

The Evaluation of Learning Objectives in Indonesian Language Lesson Plans in the 2013 Curriculum for Class X Senior High School Level

Ristiyani,

 Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia
ristiyani@sudents.unnes.ac.id

Fathur Rokhman

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Rustono

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Rahayu Pristiwati

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Abstract—The purpose of this research is to describe the suitability of learning objectives with Basic Competencies (KDs) and indicators and to explain the adequacy of the criteria for learning objectives. Based on the results of data analysis on three lesson plans for Indonesian language in the 2013 curriculum for Senior High School class X in SMA 2 Kudus, the lesson plans still do not fulfill the three elements namely the compatibility of KD with learning objectives, the suitability of indicators with learning objectives and the adequacy of the audience, behavior, conditions, and the degree criteria that have been stated in the Minister of Education and Culture Regulation No. 22 of 2016. Regarding the compatibility of KDs with learning objectives, the KDs 3.3. and 4.3 in the Lesson Plans are not compatible with the learning objectives while the KDs 3.4 and 4.4 are compatible with the learning objectives. The KD 3.5 and 4.5 in the Lesson Plans are also compatible with the learning objectives. The suitability of indicators with learning objectives in the KDs 3.3 and 4.3 has not been met. The KDs 3.4 and 4.4 in the Lesson Plans also do not meet the indicators with learning objectives. On the third element, the criteria for audience, behavior, condition, and degree, the three Lesson Plans contain only three elements (audience, behavior, and condition) while the degree criteria is not included. The recommendation for teachers based on the results of the evaluation is that they should include the complete four elements of learning objectives (audience, behavior, condition, and degree) in their lesson plans. This needs to be done so that their learning plan will be prepared as best as possible with the hope that the learning process can be successful in accordance with the learning objectives.

Keywords: Learning Objectives, Lesson Plans

I. INTRODUCTION

Education policy in Indonesia has undergone numerous changes in accordance with the policy development. The changes made by the government are expected to advance human resources in Indonesia in order to encourage the nation's progress in the global era. One way to promote learning competence in the world of education can be done by making a good and effective Lesson Plan

(RPP). In essence, lesson plans aim to design student learning experiences to achieve the expected learning objectives. According to Mulyana (2012: 1), the importance of making lesson plans is that they can help teachers think thoroughly about lessons before they are being taught, so that learning difficulties can be predicted and solutions can be found in advance. With lesson plans, Teachers can organize facilities, equipment, teaching aids, time and content in order to achieve learning goals as effectively possible and linking objectives and procedures to the overall objectives of the subject to be taught.

Using lesson plans according to education experts is quite effective in improving the quality of student's competence. According to Muslich (2008: 45), Lesson plan contains a learning unit that will be applied by teachers in the classroom. Based on this lesson plan, a teacher is expected to be able to implement programmed learning. A lesson plan must have a high degree of applicability. Without careful planning, learning objectives will be difficult to achieve optimally. Therefore, the ability to make lesson plans is a first step that teachers and prospective teachers must have and an estuary of all theoretical knowledge, basic skills, and a deep understanding of learning objects and learning situations. The purpose of this study is to describe the learning objectives in the Lesson Plans for Indonesian Language subject in the 2013 curriculum for Senior High School, grade X class.

The research will examine the learning objectives in the lesson plans for Indonesian language subject in the 2013 curriculum for Senior High school, grade X based on the literature review of Utami (2010), Wikaningsih et al. (2015), Aruan and Lubis (2017), and Setyawanto et al. (2018).

According to Utami (2010), in the field implementation, there are several opinions, first: indicators and learning objectives refer to the same thing, second: there is something that distinguishes them by simply adding the word "students can", third: there are those who show the learning process by writing a learning model or strategy to be used. The

