

THE LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE OF ECONOMICS TEACHERS INFLUENCES THEIR WILLINGNESS TO IMPLEMENT *KURIKULUM TINGKAT SATUAN PENDIDIKAN*

Lisa Agustina; Nor Aishah Buang; Muhammad Hussin

Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

e-mail: icha_harum@yahoo.com; norais@ukm.edu.my; banting99@hotmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to identify the relationship between knowledge and willingness amongst teacher of Economics in implementing *kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan*. This study used a questionnaire with 109 teachers from twelve middle schools in Aceh Besar, Indonesia, directly involved in the processes of implementing the curriculum. Descriptive analyses used were frequency, percent, mean value and standard deviation. It is found that the level of knowledge of the teachers is at a moderate level with an overall mean value of 3.04. The level of willingness also is at a moderate level with an overall mean value at 3.46. An inferential statistical correlation test was used to test hypotheses. It is found that there is a positive relationship between the level of knowledge and the level of willingness. It can be concluded that necessary knowledge will influence the willingness of the teachers to implement the curriculum.

Keywords: problem-based learning, achievement, economics

Abstrak

Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk mengidentifikasi hubungan antara pengetahuan dan kemauan pengajar bidang studi Ekonomi dalam penerapan kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan. Penelitian ini menggunakan kuisioner yang didistribusikan kepada 109 guru-guru dari 12 sekolah menengah di Aceh Besar, Indonesia dimana mereka terlibat langsung dengan penerapan kurikulum tersebut. Analisis deskriptif yang digunakan adalah frekuensi, persentase, rerata, dan simpangan baku. Hasil penelitian menemukan bahwa pengetahuan guru-guru berada pada level menengah dengan rerata total 3,04. Level kemauan guru juga berada pada level menengah dengan rerata 3.46. Uji korelasi menemukan bahwa terdapat hubungan yang positif antara pengetahuan dan kemauan guru dalam penerapan kurikulum tersebut. Dapat disimpulkan bahwa pengetahuan yang sesuai akan mempengaruhi kemauan guru-guru untuk mengimplementasikan kurikulum tersebut.

Kata kunci : pembelajaran berbasis masalah, prestasi belajar, ilmu ekonomi

INTRODUCTION

Education aims to develop skills and character. To achieve these goals, many attempts have been made by the Government of Indonesia, such as changing the curriculum. The changes in curriculum in Indonesia have undergone many stages. Since 1980, Indonesia has changed the curriculum at least three times. One innovation by the government was to enhance the quality of the curriculum, namely the competency-based curriculum (*kurikulum berbasis kompetensi / KBK*) for all primary and secondary schools. In the academic year 2007/2008, Indonesia was in a transitional period of curriculum change, from KBK to *kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan* (KTSP), which was then to be applied in all first grades (year 7) at middle schools. The KTSP is a continuation and development from the previous one, KBK, and now give full authority to each school to develop a curriculum that is appropriate for that school's own characteristics and needs. The KTSP was created and established by teachers as was recommended by the Department of Education.

According to Jadi (1993), teachers play an important role in addressing the implementation of curriculum reform, especially in terms of its spread in schools. This is because the teachers are the main driving force in the implementation of reforms in education. Furthermore, Nordin (1991) explained that a good education is the result of a good curriculum and good quality teaching as well. Whenever changes of curriculum occur, the teachers as educators must orientate themselves to the changes. Success of curriculum reform depends on the support, the readiness and the motivation of the teachers. They need more time, ability, knowledge, understanding and skills, otherwise, reforming curriculum will be difficult to perform effectively (Hurst, 1981). Malone & Howson (1987) and Avalos (1999) explained that failure of the teaching-learning process is due to lack of knowledge and skills. In order to develop teaching plans, teachers are required to have knowledge and understanding of the curriculum, either through manuals and/or

training. In order to optimize the empowerment of teachers in preparing curriculum, however, facilities such as books and reference materials must be available. This is in line with the statement by Malone & Howson (1987), who has written that the process of change will provide significant results if they are accompanied by an increase in materials.

