

Plagiasi Firdaus

by FKIP UNIVED

Submission date: 03-Nov-2021 03:49AM (UTC+0200)

Submission ID: 1690726096

File name: Template_JDER_FIRDAUS.docx (49.84K)

Word count: 2317

Character count: 12884



**THE APPLICATION OF SPECIFIC
INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVE IN LESSON
PLANS DESIGNED BY PUBLIC SENIOR
HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS
BASED ON THE TAXONOMY BLOOM**



Firdaus^{1,a)}

¹⁾Program studi Pendidikan Manajemen Informatika Institut Teknologi dan Bisnis Lembah Dempo

^{a)}Corresponding Author: firdaus@lembahdempo.ac.id

Abstract

The objective of this study was to find out the types of specific instructional objectives applied by English teachers of public Senior High School in Bengkulu and to find the differences between senior and junior teachers specific instructional objectives in their lesson plans. The population of this research was all English teachers of Public Senior High School, they were 26 English teachers. This research employed total sampling that divided based on teachers experience less than ten years and more than ten years. The instrument of the research was a check list. It was constructed based on the combined theory of Suciati and Davies. The data were analyzed by using percentage. The result of the research in category teachers experience more than ten years was that teachers applied the characteristic knowledge 36.39, comprehension 7.87, application 17.70, analysis 9.51, synthesis 18.36, evaluation 10.16. while less than ten years experience teachers applied knowledge 50, comprehension 8.1, application 9.7, analysis 9.7, synthesis 16.1, evaluation 6.5. Both experience more and less than ten years teachers applied knowledge as dominant category in designing their lesson plans. Experienced teachers had 36.39 %. While less experience teachers had 50 %. The second position, experienced teachers applied synthesis 18.36%. and less experience teachers applied synthesis 16.1%.

Key Word: Lesson Plan, Instructional Objective, Taxonomy Bloom.

Introduction

In the teaching learning process teachers have important role, because they have responsibility in teaching and learning process. One of the role is as a manager; it mean that they must plan their teaching. So, they should prepare lesson plans before they do the teaching. Lesson plan is a crucial element to give direction to the teacher about what they do in the classroom. Ibrahim and Syaodihs (1991) state that a lesson plan is the first step from all of teaching management that consist of teaching strategy that will be done. Futhermore, usman (1995) states that lesson plans are as guides for teachers in teaching, so it will be efficient and effective. In

short lesson plans are the preparation written by teachers before they begin the classes.

From the writer experience when he look teachers training, he found some of the teachers in teaching process, they did not apply the lesson plan, they did not follow their specific instructional objective of lesson plan that they have written and the irony are some of the teachers did not design lesson plans before they taught in the class. Otherwise, in the signing lesson plans most of them did not apply good characteristic of how to design good specific instructional objectives of lesson plans.

Rooijekkers (1990) states that a teachers should organize the material that he/she is going to present in a series or sequence and also how the material or unit will be discussed. Whether it is teacher – fronted, small group, pair work or individual after that determine the main materials (Nunan, 1988).

According to U⁴an (1995) that there are five main component of lesson plan, they are:

1. Specific instructional objective
2. Teaching material.
3. Teaching learning activities.
4. Teaching learning media
5. Evaluation.

The teaching objective is the main component that must be formulated before doing teaching learning process. The use of the objectives is very important, because it is guideline in teaching learning process. Furthermore³ according to Jacobsen, et el (1981) the process establishing goals is an important one because all of remaining acts of teaching logically follow from the goals established.

In determine the specific instructional objectives, teacher must understand the cognitive taxonomy objectives, On others hand it will determining whatever the objective of instructional are cognitive, effective, or psychomotor (Suciati, 1995).

In Indonesia most of teachers know and do cognitive of objective instructional taxonomy Bloom. Furthermore, Suciati (1995) states that taxonomy Bloom is² divided into six categories of cognitive objectives, they are:

1. Knowledge.
2. Comprehension.
3. Application.
4. Analysis.
5. Synthesis.
6. Evaluation.

Based on the explanation above the researcher was interested to analyze of specific instructional objectives in lesson plan designed by public senior high school English teachers based on the taxonomy Bloom. This research will be conducted at public senior high schools in Bengkulu.

Research question

Based on the background above, the research question could be formulated as follow:

1. What types of specific instructional objective of English lesson did the senior high school teachers apply in their lesson plans?

