IJMR E-ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEACH

ANALYSIS OF TEACHER WEAKNESSES IN PREPARING LEARNING OBJECTIVES IN THE LEARNING IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR ELEMENTARY MADRASAH LEVEL

Siti Salwa Yusyifa[1], Salamah[2]
[1] Postgraduate UIN Antasari Banjarmasin, Indonesia
[2] Postgraduate UIN Antasari Banjarmasin, Indonesia
Email : ssy18042003@gmail.com[1] salamah@uin-antasari.ac.id[2]

Received: Mei 2025	Accepted: Mei 2025	Published: Juni 2025

Abstract :

Formulation of learning objectives is a crucial component in the Learning Implementation Plan (RPP), which determines the direction, process, and results of teaching and learning activities. This study aims to analyze the weaknesses of Madrasah Ibtidaiyah (MI) teachers in formulating learning objectives, especially in accordance with the ABCD model (Audience, Behavior, Condition, Degree). The research method used is a descriptive qualitative approach with documentation techniques on a number of RPPs and informal interviews for data triangulation. The results of the study indicate that most teachers have not been able to formulate complete and measurable learning objectives. The Condition and Degree components are often ignored, so that the objectives become non-specific and difficult to evaluate. In addition, the dominance of memorization-based learning, limitations in methods and media, and inconsistencies between objectives, activities, and assessments strengthen the indication of weak instructional planning. The main factors causing this weakness are low understanding of the principles of formulating learning objectives, minimal professional training, and limited institutional support. These findings recommend the need for intensive training and ongoing mentoring for teachers to improve their competence in formulating effective learning objectives, in line with the principles of constructive alignment, and relevant to the 2013 Curriculum and the Independent Curriculum.

Keywords : *Learning Objectives, Lesson Plans, MI Teachers*

INTRODUCTION

Formulation of learning objectives is a crucial component in the Learning Implementation Plan (RPP) which functions as a guide for teachers in designing and implementing the learning process. However, in practice, there are still many weaknesses in the formulation of learning objectives by teachers in elementary education units. These weaknesses include inconsistencies with effective learning objective formulation models, such as the ABCD model (Audience, Behavior, Condition, Degree), as well as the lack of connection between learning objectives and competency achievement indicators. (Mager, 1962) This can have an impact on less than optimal achievement of student learning outcomes and complicate the overall learning evaluation process. (Biggs, Tang, & Kennedy, 2022)

This phenomenon is becoming increasingly relevant in the context of the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum and the Independent Curriculum, which emphasize competency-oriented learning, character strengthening, and 21st century skills. (Kemendibud, 2016). Weaknesses in formulating learning objectives can hinder the achievement of curriculum objectives, because unclear

or unmeasurable objectives make it difficult for teachers to design effective learning activities and carry out authentic assessments. (Stiggins, 2005) In addition, the lack of adequate technical training and pedagogical supervision for teachers in preparing quality lesson plans also worsens this condition.

Several previous studies have identified problems in formulating learning objectives. For example, research by Pitasari & Febriyanti, (2023) found that elementary school teacher education (PGMI) students still had difficulty in formulating complete learning objectives according to the ABCD model. Likewise, research by Putri, (2021) shows that teachers at SDS YKPP Lirik face challenges in preparing lesson plans that are in accordance with curriculum demands, especially in formulating specific and measurable learning objectives. However, there is still a gap in research that specifically analyzes the weaknesses of formulating learning objectives from the perspective of content, structure, and logical conformity with learning indicators in the lesson plan document.

This study aims to fill the gap by analyzing in depth the weaknesses in the formulation of learning objectives in the RPP prepared by teachers at the elementary education level. By using a descriptive qualitative approach, this study will identify aspects that need to be improved in the preparation of objectives, as well as explore the factors that cause the weak quality of the formulation. The results of this study are expected to provide new insights and practical recommendations for teachers, LPTK lecturers, curriculum developers, and other stakeholders in an effort to improve the quality of learning planning in schools.