Teachers are accustomed to follow curriculum set by governments. Now, however, the uneven quality of teachers in particular the diversity in the capacity for creativity of teachers is a difficulty in the program for all teachers to create their own curriculum. This was commented on by Hanafie (2007) who stated that there were some weaknesses with the KTSP, such as the lack of human capital needed to implement the KTSP. Furthermore, many teachers apparently did not understand the concept of the KTSP; especially since there was a lack of facilities and infrastructure. Thus, based on the above situation, this study investigated the relationship between the level of knowledge and the level of willingness to implement new curriculum.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Teachers' knowledge of the content of a curriculum includes pedagogical knowledge, such as the syllabus, lesson plans, teaching approach, material sources and teaching aids. Shulman (1987) and Halim (1997) also note the teachers' interest or pedagogical knowledge related to the subject to be taught. Pedagogical knowledge will help teachers to customize the curriculum to a good pedagogical form in accordance with the skills and the backgrounds of the students. This kind of knowledge also acts as a "conceptual map" or guide for teachers in making decisions about their teaching, including objectives to be achieved, selection of appropriate teaching method and type of exercises to be given in teaching. Halim & Salamuddin (2000) also added that the weaknesses of teachers, in terms of pedagogical knowledge, will lead to more traditional teaching, where teachers just give lectures and students just write down the words. Teachers will also be less willing to get student feedback about the new concepts.

Alsagoff (1983), Shulman (1987) and Ryan & Cooper (1998) has suggested a few things that must be done by a teacher who is willing to teach, namely: (1) mastering the content of the subject being taught, (2) having pedagogical knowledge related to the subject, and (3) being positive about the subject referring to interests, beliefs, statements and teachers' initiatives. In this case, Rasdi (2003) has stated that there are several issues that can cause teachers to be less willing to implement changes, namely: (1) lack of understanding of the changes, (2) lack of skills or training opportunities, (3) lack of ability or commitment to implement the changes, (4) lack of material resources, and (5) disagreement about the organizational structure.

Willingness means readiness and ability to do a task or job. Willingness of an individual is usually measured from his attitudes or his actions. Willingness of teachers to implement the KTSP could be seen and reviewed from the aspects of ability, understanding of the teachers for preparing the curriculum concepts and knowledge of content related to suitable methods to use with the new curriculum. Teachers who have better knowledge tend to be more willing and able to implement a new curriculum.

METHODOLOGY

This research used an exploratory review method with a quantitative approach that aims to measure aspects related to implementation of curriculum. The number of participants was 109 teachers of economics at middle schools in Aceh Besar district, Indonesia. Assessment used the whole sample because of the limited population. This size was included in the range suggested by Krejcie & Moorgan (1970) which was based on the size of a sample to the population size.

A Likert scale was used in the study questionnaire to measure several aspects related to the implementation of the curriculum. Data obtained via questionnaires was analysed using statistical software. This study used descriptive statistics for identifying information about the demographic profile

of the respondents, while inferential statistics were used for correlation. Descriptive analyses used were frequency, percent, mean value and standard deviation, while the inferential analysis used the Pearson correlation. This was used to determine the relationship between the variables. A level of significance of $p < 0.05$ was used.

RESULTS

Analysis of cross-tabulation in Table 1 showed that the level of knowledge of the teachers was at a moderate level. Only thirteen (12 %) of the 109 respondents had a high knowledge, fifteen respondents had poor knowledge and the remaining 81 had moderate knowledge. Five male teachers had higher knowledge and two had lower knowledge. While eight female teachers had higher knowledge and thirteen had lower knowledge.

In Table 2, 38 teachers understood the goals of the curriculum, thirteen teachers understood the principles of the curriculum, and thirty teachers understood the characteristics of the curriculum. Similarly, a total of thirty teachers understood the objectives of teaching economics. However, six teachers stated that the principles in the curriculum are not suitable for the teaching of economics. 36 teachers understood the implementation of the curriculum, 38 teachers understood the implementation of the teaching materials program, but thirteen teachers stated that the annual teacher upgrading programs do not enhance the learning process for teaching economics. A total of 35 teachers understood the implementation of the teaching program, and forty teachers understood the implementation of the lesson planning program. A total of ten teachers stated that the curriculum teaching approach is not affective for teaching economics, while 26 teachers stated that the curriculum teaching method can provide a self-learning method (learners' self-assessment). However, a total of six teachers stated that the teaching techniques in the curriculum are not suitable for economics. A total of forty teachers understood the implementation of teaching resource materials, 33 teachers

understood the implementation of curriculum teaching aids, and 36 teachers understood the exercise of assessments. Overall, the mean value for level of knowledge of all teachers of economics was 3.04.