similarity between competency indicators and learning objectives is to show the learning outcomes to be achieved in a lesson. The expected learning outcomes apply to all students. But the determination of someone as having competence is done individually. The difference is that there is a description of the learning process that is deliberately planned by the teacher for the purpose of learning. The learning process applies to all students classically. Since the learning objectives include learning process and outcomes, the learning objectives should be broader than the competency attainment indicators. A similar opinion was expressed by Wikaningsih et al. (2015) who stated that the Lesson Plans compiled by their respondents contained a lot of inconsistencies with the contents of the Ministerial Regulation of National Education Number 41 of 2007 regarding the components of the formulation of learning objectives; the presentation of teaching materials and their organization; the clarity and detail of learning scenarios; the suitability of the technique or learning methods, and the completeness of the assessment instrument. The errors contained in the lesson plans compiled by the respondents related to the appropriate components. The respondents had a positive attitude towards the preparation of lesson plans so that guidance and encouragement were needed to improve their abilities. The factors causing them to make mistakes in preparing the lesson plans were their lack of ability in the field of knowledge (cognitive) and in the formulation of lesson plans theory according to the demands of the Ministerial Regulation of National Education Number 41 of 2007.

The opinion above is strengthened by Aruan and Lubis (2017) in their research which state that the lesson plan components made by the Indonesian language teachers at SMA Negeri 7 Medan were based on the completeness of the components and the systematic preparation of the lesson plan components for class X. the lesson plans scored 80.87 and therefore belonged to the appropriate category but its preparation of the lesson plans had not been based on the Regulation of the Ministry of Education and Culture No. 22 of 2016 but the Regulation of the Ministry of Education and Culture No. 103 of 2014. The lesson plans of the class XI teachers scored 90.90 and therefore belonged in the very suitable category while the lesson plans of the class XII teachers scored (98.86) and therefore belonged to the very suitable category but both preparations of lesson plans were still based on the Regulation of the Ministry of Education and Culture No. 103 of 2014. Based on the basic competency analysis stated in the lesson plan for teachers, it can be concluded that the lesson plans for class X were already based on the 2013 Revised-Curriculum while the lesson plans for class XI and XII were still based on the 2013 curriculum. Class X was in the sufficient category (64.44%) according to the 2013 Revised Curriculum. The lesson plans for class XI (78.2%) and class XII (84.51%) were in the

appropriate category according to the 2013 curriculum.

Other research which supports the statement above is Setyawanto et al. (2018) which posits that the formulation of lesson plans indicators used by Indonesian language teachers at Junior High Schools in Malang City had not yet covered clarity and completeness aspects of the indicator coverage. The formulation of indicators were still lacking in detail and some of the lesson plans' indicators used the exact sentences from the basic competencies, allowing for multiple interpretations and did not describe stages in the competency achievement. The development planning for lesson plan materials used by the Indonesian Junior High School teachers in Malang had referred to learning indicators and could be used to achieve basic competencies. Almost all lesson plans were only in the form of inclusion of subject matter without attaching any explanation of the learning material presented, so that the theoretical truth/ accuracy of the material could not be known. Based on some of the literature reviews above, it can be concluded that the learning objectives in the lesson plans compiled by the teachers, on average, do not match the regulations set by the government, ranging from the aspect of operational verbs to the completeness element of Audience, Behavior, Condition, and Degree.

Learning objectives are a part of curricular goals and can be defined as the abilities that students must have after they learn certain materials in certain subjects in one meeting. Since only teachers understand the real conditions in the field, including the characteristics of students who will carry out learning in a school or madrasah, describing the learning objectives is the task of the teachers (Hidayat, 2013: 53).

After mapping the theme to sub-themes or topics and determining the focus of learning, the next activity is to determine or formulate general and specific learning objectives that must be achieved at the end of each lesson. Goals are broad formulations of the desired educational outcomes. They contain objectives that serve as learning targets and provide a pillar for providing learning experiences (Hamalik, 2010: 76). Objectives are the basis for measuring learning outcomes and also for determining lesson content and teaching methods (Hamalik, 2010: 77).

In formulating learning objectives, we should take a formulation of objectives and determine specific student behavior that refers to these goals. Student's specific behavior must be observed by the teacher, for example reading orally, writing essays, etc. To operationalize goals, a behavior must be defined where the teacher can observe and determine student progress with respect to these goals (Hamalik, 2010: 77). A learning objective should meet the following criteria: (1) it provides a situation or condition for learning, for example: in a role playing situation; (2) it has a purpose of defining student

behavior in a measurable and observable form; and (3) it has a goal of stating the minimum level of desired behavior. For example, on a map of the Java Island, students can color and label at least three main mountains (Hamalik, 2010: 77).