Furthermore, the formulation of weak learning objectives not only impacts teachers and the teaching and learning process, but also affects the development of students' abilities holistically. Inaccuracy in setting learning objectives can cause students to fail to develop critical thinking skills, creativity, and reflective attitudes that are the essence of 21st century learning. (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001) Therefore, it is important to review the way teachers formulate learning objectives in the lesson plan as a strategic step in improving the quality of national education.

Curriculum policy requires teachers to develop Learning Implementation Plans (RPP) independently. In the implementation, there are still teachers who do not develop RPP independently. Teachers position themselves as consumers by using and utilizing the results of other teachers' RPP designs. Teachers tend to use ready-to-use RPPs made by the Subject Teacher team at school. (Bariyah, 2014: 459). Teachers who tend to use ready-to-use lesson plans show that teachers have not made efforts to empower writing skills. (Sa'diyah & Mujahidin, 2014: 66). Teachers who do not empower writing skills are characterized by the results of designing lesson plans that are difficult to read, understand, and implement. The design of lesson plans that are difficult to read, understand, and implement shows that teachers are less able to process words into sentences editorially. (Setyawanto, 2012).

One indicator of a quality RPP is the teacher's activity in creating learning objectives in accordance with the learning concept applied in the school. Learning objectives can at least enable someone to have the desire to learn and

improve their skills. (Brown & Green, 2019)

Formulation of Learning Objectives

Learning objectives are the teacher's responsibility and must be chosen and determined carefully to create a meaningful learning process (Isman, 2011: 136). The audience, behavior, condition, and degree components are considerations for formulating learning objectives that are appropriate to the learning environment. The audience component is one element of learning objectives by considering students who will carry out learning activities. Each student has potential before entering teaching and learning activities. The innate potential possessed by students is considered in formulating learning objectives (Mudlofir & Rusydiyah, 2016). The behavioral component is one of the elements of learning objectives by considering specific behaviors that will be mastered by students after carrying out learning activities.

The condition component is one of the elements of learning objectives by considering the conditions of students and the facilities used. School conditions that support the implementation of learning objectives can improve the relationship between teachers and students. (Khuana & Khuana, 2017). The degree component is one of the elements of learning objectives by considering the expected level of student success. (Dick et al., 2005). Dick and Carey's learning objective theory which has elements of audience, behavior, condition, and degree is in line with the development of learning objectives in the 2013 curriculum. Learning objectives in the 2013 curriculum are developed by paying attention to the audience which means students who are the subjects of learning, behavior refers to the achievement of specific behavior in basic competencies, condition is a learning effort that can help students to achieve learning behavior in basic competencies, and degree is the quality of student success that can be expressed qualitatively or quantitatively.

Determination of Learning Outcomes

Learning objectives are the learning outcomes obtained by students after the learning process for one learning topic in a certain period (Tung, 2017). The theory of learning objectives that has been put forward is in line with the formulation of learning objectives in the 2013 curriculum. In the 2013 curriculum, to find out the learning outcomes of students at the end of the learning process, the formulation of learning objectives refers to basic competencies. Student learning outcomes are reflected by the mastery of basic competencies for a certain period in one subject. To achieve effective and efficient learning outcomes, teachers are required to be able to help students inductively by compiling cognitive schemes from their concrete experiences. (Van Merrienboer & Kirschner, 2018). Based on the discussion that has been described, the formulation of learning objectives is closely related to the determination of the expected learning outcomes, in the 2013 curriculum the expected learning outcomes refer to basic competencies. Maximum student learning outcomes can be obtained through learning designs that are systematically and consistently structured.

Learning objectives are developed specifically and clearly by determining one behavior carried out by students after carrying out teaching and learning

activities (Dick et al., 2005). Learning objectives that develop a specific and clear behavior can provide benefits to students to manage time and focus on the competencies to be mastered. Dick and Carey's theory is in line with the development of learning objectives in the 2013 curriculum which uses one operational verb for one behavior in one learning objective. Operational verbs in learning objectives refer to basic competencies aimed at one learning topic in a certain period. Teachers can target higher basic competencies beyond the level of student ability, this can create collaborative and interactive learning. (Paolini, 2015). Based on the explanation that has been put forward, it can be concluded that the selection of basic competencies that have high targets exceeding the minimum required limits is a manifestation of the teacher's readiness to be very optimistic in achieving maximum learning outcomes.

