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Abstract

Curriculum evaluation models are useful to ensure designs, processes, and products follow the ideology of Education. This study aims to develop the Al-Irsyad curriculum evaluation model to strengthen the educational ideology (EKADIOLOGI). This research used the ADDIE model. The analysis activity was to see the need for an evaluation model. The initial product was developed by confirming 11 experts, practitioners, and model users. The limited trial involved 159 respondents and 492 respondents in the expanded test phase. The data of instrument model test results, the model use guide, the feasibility of the model, and the assessment of the readability of the instrument were analyzed using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) to get an overview of the validity of the instrument and Cronbach Alpha for estimating its reliability. The conclusion of the study is EKADIOLOGI consists of four constructs encompassing design, process, output, and, outcome. The fit model is supported by empirical data with a Chi-square probability value of 0.08846 (> 0.05), RMSEA value of 0.049 (<0.08), an NFI value of 0.93 (> 0.9), and CFI of 0.98 (> 0.9). The EKADIOLOGI model instrument has good validity and guaranteed reliability so that the model can be recommended for curriculum evaluation in Al-Irsyad schools. The results of this study can be used as an instrument of curriculum evaluation in Al-Irsyad schools and a foundation for strengthening the ideology of Al-Irsyad Education.
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INTRODUCTION

Al-Irsyad was founded by As-Sheikh Ahmad bin Muhammad As-Sookaty Al-Khazrajiy Al-Ansariy (1874-1943) on September 6, 1914 (Baya’gub, 2016; Sudrajat, 2017; Suryana, 2017). This organization aims to purify aqidah (faith) from shirk, worship from heresy, and Islamic practices from deviant practices. The focus of the Al-Irsyad movement is in the fields of education, culture, and Islamic da’wah (Syarif, 2017).

The movement of this organization has always based its struggle on the ideology of Al-Irsyad. According to AD ART 2017-2022 (Al-Islamiyyah, 2018), Al-Irsyad’s ideology includes:

To understand the teachings of Islam from the Qur’an and Sunnah, as well as based on their rules. To have faith in the Islamic faith based on the authentic Qur’an and Sunnah, especially monotheism in Allah who is free from shirk, superstition, and khurafat. To worship according to the guidance of the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Messenger, also to clean from heresy. To have high morals and ethics of Islam and to stay away from customs, morals, and ethics that are contrary to Islam. To consider fellow Muslims as brothers and equals except for their knowledge and piety. To broaden and deepen knowledge for worldly and hereafter welfare blessed by Allah SWT. To improve personal and community life and worldly life as long as it is not forbidden by Islam with texts and to take advantage of all modern tools and technical, organizational, and administrative benefits for the individual and the ummah, morally and spiritually. To move and fight skillfully and dynamically with good organization, and coordination with other organizations with the spirit of ukhuwah Islamiyah and loyal friends, and to help each other in fighting for the ideals of Islam encompassing truth, freedom, justice, and virtue towards the pleasure of Allah.

Ideology for Al-Irsyad is important because it directs and guides all members of Al-Irsyad towards the ideals that have been set especially by the founder of Al-Irsyad. Ideology energizes and encourages continuous change. The strong ideology of Al-Irsyad causes this organization to expand throughout Indonesia.

The Central Leadership of Al-Irsyad is trying to strengthen ideology and produce Al-Irsyad cadres by implementing the Al-Irsyad curriculum nationally since 2015. However, until now the curriculum has not been evaluated. Whereas curriculum evaluation is important, according to Ansyar (2015, pp. 461-465) curriculum evaluation is to ensure whether the curriculum objectives have been achieved or not. Evaluation is also to ensure the material provided is the best material to achieve the objectives. This is also to ensure the instructional used by the teacher is following the curriculum objectives and according to the existing learning materials.

The absence of an evaluation of the Al-Irsyad curriculum is due to the absence of an evaluation instrument (Juwadi, 2017). The evaluation instrument has not been developed because the Al-Irsyad Central Leadership is still conducting the structuring and the mentoring for schools and other organizational activities (Abdullah, 2017).