In Table 3, analysis of the cross-tabulation showed that teacher willingness was also at a moderate level. Only 52 of the 109 respondents had a high willingness, 56 respondents had moderate willingness, and the remaining 1 had low willingness. Sixteen male teachers had high willingness and one had low willingness. While 36 female teachers had high willingness and 36 had moderate willingness. Based on Table 4, 71 teachers agreed to be not involved in further development of the curriculum, 24 teachers agreed to carry out the objectives of teaching Economics in the new curriculum, 39 teachers agreed to implement the principles in curriculum development, but only 32 teachers agreed to develop a teaching materials analysis program. Moreover, 34 teachers agreed to establish an annual program but 67 teachers disagreed to establish a program for a teaching unit. 42 teachers agreed to develop designs for teaching, but only 24 teachers agreed to develop a new teaching approach. 29 teachers agreed to develop teaching methods and 32 teachers agreed to carry out the new teaching techniques. Furthermore, 37 teachers agreed to use new teaching resource materials, but 80 teachers did not agree to use the teaching aids, however 34 teachers agreed to use the new teaching assessments and 27

teachers agreed to follow the course laid down in the new curriculum. Overall, the mean value for the level of willingness of all the teachers of economics was 3.46, which was at a moderate level.

There was a significant relationship between knowledge and willingness for the teachers of economics from middle schools in Aceh Besar, Indonesia, with a coefficient of $r = 0.355$ ($\text{sign} = .000 < 0.05$). The positive relationships show that the higher the knowledge, the higher the willingness towards the implementation of curriculum. Conversely, the lower the knowledge, the lower the willingness. Thus, the level of willingness depends on the level of knowledge of the task. This means that lack of knowledge makes teachers less willing to deal with and implement a new curriculum. Problems due to lack of knowledge and skills about change and innovation must often be one of the main reasons for failure of implementation of a change in curriculum. In addition, the study found that a majority of teachers think that they have never understood the content of the new curriculum in a clear and thorough way, and also that they have had to carry out the teaching-learning processes without a guide book. This makes teachers feel less willing to do their tasks and conducting the teaching. This finding was also supported by Mahfoz (1983) who stated that teachers did not attempt to carry out their roles satisfactorily. This failure was because teachers do not have sufficient knowledge and skills to implement the new curriculum.

Table 1. Cross-tabulation of variables and level of knowledge of teachers for implementing a new curriculum

Variable	High	Moderate	Low	Total
Gender				
Men	5	30	2	37
Female	8	51	13	72
Age				
25 and under	1	7	1	9
26 – 35	3	29	3	35
36 – 45	5	31	4	40
46 and above	6	15	4	25
Academic qualification				
Diploma	4	12		16
Bachelor	9	66	10	85
Post-graduate	2	4	2	8
Specialization at university				
Social science	15	81	12	108
Natural science		1		1
Teaching experience				
Less than 5 years	2	19	2	23
5 - 9 years	2	27	5	34
10 - 14 years	4	22	3	29
15 years and more	7	14	2	23
Grade				
Grade 2	1	3		4
Grade 3	3	36	3	42
Grade 4	8	14	5	27
Others	3	29	4	36
Status				
Officer	12	55	6	73
Honorary	1	8	3	12
Contractor	2	10		12
Devotee		7	1	8
Practitioner		4		4

Position				
Principal	2	3		5
Deputy principal	2	4		6
Teacher	12	62	10	84
Chief of student organization		12	2	14

