International Journal of Educational Review

Publishes original research both theory and practices in Educational Management; Social Studies Education; Educational Technolgy; Natural Science Education; Guidance and Counseling; Primary Education; Linguistics Education; Early Childhood Education; and Mathematics Education

E-ISSN 2685-709X P-ISSN 2685-905X

Volume 1, Issue 2, July-December 2019

Study Program Doctor of Education
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Bengkulu

International Journal of Educational Review

E-ISSN 2685-709X P-ISSN 2685-905X
Volume 1, Issue 2, July-December 2019

Publishes original research both theory and practices in Educational Management; Social Studies Education; Educational Technolgy; Natural Science Education; Guidance and Counseling; Primary Education; Linguistics Education; Early Chilhood Education; and Mathematics Education

International Journal of Educational Review is published by Doctoral Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Bengkulu, which disseminates the latest research findings from educational scientists in many fields of education. More detail, it focuses on publishing original research of educational management, social studies education, educational technology, natural science education, guidance and counseling, elementary education, linguistics education, early childhood education and mathematics education. It is a biannual journal issued on January and July. The editors welcome submissions of papers describing recent theoretical and experimental research related to (1) theoretical articles; (2) empirical studies; (3) practice-oriented papers; (4) case studies; (5) review of papers, books, and resources.

Address
Study Program Doctor of Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Bengkulu
Jl. WR. Supratman, Kandang Limun, Bengkulu 38371A, Telp. +63 736 21186. Fax. 073621186
e-mail: ijer@unib.ac.id

Content

Factors Affecting Teachers' Stage of Concern on Evaluation System of Primary School Curriculum Innovation

Badeni
Universitas Bengkulu
e-mail: badeni@unib.ac.id

Abstract: The purpose of the study is to describe the teachers' stage of concern for the evaluation of primary school innovation and factors affecting teachers' stage of concern. The approach used in this study was a descriptive study. Data related to factors affecting teachers' stage of concern to the evaluation of primary school curriculum innovation were collected in the form of forum discussion and study of related literature. While data on teacher's stage of concern itself to the evaluation system of primary school curriculum innovation were collected, classified, processed and analyzed by using the norms of the group in the calculation of percentile. The findings of this study were 10 % in a stage of awareness, 14 % in the stage of information; 2 % in the stage of personnel;12 % in the stage of management; 20 % in the stage of consequence;12 % in the stage of collaboration and 20 % in the stage of refocusing. Teachers' stage of concern to the evaluation of primary school curriculum innovation was low. It was caused by (a) the lack of understanding of primary school teachers on information received, (b) lack of examples and evidence of the benefits of accepted curriculum innovation in school practices, (c) lack of training by trainers in applying new curriculum, (d) so complex in evaluating and (e) the curriculum is continually changing. (f) teacher involvement in implementing program and the training needs (g) adequate time to learn, practice, master and apply what needs to be learned about an curriculum innovation (h) teachers' commitment to implement the curriculum innovation; (i); principal knowledge of educational change; (j) principals role in carrying out programs; (k) principals' moral support and active participation; (l) collaborative planning by teachers and administrators.

Keywords: Concern; Innovation; Curriculum Evaluation

1. Introduction

As the world becomes more globalized, student populations in educational institution settings will continue to grow in diversity. To ensure students develop the cultural competence to adapt to new environments, an educational institution must develop policies and programs to aid in the progression of cultural acceptance and understanding. Recently, curricular review, revisions, and modifications have been routine practice in educational institutions of the developed countries. They are also experimenting with different curricular models. However, initiating, implementing and sustaining change has not been easy (Ali, S. K., &Baig, L. A., 2012). There are many reasons accounting for why educational institution can be successful in educational improvements. Successful educational curriculum improvements require establishing a clear educational vision and a shared institutional mission (Ali, S. K., & Baig, L. A., 2012), a need for continued faculty training activities, focus on all aspects of educational related the curriculum. The later includes assessment, teacher preparation, school calendar, content structure, educational context, organizational structure, and institutional culture.

