

Instructional Analysis of Civilization Education Lesson Plan's for Class V SDN Pandanwangi I Malang

Misbahul Huda ^{1*}, Irfa'i Alfian Mubaidilla ², Ziana Dhurrotul Ainiyah ³

^{1,2,3} Tarbiyah Faculty of IAINU Tuban

Email Correspondence : misbahayren@gmail.com *

Abstract: The purpose of this study was to determine how teachers translate KD into indicators of competency achievement in the preparation of lesson plans. For this purpose, an instructional analysis of the Civics lesson plan for grade V elementary school was conducted. The subject of the research was the teacher of class V A SDN Pandanwangi I Malang. The number of lesson plans analyzed was 10 lesson plans. The main focus of the research problem is limited to the instructional analysis of the lesson plans developed by the research subjects, namely the translation of basic competencies into indicators. Further instructional analysis focused on lesson plans in which there were instructional errors in the translation of KD into indicators of competency achievement. The results showed that in the elaboration of KD into indicators of competency achievement in the ten lesson plans analyzed, it was found that teachers had elaborated KD into indicators well in the preparation of Civics lesson plans for grade V elementary school. The KD of Civics subject in Grade V consists of operational KD formulation and non-operational KD formulation. Except for the operational KD formulation, there are instructional analysis errors made by teachers in translating KD into indicators, namely in the formulation of non-operational KD. The instructional error in question is that the teacher formulates indicators that are not detailed, not comprehensive, and not systematic. This finding is in 3 KD, namely KD 2.2, KD 2.3, and KD 3.2.

Keyword : RPP, Instructional Analysis, Basic Competencies (KD), Indicators.

Article info: Submitted : 16 January 2024 | Accepted : 15 March 2024 | Published : 25 March 2024

Copyright © 2024, Author.

This is an open-access article under the [CC BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)



How to Cite : Huda, M., Mubaidilla, I. A., & Ainiyah, Z. D. (2024). Instructional Analysis of Civilization Education Lesson Plan's for Class V SDN Pandanwangi I Malang. *Journal of Asian Primary Education (JoAPE)*, 1(1), 34–52.

Introduction

Educational activities in elementary school (SD) are the foundation of further educational activities. The more mature the learning process at the elementary level, the better the next level of education will be. The implementation of learning in elementary schools aims to develop students' basic abilities in the form of academic abilities, life skills, the ability to cooperate, and more importantly the formation of strong character (Nur, 2004) At the elementary school level, students will get the most important learning both from attitude, ethics, and aesthetics, which of course cannot be separated from the activeness of a teacher in the classroom.

It cannot be denied that in the classroom, the teacher determines the climate and learning activities. No matter how good the curriculum is, no matter how complete the

facilities are, if the teacher is not animated or even does not love, understand, and carry out his duties properly, the curriculum will become a mere administrative document (Kemp, 1994) Conversely, no matter how simple the curriculum and facilities are, if the teacher has broad insight, loves his profession, and has a broad understanding of skills in carrying out his duties, then the learning that takes place will be able to bring his students to students with personality and success of course. This is in accordance with the statement "teachers are a living curriculum and teachers who bring the curriculum to life". (Pidarta, 2007)

Education as a system has elements of input, process, and output. In the education process, there are several components, among others: curriculum, teaching staff, and infrastructure. In the curriculum, there are learning tools, and in the learning tools there is a Learning Implementation Plan (RPP). This lesson plan will provide information about what activities will be carried out by the teacher to achieve learning objectives, the achievement of indicators, the material to be delivered, and methods to achieve these learning objectives. In other words, besides the teacher who plays an important role in the learning process, the lesson plan as an academic paper also plays a role in the learning process. (Tilaar, 2003)

In learning, the learning planning process determines the quality of learning that will be carried out. If in this planning stage the teacher fails, then the learning process will not be able to be carried out optimally. Thus, the assumption is that if teachers can formulate learning plans optimally, then the learning process can be carried out optimally as well. (Suparno, 2001) One aspect of lesson planning that teachers must do is preparing lesson plans. This means that the quality of lesson plans prepared by teachers determines the quality of learning implementation. (Wahab, 2004)