2. Is there difference between senior high school teachers instruction objectives and junior in their lesson plans?

Objectives

The objectives the research are:

1. To fine the types of specific instructional objectives applied by the English teachers of public senior high school in Bengkulu
2. To fine the difference between senior teachers instructional objectives and junior teachers specific instructional objectives in their lesson plans.

METHOD

The research used descriptive method. Gay (1990) says that the descriptive method is considered appropriate for describing the present conditional of research subject. This research aimed to describe the types of specific instructional objectives applied by the English teachers of senior high schools at Bengkulu.

Population

The population of this study was all English teachers at SMUN Bengkulu. The total number of senior high school English teachers in Bengkulu are 26 separated in eight of SMUN Bengkulu.

Sample

The sample of this study was total sampling. They were divided into two groups based on their teaching experiences, they are:

1. Less than ten years of senior high school teachers experience. The total numbers of teachers are six teachers.
2. More than ten years of senior high school teachers experience. The total of teachers are 20 separated in eight of SMUN Bengkulu.

Data collection and analysis

In collecting data do the technique used checklist. Where the component of this checklist⁹ e taken from taxonomy bloom which consists of knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, evaluation²

Data was analysis by use formula:

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%$$

Where:

P = percentage that will be found

F = Frequency

N = Number of sample

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of data were divided into two groups. They are 1).Less than ten years of senior high school teachers experience. 2). More than ten years of senior high school teachers experience.

1. More than ten years of senior high school teachers experience.

Based on the researcher analyzing the lesson plan of the English teachers more than ten years experience, he found some characteristic of cognitive Taxonomy Bloom in specific instructional objective as illustrated in the following table.

Table 1. frequency of items in characteristic of cognitive taxonomy Bloom

Characteristic of Cognitive Taxonomy Bloom	F	%
Knowledge	111	36.39
Comprehension	24	7.87
Application	54	17.70
Analysis	29	9.51
Synthesis	56	18.36
Evaluation	31	10.16
Total	305	100

From table 1. It can be seen that the teachers applied characteristic knowledge 111 (36.39), comprehension 24 (7.87), application 54 (17.70), analysis 29 (9.51), synthesis 56 (18.36), evaluation 31 (10.16).

2. Less than ten years of senior high school teachers experience.

During the researcher analyzing the lesson plan of the English teachers less than ten years experience. He found that some characteristics of cognitive taxonomy Bloom in the specific instructional objective as illustrated in the following table.

Table II frequency of items in characteristic of cognitive taxonomy Bloom.

Characteristic of Cognitive Taxonomy Bloom	F	%
Knowledge	31	50
Comprehension	5	8.1
Application	6	9.7
Analysis	6	9.7
Synthesis	10	16.1
Evaluation	4	6.5
Total	62	100

From table 1. It can be seen that the teachers applied characteristic knowledge 31 (50), comprehension 5 (8.1), application 6 (9.7), analysis 6 (9.7), synthesis 10 (16.1), evaluation 4 (6.5).

The characteristic of cognitive objectives applied by teachers at senior high school in Kota Bengkulu

The finding of specific instructional objectives of lesson plans analysis has revealed based on taxonomy Bloom of cognitive that were applied in English teachers lesson plans that designed by public senior high school English teachers were knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation.

From the result of analysis, it indicates that the teachers of public senior high school at Bengkulu applied the six characteristic of taxonomy Bloom. It shows that the higher was characteristic knowledge. It should not like this, but teachers should contribute to any other language skill in the highest levels. It is more details that teachers only focus the item to identify.

In the characteristic comprehension teachers only focused on the item to clarify, it means that most of teachers applied the item to clarify, it is not good because the teachers should give the contribution to another item such as to conclude, to summary, to guess.

In characteristic application, in this characteristic teachers focused on applied the item to use, it is not effective because teachers should contribute to any other item to improve their language skill.

The analysis characteristic, in this characteristic they focus on the item to spell out, it means that most of them applied the item to spell out, the teachers should apply another language skill, so it will be efficient.

The last characteristic was characteristic evaluation, based on the results of analysis showed that teachers applied the characteristic evaluation was low presented. The teachers should applied the characteristic evaluation as the highest level, because in the characteristic required higher thinking processes for students and this effective or not it depends on the teaching process.

Based on the result of analysis of each lesson plans, in general most of the specific instructional objectives of lesson plans were designed by teacher that categorized into lower level of cognitive such as knowledge was higher represented. Each specific instruction objectives

of lesson plans designed by teachers shows that most of specific instructional objectives were focused on knowledge characteristic.