Meanwhile, based on literature research, most of the studies related to Al-Irsyad focus on aspects of the thoughts of the founders of Al-Irsyad (Affandi, 1991), the movement of Al-Irsyad’s struggle (Mobini-Keshah, 2007). Not many discuss curriculum evaluation as a basis for ideological strengthening. Most of the curriculum evaluation research is outside Al-Irsyad, as was done by Mamduh and Hidayat (2019). Mamduh and Hidayat (2019) conducted a study with the title of Reproduction of Ideology in the 2006 and 2013 Curriculum of High School Sociology Textbooks. The results reveal that high school sociology textbooks have the context of achieving the MDGs program (2006 curriculum) and demographic bonus (2013 curriculum), so the dominant discourses are globalization, local wisdom, and multiculturalism with the dominant ideology of economic stability and community...
harmonization. The researcher also concludes that the high school sociology textbook is a state tool to shape attitudes so that students want to perpetuate the status quo of the rulers. Meanwhile, Gultom, Sumarno, and Madya (2014) develop a Reflective Evaluation Model of the English Education Curriculum in Developing National Character. This evaluation model can capture the value of the nation's character such as love for the homeland in learning English in universities. Although the ideological research above is not related to Al Irsyad, it can be used as a basis that ideology can be strengthened by the curriculum through the learning process and learning media such as textbooks.

The two ideological studies above are not related to the strengthening of religious ideology. Research related to religious ideology is research by Huda (2018) and Shodiq (2015). Huda (2018) conducts a study entitled Evaluation of the Al-Islam Kemuhammadiyahan curriculum and integrate-holistic-based Arabic at Muhammadiyah High School 1 of Muntilan. The research used the CIPP evaluation model with the result that the Al-Islam Kemuhammadiyahan and Arabic (Ismuba) curriculum developed by the TPK (Curriculum Development Team) is following the policy of Elementary and Secondary Education Council (Dikdasmen) of Central Leadership of Muhammadiyah. The Ismuba curriculum is a defining curriculum in schools combining classical and modern education so as to produce students who master general science, Islam, Muhammadiyah and Arabic. Regarding kemuhammadiyahan (science that studies everything related to the Muhammadiyah organization), the competencies emphasized are believing in the principles of Muhammadiyah struggle as Islamic teachings, believing in the values of Muhammadiyah regeneration as Islamic teachings, believing in the truth of Muhammadiyah's attitude towards transnational movements, and living up to the main ideas of progressive Islam as an attitude of da'wah.

Shodiq (2015) has once held a study with the title of transmitting the ideology of Ahlussunnah Wal Jama'ah. The research is conducted at al-Ma'arif High School of Kudus and Banat Islamic High School of Kudus. The study used the CIPP evaluation model with a qualitative approach. The results indicate that the implementation of learning in NU-style schools succeeded in passing down the typical Ahlussunnah Wal Jama'ah Islam of NU and also strengthen the NU-ness and fanaticism of its students.

Shodiq and Huda's research above are quite good, and the two research are certainly useful for the two religious organizations studied. For Al-Irsyad, of course, it needs its research and study, which is carried out at the Al-Irsyad school and is related to the Al-Irsyad curriculum.

Research related to the Al-Irsyad curriculum is Famela's research (2018). This study examines qualitatively the curriculum design of Al-Irsyad Al-Islamiyyah Purwokerto Middle School in the aspects of objectives, materials, processes, and evaluations. However, Famela's research does not use an ideological approach and is not in the context of developing a comprehensive evaluation model in strengthening ideology so that the urgency of the emergence of the Al-Irsyad curriculum in the context of strengthening Al-Irsyad ideology is not so obvious.

Based on the above considerations, this study aims to develop an evaluation model of the Al-Irsyad curriculum as a basis for strengthening the ideology of Al-Irsyad.