In the current Education Unit Level Curriculum (KTSP), lesson plans are prepared and developed by subject teachers. The National Education Standards Agency (BNSP) only prepares Competency Standards (SK) and Basic Competencies (KD). The process to achieve the SK and KD is left to the educator (teacher). Teachers are given full power in translating SK-KD into learning indicators. However, it is often found that lesson plans developed by teachers are still far from the rules that must be considered in developing lesson plans so that it is not uncommon for lesson plans that have been developed by teachers to be rationally accountable. (Djahiri, 2006)

One of the most important aspects in preparing lesson plans is to translate SK-KD into more specific indicators. The obstacle that is often faced by teachers in general is the difficulty in identifying indicators of a KD, in addition to other difficulties, namely the difficulty of teachers in understanding the formulation of KD and consequently having difficulty identifying indicators. (Susanto, 2008) This means that the lesson plans produced by teachers are still far from what is expected.

Some other problems that often arise related to the preparation of lesson plans are that teachers only pay more attention to the components in the preparation of lesson plans and even often the format of the lesson plan is more often debated than its substance, especially the methods in translating SK-KD into learning indicators. Another

problem that teachers often face in translating SK-KD into indicators in general is that teachers do not understand the formulation of the SK-KD itself, so teachers have difficulty in compiling good learning indicators. (Dick, 2009) This of course can have an impact on the quality of learning carried out and the achievement of basic subject competencies becomes less than optimal if the teacher himself cannot understand the basic competencies and learning indicators properly.

According to Mulyasa (Mulyasa, 2006) an important step that teachers must understand in relation to the preparation of lesson plans is that teachers must be able to translate basic competencies into competency indicators, which must first understand what basic competencies and competency indicators are. However, often the lesson plans prepared by teachers are still far from academic concepts, which often lack consistency and coherence and rationalization of the elements. It is also not uncommon to find that the preparation of lesson plans by teachers seems perfunctory, only as a formal prerequisite to meet administrative demands. In fact, the debate about the format of the lesson plan is prioritized and becomes the justification of the lesson plan, while the debate about the content is rarely done. In fact, this is more important and the responsibility of teachers in preparing lesson plans as a manifestation of the freedom and authority given, which will certainly affect the quality of graduates (competencies) produced. (Desmita, 2009)

The purpose of this study was to determine the translation of KD into indicators of competency achievement in the preparation of PKn lesson plans developed by PKn teachers at SDN Pandanwangi I Malang. Thus, the main focus of the research problem is limited to instructional analysis of the lesson plans developed by the research subjects, namely the translation of basic competencies into indicators of competency achievement. Further instructional analysis focused on lesson plans in which there were instructional errors in the translation of KD into indicators of competency achievement.

Methodology

In this research, the author uses qualitative research with descriptive analysis where the author is the main instrument to obtain and explore data widely and deeply. (Sugiyono, 2008) Meanwhile, the form of this research is a case study because the subject studied is narrow and limited, namely only on instructional analysis in the translation of KD into indicators (Arikunto, 2006) of competency achievement in the preparation of Learning Implementation Plans (RPP) developed by Civics teachers of Grade V SDN Pandanwangi I Malang. However, this research was conducted intensively, in detail, and in depth.

This research was conducted at SDN Pandanwangi I Malang, located at L.A. Sucipto 330 street, Pandanwangi Village, Blimbing Subdistrict, Malang East Java, in the even semester of the 2011-2012 academic year. The research subject was the Civics teacher of Class V.a SDN Pandanwangi I Malang.

The source of research data is the Civics lesson plan for grade V elementary school that has been developed by the research subject for semester I and semester II of the

2011-2012 academic year, which is a total of 10 lesson plans. Further instructional analysis is more emphasized on the lesson plans in which there are still instructional errors in the translation of KD into indicators of competency achievement.

Data collection techniques in the study were conducted through (1) library studies, (2) documentation, and (3) interviews. (Moleong, 1991) Meanwhile, the data analysis technique used was descriptive technique. This technique is very much in line with this study because in this study the researcher conducted an instructional analysis of the lesson plans developed by the research subjects, which in this case focused on the translation of KD into indicators of competency achievement.