Law of the Republic of Indonesia Law No. 14 The year 2005 on Teachers and Lecturers explains that teachers are professional educators with the main task of educating, teaching, guiding, directing, training, assessing, and evaluating learners in

early childhood education formal education, basic education, and secondary education. Teachers are not only responsible for educating and facilitating the learning process, but also must conduct assessment and evaluation of process and learning outcomes and ongoing curriculum. Evaluation and assessment of ongoing curriculum are the basic competencies that must be owned by both teachers and prospective teachers. This is considering the importance of the evaluation function and assessment of learning outcomes and ongoing curriculum as a feedback of the learning process that has been done and its role in improving the quality of the education process in general and ongoing curriculum in specific. To be able to develop a better curriculum and learning program, teachers use the results of the previous curriculum and learning program evaluations as a reference. Rationally that teachers' success in student learning needs the information of evaluation results on the quality of previous learning program and the used curriculum.

There were still many public complaints with the implementation of the new curriculum, including (a) many new curriculum components had not been well understood by all teachers; (b) many teachers had not understood the authentic assessment system; (c) many teachers had not attended training of new curriculum; (d) the content of the textbooks still needed to be fixed; (e) there were books in which the materials were too sensitive to the community; (f) undistributed of teacher and student handbooks into schools; (h) a large number of schools that were still indecisive in implementing the new curriculum; (i) a large number of teachers who were less concerned about the new curriculum innovation (Harian Nasional, 2014).

The lack of teachers' awareness of the new curriculum also is shown in the results of research: a) most of the teachers didn't understand the Curriculum 2013, yet they were not given any training before; b) teachers' understanding in authentic assessment system were low; c) the teachers were lack of the ability to define the competence, indicators, learning objectives, and also arranging of assessment instrument and final report, d) the teacher effort to solve those difficulties were by joining the training peer discussion, and mentoring by the Education Department as well as to the higher education institution (Ika Maryani and Sri Tutur Martaningsih, 2017); (Kristiawan, et al, 2016); (Kristiawan, 2015); (Kristiawan dan Elnanda, 2017).

Based on the above pieces of evidence we can draw meaning that a lot of teachers lack concern on curriculum evaluation. In other words, teachers' concern of curriculum is in variety, either in constructing a learning plan or in curriculum evaluation. Some are at a higher level than others. It looks like important to research the stage of teachers' concern on the curriculum evaluation. Related to this, we have willing to know the teachers' stage of concern on curriculum evaluation. In more detail, the purpose of the study is to describe teachers'stage of concern and factors affecting teacher' stage of concern on the evaluation of primary school innovation.

2. Research Method

The approach used in this study was a descriptive study. Data related to factors affecting teachers' stage of concern to the evaluation of primary school curriculum innovation were collected in the form of forum group discussion (FGD) among researchers and elementary school teachers and study of related literature. While data on teacher's stage of concern itself to the evaluation of primary school curriculum innovation were collected, classified, processed and analyzed by using the norms of the group in the calculation of percentile. The number of population of this study were 500 primary school teachers. Meanwhile, the research sample were 50 teachers. A random sampling technique in the form of the lottery was used to choose research samples.

Inventory methods and documentation are used to collect data on teachers' stage of concern to the evaluation of curriculum innovation

To know the teachers' stage of concern evaluation of primary school curriculum innovation were collected in the form of forum discussion, in this study was applied the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBM) (Hall, G E., Wallace, RC, Jr. And Dossett, W A., 1973 Hall, G., & Hord, S., 1987; Hall, G., & Hord, S., 2011). This model provides ways to study teachers' stages of concern by identifying levels of concern of the innovation evaluation. On stages of concern, a set of seven categories is identified, including awareness, information, personal concerns, management, consequence, collaboration, and refocusing. The typical expressions for each stage are as follows.