Table 2. Phase of knowledge of teachers in implementing the curriculum

	Knowledge levels	Really do not know (%)	Know very little (%)	Know (%)	Know well (%)	Know very well (%)
1	I know the purpose of changing the curriculum	3.7	8.3	53.2	34.9	-
2	I understand the basics of the new curriculum development	1.8	6.4	64.2	27.5	-
3	I know the characteristics of the new curriculum	1.8	4.6	65.1	27.5	0.9
4	I know the objectives for teaching Economics based on the new curriculum	3.7	8.3	60.6	27.5	-
5	I know the principles in the new curriculum development that are not suitable for teaching Economics	19.3	26.6	48.6	5.5	-
6	I know the basics for the new curriculum implementation	1.8	8.3	56	33	0.9
7	I know how to implement teaching based on the new curriculum	2.8	11.9	49.5	34.9	0.9
8	I know the implementation of the annual teaching program will not improve the processes of teaching Economics	16.5	20.2	51.4	11.9	-
9	I know how to implement the program based on the new curriculum	1.8	9.2	56	32.1	0.9
10	I know how to implement the new curriculum plan	0.9	9.2	51.4	36.7	1.8
11	I know the implementation of the new curriculum will not be effective for teaching Economics	14.7	19.3	56.9	9.2	-
12	I know the implementation of the new teaching method can help	4.6	7.3	63.3	23.9	0.9

	learners do self-assessments					
13	I know that the implementation of the new curriculum teaching techniques will not be suitable for teaching Economics	11.9	24.8	57.8	5.5	-
14	I know the implementation of the new curriculum will require new teaching resource materials	0.9	8.3	52.3	36.7	1.8
15	I know how to implement teaching tools for the new curriculum	-	1.8	67	30.3	0.9
16	I understand how to implement, evaluate and teach the new curriculum	-	3.7	62.4	33	0.9
	Overall mean value			3.04		

Table 3. Cross-tabulation of variables and level of willingness of teachers for implementing a new curriculum

Variable	High	Moderate	Low	Total
Gender				
Men	16	20	1	37
Female	36	36		72
Age				
25 and under	6	3		9
26 – 35	23	12		35
36 – 45	31	9		40
46 and above	14	11		25
Academic qualification				
Diploma	14	2		16
Bachelor	54	31		85
Post-graduate	6	2		8
Specialization at university				
Social science	74	34		108
Natural science		1		1
Teaching experience				
Less than 5 years	12	11		23
5 - 9 years	26	8		34
10 - 14 years	19	10		29
15 years and more	17	6		23

Grade			
Grade 2	4		4
Grade 3	31	11	42
Grade 4	19	8	27
Others	20	16	36
Status			
Officer	54	19	73
Honorary	6	6	12
Contractor	6	6	12
Devotee	6	2	8
Practitioner	2	2	4
Position			
Principal	3	2	5
Deputy principal	4	2	6
Teacher	54	30	84
Chief of student organization	13	1	14

Table 4. Phase of willingness of teachers in implementing the curriculum

Willingness levels	Highly disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Disagree a little (%)	Agree (%)	Very strongly agree (%)
1 I feel no need to engage in new curriculum development	-	5.5	25.7	65.1	3.7
2 I am willing to carry out the objective of teaching Economics based on the new curriculum	1.8	8.3	66.1	22.0	1.8
3 I am willing to implement the principles in the new curriculum development	-	0.9	63.3	35.8	-
4 I am willing to develop program analysis materials for teaching based on the new curriculum	1.8	2.8	65.1	29.4	0.9
5 I am willing to establish an annual teaching program based on the new curriculum	0.9	-	67.9	31.2	-
6 I do not think we need to	-	5.5	27.5	61.5	5.5

	develop a new teaching program based on the new curriculum					
7	I am willing to develop a new teaching design based on the new curriculum	0.9	1.8	57.8	38.5	0.9
8	I am willing to develop a new teaching approach based on the new curriculum	0.9	7.3	68.8	22	0.9
9	I am willing to develop new teaching methods	1.8	4.6	66.1	26.6	0.9
10	I am willing to carry out new teaching techniques	-	10.1	59.6	29.4	0.9
11	I am willing to use new teaching resource materials	-	5.5	58.7	33.9	1.8
12	I feel no need to use new teaching aids	-	-	24.8	73.4	1.8
13	I am willing to use new teaching assessments	-	2.8	65.1	31.2	0.9
14	I am willing to follow the course of the new curriculum at my school	-	-	-	24.8	75.2
Overall mean value				3.46		