Formulation of learning objectives using operational verbs to observe student behavior. The use of appropriate operational verbs can measure student behavior at the end of the learning process (Dick et al., 2005). Dick and Carey's learning objective theory for the use of operational verbs is in line with the formulation of learning objectives in the 2013 curriculum. The use of operational verbs for the formulation of learning objectives in the 2013 curriculum refers to the basic competencies that have been outlined in accordance with the Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture. (Kemendikbud, 2014) Republic of Indonesia Number 37 of 2018 concerning core competencies and basic competencies. Based on the discussion that has been described, it can be concluded that the operational verbs used reflect the behavior of students that must be carried out as a form of achieving the learning outcomes that have been obtained. The achievement of student learning outcomes can be adjusted to the level of students starting with easy to complex abilities. Abilities begin with knowing, understanding, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating (Moore, 2014).

Students' abilities can be identified through the achievement of cognitive aspects, psychomotor aspects, and affective aspects. Cognitive aspects include:

(1) remembering is the process of recalling memory and long-term memory in the form of explaining, quoting, mentioning, describing, identifying, counting, marking, naming and matching; (2) understanding is adjusting new skills and knowledge in students' thought patterns in the form of summarizing, interpreting, comparing, and classifying; (3) applying is solving problems according to procedures including implementing and running; (4) analyzing is determining relationships and breaking down problems in the form of organizing, finding and breaking down; (5) evaluating is creating considerations according to criteria and standards in the form of criticizing and checking; and

(6) creating is creating unity by integrating several elements in the form of planning, production, and making.

The psychomotor aspect includes: (1) view, (2) preparing, (3) imitating, (4) getting used to, (5) adjusting, and (6) creating. The affective aspect includes: (1) accepting is the student's attitude of sensitivity to conditions, phenomena, and situations, (2) responding is the student's attitude when participating and

responding when the learning process takes place, (3) giving value is the attitude when giving trust or assessment to a condition, phenomenon or symptom, (4) organizing is the skill to organize, manage, and elaborate values in a structured system, and (5) characterizing values is the ability to regulate behavioral guidelines through the development of personal views. The use of operational verbs can include learning behaviors that encourage high-level abilities possessed by students (Kistner et al., 2015). In addition, it is also possible to consider the intelligence, profile, interests, readiness and multiculturalism of students. (Hamm & Adams, 2009).

Based on the explanation of the use of operational verbs that have been described, it can be concluded that the selection of operational verbs is greatly influenced by the characteristics of the students. Before determining the operational verbs used, teachers can conduct a needs analysis that can be used as a consideration. The use of operational verbs in learning objectives affects the assessment process carried out by teachers. The selection of appropriate operational verbs in learning objectives makes it easier for teachers to assess student activities and prepare tests. Achievement of student learning outcomes can be done by giving assignments that follow developments in the era so that students can become more skilled and innovative (Ibrahim & Aziz, 2012). In addition, giving assignments based on the world of work can develop critical, independent and active thinking in students (Hidayat, 2015: 210). Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that the selection of operational verbs presents problems for teachers in formulating learning objectives that take into account the student assessment process.

Relevance of Learning Tools

Designing learning objectives should be able to create systematic, practical, effective and appropriate activities (Sesiorina, 2014). The learning objectives designed are required to consider the learning tools available in schools and consider the conditions of students. The selection of learning tools such as media, tools, and learning resources is closely related to the realization of the expected learning conditions. The selection of appropriate learning tools is a reflection of the teacher's readiness in compiling media, tools, and learning resources that have an impact on changes in student behavior, so that the alignment between the learning tools used and the learning objectives tends to be strengthened. (Mudlofir & Rusydiyah, 2016).

Based on the discussion above, it can be concluded that the formulation of learning objectives should be relevant to the condition of learning devices available at school and relevant to the condition of students. This consideration is very important because complete school facilities and infrastructure can help students achieve learning outcomes.