Stage of Awareness: the new teacher is aware of the innovation in the evaluation of curriculum innovation. Stage of informational: the teacher notices and wants to explore the meaning and benefits of innovation contained in the evaluation of curriculum innovation. Stage of personal: the teacher notices the influence of innovation in the evaluation of curriculum innovation to herself or himself. Stage of management: the teacher notices an efficient way to carry out activity related to the evaluation of curriculum innovation. Stage of consequence: the teacher notices an influential factor when innovation made toward the evaluation of curriculum innovation against him and learners. Stage of collaboration: teacher strives to coordinate and cooperate with colleagues in order to evaluate curriculum innovation to enhance the innovation impact on learners. Stage of refocusing: the teacher began to explore the possibility to organize renewal, repair, and adjustments in the evaluation of curriculum innovation.

The population of this research is primary teachers amount to 500 teachers. The sample in this research were 50 teachers. The sample was taken by using a random sampling technique, lottery. To obtain data on the stage of concern of primary school teacher in the evaluation of primary school curriculum innovation in advance developed a data collection tool in the form of inventory and documentation. Inventory was developed regarding the evaluation of primary school curriculum innovation. Inventory is used to reveal the tendency of the teacher' stage of concern in the evaluation of curriculum innovation.

By referring to the seventh stage of concern which has researchers suggested, is developed inventory to determine teacher' stage of concerning the evaluation of curriculum innovation. The data collection tool is to identify elementary school teacher' stage of concern. Data collector tool which was developed is in the form of inventory used to assess themselves which contain a number of items in the form of paired comparison. Each item is about a couple of statements that each represents one stage of concern. Respondents who in this case is elementary school teachers were asked to choose one statement for each pair that best fit in the situation. By doing so, in the end, after the entire inventory was done, it would be noted that the statements of the stage of concern which is the most widely chosen by respondents. The largest selection reflects the stage of concern of the respondent. To determine the position of each selection, then the frequency is converted into a percentile

Data analysis was carried out with the group norms in the calculation of percentile. This technique is used to calculate the percentage of teacher' stage of concern on the evaluation of curriculum innovation.

3. Results and Discussion

The study resulted in the following data: there are 10 % of teachers on the stage of awareness, 10 % of teachers on the stage of informational, 12% of teachers on the stage of personal, 12 % of teachers on the stage of management, 20 % on the stage of consequences, 12 % teachers on the stage of

collaboration, and 12 % of teachers stage of refocusing. It means that based on the results of the questioners that elementary teachers'stage of concern to curriculum evaluation were low

Based on the results of FGD and study of related kinds of literature that the low stage of elementary teachers concern to curriculum evaluation was affected by several factors. These were (a) the lack of understanding of primary school teachers on information received, (b) lack of examples and evidence of the benefits of accepted curriculum innovation in school practices, (c) lack of training by trainers in applying new curriculum, (d) so complex in evaluating and (e) the curriculum is continually changing. (f) teacher involvement in implementing program and the training needs (g) adequate time to learn, practice, master and apply what needs to be learned about an curriculum innovation (h) teachers' commitment to implement the curriculum innovation; (i); principal knowledge of educational change; (j) principals role in carrying out programs; (k) principals' moral support and active participation; (l) collaborative planning by teachers and administrators.

Based on collected data it could be seen that the average score is 3.34. The average shows that primary school teacher' stage of concern on the evaluation of primary school curriculum innovation on stage between management and consequence. It means that the stage of concern from primary school teachers has noticed the innovation element in the evaluation of primary school curriculum innovation. Based on the average score it can be categorized that elementary school teachers concern on the evaluation of curriculum innovation is relatively low, that is in the medium category. This means that their level of concern for the evaluation of the primary school curriculum innovation is on the stage of management. It means that the stage of concern from primary school teachers have just noticed (a) innovation element in the evaluation of primary school curriculum innovation and; (b) an efficient way to conduct the evaluation of primary school curriculum innovation; However, they have not really noticed (a) efforts that influence the evaluation of curriculum innovation on self and the interests of learners; (b) how to strive, coordinate and cooperate with colleagues in order to evaluate curriculum innovation to enhance the innovation impact on learners how to explore the possibility to organize renewal, repair, and adjustments in the evaluation of curriculum innovation