In formulating these objectives, two things must be considered: (1) the formulation of objectives should be based on learning activities derived from themes that have been mapped and selected by students; (2) the formulation of objectives also considers the formulation of Core Competencies (KI) and Basic Competencies (KD). In the 2013 Curriculum Implementation Guidelines, it is also stated that the formulation of learning objectives refers to Basic Competencies and teacher's consideration of students' initial knowledge as well as their interests and motivations (Sundayana, 2014: 41).

Based on Regulation No. 20 of 2003, after the indicators are formulated, the next stage is to formulate specific learning objectives (which can be measured and observed), pay attention to the aspects that must be included in the formulation of learning objectives as suggested by Dick and Raiser (1996) in (Sundayana, 2014: 43), namely: (1) learning objectives begin with the formulation of conditions, namely the learning situation in which teacher will train students to practice the abilities contained in the indicators; (2) after the condition formulation, the audience aspect or the subject who will study, namely students, will follow; (3) after the subject or student formulation, the aspects of ability or behavior stated in the indicators will follow; and (4) concluding the formulation of learning objectives with benchmarks/ standards/ levels of learning success that are in line with the abilities that are the focus in the formulation of goals, whether related to cognitive, affective, or psychomotor aspects.

Based on the Regulation of the Ministry of Education and Culture No. 22 of 2016, the lesson plan is a face-to-face learning activity plan for one or more meetings. Lesson plan is developed from the syllabus to direct students' learning activities in an effort to achieve Basic Competence (KD). Every educator in an educational unit is obliged to prepare a complete and systematic lesson plan so that the learning process will be interactive, inspirational, fun, challenging and efficient, motivating students to actively participate, and providing sufficient space for students' initiative, creativity, and independence according to their talents, interests, and physical and psychological development. Lesson plan is prepared based on Basic Competence or sub-themes which are held at one or more class meetings.

The lesson plan components consist of a) school identity namely the name of the educational unit; b) the identity of the subject or theme/ sub-theme; c) Class/ semester; d) Subject matter; e) Time allocation, determined according to the need for achieving Basic Competence and learning loads by considering the number of lessons available in the

syllabus and Basic Competence which must be achieved; f) The learning objectives, formulated based on Basic Competence, using operational verbs that can be observed and measured, which include attitudes, knowledge, and skills; g) Basic competencies and indicators of competency achievement; h) Learning materials which contain facts, concepts, principles, and relevant procedures, and are written in the form of items in accordance with the formulation of competency achievement indicators; i) Learning methods, used by educators to create a learning atmosphere and learning process so that students achieve basic competency that is adjusted to the characteristics of students and the basic competencies to be achieved; j) Instructional media, in the form of learning aids to help deliver subject matter; k) Learning resources, can be in the form of books, print and electronic media, natural surroundings, or other relevant learning sources; l) Learning steps, carried out through preliminary, core and closing stages; and m) the assessment of learning outcomes.

II. METHODS

This research design is classified as a qualitative research type. According to Moleong (2005: 4), qualitative research is a research procedure that produces descriptive data in the form of written or spoken words from people and observable behavior. Sources of data in this study were three Lesson Plans for class X in SMA (Senior High School) 2 Kudus. The research instrument is a human instrument, where the researcher determines the focus of the research, selects informants as data sources, performs data collection, assesses data quality, analyzes data, interprets data, draws conclusions on her findings, and finally the researcher becomes the reporter of the research results. The analysis steps used in this study are as follows. The data analysis process in this study was in the form of document study: the researcher collected the lesson plans used by Indonesian language teachers in class X in SMA 2 Kudus.

After being collected, the lesson plans are analyzed according to the components observed in the Rubric for the Preparation of Lesson Plan using a check list. In this study, the rubric was not used to assess but to guide the data analysis process. The analysis in the Lesson Plan Preparation Guide Rubric is marked with (√) when the aspects contained in the Lesson Plans under study match the criteria in the Lesson Plan Compilation Guide Rubric, but if not then it is marked with (X). The focus of this research is only learning objectives. The next step is the verbal analysis of the results of the check list of the suitability of the learning objectives theory in the lesson plans with the data source. The validity of the data carried out in this study were confirmed by reading and reviewing all data sources repeatedly so that it becomes a form of extended observation.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The following results will be presented and discussed.