**METHOD**

This research is development research using the ADDIE model (analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation). The first is Analysis. At this stage, the activity carried out is preliminary research and literature review. The research was conducted at Al-Irsyad Middle School of Cirebon, Al-Irsyad Middle School of Surakarta and Al-Irsyad Middle School of Tulungagung. The purpose of this research is
to examine the problems of implementing the Al-Irsyad curriculum and its solutions. The form of activity was interviews with school principals (3 people), vice principals in the field of curriculum and religion (3 people), and Islamic Education teachers (6 people). Interviews were also conducted with the Chair of the central Al-Irsyad Education Council (1 person), the Coordinator for implementing the Central Al-Irsyad curriculum (1 person), the Central Al-Irsyad Curriculum development team (3 people) to confirm and validate the data from the source aspect so that the total Subjects in the initial study were 17 people. Collecting data employed interview guidelines. The data obtained were analyzed descriptively qualitatively. The next activity was a literature review related to curriculum theory, the theory of strengthening ideology, and Al-Irsyad's Educational Ideology. Researchers examined curriculum books, value education books, and books discussing the educational ideology of Al-Irsyad such as Surat Al Jawab, Al-Masa'il al-Thalath, Az-Zachratul Islamiyyah magazine, Muhammadiyah Bertanya Surkati Menjawab, Al-Wasiyyah Al-Amiriyah. Secondary books that have related topics include the Risalah Tauhid, Islam Wa Nashariyah Fil Ilmi Wal Madaniyyah written by Sheikh Muhammad Abduh, Criteria Between Sunnah and Bid'ah written by Hasbi Ash-Siddique, as well as other relevant studies.

Second is Design, the results of the literature review obtained an EKADIOLOGI model construct encompassing design, process, output, and outcome. The third is Development. At this stage, the researcher first prepares the basic form of the curriculum evaluation model. The result is a prototype EKADIOLOGI model. The next activity is compiling grids and instruments based on the prototype model and equipped with evaluation implementation procedures, scoring guidelines, and evaluation criteria as well as the evaluation report format. In the last activity at this stage, the researcher validated the instrument by involving colleagues, curriculum evaluation experts, education measurement and evaluation experts, linguists, Islamic religious education experts, and Al-Irsyad curriculum practitioners to get input and assessments related to the EKADIOLOGI model instrument. The final result that is expected at the development stage is a conceptual model of EKADIOLOGI. Fourth is implementation. At this stage, the conceptual model is implemented in a limited way at Al-Irsyad Al-Islamiyyah Middle School of Purwokerto, Al-Irsyad Al-Islamiyyah Middle School of Cirebon, and Al-Irsyad Junior High School of Surakarta to get a review and assessment of the feasibility of the model as well as an overview of the validity and reliability of the instrument. Extensive trials were conducted at Al-Irsyad Middle School of Banyuwangi, East Java, Al-Irsyad Al-Islamiyyah Middle School of Bondowoso, East Java, schools with the second category were Al-Irsyad Islamic Integrated Middle School of Karawang, West Java, Al-Irsyad Al-Islamiyyah Islamic Integrated Middle School of Bandung, West Java, and schools in the third category is Al-Irsyad Middle School of Pemalang, Central Java and Al-Irsyad Middle School of Tawangmangu Karanganyar, Central Java. The number of experimental subjects consisted of 55 teachers and 492 students. The evaluation stage was carried out by improving the items and model guides until a final model was obtained used for measurement in Al-Irsyad schools.

The data were analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively. Qualitative descriptive is used to analyze qualitative data in the form of literature review results, results of theoretical studies used to build constructs, and evaluation criteria. Qualitative descriptions were also used to analyze data from expert and practitioner input, user input data at the limited trial stage, and expanded trials to obtain valid instruments. Quantitative inferential, there are several statistical tests used in this study, encompassing:

Reliability Analysis Cronbach Alpha is used to analyze the reliability of the instrument. In this study, the analysis process
used the help of the SPSS version 20 program. The reliability of the dimensions used in the SPSS program can then be used to predict the reliability of variables by adding up all the reliability values of the dimensions and then dividing them by the number of dimensions. According to Nunnally (Ghozali, 2014, p. 261), the instrument is considered to be reliable if the alpha coefficient is \( \geq 0.60 \).

Aiken's formula and EFA technique were used to test the validity of the instrument. Aiken's formula was used to prove content validity, while the EFA technique was used to analyze construct validity. The criteria used in content validity is if the value of Aiken's \( V > V_{table} \). In this study, 11 experts gave the assessment and the number of categories was 4, so the \( V_{table} \) value was 0.79 (Aiken, 1985). The indicators used in the construct analysis are five; four indicators are used to determine whether the sample is suitable for further analysis and one indicator to determine whether the items that make up the instrument have good validity or not. Four indicators to see the feasibility of the sample are Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO MSA), Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, Anti Image Correlation, and Factor Loading. According to Santosa (2006, pp. 20-22), if the significance level of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is \( < 0.05 \) and the KMO MSA value is \( > 0.5 \), and the Anti Image Correlation \( > 0.5 \) then the sample is eligible for further analysis. Then one more indicator is factor loading. If each item has a loading factor greater than or equal to 0.5 then the items in the preparation of the instrument have good validity.

The confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) technique was used to prove the construct validity of the instrument. According to Ghozali (2014, pp. 29-35) and Latan (2013, p. 53) the model is said to be fit if it meets the following criteria: \( \chi^2/df < 2 \), \( P \) value \( \geq 0.05 \), \( \text{RMSEA} \leq 0.08 \), \( \text{NFI} \geq 0.9 \), \( \text{NNFI} \geq 0.9 \), \( \text{CFI} \geq 0.9 \), \( \text{IFI} \geq 0.9 \), \( \text{GFI} \geq 0.9 \), \( \text{AGFI} \geq 0.9 \).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Al-Irsyad's curriculum evaluation model in strengthening educational ideology includes evaluation components of design, process, attitude, and behavior. Design evaluation is used to analyze curriculum objectives, content, activities, and evaluation of learning. Process evaluation was conducted to analyze emotional support, classroom management, and instructional support. Evaluation of attitudes and behavior were used to analyze attitudes and behaviors related to the ideology of Al-Irsyad which includes sources of law, monotheism, worship, morals, equality, knowledge, modernity, and ukhuwah Islamiyyah.

The relationship between evaluation components can be illustrated in Figure 1.
Based on the analysis of the hypothetical ecological model constructs with SEM as a whole, the results show that the model has a good data fit (good fit). This can be seen in Table 1.

**Table 1. Evaluation of Loading Factor and Overall Criteria Measurement of Fit Model of EKADIOLOGI Hypothetical Model**

| Overall model fit test size | Cut score | Value of model | Modal Fit to Data |
|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------|-------------------|
| Probability of $\frac{\chi^2_{hitung}}{df}$ | ≥ 0.05 | 0.08846 | Good Fit |
| Goodness of fit index (GFI) | ≥ 0.9 | 0.72 | Fit |
| Adjusted Goodness of fit index (AGFI) | ≤ 0.9 | 0.64 | Good Fit |
| Root Mean Square Residual (RMR) | ≤ 0.5 | 0.033 | Good Fit |
| Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) | ≤ 0.5 | 0.069 | Good Fit |
| Root Mean Square Error Of Approximation (RMSEA) | ≤ 0.8 | 0.049 | Good Fit |
| Normed fit index (NFI) | ≥ 0.9 | 0.93 | Good Fit |
| Non normed fit index (NNFI) | ≥ 0.9 | 0.98 | Good Fit |
| Comparative fit index (CFI) | ≥ 0.9 | 0.98 | Good Fit |
| Incremental fit index (IFI) | ≥ 0.9 | 0.98 | Good Fit |

**Convergent Validity**

Convergent validity is used to test the significance of the indicator on the latent variable. The indicator criteria are said to be significant for the latent variable if: (1) the value of standardized loading factor (SLF) >0.5 and better if SLF is >0.7; (2) Construct Reliability (CR) >0.7 and for the development stage, the CR value>0.6 is still accepted; (3) Average Variance Extracted (AVE)is ≥0.5 (Ghozali, 2014, p. 43)
Based on Table 2, each indicator SLF is > 0.7 except for aspects of knowledge and attitudes inequality. CR > 0.7 and AVE > 0.5, so it can be concluded that the EKADIOLOGI model has a convergent validity guarantee (Ahmad & Afthanorhan, 2014; Khoshmaram, Zarafshani, Alibaygi, & Mirakzadeh, 2017; Silaparasetti, Rao, & Khan, 2017).

### Table 3. Discriminant Validity

| Variable of Latent | Design | Process | Attitude | Behavior |
|--------------------|--------|---------|----------|----------|
| Design             | $\sqrt{AVE_{Design}} = 0.87$ | Correlation between process and design of 0.84 | Correlation between attitude and design of 0.44 | Correlation between behavior and design of 0.38 |
| Process            | Correlation between design and process of 0.84 | $\sqrt{AVE_{Process}} = 0.83$ | Correlation between attitude and process of 0.55 | Correlation between behavior and attitude of 0.55 |
| Attitude           | Correlation between design and attitude of 0.44 | Correlation between process and attitude of 0.55 | $\sqrt{AVE_{Sikap}} = 0.75$ | Correlation between behavior and attitude of 0.55 |
| Behavior           | Correlation between design and behavior of 0.38 | Correlation between process and behavior of 0 | Correlation between attitude and behavior of 0 | $\sqrt{AVE_{Perilaku}} = 0.72$ |