Implementation of Learning Objectives

Learning objectives in the 2013 curriculum are developed by considering the ability of students and teachers to represent learning objectives in real terms. Activities reflected in learning objectives take into account motivation, student conditions, task complexity, and the environment. (Dick et al., 2005). The consideration of learning objective activities is the same as the behaviorist

learning theory which states that the teacher's ability to manage the relationship between stimulus and response in learning situations can optimize student learning outcomes. (Mudlofir & Rusydiyah, 2016: 1).

Based on the explanation that has been put forward, it can be concluded that learning objectives are not only as a written design, but should be realized in real terms in the classroom. Teachers who prioritize designing learning objectives that can be applied in the classroom can improve the quality of learning. (Nesari & Heidari, 2014). To realize a learning process that is in accordance with learning objectives, teachers can analyze previous learning concepts as a basis for studying new learning concepts. (Yildiz & Karabiyik, 2012). In addition, teachers can analyze competencies, student characteristics, learning experiences and motivation, learning situations, and learning resources. (Alzand, 2010).

Based on the opinions of experts that have been put forward, it can be concluded that to realize learning objectives in real terms in the classroom, teachers can study learning experiences that have been carried out previously. The results of these observations can be used as considerations for designing optimal learning objectives if realized in the classroom.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses a descriptive qualitative approach that aims to describe in depth the weaknesses in the formulation of learning objectives in the Learning Implementation Plan (RPP) document prepared by teachers at the Madrasah Ibtidaiyah (MI) level. This approach was chosen because it is able to capture phenomena naturally, contextually, and focuses on understanding the meaning behind the practice of formulating learning objectives carried out by teachers.. (Creswell, 2009)

The main data source in this study was the RPP document prepared by MI teachers, both lower and upper grades, which was obtained purposively. In addition to the RPP document, data was also strengthened through informal interviews with teachers as triangulation to understand the background of the formulation of the objectives found. The data collection technique was carried out using the documentation method, namely collecting and reviewing the RPP script used in learning activities. The documents analyzed were selected based on the completeness of the structure and readability of the contents.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Teacher Weaknesses In Formulating Learning Objectives In Mi Rpp Nonconformity with ABCD Model

Analysis of the RPP shows that many teachers have not implemented an effective learning objective formulation model, such as the ABCD model (Audience, Behavior, Condition, Degree). Most objectives only include the Audience and Behavior components, while Condition and Degree are often ignored. This causes learning objectives to be less specific and difficult to measure.

In line with research from (Alhikmah et al., 2021) found that teachers had difficulty in formulating learning objectives that took into account the ABCD requirements, which resulted in a mismatch between objectives, activities, and assessments in the lesson plan. This mismatch resulted in unclear learning directions and difficulties in designing appropriate activities and assessments. Biggs et al., (2022) emphasizes the importance of constructive alignment, namely consistency between goals, learning activities, and assessments, to achieve optimal learning outcomes.

Dominance of Memorization-Based Learning

In the MI RPP, for example especially in the subject of Al-Qur'an Hadith, learning objectives often only emphasize the ability to memorize and understand the text literally. The applicative and reflective aspects of Islamic teaching values are less emphasized. This shows that learning objectives have not led to the development of high-level thinking skills (Higher-Order Thinking Skills/HOTS).

In line with research from Suriani et al., (2022) stated that teachers experience difficulties in developing HOTS-based lesson plans, including in formulating learning objectives that encourage analysis, evaluation, and creativity.

Reliance on Traditional Methods

The learning methods in the RPP are still predominantly lectures, reading together, and Q&A. Active methods such as group discussions, role-playing, or project-based learning are rarely found. The media used are also limited to textbooks and LKS, without integration of digital media (video, interactive applications). Teachers have difficulty in determining indicators and learning objectives that are in accordance with the thematic approach and various learning methods.

Less Specific Assessment Instruments

Learning objectives that are formulated in general and not specific make it difficult for teachers to design appropriate assessment instruments. As a result, the assessment becomes less objective and does not reflect the expected learning outcomes.

