sup>14</sup> See. Everett M. Rogers, *Diffusion of Innovations, 3rd Edition* (London: Collier Macmillan Publisher, 1995), 14-16

<sup>15</sup> Dadang Suhardan, *Supervisi Profesional* (Bandung: Alfabeta, 2010), 115.

<sup>16</sup> Ibrahim, *Inovasi Pendidikan* (Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 1988), 40.

<sup>17</sup> Uhar Suharsaputra, *Administrasi Pendidikan* (Bandung: Refika Aditama, 2010), 284.

<sup>18</sup> See. OECD-Eurostat, *Oslo Manual: Guidelines for Collecting and Interpreting*

The innovation development process, according to Everett M. Rogers, consists of six phases, namely: 1) Recognizing a Problem or Need; 2) Basic and Applied Research; 3) Development; 4) Commercialization; 5) Diffusion and Adoption Diffusion, and 6) Consequences. These six phases take place linearly, but sometimes they are skipped or out of sequence.<sup>19</sup>

There are five characteristics of an innovation, from an adopter perspective, that can help explain why their adoption rates differ, namely: excellence, compatibility, complexity, testability, and observability.

One form of innovation in the world of education is curriculum innovation. The curriculum has a vital and strategic function and role. Although not the only major factor in the success of the educational process, the curriculum is a guide and direction for academic success. The curriculum guides education implementers—educators and staff—to develop their creativity and ability to develop and describe various learning materials and tools.<sup>20</sup>

In Indonesia, the change in the post-reform curriculum begins with the 2004 curriculum or what is known as the KBK. Following KBK is the Education Unit Level Curriculum (KTSP). However, after seven years of implementing the KTSP, in 2013 the new curriculum implemented in the education system in Indonesia was the 2013 curriculum, known as K-13. According to Subandi, the idea behind the 2013 curriculum development stems from the writings of Vice President Boediono entitled "Education Keys to Development" in Kompas (Monday, 27/8/2012), who considered that national education could not produce competent graduates because they did not have a clear concept.<sup>21</sup> With this, the government hopes there will be an improvement in the mindset of curriculum formulation.<sup>22</sup>

The 2013 curriculum change policy aims to manifest the basic principles of curriculum change and continuity, namely the results of studies, evaluations, criticisms, responses, predictions, and various challenges faced. The 2013 curriculum, by E. Mulyasa, is defined as the competency-based curriculum is a curriculum concept that emphasizes character development and the ability to perform (competence) tasks with specific performance standards so that the results can be felt by students in the form of mastery of a certain set of competencies.<sup>23</sup>

Emphasis on character education aims to improve the quality of educational processes and outcomes, which leads to the formation of character and noble character of students in a comprehensive, integrated, and balanced manner, under the competency standards of graduates in each educational unit. In the application of character education, it is not only the responsibility of the school

---

*Innovation Data*, 3rd ed. (Paris: OECD Publishing, 2005), 47–52.

<sup>19</sup>See. Everett M. Rogers, *Diffusion of Innovations*, 3rd Edition (London: Coller Macmillan Publisher, 1995), 135–149.

<sup>20</sup>Imam Machali, "Kebijakan Perubahan Kurikulum 2013 Dalam Menyongsong Indonesia Emas Tahun 2045," *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam* 3, no. 1 (2014): 71.

<sup>21</sup>Subandi, "Pengembangan Kurikulum 2013 (Studi Analitis Dan Substantif Kebijakan Kurikulum Nasional)," *Terampil Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Dasar* 1, no. 1 (2014): 18–36.

<sup>22</sup>Ayu Novia Hariatiningsih, "Implementasi Kebijakan Kurikulum 2013 ( Studi Deskriptif Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nomor 160 Tahun 2014 Tentang Pemberlakuan Kurikulum Tahun 2006 Dan Kurikulum 2013 Tingkat SMA Dan SMK Di Kabupaten Blitar )," *Kebijakan dan Manajemen Publik* 4, no. 2 (2016): 64–70.