Based on Table 3, the correlation value between variables < the square root of AVE, so it can be concluded that the ecological model has a guarantee of discriminant validity (Ghozali, 2014; Khoshmaram et al., 2017; Sarstedt & Cheah, 2019).
Initially, the instrument of the curriculum evaluation model consisted of 191 items encompassing 32 design evaluation items, 32 process evaluation items, 93 items of output/attitude evaluation, and 34 items of outcome/behavior evaluation. After going through expert validation tests, limited trials and expanded trials, the instrument of the curriculum evaluation model left 112 items consisting of 23 design evaluation items, 19 process evaluation items, 39 output or attitude evaluation items, and 31 outcome or behavior evaluation items, see table 4. The evaluation instrument of design, process, and outcome uses a Likert scale with 4 levels, encompassing strongly agree/very often, agree/often, disagree/sometimes, strongly disagree/never.

Al-Irsyad's curriculum evaluation model, in addition to containing model instruments, also contains guidelines for using the model. The model usage guide contains an overview of the evaluation components, evaluation steps, scoring guidelines, and evaluation report formats. The model guide has been tested related to evaluation procedures, scoring guidelines, evaluation results recommendations, layout, writing, and language use. The test results show that the guide to use the model gets very good ratings from experts and users. This is indicated by the average score of 3.45 and includes very good criteria. The instrument has also been tested from the aspects of clarity of instructions for filling, the accuracy of writing and spelling, ease of language use. The results are expert and user assessments that the instrument is considered very good.

| Table 4. Number of Valid Items for Al-Irsyad Curriculum Evaluation Model Instruments |
|---------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Dimension                     | Aspect            | Initial Product | Expert Validation | Limited Trial | Expanded Trial |
|---------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| **Design**                                | Aims             | 7                | 7                | 7               | 6               |
|                                             | Curriculum Content | 14               | 14               | 12              | 9               |
|                                             | Activity         | 5                | 5                | 5               | 5               |
|                                             | Evaluation       | 6                | 6                | 4               | 3               |
| **Total**                                  |                  | 32               | 32               | 28              | 23              |
| **Process**                                | Emotional Support | 9                | 9                | 9               | 5               |
|                                             | Class Management  | 14               | 14               | 13              | 10              |
|                                             | Instructional Support | 9            | 9                | 9               | 4               |
| **Total**                                  |                  | 32               | 32               | 31              | 19              |
| **Attitude**                               | Source of LAw    | 9                | 9                | 9               | 3               |
|                                             | Tauhid (Monotheism) | 15               | 15               | 15              | 9               |
|                                             | Worship          | 15               | 15               | 15              | 3               |
|                                             | Morals           | 12               | 12               | 12              | 12              |
| **Total**                                  |                  | 93               | 93               | 87              | 51              |
| **Behavior**                               | Source of Law    | 5                | 5                | 5               | 4               |
|                                             | Tauhid (Monotheism) | 4                | 4                | 4               | 3               |
|                                             | Worship          | 5                | 4                | 4               | 4               |
|                                             | Morals           | 4                | 4                | 4               | 4               |
|                                             | Equality         | 4                | 4                | 4               | 4               |
|                                             | Knowledge        | 4                | 4                | 4               | 4               |
|                                             | Modernity        | 4                | 4                | 4               | 4               |
| **Total**                                  |                  | 34               | 33               | 33              | 31              |
Discussion

Based on SEM analysis, the structure of the EKADIOLOGI model is as shown in Figure 2.

Instrument of Curriculum Design Evaluation

The design of the Al-Irsyad curriculum is the Al-Irsyad curriculum design in strengthening the ideology of education including four components; learning objectives, content, learning activities, and evaluation. The criteria for setting learning goals in this study are based on four (four) things, encompassing (1) validity; the content of the educational ideology of Al-Irsyad that you want to present, (2) clarity of goal formulation, (3) consistency of learning objectives with institutional goals and other curriculum components, (4) the feasibility of learning objectives can be achieved with the ability of students and existing learning resources.