Teachers have difficulty in compiling detailed assessment instruments that are in accordance with learning indicators, which is caused by a lack of understanding of the assessment principles in the 2013 Curriculum. (Arikunto, 2010)

Mismatch between Objectives, Activities, and Assessment

There is often a mismatch between the formulated learning objectives and the designed learning activities and assessments. This shows that teachers have not applied the principle of constructive alignment in the preparation of lesson plans.

Many teachers have difficulty in preparing lesson plans that are consistent between objectives, activities, and assessments, which is caused by a lack of training and understanding of effective lesson plan preparation. (Amelia & Sesrita, 2023)

Factors Causing Weakness

Several factors that cause teacher weaknesses in formulating learning objectives in the MI level RPP include:

Lack of Understanding of the Learning Objective Formulation Model. Teachers do not fully understand the effective learning objective formulation model, such as the ABCD model, so they have difficulty in formulating objectives that are specific, measurable, and in accordance with the expected competencies.

Lack of Training and Professional Development. Teachers rarely attend training or seminars that discuss the preparation of RPP in depth, so they do not get the necessary information and skills updates.

Time Limitations and High Workload. Teachers have a high workload, including administrative tasks and extracurricular activities, so the time available to design RPP in depth is limited.

Lack of Support and Supervision from the School. The school has not provided adequate support in the form of supervision, guidance, or facilities that support the development of quality RPP.

CONCLUSION

The results of this study indicate that the formulation of learning objectives by Madrasah Ibtidaiyah (MI) teachers in the RPP document still faces various significant and systematic weaknesses. These weaknesses mainly lie in:

Inconsistency with the ABCD (Audience, Behavior, Condition, Degree) model, where most objectives only cover the first two components and ignore aspects of conditions and standards of success. As a result, the formulation of objectives becomes unspecific and not objectively measurable.

Dominance in the low cognitive domain, especially in the ability to memorize and understand texts literally, without expanding it to the development of high-level thinking skills (HOTS) such as analysis, evaluation, and creation. This is contrary to the essence of the 2013 Curriculum and the Merdeka Curriculum which encourage competency-based learning and character strengthening.

Lack of diversity in learning methods and media reflected in the formulation of objectives. The objectives designed tend to support traditional learning approaches such as lectures, and have not encouraged the use of technology or active, collaborative, and contextual learning.

The assessment instruments designed are not in line with learning objectives. When objectives are not formulated operationally and specifically, the assessment becomes invalid in measuring student success, and does not comply with the principles of authentic assessment emphasized in the 2013 Curriculum. Mismatch between objectives, learning activities, and assessments (constructive alignment). When objectives are formulated inappropriately, the design of activities and assessments becomes ineffective. This results in unfocused learning and has no impact on strengthening student learning outcomes as a whole.

The factors causing this weakness include teachers' minimal understanding of the theory and practice of formulating learning objectives, lack of in-depth technical training, high administrative workload, and limited pedagogical

supervision from the school.

Therefore, strategic steps need to be taken in the form of intensive training in preparing lesson plans based on the ABCD model, increasing teacher capacity in planning learning that is in line with the principles of the 2013 Curriculum and the Independent Curriculum, and increasing institutional support from school principals and supervisors. Reforming the quality of formulating learning objectives will have a direct impact on the quality of the process and learning outcomes of students in Madrasah Ibtidaiyah in general.

REFERENCES

Alzand, W. (2010). Instruction design and educational quality. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *2*(2), 4074–4081.

Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives: complete edition*. Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Bariyah, L. (2014). Analisis Kesesuaian RPP Dan Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran Guru Smpn Di Kabupaten Mojokerto Pada Sub Materi Fotosintesis Dengan Kerikulum 2013. *Berkala Ilmiah Pendidikan Biologi (BioEdu)*, *3*(3).

Biggs, J., Tang, C., & Kennedy, G. (2022). *Teaching for quality learning at university 5e*. McGraw-hill education (UK).

Brown, A. H., & Green, T. D. (2019). *The essentials of instructional design: Connecting fundamental principles with process and practice*. Routledge.