3.1. Results

The data sources of the class X Lesson Plans include KD 3.3 exposition text identification material, KD 3.4 exposition text language elements material and KD 3.5 anecdotal text material. Based on the analysis of the data obtained from the three Lesson Plans for Indonesian Language subject for class X at SMA 2 Kudus, the data obtained from the research results are as follows. The formulation of learning objectives in the Lesson Plans do not yet include the criteria in the Regulation of the Ministry of Education and Culture No. 22 of 2016 which include: (1) the imperative that learning objectives must provide a situation or condition for learning; (2) the purpose of defining student behavior in a measurable and observable form; and (3) the purpose of determining the minimum level of desired behavior. The aspects of learning objectives which include Audience, Behavior, Condition, and Degree have not also been completely fulfilled.

In the three Lesson Plans, learning objectives have not all been started with the formulation of conditions, namely the learning situation in which the teacher would train students to practice the abilities contained in the indicators. Audience aspects or subjects to be studied have been mentioned. The aspects of ability or behavior that are stated in the indicators could not be found in each Lesson Plan. On the aspect of standard level of learning success that is in line with the abilities that are the focus in the formulation of objectives, whether it is related to cognitive, affective, or psychomotor aspects, not all Lesson Plans included it.

In addition to incomplete aspects of learning objectives, there is a mismatch of learning indicators with learning objectives. This is because the operational word is not the same. In addition to the mismatch of indicators with learning objectives, there is one lesson plan that does not match between KDs and objectives.

3.2. Discussion

The following discussion will focus on three things: the compatibility of KDs with learning objectives, the suitability of indicators with learning objectives, and the adequacy of audience criteria, behavior, conditions, and degree according to the Regulation of the Ministry of Education and Culture No. 22 of 2016. The first analysis will relate to the suitability of KD with learning objectives. Based on the results of the analysis, there is one lesson plan that does not match the KD with the learning objectives, namely KD 3.3. exposition text identification material. The KD 3.3. mentions identifying (problems, arguments, knowledge, and recommendations) the exposition text that is heard and/ or read, but the

objective mentions by applying the contextual teaching learning model, students can work independently and honestly, determine the structure, content of the exposition text, determine the characteristics of the language, and to be able to make the exposition text in accordance with the context that exists in everyday life.

Based on the research results, it can be seen that the learning objectives of each lesson plan consist of only one item which covers all aspects of Basic Competency. The KDs 3.3 and 3.4 show discrepancies with the learning objectives. In the Basic Competencies, the competencies in identifying problems, argumentation, knowledge and recommendations are listed. However, the learning objectives do not contain these competencies.

In the KDs 3.4 and 4.4, the Basic Competencies and the learning objectives are compatible. The KD contains the competence to analyze language elements and structures whereas in the objectives there are also the same competencies, namely students are able to analyze the elements and linguistic structures of the exposition text. In the aspect of skills, KD 4.4 is compatible with the learning objective. In KDs 3.5 and 4.5, the compatibility between the KDs and learning objectives are found. In the Basic Competence, there is the competence to criticize anecdotal texts from implied meanings. The competence is also stated in the learning objectives, namely evaluating anecdotal texts. The only difference is the choice of words, namely criticism and evaluation.

The second analysis includes the suitability of indicators with learning objectives. The learning objectives contained in the Lesson Plans 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5 each have one indicator. This is not in accordance with the Regulation of the Ministry of Education and Culture No. 22 which states that each indicator must be lowered in one goal. This means that from the three lesson plans analyzed, all of the indicators and learning objectives are not compatible. The indicators for KD 3.3 and 3.4 consist of 7 indicators, 4 indicators for 3.3 and 3 indicators for 3.4. The KDs 3.4 and 4.4 consist of 5 indicators, 3 indicators on KD 3.4 and 2 indicators on KD 4.4. In the KDs 3.5 and 4.5 there are 5 indicators consisting of 2 indicators for KD 3.5 and 3 indicators for KD 4.5.

When analyzed more deeply, there are discrepancies in KD 3.5 and 4.5 where students are able to compare anecdotal texts with humorous texts while the learning objectives do not contain these competencies. The discrepancy also appears in indicators 3.5 and 4.5 which contain student competencies being able to conclude anecdotal texts but in the learning objectives do not contain these competencies.