Result and Discussion

Result

1. Analysis of the Explanation of Basic Competencies into Indicators

The number of lesson plans analyzed (Sunarto, 1990) in this study was 10 (ten) lesson plans because for grade V SD there are 4 SK with 10 KD. Thus the research subject compiled lesson plans, namely one lesson plan for one KD. The analysis of the translation of KD into indicators of competency achievement in 10 lesson plans developed by the research subjects is as follows.

Table 1.

Results of Analysis of KD Translation into Competency Achievement Indicators

RPP	Results
RPP 1: KD 1.1	The formulation of this indicator is good because it has developed more than three indicators, has met the demands of the competencies stated in the KD, the indicators developed have illustrated the hierarchy of competencies, and the formulation of indicators has included the level of competence and learning material. However, the translation of KD 1.1 into learning indicators above only touches the cognitive domain because indicators (1) - (4) are statements of competence for the cognitive domain and only concern the cognitive aspects of the C-1 and C-2 domains. Meanwhile, the affective domain has not been touched, so the indicators have not accommodated the characteristics of the subject.
RPP 2: KD 1.2	The formulation of this indicator is good because it has developed more than three indicators, has fulfilled the demands of the competencies contained in the KD, the indicators developed have illustrated the hierarchy of competencies, and the formulation of indicators has covered the level of competence and learning material and indicators have accommodated the characteristics of the subject even though they have not used the appropriate operational verbs. Indicators (1), (2) and (3) are statements of competence for cognitive aspects but only concern the cognitive aspects of the C-1 and C-2 domains, while in indicator (4) the

RPP	Results
	indicator formulation does not use operational verbs.
RPP 3: KD 1.3	The formulation of this indicator is good because it has been developed for more than three indicators, has met the demands of the competencies contained in the KD, the indicators developed have illustrated the hierarchy of competencies, and the formulation of indicators has included the level of competence and learning material and indicators have accommodated the characteristics of the subject. Indicators (1), (2) and (3) are competency statements for cognitive aspects but only concern the cognitive aspects of the C-1 and C-2 domains, and indicator (4) has touched the affective domain (A5).
RPP 4: KD 2.1	<p>1. The formulation of indicators has basically accommodated the characteristics of the subject, but the formulation of indicators is too minimal (less than three indicators), has not fulfilled the demands of the competencies contained in the KD, has not illustrated the hierarchy of competencies, and the formulation of indicators has not included the level of competence and learning material. Thus, there are still instructional errors in the translation of KD 2.1 into learning indicators because it is not done in detail, not comprehensive, and not systematic. The formulation of indicators is said to be not detailed because the research subject does not describe in detail and clearly in the indicators the material elements contained in the KD. It is said to be not comprehensive because the indicators made only contain limited knowledge, the indicators are not made completely. It is said to be unsystematic because the formulation of the indicators does not reflect the actual content of the KD. The indicators should be formulated as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. List the meaning/definition of regulation (C1) 2. Explain the meaning of laws and regulations (C2) 3. Describe the meaning of central and regional level laws and regulations (C2) 4. Give reasons about the importance of central and regional laws and regulations (C3, A3) 5. Show a positive attitude towards the importance of central and regional level legislation (C3, A5) 5.
RPP 5: KD 2.2	The elaboration of KD 2.2 into indicators above has developed more than three indicators but has not met the demands of the competencies stated in the KD, has not described the hierarchy of competencies, has not included the level of competence and learning material, and has not accommodated the characteristics of the subject because it only touches the cognitive domain (C1 and C2) and has not touched the affective domain. Thus, there are still instructional errors in the translation of KD