The results of this study indicate that there is a gap between "What" is done by primary school teachers with "What" should be done by elementary school teachers in the evaluation of curriculum innovation. The next question "why does the gap occur? Why do elementary school teachers not adopt how to evaluate curriculum innovation?" According to Spotts, T.H. (1999), adoption is a decision of "full use of an innovation as the best course of action available" and rejection is a decision "not to adopt an innovation" (Spotts, T.H., 1999). Rogers defines diffusion as "the process in which an innovation is communicated through certain channels over time among the members of a social system" (Spotts, T.H., 1999). As expressed in the definition, innovation, communication channels, and social system are the four key components of the diffusion of innovations

Innovation

Rogers offered the following description of an innovation: "An *innovation* is an idea, practice, or project that is perceived as new by an individual or other units of adoption" (Spotts, T.H., 1999). Innovation may have been invented a long time ago, but if individuals perceive it as new, then it may still be an innovation for them. It is the same as the case being in the evaluation of curriculum innovation. The innovation of the curriculum called the curriculum 2013 had been executed four years ago, but a lot of elementary teachers have not fully adopted or concerned

to implement the new curriculum evaluation yet. The lack of application of curriculum innovation evaluation as a result of the lack of understanding of primary school teachers on information of the evaluation system in the new curriculum received, no examples and evidence of the benefits of the evaluation system implementation of the accepted curriculum innovation, lack of training by trainers in applying the new curriculum evaluation system, complicated system of curriculum evaluation perceived by teachers. This causes teachers to experience uncertainty in making decisions to adopt it.

The newness characteristic of adoption is more related to the three steps (knowledge, persuasion, and decision) of the innovation-decision process. The unwanted to adopt the new curriculum is related to uncertainty. Uncertainty is an important obstacle to the adoption of innovations. An innovation's consequences may create uncertainty: "*Consequences* are the changes that occur in an individual or a social system as a result of the adoption or rejection of an innovation" (Rogers, 2003, p. 436). Further explanation, Rogers said "to reduce the uncertainty of adopting the innovation, individuals should be informed about its advantages and disadvantages to making them aware of all its consequences. The lack of adoption to implement the curriculum innovation evaluation might be of consequence of the elementary teachers feel less information concerning the advantage or disadvantage of the evaluation system of curriculum innovation for them.

Communication Channels

The second element factor of the diffusion of innovations process is communication channels. Communication is "a process in which participants create and share information with one another in order to reach a mutual understanding" (Spotts, T.H., 1999). This communication occurs through channels between sources. Rogers states that "a *source* is an individual or an institution that originates a message. A channel is the means by which a message gets from the source to the receiver" (Hall, G., & Hord, S., 2011). (Hall, G., & Hord, S., 2011) states that diffusion is a specific kind of communication and includes these communication elements: an innovation, two individuals or other units of adoption, and a communication channel. Mass media and interpersonal communication are two communication channels. While mass media channels include a mass medium such as TV, radio, or newspaper. Interpersonal channels consist of two-way communication between two or more individuals. On the other hand, "diffusion is a very social process that involves interpersonal communication relationships" (Hall, G., & Hord, S., 2011). Thus, interpersonal channels are more powerful to create or change the strong attitudes held by an individual. In interpersonal channels, the communication may have a characteristic of *homophily*, that is, "the degree to which two or more individuals who interact are similar in certain attributes, such as beliefs, education, socioeconomic status, and the like." The diffusion of innovations, however, requires at least some degree of heterophily, which is "the degree to which two or more individuals who interact are different in certain attributes." In fact, "one of the most distinctive problems in the diffusion of innovations is that the participants are usually quite heterophilous" (Hall, G., & Hord, S., 2011). Related to the evaluation system of curriculum innovation, the low understanding of the evaluation system of curriculum innovation of primary school teachers may be due to the lack of effective interaction or communication between primary school teachers and instructors. This is a possibility as a barrier to the increased awareness of primary school teachers to apply the evaluation system of curriculum innovation.