![Figure 2. The Structure of EKADIOLOGI Model](attachment:figure2.png)

Chi-Square=245.58, df=216, P-value=0.0000, RMSEA=0.049

The above is in line with the opinion of Brady and Kennedy (2013) clarifying that learning objectives are set by taking into account several things, including; (1) Scope, encompassing all learning stimuli, (2) relevance, covering the relationship between goals and social situations and contexts, (3) validity, namely reflecting the value to be presented, (4) feasibility, encompassing goals that can be achieved with the students’ ability and the availability of existing learning resources, (5) compatible; consistency between instructional goals and institutional goals, (6) specific or unambiguous, and (7) interpretive or easy to understand. The criteria above are also almost the same as those revealed by Ansyar (2015), Schubert (1986), Ornstein and Hunkins (2013), but they use different terms. To state-specific and interpretative, Ansyar uses the term clarity, and to state validity, he uses the term defensibility. Regarding the compatibility between instructional goals and curriculum goals, subject goals, and institutional goals, Ansyar is more likely to use the term consistency. Sanjaya (2008) states that setting curriculum goals, focuses more on three criteria, encompassing (1) the suitability of the objectives of the subject with the goals of the institution, (2) the ease of the objectives to be understood, and (3) the formulation of objectives that are in accordance with the level of student development.

The criteria for determining content in this research are significance, utility, learnability, feasibility, integration, sequence, and sustainability. These criteria are partly following the criteria of Ornstein and Hunkins (2013) which is a full state that the criteria for determining curriculum content include seven things; (1) self-sufficiency means that content is determined by taking into account economic factors, encompassing economics in implementation, learning resources and generalization to the level of educational goals. The material studied can make students independent in developing their intellectual, emotional, and spiritual potential, as well as helping students become complete individuals; (2) significance means that significant content is content contributing to the development of concepts, principles, generalizations that are following the curriculum objectives. Significant in the formation of student attitudes is to facilitate students to live well in society; (3) validity, (4) interest, (5) utility, the material equips students in community activities (6) learnability, curriculum content following the environment and level of student development, (7) feasibility, adequate facilities and infrastructure to deliver the material.

Regarding the curriculum organization, the criteria in this study are following the opinion of Ansyar (2015). Ansyar clarifies that the criteria used in determining the curriculum
organization were integration, sequence, and sustainability. Integration, learning uses the principle of integration or linkages between subjects and integration between learning experiences in the classroom and outside the classroom (Ansyar, 2015; Ornstein & Hunkins, 2013). Sequence, placing content, learning activities, or learning experiences in a vertical arrangement that develops accumulatively and continuously, is getting wider and deeper. The sequence of content and learning activities avoids repetition/reduplication that does not develop to a deeper and wider level (Ansyar, 2015, p. 382). The model of the order of content and learning activities according to Smith (1957) includes from simple to complex, familiar to unknown, concrete to abstract, based on the order of use, and chronologically. Continuity means the development of understanding that is getting deeper and wider in line with the progress of student learning (Tanner & Tanner, 1975, p. 429). The continuity principle states that content, concepts, ideas requiring deepening and expansion need to be re-emerged (Ansyar, 2015; Ornstein & Hunkins, 2013).

The criteria for assessing learning activities in this study are (1) the suitability of learning activities in supporting learning objectives, (2) easy-to-understand learning strategies, (3) availability of time, facilities, and energy, (4) learning activities teach about thinking skills and the power of reasoning, (5) organize various educational activities such as reading, observing, doing, etc., (6) clarity in applying knowledge and skills outside of school situations.

The criteria for determining the evaluation in this study is (1) valid: the evaluation program is relevant to the curriculum objectives, (2) variation: covers all aspects of the curriculum (cognitive, affective, and psychomotor), (3) diagnostic: the strategy used not only evaluates results but also evaluates process, (4) flexibility: includes competence inside and outside the classroom, (5) clarity: refers to clear criteria, (6) continuous: evaluation is part of the teaching and learning process.