RPP	Results
	<p>2.2 into learning indicators because it is not done in detail and is not comprehensive. The formulation of indicators is said to be not detailed because the research subject does not describe in detail and clearly in the indicators the material elements contained in the KD. It is said to be not comprehensive because the indicators made only contain limited knowledge, the indicators are not made completely. KD 2.2 essentially requires the competence possessed by students to analyze several examples of laws and regulations both at the central and regional levels. The indicators should be formulated as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify various examples of laws and regulations (C1) 2. List examples of central level laws and regulations (C1) 3. List examples of regional level laws and regulations (C1) 4. Analyze examples of central and local level laws and regulations such as tax, anti-corruption, traffic, smoking ban (C4) 5. Classify laws and regulations at the central and regional levels (C4) 6. Make a chart of the order of national laws and regulations (C4) 7. Show a positive attitude towards the importance of national laws and regulations (C3, A5).
RPP 6: KD 3.1	<p>The formulation of this indicator is good because it has been developed more than three indicators, has fulfilled the demands of the competencies stated in the KD, has illustrated the hierarchy of competencies, and the formulation of indicators has included the level of competence and learning material and indicators have accommodated the characteristics of the subject. Indicators (1) to (5) are statements of competence for the cognitive domain C-1 and C-3, while the affective domain (aspect) is formulated in the form of student character that is expected to be achieved at the end of learning.</p>
RPP 7: KD 3.2	<p>The formulation of indicators above is not operational because the formulation of indicators contains more than one competency and the formulation of indicators is too minimal (less than three indicators), has not met the demands of the competencies contained in the KD, has not illustrated the hierarchy of competencies, and the formulation of indicators has not included the level of competence and learning material. Thus, there are still instructional errors in the translation of KD 3.2 into learning indicators because it is not done in detail, not comprehensive, not systematic, and not operational. The formulation of indicators is said to be not detailed because the research subject does not describe in detail and clearly in the indicators the material elements contained in the KD. It is said to be not comprehensive because the indicators made only contain limited knowledge, the indicators are not made completely. It is said to be unsystematic because the formulation of</p>

RPP	Results
	<p>the indicators does not reflect the actual content of the KD. It is said that it is not operational because the formulation of indicators contains more than one competency (mentioning various kinds of organizations in society and explaining the objectives, members, structure, and rules of the organization). The indicator should be formulated as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the types of organizations in the school environment (C1) 2. Identify the types of organizations in the community (C1) 3. Analyze the purpose, membership, structure, and rules of organizations in the school environment (C4) 4. Explain the procedure for selecting a class administrator (C2) 5. Practicing how to elect class administrators (C3, P2) 6. Make a class organizational structure chart (C5) 7. Show a positive attitude towards the importance of organization in the school environment (C3, A5) 7.
RPP 8: KD 3.3	<p>The indicator formulation above is not operational because the indicator formulation contains more than one competency, namely (1) knowing the organization, (2) choosing an organization to join, and (3) explaining the reasons for choosing the organization. If the indicator is broken down to be more operational, the following indicators will be obtained.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Know the organization (C1) 2. Choosing an organization to join (C6, A1) 3. Explaining the reasons for choosing the organization (C6, A3). <p>The three indicators are basically good because they meet the demands of the competencies contained in the KD and the indicators developed have described the hierarchy of competencies. The formulation of indicators has included the level of competence and learning materials and indicators have accommodated the characteristics of the subject because they have touched the cognitive domain (C1 and C6) and the affective domain (A3) and are formulated in the form of student character that is expected to be achieved at the end of learning. In indicator (3) the operational verb "explain the reason" can be replaced by "express the reason" because this competency formulation is the C6 cognitive domain.</p>
RPP 9: KD 4.1	<p>The formulation of this indicator is good because it meets the demands of the competencies contained in the KD, the indicators developed have described the hierarchy of competencies, and the formulation of indicators has included the level of competence and learning material and indicators have accommodated the characteristics of the subject. Indicators (1) to (3) are statements of competence for the cognitive domain C1 and C2, while the affective domain (aspect) is formulated in the form of student character that is expected to be achieved at the end</p>

RPP	Results
	of learning.
RPP 10: KD 4.2	The formulation of this indicator is good because it meets the demands of the competencies contained in the KD, the indicators developed have described the hierarchy of competencies, and the formulation of indicators has included the level of competence and learning material and indicators have accommodated the characteristics of the subject because it has touched the cognitive domain (C3) and the affective domain (A5) and is formulated in the form of student character that is expected to be achieved at the end of learning.