<sup>23</sup>E.Mulyasa, *Pengembangan Dan Implementasi Kurikulum 2013* (Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya, 2013).66.

alone, but the responsibility of all parties, such as parents of students, the government, and the community.<sup>24</sup>

The 2013 curriculum policy is one of the policies in the education sector launched by the government where the government adds attitude assessment in the curriculum structure. This assessment then became the basis for the 2013 curriculum that was character-based. The goal is that students who receive 2013 curriculum education are not only able to master terms of knowledge and skill competencies—but also supported by character behavior.<sup>25</sup> The 2013 curriculum policy is expected to play the adjusted or adaptive function, namely a curriculum that can direct students to adapt to the environment, both the physical environment and the constantly changing social environment.

Conceptually, the implementation of the 2013 curriculum in madrasahs is based on a separate policy, namely the policy formulated by the Ministry of Religion, the Directorate General of Islamic Education. Thus, it can be said that the implementation of the 2013 curriculum at the Ministry of Religion, starting from the preparation of concepts, software, and hardware policies, lies with the Directorate General of Islamic Education.<sup>26</sup>

The 2013 curriculum is a form of educational innovation in the curriculum aspect. In the context of this research, the 2013 curriculum is seen as product innovation.<sup>27</sup> The curriculum is a product of thoughts, concepts, ideas, and paradigms<sup>28</sup> that becomes a reference in the implementation of education and teaching at the primary and secondary levels with different characteristics from the previous curriculum.

As a product innovation, Curriculum 2013 is undoubtedly expected to be adopted and implemented by adopters (educational actors), especially teachers. The diffusion of innovation has also been carried out. It has been running for almost ten years since its launch. However, as previously explained, implementing the 2013 Curriculum in the field has not run optimally. At least a few schools still have not implemented it according to the expected standards.

Based on the explanation above, it is interesting to observe how the implementation of K13 in educational institutions under the Ministry of Religion especially explores the factors that influence the adoption of K13 innovation in the field. This study will explore this by limiting the object of study to Madrasah Aliyah in Tolitoli district. In this study, the authors chose the three most relevant factors in the context of curriculum innovation: advantages, compatibility, and

---

<sup>24</sup>E.Mulyasa, *Pengembangan Dan Implementasi Kurikulum 2013*, 13.

<sup>25</sup>Hariatiningsih, "Implementasi Kebijakan Kurikulum 2013 ( Studi Deskriptif Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nomor 160 Tahun 2014 Tentang Pemberlakuan Kurikulum Tahun 2006 Dan Kurikulum 2013 Tingkat SMA Dan SMK Di Kabupaten Blitar )."

<sup>26</sup>Sumarni, "Evaluation of the Implementation of 2013 Curriculum in Madrasah," *Puslitbang Pendidikan Agama dan Keagamaan Badan Litbang dan Diklat Kementerian Agama Jl. 15, no. 3 (2017): 387–404.*

<sup>27</sup>Although in terms of content, the 2013 Curriculum contains elements of product and process innovation. Product innovation is reflected in the competency standards of elementary and secondary education graduates, which include aspects: attitudes, knowledge and skills. Meanwhile, in terms of the process, it is illustrated—among others—with thematic and scientific approaches in the learning process. See: Ministry of Education and Culture, Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia, Number 54 of 2013 concerning Competency Standards for Graduates of Primary and Secondary Education. And Number 65 of 2013 concerning Standards for Primary and Secondary Education Process.

<sup>28</sup> Machali, "Kebijakan Perubahan Kurikulum 2013 Dalam Menyongsong Indonesia Emas Tahun 2045."

complexity. The impact of these three factors will be observed on the implementation of K13, either partially or jointly.