Communication channels also can be categorized as local channels and cosmopolite channels that communicate between an

individual of the social system and outside sources. While interpersonal channels can be local or cosmopolite, almost all mass media channels are cosmopolite. Because of these communication channels' characteristics, mass media channels and cosmopolite channels are more significant at the knowledge stage and local channels and interpersonal channels are more important at the persuasion stage of the innovation-decision process (Hall, G., & Hord, S., 2011).

All these communication channels might be the cause of the lack of knowledge concerning the evaluation system of curriculum innovation as reality is, disadvantage and advantage of it, then all these to be the causal factor of the low willing to implement the evaluation system of curriculum innovation by elementary teachers

Social System

The social system is the last element in the diffusion process. Hall, G., & Hord, S., 2011) defined the social system as "a set of interrelated units engaged in joint problem solving to accomplish a common goal" (Hall, G., & Hord, S., 2011). Since the diffusion of innovations takes place in the social system, it is influenced by the social structure of the social system. A structure is "the patterned arrangements of the units in a system" (Hall, G., & Hord, S., 2011). He further claimed that the nature of the social system affects individuals' innovativeness, which is the main criterion for categorizing adopters. In this research finding is not correspond to the case of implementation of curriculum innovation as either the central, provincial, county or municipality government have quite often socialized the evaluation system of the curriculum innovation. The lower stage of elementary school teachers' concern to the evaluation system of curriculum innovation might be lighted from the process of innovation. In this case, the low stage of teachers' concern of the evaluation system of curriculum innovation as a result of the lack of understanding of primary school teachers on information received, no examples and evidence of the benefits of the evaluation system of accepted curriculum innovation, lack of training by trainers in applying the new evaluation system of the curriculum innovation, complicated evaluation system in its application and the evaluation system itself is still changing.

According to Hall, G., & Hord, S., (2011) described the innovation-decision process as "an information-seeking and information-processing activity, where an individual is motivated to reduce uncertainty about the advantages and disadvantages of an innovation". For Hall, G., & Hord, S., (2011), the innovation-decision process involves five steps: (1) knowledge, (2) persuasion, (3) decision, (4) implementation, and (5) confirmation. These stages typically follow each other in a time-ordered manner.

The Knowledge Stage

The innovation-decision process starts with the knowledge stage. In this step, an individual (elementary school teacher) learns about the existence of innovation and seeks information about the innovation. "What? " "how? " and "why?" are the critical questions in the knowledge phase. During this phase, the elementary school teacher attempts to determine "what the innovation is and how and why it works" (Hall, G., & Hord, S., 2011). According to Hall, G., & Hord, S., (2011), the questions form three types of knowledge: (1) awareness-knowledge, (2) how-to-knowledge, and (3) principles-knowledge.

a. Awareness-knowledge represents the knowledge of the evaluation system of the curriculum innovation's existence. This type of knowledge can motivate the elementary school teacher to learn more about the evaluation system of the curriculum innovation and, eventually, to adopt it. Also, it may encourage an elementary school teacher to learn about the other two types of knowledge.

b. How-to-knowledge: The other type of knowledge, how-to-knowledge, contains information about how to use an innovation correctly. Technology is not used at an expected stage since they need help in how to use the technology effectively in teaching (Spotts, T.H., 1999). Rogers saw this knowledge as an essential variable in the innovation-decision process. To increase the adoption chance of the evaluation system of curriculum innovation, in this case, an elementary school teacher should have a sufficient level of how-to-knowledge prior to the trial of the evaluation system of the curriculum innovation. Thus, this knowledge becomes more critical for relatively complex innovations.
c. Principles-knowledge: the last knowledge type is principles-knowledge. This knowledge includes the functioning principles describing how and why an innovation works. An evaluation system of curriculum innovation can be adopted without this knowledge, but the misuse of the curriculum innovation may cause its discontinuance. Sprague, D., Kopfman, K., & Dorsey, S. (1999) said that the biggest barrier to faculty use of technology in teaching was that faculty lack a vision of why or how to integrate technology in the classroom.