The above criteria are following the opinion of Sanjaya (2008, p. 347), which states that the evaluation criteria for the assessment program are the relevance of the evaluation program to the curriculum objectives, the evaluation program encompassing formative and summative evaluations. The planned evaluation program is easy to read and understand and includes all aspects of learning (cognitive, affective, and psychomotor). The evaluation principle according to William Glaser (Brady & Kennedy, 2013) is to develop student potential, to facilitate student learning, to refer to clear criteria, to cover all aspects of the curriculum (cognitive, affective, and psychomotor), and to use various strategies. According to Harris, Hobart, and Lundberg well are (1) clarity of steps to apply knowledge and skills outside of school situations, (2) availability of time, facilities, adequate manpower, (3) optimizing students to learn content, (4) developing thinking skills and reasoning power, (5) stimulating students to understand themselves as individuals and members of society, (6) fostering students to open up to new experiences and accept differences, (7) facilitating learning and encouraging students to continue learning, (8) serving student needs, (9) broadening student interest, (10) fostering cognitive, affective, psychomotor, social and spiritual development aspects. (Taba, 1962, p. 307) states that for effective learning activities to achieve learning objectives, learning activities must provide a variety of learning models such as reading, observing, etc. There are also various educational activities, such as discussions, watching videos, etc.
evaluation criteria include validity covering knowledge and skill competencies, fairness, namely processes, and evaluation methods that are fair to all groups. According to Brady and Kennedy (2013), evaluation criteria are varied, namely providing opportunities for students to show what they have mastered in class, sustainable which is an integral part of the teaching and learning process, valid in accessing the goals to be achieved by the curriculum, involving students, interpreting same evaluation results.

Instrument for Evaluation of Ideological Strengthening Process

The indicators used in the assessment of the ideological strengthening process in this study are a combination of strategies for internalizing ideological values in the interaction process of teachers and students in the classroom encompassing the inculcation method, exemplary, value facilitation, development of academic and social skills in the domains of social support, instructional and classroom management.

Indicators of the quality of teacher and student interaction are following the opinion of Hamre and Pianta (2005), Hamre and Pianta (2006), Mashburn et al. (2008), Pianta, La Paro, and Hamre (2008), Pianta, Mashburn, Downer, Hamre, and Justice (2008), Jerome, Hamre, and Pianta (2009), Pianta, Hamre, and Allen (2012) which reveals that the quality of the teacher-student interaction process is determined by several aspects; emotional support, classroom organization, and instructional support. Emotional support includes a positive climate, teacher response, and teacher respect for students' perspectives. Meanwhile, classroom organization is determined by the management of student behavior, learning products, and teaching and learning formats, while instructional support includes the concept of instructional development, feedback quality, and language use.

Meanwhile, related to the cultivation of values, this research uses the theory of Kirschenbaum (1995) as the foundation in developing the instrument. Kirschenbaum states that a comprehensive method of inculcating values includes ideological values encompassing (1) the method of inculcating values (inculcation) with the following characteristics: communicating beliefs about dissertation reasons, treating others fairly, respecting others' opinions, and creating social and emotional experiences of desired values, setting rules, giving rewards, giving consequences with reasons, maintaining good communication with those who disagree, giving freedom for different behavior, providing direction for change for different parties, (2) The exemplary method, teachers and parents must have assertive skills and listening skills. Assertive skills are the ability to express opinions openly without hurting others' feelings. Listening skills are the ability to listen with understanding and critically. Both of these skills are often done by teachers so that students take them as role models. Another thing that can be done in the context of value education with the exemplary method is to make the Prophet an example in their life. (3) Value Facilitation Method. This method provides opportunities for a student to express, implement, practice, and demonstrate opinions. (4) The method of developing academic and social skills. Academic and social skills are needed so the students practice the values adopted and they behave constructively. These skills are critical thinking, creative thinking, clear communicating, listening, acting assertively, and finding conflict resolution.

Evaluation Instrument of Ideological Attitudes and Behavior

The indicators for constructing attitudes and views reflecting Al-Irsyad's ideology are as follows; (1) Sources of Law: based on the Qur'an and Sunnah by avoiding fanaticism and blind taqlid, (2) Aqidah (Faith): uniting Allah by denying superstition, (3) Worship: based on the Qur'an and Sunnah in Worship, to believe that the practice of heresy will be rejected (4) Akhlak (Morals): not to speak dirty, lie, arrogant, prejudice, and not to talk about the disgrace of others, also to be sincere in doing good, (5) Equality: to reject superstitious views, too considers fellow Muslims as equals, (6) Science:
to believe that reason as a source of knowledge can prove the existence of Allah and the Qur'an comes from Allah (Allah's kalam), to believe that the problems of the world and the hereafter will be obtained by science, (7) Modernity: to believe that Islam allows the use of western technology, (8) Ukhuwah Islamiah: to feel brothers and one body.