The results of this study also found that even after three years of the new curriculum being introduced, many teachers in schools did not implement the objectives of the new curriculum as they had not yet received any training in the new curriculum. This was supported by Jasin (1987) and Raharjo (1997) who has stated that the objectives of the new curriculum will only be achieved if teachers have the knowledge needed to implement the changes to the curriculum and to understand the new concepts and implementation of the new curriculum. This was also supported by Derville (1979) whose report stated that action to do something depends on cognitive and affective actions formed through experience and learning. The above

statement indicates that willingness to do something depends on the ability or knowledge and experience of a person. Knowledge of the new curriculum should be considered. This finding was also supported by Clark & Yinger (1977) who has stated that whatever teachers do is influenced by their own personal ideas. Attitudes and understanding of teachers to a new innovation are important factors in determining the success of the implementation of a new curriculum. An adaptive study has also found that willingness of teachers is an important factor in determining the effectiveness of introducing a new curriculum. Without the willingness of teachers and their knowledge, implementation of new curriculum cannot be effective.

CONCLUSION

Descriptive statistics found that the level of knowledge of the teachers was at a moderate level with an overall mean value of 3.04. The level of willingness was also at a moderate level with the overall mean value at 3.46. Inference statistics found that there was a relationship between knowledge and willingness. Based on this study, it can be concluded that the success of implementation of a new curriculum is crucially dependent on the willingness of teachers.

REFERENCES

- Alsagoff, S.A. 1983. *Ilmu Pendidikan*. Kuala Lumpur: Heinmann Asia.
- Avalos, 1999. *At a Glance: What We Know about the Effects of Service-Learning on College Students, Faculty, Institutions & Communities*. New York: Mac Millan Publication.
- Clark, C.M. & Yinger, R.J. 1977. Research on Teacher Thinking. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 7 (14).
- Derville, L. 1979. *Penggunaan Psikologi dalam Pengajaran*. Kuala Lumpur.
- Halim, L. 1997. *A Critical Appraisal of Secondary Science Teacher Training Programmers in Malaysia with Anemphasis on Pedagogical Content Knowledge*. Ph.D. Thesis. Universiti of London.
- Halim, L. & Salamuddin, N. 2000. Orientasi Akademik: Pendekatan Alternatif dalam Program Pendidikan Guru Siswazah di Malaysia. *Akademika*: 56: 47-64.
- Hanafie, I. 2007. Plus Minus Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP) <http://pendidikan.net/mod.php?mod=publisher&op=viewarticle&cid=25&artid=14> [18 Februari 2009].
- Hurst, P. 1981. Some Issues in Improving the Quality of Education. *Comparative Education*, 17: 185-193.
- Jadi, H.H.M. 1993. Persepsi Mata Pelajaran Sejarah dalam Menangani Cabaran Wawasan 2020. *Proceedings of Seminar Pelaksanaan Sukatan Pelajaran Sekolah Menengah Rendah*, KBSM.
- Jasin, A. 1987. *Pembaharuan Kurikulum Sekolah Dasar*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Krejcie, R.V. & Morgan, D.W. 1970. Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30: 608.
- Mahfoz, N. 1983. *The Role Key Teachers in the Implementation of a New History Curriculum in Malaysia: A study of Perceptions*. Ph.D. Thesis. University of British Columbia.
- Malone & Howson. 1987. *Intermath Professional & Cognitive Development through Problem Solving with Technology*.
- Nordin, A.B. 1991. *Kurikulum: Perspektif dan Pelaksanaan*. Kuala Lumpur: Pustaka Antara.
- Raharjo, D. 1997. *Keluar dari Kemelut Pendidikan Nasional*. Jakarta: PT Internusa.

Rasdi, M. 2003. *Kesediaan Guru-guru Sekolah Rendah Melaksanakan Perubahan Bahasa Pengantar Mata Pelajaran Sains dan Matematika*. Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Ryan, K. & Cooper, J.M. 1998. *Those Who can Teach*, 8th Ed. New Jersey: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Shulman, L.S. 1987. *Knowledge and teaching: foundations of the new reform*. Harvard Educational Review, 57: 1-22.