To create new knowledge, technology education and practice should provide not only a how-to experience but also a know-why experience (Seemann, K., 2003). Unfortunately, based on research, elementary school teachers have not fully understood the evaluation system nature of the curriculum innovation, so they lack adopting the evaluation system nature of curriculum innovation, even some of them reject it

The Persuasion Stage

The persuasion step occurs when the individual has a negative or positive attitude toward the innovation, but "the formation of a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward an innovation does not always lead directly or indirectly to adoption or rejection" (Hall, G., & Hord, S., 2011). In this case, the elementary school teacher shapes his or her attitude after he or she knows about the evaluation system of the curriculum innovation, so the persuasion stage follows the knowledge stage in the innovation-decision process. Furthermore, Rogers states that while the knowledge stage is more cognitive centered, and the persuasion stage is more feeling centered. Thus, the individual is involved more sensitively with the innovation at the persuasion stage. The degree of uncertainty about the innovation's functioning and the social reinforcement from others (colleagues, peers, etc.) affect the individual's opinions and beliefs about the evaluation system of the curriculum innovation. Close peers' subjective evaluations of the innovation that reduce uncertainty about the innovation outcomes are usually more credible to the individual: "While information about a new innovation is usually available from outside experts and scientific evaluations, teachers usually seek it from trusted friends and colleagues whose subjective opinions of a new innovation are most convincing" (Sherry, L., (1997).

The Decision Stage

At the decision stage in the innovation-decision process, the individual chooses to adopt or reject the innovation. While adoption refers to "full use of an innovation as the best course of action available," rejection means "not to adopt an innovation" (Spotts, T.H., 1999). If an innovation has a partial trial basis, it is usually adopted more quickly, since most individuals first want to try the innovation in their own situation and then come to an adoption decision. The vicarious trial can speed up the innovation-decision process. However, rejection is possible in every stage of the innovation-decision process. In these findings, the elementary school teachers lack no examples and

evidence of the benefits of the evaluation system of accepted curriculum innovation, lack of training by trainers in applying the new curriculum evaluation system.

The Implementation Stage

At the implementation stage, innovation is put into practice. However, an innovation brings the newness in which "some degree of uncertainty is involved in diffusion" (Hall, G., & Hord, S., 2011). Uncertainty about the outcomes of the innovation still can be a problem at this stage. Thus, the implementer may need technical assistance from change agents and others to reduce the degree of uncertainty about the consequences. Moreover, the innovation-decision process will end, since "the innovation loses its distinctive quality as the separate identity of the new idea disappears" (Hall, G., & Hord, S., 2011). In these findings of the research, the elementary school teachers lack examples and evidence of the benefits of the evaluation system of accepted curriculum innovation, lack of training by trainers in applying new curriculum. So it is the cause the elementary school teachers are quite low in the implementation of the evaluation system of the curriculum innovation

The Confirmation Stage

The innovation-decision already has been made, but at the confirmation stage, the individual looks for support for his or her decision. According to Hall, G., & Hord, S., (2011), this decision can be reversed if the individual is "exposed to conflicting messages about the innovation" (Hall, G., & Hord, S., 2011). However, the individual tends to stay away from these messages and seeks supportive messages that confirm his or her decision. Thus, attitudes become more crucial at the confirmation stage. Depending on the support for the adoption of the innovation and the attitude of the individual, later adoption or discontinuance happens during this stage.

Other research found that teachers' commitment to innovation important for project implementation (Berman, Paul, and Mclaughlin, Milbrey, 1978). The main reason why many great social reform efforts fail was that the programs seriously underestimated the importance of teacher involvement in implementing the program and the training needs (McKay, A. B., & Nelson, M. E., 1980). Programs are most likely to fail without training and support (Hall, G.E. & Louck, F., (1979). It is the same as the case in this study that the stages of the elementary teachers' concern are very influenced by teachers' commitment and involvement in implementing the evaluation system of curriculum innovation and the training needs.