Based on the Regulation No. 20 of 2003, the aspects that must be included in the formulation of learning objectives as suggested by Dick and Raiser (1996) in (Sundayana, 2014: 43), are: (1) learning

objectives begin with the formulation of conditions, namely a learning situation in which the teacher will train students to practice the abilities contained in the indicators; (2) after the condition formulation, the audience aspect or the subject who will study, namely students, will follow; (3) after the subject or student formulation, the aspects of ability or behavior stated in the indicators will follow; and (4) lastly to conclude the formulation of learning objectives with benchmarks/ standards/ levels of learning success that are in line with the abilities that are the focus in the formulation of goals, whether related to cognitive, affective, or psychomotor aspects.

Based on the results of data analysis, the learning objectives of KDs 3.3. and 4.3 in the lesson plans do not contain the degree criteria. Meanwhile, the audience criteria seem to use the word students. In the Condition criteria, KDs 3.3. and 4.3 contain the application of the contextual learning model (contextual teaching learning). If further analyzed, the teacher should be able to choose the right conditions, such as by reading the exposition text. This will be clearer and more precise. The degree criteria appeared not to be included in the objective formulation. The Learning Objectives in KD 3.4 and 4.4 contain only three criteria, namely Audience, Behavior, and Condition. The degree criteria has not been included.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of data analysis on the three lesson plans for Indonesian language subject in the 2013 curriculum for class X in SMA 2 Kudus, the lesson plans still do not fulfill the three elements, namely, the compatibility of KDs with learning objectives, the suitability of indicators with learning objectives, and the adequacy of audience, behavior, conditions, and the degree criteria that has been stated in the Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture No. 22 of 2016. Regarding the element of compatibility between KD with learning objectives in the lesson plans, KDs 3.3. and 4.3 are not compatible, while KDs 3.4 and 4.4 are compatible with the learning objectives. The KDs 3.5 and 4.5 have been compatible with their learning objectives. The element of suitability of indicators with learning objectives in the KDs 3.3 and 4.3 has not been met. The KDs 3.4 and 4.4 also do not meet the indicators with the learning objectives. On the third element, the criteria for audience, behavior, condition, and degree, the three lesson plans only contain three elements,

namely audience, behavior, and condition, while the degree criteria is not listed. The recommendation for teachers based on the evaluation result in this research is that they should include the complete four elements of learning objectives namely audience, behavior, condition, and degree in their lesson plans. This needs to be done so that their learning plans will be prepared as best as possible with the hope that the learning process can be successfully performed in accordance with the learning objectives.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aruan, Mei Anggriani dan Fitriani Lubis. (2017). Analisis Rencana Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran (RPP) Guru Bahasa Indonesia SMA Negeri 7 Medan Tahun Pembelajaran 2016/2017. *Jurnal Basastra*. Volume 1 nomor 14.
- [2] Hamalik, Oemar. (2006). *Proses Belajar Mengajar*. Jakarta: PT. Bumi Aksara.
- [3] Moleong, L. (2005). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: Rosdakarya.
- [4] Mulyana, A. (2012). Inovasi Pendidikan Diawali dari Inovasi Pengembangan Rencana Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran (RPP).(online) (<http://ainamulyana.blogspot.com/2012/02/inovasi-pendidikan-dapat-diawali-dari.html>) , diakses diakses 24 Mei 2012.
- [5] Mulyasa, E. (2007). *Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan: Suatu Panduan Praktis*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- [6] Mulyasa, E. (2008). *Implementasi Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan: Kemandirian Guru dan Kepala Sekolah*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- [7] Muslich, M. (2008). *Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan: Dasar Pemahaman dan Pengembangan*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- [8] Setyawanto, Agung, dkk. (2018). Rencana Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran (RPP) Guru Bahasa Indonesia Tingkat SMP Di Kota Malang. *Jurnal Basastra*. Volume 1 nomor 8.
- [9] Utami, Tri Hapsari. (2010). Indikator dan Tujuan Pembelajaran dalam Rencana Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran. *Jurnal Kredo*. Volume 2 nomor 12.
- [10] Wikaningsih, dkk. (2015). Analisis Rencana Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran (RPP) Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Indonesia (Studi Terhadap RPP yang Disusun Guru Bahasa Indonesia Tingkat SMP Di Kota Cimahi). *Jurnal Diglosia*. Volume 2 nomor 4