## 2. Method

This study uses a mixed-method model, combining a quantitative approach with a qualitative approach. In this case, the quantitative method is the main method, further strengthened by further investigation using a qualitative approach.

### 2.1. Research Variables

This study has three independent variables (X) and one dependent variable (Y). The independent variable is the variable that influences the adopter in adopting the K13 innovation. The benchmark is the adopter's perception of the characteristics of K13, which include: Advantages. In the context of this study, the researcher uses the terms Excellence (X1), Compatibility (X2), and Complexity (X3).

The dependent variable in this research is the adoption of K13 innovation. The benchmark is the extent to which adopters—in this case, teachers—apply K13 in learning in terms of materials, methods, approaches, and evaluation techniques used.

### 2.2. Population and Sample

The population of this study was all teachers who were actively teaching at Madrasah Aliyah in Tolitoli Regency, including 1 (one) State Madrasah Aliyah (MAN) Tolitoli, and 15 (fifteen) Private Madrasah Aliyah (MAS).<sup>29</sup> Therefore, the number of Madrasah Aliyah teachers is 217, consisting of 49 PNS (State Officer) teachers and 168 private teachers.<sup>30</sup> Furthermore, sampling was carried out using a random sampling method, namely 94 people or 43% of the total number of teachers. Therefore, the sampling results obtained 8 (eight) Madrasah Aliyah, one of which is Madrasah Aliyah Negeri (MAN), located in Tolitoli main district. At the same time, the other is Madrasah Aliyah Private (MAS), spread over 4 (four) sub-districts. Therefore, the number of respondents from each madrasa is not the same according to the conditions of teachers.

**Table 1. Respondents based on school origin**

No.	Schol	Kecamatan	Number of Respondent	Percentage
1	MAN Tolitoli	Baolan	18	19 %
2	MA Almunawarah	Baolan	9	10 %
3	MA Buntuna	Baolan	10	11 %
4	MA DDI	Baolan	9	10 %
5	MA Alkhairat Galang	Galang	13	14 %
6	MA Darul Ulum	Galang	13	14 %
7	MA Salumpaga	Tolitoli Utara	11	12 %

<sup>29</sup>Data on Madrasah Aliyah of the Ministry of Religion of Central Sulawesi Province for the 2017/2018 academic year in <http://sulteng.kemenag.go.id/layanandata/penmad/> (accessed 4 December 2018).

<sup>30</sup>Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Sulawesi Tengah, *Provinsi Sulawesi Tengah dalam Angka* (Palu: BPS, 2018), 156

8	MA DDI Soni	Dampal Selatan	11	12 %
Total			94	100%

Source: the results of the questionnaire data recapitulation

Based on the subjects taught by each respondent, the data collected shows 20 (twenty) variants/categories, and 3 (three) respondents do not include the subjects.

**Table 2. Respondents based on the subjects taught**

No,	Course Teacher	Number of Respondent	Percentage
1	Math	8	9 %
2	English	8	9 %
3	Arabic	6	6 %
4	Physic	4	4 %
5	Chemistry	5	5 %
6	Economy	6	6 %
7	History	7	7 %
8	Sociology	5	5 %
9	Biology	3	3 %
10	Aqidah Akhlak	7	7 %
11	Fiqh	5	5 %
12	Art and Craft	3	3 %
13	Bahasa Indonesia	6	6 %
14	Geography	4	4 %
15	Qur`an Hadis	3	3 %
16	Islamic History and Culture	2	2 %
17	Local Sciences	1	1 %
18	Craft and Entrepreneurship	3	3 %
19	Civic	3	3 %
20	Sport	2	2 %
21	Unlabel	3	3 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>94</b>	<b>100%</b>

### 2.3. Data Collecting Technique

Quantitative data was collected using a questionnaire method, while qualitative data was collected through in-depth interviews. The questionnaire instrument consists of a set of questions that are systematically arranged and standardized so that the same questions can be asked to each respondent, namely the teachers (adopters) of K13. Questionnaire questions use closed questions with a stratified scale modified from the Likert scale with four answer choices: strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree.