2. Instructional Analysis in Formulating Indicators

Indicators are markers of KD achievement marked by measurable behavioral changes that include attitudes, knowledge, and skills. Indicators are developed in accordance with the characteristics of students, subjects, education units, regional potential and formulated in operational verbs that are measurable and / or observable. In this assessment, the KD is translated into indicators.

The results of the analysis of the translation of KD into indicators of competency achievement in 10 lesson plans developed by the research subjects found instructional errors in the translation of KD into indicators on 3 KD, namely KD 2.1, KD 2.2, and KD 3.2. The instructional errors referred to, among others, because the research subjects formulated indicators not in detail, not comprehensive, not systematic, and only covered the cognitive aspects of the C1 and C2 domains. Whereas the cognitive domain levels C3 to C6 did not appear. (Depdiknas, 2007) Likewise, the affective domain is formulated very little. The formulation of indicators is said to be not detailed because the research subject does not describe in detail and clearly in the indicators the material elements contained in the KD. (Depdiknas, 2005) It is said to be not comprehensive because the indicators made only contain limited knowledge, the indicators are not made completely.

Instructional Analysis 2.1

KD 2.1 Explain the meaning and importance of central and regional laws and regulations

Rational. KD 2.1 requires the competency of students to be able to analyze the meaning and significance of laws and regulations at the central and regional levels. If you look closely at KD 2.1, it is known that the KD formulation contains more than one competency, namely (1) **explaining** the meaning of central and regional level legislation, (2) **analyzing** the importance of central and regional level legislation. So that competency achievement can be carried out completely, a comprehensive analysis must be carried out in order to determine relevant indicators of competency achievement.

Instructional analysis of KD formulations that contain more than one competency to identify the indicators is by first elaborating the KD through the sub-KD and sub-sub-KD identification stages. The steps that can be taken are **first**, create a tree diagram;

second, reviewing KD to determine sub-KD or sub-sub KD, and **third** identifying indicators for each sub-KD or sub-sub KD.

Instructional Analysis 2.2

KD 2.2 Provide examples of central and regional laws and regulations, such as taxes, anti-corruption, traffic, smoking bans

Rational. Paying close attention to the KD 2.2 formulation is actually not a KD formulation in its true meaning, because KD 2.2 is too specific because it only states the realm of knowledge (C1). So that competency achievement can be carried out completely, a comprehensive instructional analysis must be carried out in order to determine relevant indicators of competency achievement.

Instructional analysis of KD with a specific formulation (only covering the domain of knowledge) requires different elaboration steps from operational KD. The steps that can be taken are **first**, carrying out an analysis to determine the place of KD in the competency map that covers it; **second**, formulate KD and its indicators; and determining competency achievement indicators that contain main indicator content.

Instructional Analysis 3.2

KD 3.2 Mention examples of organizations in the school and community environment

Rational. KD 3.2 also only states the realm of knowledge (C1), so KD 3.2 is not actually a KD formulation in its true meaning. This KD is basically not a statement about a competency, because the KD as a statement about competency must clearly express the demands for implementing (C3), carrying out analysis (C4), or carrying out assessments (C5, C6). To be able to determine indicators of competency achievement, in this case further analysis must be carried out, namely describing KD 3.2 by first creating a competency map that covers it. A KD basically contains the minimum competencies that students must achieve at the end of learning. However, so that competency achievement can be carried out completely, a comprehensive instructional analysis must be carried out in order to determine relevant indicators of competency achievement.

Instructional analysis of KD with a specific formulation (only covering the domain of knowledge) requires different elaboration steps from operational KD. The steps that can be taken are **first**, carrying out an analysis to determine the place of KD in the competency map that covers it; **second**, formulate KD and its indicators; and determining competency achievement indicators that contain main indicator content.

Discussion

1. Elaboration of Basic Competencies into Indicators

The teacher plays a very important role in learning, because he is the one who plans the learning, implements it, and assesses the success or failure of the learning. (Semiawan, 2008) Whether a lesson is good or bad and the quality or not is largely

determined by the teacher as the learning leader. According to Arend (Arends, 1997) there are three most important functions of a teacher as a learning leader, namely planning, managing the class (managing classroom life), and assessing and evaluating student progress (assessing and evaluating student progress).