Contrary to the lower level characteristic, the characteristic in which required higher cognitive thinking processes are low represented. According to Suciati (1995) there are six of characteristic taxonomy Bloom. The sixth of characteristic are hierarchy. It means that the highest of characteristic level can not achieve, if the lowest one can not achieve. The application of characteristic, a teacher should applied of each characteristics in order to arrange such as if the characteristic of knowledge was fifty percent, so the characteristic of comprehension should up of it and so on. But in the fact, based on the result that the researcher was found teachers were applied the specific instruction objectives are not in order arrange.

Unfortunately, it may affect the learning outcomes and ability of students achievement. Indeed, if students tend do lesson that only recalling of the fact or information they have learned, they will not be motivated to do the lesson that required them to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate because they might think it is so difficult because they have not been adequately for it.

Another thing is instructional objectives of lesson plan that applied by teachers were not reflected the general teaching objectives of the curriculum, which required higher level of cognitive processes of education stage. The predominance of lower characteristic is unfortunate since the students were senior high school at which they should thought higher order thinking skill.

As result, the findings may not have reflected the theories as claimed by expert in education in which it is recommended that the higher the level of students, the higher level thinking are trained.

The differences of senior and junior teachers specific instructional objectives in their lesson plans.

Based on the result, found the differences in the teachers applied specific instructional objectives between senior and junior teachers based on each the characteristic. In the senior teachers were applied all items on each characteristic. The junior teachers on characteristic comprehension applied the items to differentiate, to summary. In the characteristic application they did not applied the items: to calculate, to improve, to modify, to transfer.

Then the characteristic analysis they just applied items to combine and to spell out. On the characteristic synthesis they did not applied items to create. And the last characteristic evaluation they applied items to evaluate and to assess.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

CONCLUSION

The main finding of the study on the application of specific instructional objective of lesson plans designed by public senior high school English teacher based on the taxonomy Bloom indicates that all of specific instructional objective of lesson plans designed by English senior teacher were on the lower level of cognitive taxonomy Bloom such as knowledge. It means that all of public senior high school English teachers in Kota Bengkulu applied the characteristic of cognitive knowledge as the dominant. In other words, it means that there is not any different between senior and junior teacher.

SUGGESTION

In this study the researcher suggested the English teachers in Kota Bengkulu be more attention in applying taxonomy Bloom in their specific instructional objective.

1. To the English teacher who are teaching at senior high school in Kota Bengkulu, it suggested to design the lesson plan effectively based on the characteristic taxonomy Bloom and curriculum.

2. This study only focused on cognitive objective of specific instructional objectives of lesson plans based on taxonomy Bloom. The other variable of taxonomy Bloom such as effective and psychomotor have not been investigated. They may affect the result of this study in which may not reflect the result of lesson plans analysis of cognitive objective accurately, therefore furthers studies are strongly recommended in those areas that result of the lesson plans analysis can be reflected.

REFERENCES

- Davies, I. K.(1976). Objectives in Curriculum Design. Indiana University: Mc Grew Hill.
- Gay, L. (1990). Education Research. New York: Mc Millan.
- Ibrahim and Syaodihs, N. (1996). Perencanaan Pengajaran. Jakarta: Renika Cipta.
- Roosjekkars (1980). Mengajar Dengan Sukses. Jakarta: PT. Gramedia.

Suciati. (1995). *Mengajar di Perguruan Tinggi*. Jakarta: PAU – PPAI Universitas Terbuka.

Usman, U. M. (1995). *Menjadi Guru Profesional*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

Plagiasi Firdaus

ORIGINALITY REPORT

7%

SIMILARITY INDEX

6%

INTERNET SOURCES

1%

PUBLICATIONS

1%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	jurnal.unived.ac.id Internet Source	2%
2	media.neliti.com Internet Source	1%
3	Submitted to University Of Tasmania Student Paper	1%
4	adoc.pub Internet Source	<1%
5	eprints.uns.ac.id Internet Source	<1%
6	yusrizal75bengkulu.wordpress.com Internet Source	<1%
7	epdf.pub Internet Source	<1%
8	journal.iain-samarinda.ac.id Internet Source	<1%
9	turcomat.org Internet Source	<1%

10	www.scribd.com Internet Source	<1 %
11	ices.prosiding.unri.ac.id Internet Source	<1 %
12	Colby Kumwenda, Wezzie Chiziwa. "Exploring the use of continuous assessment in the context of outcome-based education in Malawian primary schools", SAGE Publications, 2021 Publication	<1 %

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography Off