### 2.4. Data Analysis

The analytical method used in this research is the Multiple Linear Regression Analysis method (multiple linear regression). Before testing the hypothesis, the data quality is tested with reliability and validity tests and classical assumption tests (including multicollinearity, heterodoxy, and normality tests).



### 3. Findings and Discussion

#### 3.1. Data Variable Description

As previously explained, there are four variables in this study, three of which are independent variables symbolized by X1, X2, X3, and one dependent variable symbolized by Y. Data from the questionnaire results from each variable can be seen in the description below.

##### Advantages (X1)

Advantages in the field of the curriculum are assessed in terms of their advantages over other (previous) curricula. For example, the advantages of K13 can be seen through respondents' perceptions of effectiveness and efficiency in the learning process and the advantages of K13 compared to the previous curriculum, as illustrated in Table 3.

**Table 3. Respondents' Perspectives on the Advantages of Adopting K13**

No.	Advantages	F	%
1	Very Beneficial	6	6
2	Beneficial	65	69
3	Less Beneficial	21	22
4	No Benefits	2	2
		<b>94</b>	<b>100</b>

##### Compatibility (X2)

K13 compatibility is measured based on the level of conformity with the situation and condition of students, school and community environments, and subjects. Respondents' perceptions of K13 compatibility are presented in Table 3.

**Table 4. Respondent's Perspective on K13 Compatibility**

No.	Compatibility	f	%
1	Very Compatible	14	15
2	Compatible	48	51
3	Less Compatible	29	31
4	Not Compatible	3	3
		<b>94</b>	<b>100</b>

##### Complexity (X3)

The complexity of K13 is measured based on respondents' perceptions of the ease or difficulty of adopting K13 in their learning practice. The results of the calculation of respondents' answers are presented in Table 5.

**Table 5. Respondent's Perspective on the Complexity of K13**

No.	Complexity	f	%
1	Very Easy	13	14
2	Easy	54	57
3	Quite Complex	17	18
4	Complex	10	11
		<b>94</b>	<b>100</b>

### Implementation of Curriculum 2013 (Y)

The implementation of K13 is measured from respondents' answers to the application of K13 in their learning practices, including learning tools, implementation, scientific approach, learning resources, and assessment. The results show that all respondents apply or adopt K13, it is just that the level of implementation is different. Most (60%) stated that it was implemented, but only 34% stated that it was fully implemented, and 6% said it was poorly implemented. The details can be seen in Table 6.

**Table 6. Respondents' perspectives on the complexity of K13**

No.	Implementation of K13	f	%
1	Fully Implemented	32	34
2	Implemented	56	60
3	Incomplete Implementation	6	6
4	Not Implemented	0	0
		<b>94</b>	<b>100</b>

### 3.2. Classic Assumption Tes

#### Normality Test

The normality test was carried out using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) method with the help of the SPSS version 23 program. It was found that the residual data from the multiple regression results had a P-value of 0.200 0.05, so the data was declared normally distributed.

**Table 7. Normality Test Summary**

No	Model	Test Result		Description
		P-value	Criterion	
1	Research Model	0,200	0,05	Normal Distribution

Data source: SPSS version 23 data processing results

#### Multicollinearity Test

The multicollinearity test of this study was carried out by looking at the value of the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). From the results of the calculation of the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) value using SPSS version 23 program, it is known that the VIF values of each independent variable are 5. So that all independent variables in this study are declared free from multicollinearity problems.