Planning learning is the teacher's first task in the learning series. The teacher formulates a learning plan before the learning process takes place in the classroom. So, before the teacher enters the classroom to teach, the teacher must prepare a learning plan well, because the quality of the learning process in the classroom is largely determined by the learning plan that is made. (Arends, 1997) illustrates this by saying "*successful classroom learning almost always is the result of considerable planning prior to actual instruction*". The Learning Implementation Plan (RPP) in question is of course not just a formal RPP, but the RPP that is made must be good, because a good RPP really helps the implementation of learning (Mulyasa, 2006)

A RPP can only be said to be good if the elements in it meet the minimum requirements for a RPP and are formulated systematically, completely and comprehensively. In Law no. 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System in Article 20 explains that learning program plans have at least several elements, namely: learning objectives, teaching materials, methods, learning resources, and assessment of learning outcomes. (Depdiknas, 2006) In the RPP Development Guidebook published by the Director General of Basic Education (Depdiknas, 2008) the preparation of the Learning Implementation Plan (RPP) consists of several components, namely: (1) subject identity, (2) competency standards, (3) basic competencies, (4) competency achievement indicators, (5) learning objectives, (6) teaching materials, (7) time allocation, (8) learning methods, (9) learning activities, (10) assessment of learning outcomes, and (11) learning resources. The quality of the RPP prepared by the teacher will greatly determine the quality of learning implementation. The elements of the learning plan mentioned above are included in every lesson plan made by the teacher.

The standard competency (SK) and basic competency (KD) components in the RPP are formulations that already exist in the KTSP, therefore these components only have to be quoted by the teacher when making the RPP. Meanwhile, other components must be formulated by the teacher himself. KD is a learning objective that is still general in nature. Thus, KD needs to be translated into a number of competency achievement indicators so that KD achievement can be carried out and measured easily. This is in line with what was stated by Susanto (Susanto, 2007) that in order for KD to be achieved, a sign that can be used to plan learning needs to be developed.

Therefore, one of the most important aspects that teachers must carry out in relation to compiling this RPP is that teachers must carry out instructional analysis to examine the basic competencies (KD) that students will obtain at the end of learning. This instructional analysis aims to describe KD as an indicator of competency achievement so

that in the end teachers can easily choose teaching and select appropriate assessment methods and tools to help students achieve the expected basic competencies.

However, from the description and data analysis explained in the previous section, it is known that in the RPPs made by research subjects, some of the RPPs contain indicator components and others do not have learning indicators formulated in the RPPs. Likewise, based on the results of the analysis of the RPP developed by the research subjects, it is known that for the formulation of indicators, the research subjects have not formulated them in detail, are not comprehensive, and are not systematic. The formulation of the indicators is said to be not detailed because the research subjects did not explain in detail and clearly in the indicators the material elements contained in the KD. It is said to be not comprehensive because the indicators created only contain limited knowledge, and the indicators were not created completely. It is said to be unsystematic because the formulation of the indicator does not yet reflect the actual content of the KD. This means that the indicators formulated do not yet describe the material contained in basic competencies. This is especially seen in the explanation of KD 2.2, KD 2.3, and KD 3.2 as indicators of competency achievement.

The teacher's incomplete formulation of indicators will of course greatly influence the formulation of the elements of the next RPP, because the formulation of other RPP elements departs from the indicators that have already been created. This is in accordance with what Susanto (Susanto, 2008) said:

"Identification of indicators from KD needs to be carried out systematically so that the indicators obtained truly represent and deepen the intended KD. Indicators determine the selection of learning materials, learning activities, time allocation, assessment and learning resources and media."

Susanto (Susanto, 2008) further explained that teacher skills in carrying out instructional analysis are evidence of teacher mastery of everything related to learning, namely understanding learning objectives (KD and indicators), mastery of learning materials, mastery of the learning process, and selecting and preparing learning assessments. Thus, to be able to formulate learning objectives, teaching materials, selection of methods, determining time allocation, learning activities, selection of sources and media and selection of appropriate and good evaluation tools, teachers must first formulate good learning indicators. Because the next teacher's formulation of RPP elements will always be based on the indicators created.