This attitude indicator is following Surkati's books such as Adz dzakirah Al Islamiyyah, Surah Al Jawab, Al wasiyyah Al amiriyyah, and the books of the previous generation that influenced his thinking, such as the book of monotheism by Muhammad At Tamimi, Risalah Tauhid, Al Islam Wa Nashraniyyah Fil Ilmi Wal Madaniyyah by Muhammad Abdhu, and books by Surkati's student; Hasbi Ash shiddieqy such as Criteria for Bid'ah and Sunnah, and books by Al-Irsyad historians such as Deliar Noer, Bisri Affandi, and Pijper.

Meanwhile, behavioral constructs reflecting Al-Irsyad's ideology are; (1) Sources of Law: reading, studying, practicing the Qur'an and Sunnah, (2) Aqidah (Faith): avoiding shirk, (3) Worship: not to practice heresy; (4) Akhlak (Morals): not to speak dirty, lie, be arrogant, and not to talk about the disgrace of others, but to be sincere in charity, (5) Equality: to treat fellow Muslims fairly; (6) Knowledge: to study science for the benefit of the world and the hereafter, (7) Modernity: to utilize technology that does not conflict with Islam; (8) Ukhuwah Islamiyyah: to establish friendship, to serve (ri'ayah), and to help each other. These behavioral indicators are following the explanation of the book of Mabadi Al-Irsyad published by the Central Leadership Council of Al-Irsyad Al Islamiyyah and according to the primary sources previously mentioned.

**Instrument readability, effectiveness, and efficiency of a model usage guide**

The criteria for instrument readability in this study are following the opinion of Khuriyah, Zamroni, and Sumarno (2016) which clarifies that the readability of the instrument can be seen from the aspect of language use, the accuracy of writing, punctuation, and use of terms. Readability is a measure of whether the instrument is difficult, easy, or difficult to understand (Widyantingsih & Zuchdi, 2015). The accuracy of language, punctuation, and use of terms will affect respondents in filling out the instrument. Instruments containing many errors in word selection, and punctuation will cause respondents to be reluctant to participate in filling out the instrument (Periantalo, 2015).

Based on the measurement results and the established criteria, the readability assessment of the EKADIOLOGI model instrument is categorized as very good, meaning that it is very easy to understand. Instruments that are easy to understand will encourage respondents to fill in the instrument and avoid ambiguous answers. The EKADIOLOGI model is considered very good because it is practical as research Abi Hamid (2016) and also efficient from the aspect of time, cost, and energy according to the criteria set by Khuriyah et al. (2016), Wahyuningsih and Budiyono (2014). Models that are high in cost and require a lot of time, also effort will make the model easy to dump. With the guarantee of the model's effectiveness, the EKADIOLOGI model in carrying out the evaluation does not require a lot of energy and time, and the cost is low.

**CONCLUSION**

This research produces an EKADIOLOGI model that can be used to evaluate the design, process, output, and outcome. The EKADIOLOGI model consists of guides and instruments. The model guide in the trial receives very good reviews from experts and users. This is indicated by the average score of 3.45 and after being consulted the conversion table includes very good criteria. The model instrument has been through empirical testing so that a valid and reliable instrument is obtained and a fit EKADIOLOGI model is obtained with a Chi-square probability value of 0.08846 (>0.05), and RMSEA value of 0.049 (<0.08), an NFI value of 0.93 (≥0.9), CFI of 0.98 (≥0.9), and IFI of 0.98 (≥0.9).

In the empirical test, the effectiveness of the EKADIOLOGI model receives a very good
assessment from experts and users. This is indicated by the mean value of 3.58 and after consulting with the conversion table that has been set, the effectiveness of the model including the criteria is very good. The results of the evaluation of the Al-Irsyad curriculum using the EKADIOLOGI model at the Al-Irsyad School indicate that from the dimensions of the curriculum design the user gave an assessment with an average score of 3.41, and after consulting the conversion table it includes very good criteria. The process dimension is assessed with a mean score of 3.01, the output dimension is assessed with an average score of 4.09, and the outcome dimension is assessed with an average score of 2.93, and after consulting the conversion table, it includes good criteria. The results of this study can be used as material for evaluation and ideological strengthening programs in Al-Irsyad schools nationally.
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