**Table 8. Summary of Multicollinearity Test**

No	Variable	Test Result		Description
		VIF	Criteria	
1	Advantages (X1)	1,560	≤ 5	Multicollinearity Free
2	Compatibility (X2)	2,262	≤ 5	Multicollinearity Free
3	Complexity (X3)	2,589	≤ 5	Multicollinearity Free

Data source: SPSS version 23 data processing results

#### Heteroscedasticity Test

Heteroscedasticity testing was carried out using the Spearman rank method using SPSS version 23 program by correlating each independent variable with its absolute residual. The test results show that the correlation value

of each independent variable is not significant with the absolute residual, so the data used is free from heteroscedasticity problems.

**Table 9. Summary of Heteroscedasticity Test**

No	Variable	Test Result		Description
		P-value	Criteria	
1	Advantages (X1)	0,261	$\geq 0,05$	Heteroscedasticity Free
2	Compatibility (X2)	0,706	$\geq 0,05$	Heteroscedasticity Free
3	Complexity (X3)	0,524	$\geq 0,05$	Heteroscedasticity Free

Data source: SPSS version 23 data processing results

### 3.3. Regression Analysis

#### F-Test

The results of the multiple regression estimation with the help of the SPSS version 23 program show that the calculated f value is 7.895, and the df value is 91. With the df value, the f table value can be known to be 2.704 because the value of f count  $\geq$  f table. So it can be concluded that the variables of excellence (X1), compatibility (X2), and complexity (X3) simultaneously significantly influence the implementation of K13 (Y) with a correlation of 18.2%.

**Table 10. Summary of F. Test Results**

No	Model	Test Result		Criteria		Description
		F-count	P-value	F-table	A	
1	Research Model	7,895	0,000	$\geq 2,704$	$\leq 0,05$	Significant

Data source: SPSS version 23 data processing results

#### T-Test

From the results of the multiple regression estimation with the help of the SPSS version 23 program, it is known that the t-count value of the superiority variable (X1) is 1.020, and the compatibility variable (X2) is 2.450, and the complexity variable (X3) is 0.311. At the same time, the t table value is known to be 1.987, with df worth 91. So it can be concluded that only the compatibility variable (X2) significantly affects the K13 implementation variable (Y) because the t count value is greater than the t table.

**Table 11. Summary of T-Test Results**

No	Variable	Test Result		Criteria		Description
		T-count	P-value	T-table	A	
1	Advantages (X1)	1,020	0,311	$\geq 1,987$	$\leq 0,05$	Not Significant
2	Compatibility (X2)	2,450	0,016	$\geq 1,987$	$\leq 0,05$	Significant
3	Complexity (X3)	0,311	0,756	$\geq 1,987$	$\leq 0,05$	Not Significant

Data source: SPSS version 23 data processing results

#### Determination Test

The results of the multiple regression estimation show that the adjusted *r* squared value is 0.182, so it can be concluded that the model developed in this study is only able to explain changes in the implementation variable K13 (Y) of 18.2%. In comparison, other variables explain 81.8% outside of this study.

#### 3.4. Discussion

Based on the results of the quantitative analysis above, it is interesting to note that the compatibility, advantage, and complexity, although they affect the implementation of K13, only contribute 18.2%. Even partially, the factors of advantage and complexity have no significant effect. This means that adopters implement K13 not because of the benefits (advantages) offered from the results of this innovation, nor easy-implementation character, but because of other factors. So it can be assumed that adopting K13 innovations initiated by the Government is more accepted as a necessity by adopters (teachers) than adopters' positive perceptions of K13 itself. This is understandable because K13 is an innovative product that uses a top-down model. Innovation that utilizes a top-down model, according to Gaynor, requires a very high level of management involvement and can also experience obstacles if adopter motivation is low.<sup>31</sup>

Increased management involvement in the context of K13 implementation is especially needed in the intensive socialization (commercialization) and diffusion phases. And because the curriculum is not a product of innovation in the form of goods but innovation in the form of concepts/ideas, a higher process of socialization and diffusion is needed. Unfortunately, this is what has not been done, especially at the locus and subject of this research, the Madrasah Aliyah teachers in Tolitoli district. One teacher explained that since the launch of K13, there has never been intensive training involving local teachers. Training is usually carried out at the national level, the regions only send one or two teachers. Of course the knowledge obtained from the envoy is very limited according to its absorption capacity, so it is impossible to become an optimal K13 socialization agent in the region.<sup>32</sup>