Some findings of this research indicate that the role, knowledge of evaluation system of curriculum innovation, attitude, moral support and active participation of the elementary school principal is the important key to development stages of elementary teachers' concern to the evaluation system of the curriculum innovation. Many studies have stressed the principals crucial role in carrying out programs (McKay, A. B., & Nelson, M. E., 1980 and Susan F Loucks and Harold Patt, 1979); Principal knowledge of educational change and understanding of their role were significantly related to teachers'attitude toward the change (Susan F Loucks and Harold Patt, 1979); principals' moral support and active participation are key elements of an effective support system during implementation (Sarason, Seymour, (1982). Selected aspects of staff development determine the effectiveness of the development effort in promoting successful implementation of the program (Griffin, Garry, 1983). These aspects include (1) context, (2) assessment and incorporation of teacher need, (3) content, and (4) process. Interaction, or active participation in training sessions, allows participants to relate personally to the knowledge, skills, and attitudes gained (Fenstermacher, Gary D, and Berliner, David, 1985). Locus of decision-

making also affects how the evaluation system of the curriculum is carried out. Top-down discussions about staff development and the program being carried out are likely to produce undesirable side effects and minimal recipient satisfaction (Fenstermacher, Gary D, and Berliner, David, 1985). Neither top-down nor bottom-up but rather collaborative planning by teachers and administrators result in the more effective implementation of resulting plans (McKay, A. B., & Nelson, M. E., 1980).

Time is another critical factor relating to the implementation of the evaluation system of the curriculum change. The most successful implementation implementations provide adequate time to learn, practice, master and apply what needs to be learned about innovation (McKay, A. B., & Nelson, M. E., 1980). Change must be thought out long-term, with two to three years the minimum time allowed for bringing about innovation Dupuis, Mary M and Askov, Eunice N, 1982).

4. Conclusion

The findings of this study were 10 % in a stage of awareness, 14 % in the stage of information; 2 % in the stage of personal); 12 % in the stage of management); 20 % in the stage of consequence; 12 % in the stage of collaboration and 20 % in the stage of refocusing. The average score is 3.34 (three point three four). The average shows that primary school teachers' stage of concern on the evaluation of primary school curriculum innovation is on the stage of management. There were factors influencing teachers' stage of concern to the evaluation system of primary school curriculum innovation were low. It was caused by (a) the lack of understanding of primary school teachers on information of the evaluation system received, (b) lack of examples and evidence of the benefits of the accepted evaluation system in school practices, (c) lack of training by trainers in applying the evaluation system of the curriculum innovation, (d) so complex in implementation of the evaluation system in practices and (e) the evaluation system of the curriculum innovation is continuously changing. (f) teachers' involvement in implementing program and the training needs (g) adequate time to learn, practice, master and apply what needs to be learned about an curriculum innovation (h) teachers' commitment to implement the curriculum innovation; (i); principal knowledge of educational change; (j) principals role in carrying out programs; (k) principals' moral support and active participation; (l) collaborative planning by teachers and administrators

Firstly, we would like to first acknowledge the educational technology Program, Bengkulu University that provided a fund for this research project. Secondly, we would like to thank for all of the head of the research and social service Board Bengkulu University who coordinated and facilitated administration of this research project. Lastly, we would like to thank all the heads of public Elementary School Bengkulu Province, teachers, support staff, and students who helped us develop and complete this project through their participation and cooperation.

Acknowledgment

The author gratefully acknowledges the Doctorate Program of Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education Bengkulu University, which provided fund for this research project. Secondly, we would like to thank for all of the head of the research and social service Board Bengkulu University who coordinated and facilitated administration of this research project. Lastly, we would like to thank the heads of elementary schools, teachers, support staff, and students in Bengkulu Municipality, who helped us to develop and complete this project through their participation and cooperation.