Dick, W., Carey, L., & Carey, J. O. (2005). *The systematic design of instruction*. Hamm, M., & Adams, D. (2009). *Activating assessment for all students*. Rowman &

Littlefield Publishers.

Hidayat, H. (2015). Production based Learning: An Instructional Design Model in the context of vocational education and training (VET). *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *204*, 206–211.

Ibrahim, Z., & Aziz, A. A. (2012). Instructional design theory on teaching delivery and evaluation online for graphic design courses. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *67*, 606–610.

INDONESIA, M. P. D. A. N. K. R. (n.d.). *PERATURAN MENTERI PENDIDIKAN DAN KEBUDAYAAN REPUBLIK INDONESIA NOMOR 34 TAHUN 2018 2018 TENTANG STANDAR NASIONAL PENDIDIKAN SEKOLAH MENENGAH*.

Isman, A. (2011). Instructional design in education: new model. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, *10*(1), 136–142.

Kemendikbud. (2014). Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia Nomor 103 Tahun 2014 tentang Pembelajaran pada Pendidikan Dasar dan Pendidikan Menengah. *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan*, *53*(9), 1–11. Retrieved

from

https://jdih.kemdikbud.go.id/sjdih/siperpu/dokumen/salinan/Permend

ikbud Nomor 103 Tahun 2014

Khuana, K., & Khuana, T. (2017). Impressive Learning Strategies With Indoctrinating Research-Based To Creative Thinking Skills For Educational Students. *European Journal of Education Studies*.

Kistner, S., Rakoczy, K., Otto, B., Klieme, E., & Büttner, G. (2015). Teaching learning strategies. The role of instructional context and teacher beliefs. *Journal for Educational Research Online*, *7*(1), 176–197.

Mager, R. F. (1962). *Preparing instructional objectives.*

Moore, K. D. (2014). *Effective instructional strategies: From theory to practice*. Sage Publications.

Mudlofir, A., & Rusydiyah, E. F. (2016). *Desain Pembelajaaran Inovatif Dari Teori Ke Praktik Jakarta: PT RajaGrafindo Persada*.

Nesari, A. J., & Heidari, M. (2014). The important role of lesson plan on educational achievement of Iranian EFL teachers' attitudes. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching & Research*, *3*(5), 25–31.

Paolini, A. (2015). Enhancing teaching effectiveness and student learning outcomes. *Journal of Effective Teaching*, *15*(1), 20–33.

Pitasari, M., & Febriyanti, B. D. (2023). Analisis kelengkapan dalam merumuskan tujuan pembelajaran pada mahasiswa PGMI semester V. *Qalam: Jurnal Ilmu Kependidikan*, *12*(1), 35–42.

Putri, D. R. (2021). Analisis Permasalahan Pembuatan Rencana Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran (RPP) Tematik Kelas IV di SDS YKPP Lirik. *Qalamuna-Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial, Dan Agama*, *13*(2), 521–532.

Sa'diyah, M., & Mujahidin, E. (2014). Upaya Membangun Budaya Akademik Guru Madrasah (Sebuah Langkah Awal). *FIKRAH*, *7*(2).

Sesiorina, S. (2014). The analysis of teachers' lesson plan in implementing theme-based instruction for teaching English to young learners. *Journal of English and Education*, *2*(1), 84–95.

Setyawanto, A. (2012). *Rencana pelaksanaan pembelajaran (RPP) guru bahasa Indonesia tingkat SMP di Kota Malang*. Universitas Negeri Malang.

Stiggins, R. J. (2005). *Student-involved assessment for learning*. Prentice Hall.

Tung, K. Y. (2017). Desain Instruksional Perbandingan Model dan Implementasinya. *Yogyakarta: Andi*.

Van Merriënboer, J. J. G. van, & Kirschner, P. A. (2018). Ten Steps to Complex Learning: a Systematic Approach to Instruction and Instructional Design. *TechTrends*, *62*, 204–205.

Yildiz, Z., & Karabiyik, B. (2012). The implementation of a lesson plan which is prepared according to the meaningful learning theory and evaluation of the results. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *46*, 4021–4025.