The lack of teachers' knowledge about the paradigm and technical implementation of K13 was also confirmed by one of the Principal of Madrasa. The principal of the madrasa stated that there are still many teachers who do not understand how to apply this 13 curriculum. Let alone the teachers, the principal of the *madrasah* is still very limited in their understanding of the K13 concept. Some teachers even complained that this K13 only added to the teacher's burden, especially on technical matters such as making lesson plans and evaluation systems more complex than before. However, because this is already a government policy, and we know the purpose is good, the teachers continue implementing it with all their limited knowledge. So, in essence, K13 is implemented while continuing to learn and improve any shortcomings all the time. It may take a year or two for it to work out ideally.<sup>33</sup>

The interview excerpt above shows that the process of socialization and diffusion of K13 as an innovative product is still lacking. Strengthening the resources of adopters (teachers) to support its implementation is also minimal.

<sup>31</sup> Gaynor, "Innovation: Top down or Bottom Up," 5.

<sup>32</sup> Ilham, Aqidah Akhlak Teacher at MA al-Munawarah Kec. Baolan, "Interview", Tolitoli, 6 July 2021

<sup>33</sup> Principal of MA Alkhairaat Kalangkangan, Kec. Galang, "Interview", Kalangkangan: 8 July 2021

Thus, although theoretically, K13 is expected to improve the quality of education, if the teachers who spearhead its realization are not carefully prepared, implementing K13 may only become a formality in reporting teacher performance. To fulfill obligations that are "forced" through state policy.

Some teachers in the field were forced to surf the internet to get a ready-to-use lesson plan format. One teacher said that the lesson plans used in reporting were obtained from the internet, but in practice, the lesson plans were not used as a reference because many things were not understood. Of course, the K13 spirit does not just offer technical changes to learning tools. Still, its substance is a paradigm shift in the teaching and learning process that can produce educational products with solid characters and competencies following community development on a national, regional, and international scale. This is what the innovators behind the birth of K13 want.

#### 4. Conclusion

The adopter's (teachers) perspective on the benefits, compatibility, and complexity of the 2013 Curriculum as an innovative product in the field of education has a significant effect on adopters' decisions to adopt K13 in their learning practice. However, partially it was found that only the compatibility factor had a significant impact, while the other two factors did not.

As an innovative product that uses a top-down model, K13 requires more intense socialization and diffusion. However, the teachers' lack of understanding of the K13 concept shows that the process of socialization and diffusion has not been maximized. Therefore, it is recommended that there be intensive and massive training for teachers on the paradigm and technique of implementing K13 to run as expected.

#### References

- Beall, George. "8 Key Differences between Gen Z and Millennials." Last modified 2017. Accessed January 20, 2018. [https://www.huffingtonpost.com/george-beall/8-key-differences-between\\_b\\_12814200.html](https://www.huffingtonpost.com/george-beall/8-key-differences-between_b_12814200.html).
- Bostad, Inga, and Aled Dilwyn Fisher. "Curriculum and Social Change in Education for a Sustainable Future?" In *Human Rights in Language and STEM Education*, edited by Babaci-Wilhite Z, 71–90. Rotterdam: SensePublishers, 2016.
- Budiani, Sri, Sudarmin, and Rodia Syamwil. "Evaluasi Implementasi Kurikulum 2013 Di Sekolah Pelaksana Mandiri." *Innovative Journal of Curriculum and Educational Technology* 6, no. 1 (2017): 45–57.
- Budiwati, Neti, Sumartini, and Ani Pinayani. "Tantangan Profesionalisme Dan Kesiapan Guru Mengimplementasikan Kurikulum 2013." *Jurnal Ekonomi Pendidikan dan Kewirausahaan* 4, no. 1 (2016): 92–100.
- E.Mulyasa. *Pengembangan Dan Implementasi Kurikulum 2013*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya, 2013.
- Edquist, Charles, and Bjorn Johnson. "Institutions and Organizations in Systems of Innovation." In *Systems of Innovation: Technologies, Institutions and Organizations*, edited by Charles Edquist, 31:333. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Gaynor, Gerard H. "Innovation: Top down or Bottom Up." *IEEE Engineering Management Review* 41, no. 3 (2013): 5–6.