References

Ali, S. K., &Baig, L. A., (2012), "Problems and issues in implementing an innovative curriculum in the developing

countries: the Pakistani experience", *BMC Medical Education*, 12 (1), 31. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6920-12-31.

Berman, Paul, and Mclaughlin, Milbrey, (1978), Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, *Volume VIII Factors Affecting Change Agents* (Santa Monica, Calif. Rand Corporation).

Dupuis, Mary M, and Askov, Eunice N, (1982). An Effective Inservice Model for Content Area Reading in Secondary School, *Educational Leadership* 40 (October 1982): 48=50

Fenstermacher, Gary D and Berliner, David, (1985), "Determining the Value of Staff Development," *Elementary School Journal* 85 (January 1985: 281-3314)

Griffin, Garry, (1983), "Implications of Research for Staff Development." *Elementary School Journal* 83 (March 1983): 414-425)

Hall, G E., Wallace, RC, Jr. And Dossett, W A., (1973), *A Developmental Conceptualization of The Adoption Process Within Institutional Institutions*, University of Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, Texas

Hall, G., & Hord, S., (1987), *Change in schools: Facilitating the Process,* State University of New York Press, New York, NY

Hall, G., & Hord, S., (2011), *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes*, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Boston.

Hall, G.E. & Louck, F., (1979), *Measuring Stage of Concern About The Innovation: Manual for Use of The SoC Questionnaire,* The University of Texas: Second Edition, Texas.

Harian Nasional, (2014), Kurikulum Diterapkan Bertahap,14 Desember 2014: 12, Jakarta.

Ika Maryani and Sri Tutur Martaningsih, (2017),"Persepsi Guru Sekolah Dasar Terhadap Sistem Penilaian Pada Kurikulum 2013", *Scolaria*, *7*(2), 153–164.

Kristiawan, M. (2014). A Model for Upgrading Teachers Competence on Operating Computer as Assistant of Instruction. *Global Journal of Human-Social Science Research*.

Kristiawan, M., & Elnanda, D. (2017). The Implementation of Authentic Assessment in Cultural History of Islamic Subject. *Al-Ta lim Journal*, *24*(3), 266-276.

Kristiawan, M., Jumeldi, A., Ahmad, S., & Asvio, N. (2016). The Implementation Of Affective Assessment For Islamic Education In High School 1 Pariangan. *Research Journal of Social Sciences*, *9*(4), 1-8.

Law of the Republic of Indonesia Law No. 14 The year 2005 on Teachers and Lecturers. Bandung: Fokusmedia/

McKay, A. B., & Nelson, M. E., (1980), "Inservice training for the curricular change. *School Science and Mathematics* 80", (December 1980), 684-690)

Rogers, Everet, M., (2003), *Diffusion of Innovation*, The Free Press, A division of Macmillan Publishing Co. Inc., New York.

Sarason, Seymour, (1982), The Culture of the School and The Problem of Change, (2nd ed.) Allyn and Bacon, Boston

Seemann, K., (2003), Basic principles in holistic technology education, Journal of Technology Education, 14(2), 28-39

Sherry, L., (1997), "The boulder valley internet project: Lessons learned", THE (Technological Horizons in Education) Journal, 25(2), 68-73.

Spotts, T.H. (1999). Discriminating factors in faculty use of instructional technology in higher education. *Educational Technology & Society, 2*(4), 92-99.

Sprague, D., Kopfman, K., & Dorsey, S. (1999). Faculty development in the integration of technology in teacher education courses. *Journal of Computing in Teacher Education, 14*(2), 24-28.

Susan F Loucks and Harold Patt, (1979). "A Concerns-Based Approach to Curriculum Change," Educational Leadership 37 (December 1979), 212-2015)

Susan F Loucks and Harold Patt, (1979). "A Concerns-Based Approach to Curriculum Change," Educational Leadership 37 (December 1979), 212-2015)