- Hariatiningsih, Ayu Novia. "Implementasi Kebijakan Kurikulum 2013 ( Studi Deskriptif Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nomor 160 Tahun 2014 Tentang Pemberlakuan Kurikulum Tahun 2006 Dan Kurikulum 2013 Tingkat SMA Dan SMK Di Kabupaten Blitar )." *Kebijakan dan Manajemen Publik* 4, no. 2 (2016): 64–70.
- Ibrahim. *Inovasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 1988.
- Kartowagiran, Badrun, Heri Retnawati, Sutopo, and Faridl Musyadad. "Evaluation of The Implementation of Curriculum 2013 Vocational High School In Indonesia." In *International Conference on Educational Research and Innovation*, 814–819, 2017.
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia*. Republik Indonesia, 2013.
- Kunandar. "Menakar Keberhasilan Implementasi Kurikulum 2013." *Kompasiana*, December 30, 2015. [https://www.kompasiana.com/kunandar/menakar-keberhasilan-implementasi-kurikulum-2013\\_5683ff75709773050ba881ef](https://www.kompasiana.com/kunandar/menakar-keberhasilan-implementasi-kurikulum-2013_5683ff75709773050ba881ef).
- Machali, Imam. "Kebijakan Perubahan Kurikulum 2013 Dalam Menyongsong Indonesia Emas Tahun 2045." *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam* 3, no. 1 (2014): 71.
- OECD-Eurostat. *Oslo Manual: Guidelines for Collecting and Interpreting Innovation Data*. 3rd ed. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2005.
- OECD. *Innovating Education and Educating for Innovation: The Power of Digital Technologies and Skills*. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2016.
- Rasyidi, Muhammad. "Inovasi Kurikulum Di Madrasah Aliyah." *Al Qalam: Jurnal Ilmiah Keagamaan dan Kemasyarakatan* 13, no. 1 (2019): 33–50.
- Rogers, Everett M. *Diffusion of Innovations*. 3rd Edition. London: Collier Macmillan Publisher, 1995.
- Ruja, I Nyoman, and Sukamto. "Survey Permasalahan Implementasi Kurikulum Nasional 2013 Mata Pelajaran Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial Sekolah Menengah Pertama Di Jawa Timur." *Jurnal Sejarah dan Budaya* 11, no. 2 (2015): 193–199.
- Subandi. "Pengembangan Kurikulum 2013 (Studi Analitis Dan Substantif Kebijakan Kurikulum Nasional)." *Terampil Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Dasar* 1, no. 1 (2014): 18–36.
- Suhardan, Dadang. *Supervisi Profesional*. Bandung: Alfabeta, 2010.
- Suharsaputra, Uhar. *Administrasi Pendidikan*. Bandung: Refika Aditama, 2010.
- Sumarni. "Evaluation of the Implementation of 2013 Curriculum in Madrasah." *Puslitbang Pendidikan Agama dan Keagamaan Badan Litbang dan Diklat Kementerian Agama Jl.* 15, no. 3 (2017): 387–404.
- "ICW Kritik Kurikulum 2013." *Republika*, August 29, 2014. <http://www.republika.co.id/berita/koran/didaktika/14/08/29/nb23g85-icw-kritik-kurikulum-2013>.