Therefore, indicators should be explained in detail and thoroughly, so that teachers know exactly which domains and competencies will be studied and students must achieve after learning. So, if the indicators formulated by the teacher are complete, then the other elements of the RPP will be formulated well. If the formulation of these elements is good, the teacher will carry out learning well. If the learning is done well, the results will be quality. On the other hand, if the indicators formulated are not complete, then the teacher will not formulate the following elements well. If these formulations are not good, then

the learning carried out will not be good. And if the learning carried out is not good, then the results will not be of high quality. Therefore, to be able to formulate the elements of the next RPP, teachers must first formulate learning indicators in detail and systematically.

Based on the results of the analysis of the translation of KD into indicators of competency achievement in the 10 (ten) RPPs developed by research subjects, it was found that in some RPPs, research subjects did not formulate indicators of competency achievement but instead directly formulated learning objectives. This certainly does not indicate a good RPP format, namely the components of competency achievement indicators should be included in the RPP. Even though the debate about the format of the RPP is not more important than the substance of the RPP itself, in relation to the formulation of competency achievement indicators it must still be included in the RPP.

This is because indicators are markers of whether a KD has been achieved or not. KD is a learning objective that is still general in nature. Therefore, KD needs to be translated into indicators so that the achievement of KD can be carried out and measured easily.

Susanto (Susanto, 2008) emphasizes that the indicators of a KD show "what must be taught (learning material)", "how it is taught (learning activities)", and "how it is assessed (evaluation/assessment)". Based on what Sosanto stated Therefore, it becomes increasingly clear that in order to be able to formulate learning objectives, teaching materials, selection of methods, determining time allocation, learning activities, selection of sources and media and selection of appropriate and good evaluation tools, teachers must first formulate good learning indicators. Because in the next teacher's formulation of RPP elements, it will always be based on the indicators created. Likewise, it can be said that the implementation of learning will only be effective if the indicators of a KD have been formulated well.

After the teacher has formulated a number of indicators for achieving competency well, it is also important to formulate learning objectives. This is because this objective component describes the learning process and outcomes that students are expected to achieve in accordance with basic competencies. In the analysis of a number of lesson plans where the research subjects formulated learning objectives (not all lesson plans formulated learning objectives), it was discovered that the research subjects had not formulated learning objectives in detail and correctly in accordance with the rules for formulating operational, good and correct learning objectives. In KD 3.2, for example, the research subject formulated the learning objectives as follows.

"Students can name various types of organizations in society, as well as explain the objectives, members, structure and rules of these organizations"

The learning objectives are not detailed and not operational because they only formulate one learning objective and contain more than one competency. Mager (in Arend (Arends, 1997) says *"...for instructional objectives to be meaningful, they must clearly*

communicate a teacher's instructional intent and should be very specific". According to Mager, the learning objectives formulated by the teacher must be communicative and specific, so that the RPP created will be meaningful. A similar opinion was also expressed by Tylor in Nasution and Popham (Popham, 2005) who said that teachers must formulate specific goals and these goals are formulated in the form of student behavior. The formulation of clear and specific learning objectives according to Nasution (Nasution, 2005) can be a guide and guide to more harmonious teaching methods and enable better assessment of learning processes and outcomes. The formulation of learning objectives will of course be good if the indicators that have been formulated are good, because the formulation of learning objectives is formulated from the formulation of indicators that have been prepared previously.

In formulating good and specific learning objectives, there are four elements that must be present in it, namely: student elements (audience), learning outcomes to be achieved (behavior), tools or materials that are deliberately provided so that the objectives are achieved (conditions), and standards. success (degree) (Ibrahim, 2005) These four formulas are often abbreviated to the A-B-C-D formula. Of these four elements, at least the elements of behavior and behavior must be present in the formulation of learning objectives. In addition, according to Nasution (Nasution, 2005) in formulating learning objectives, the operational words used must not be ambiguous or interpretative, such as; know, know, comprehend, realize, feel, comprehend and appreciate.

Apart from that, the formulation of learning objectives formulated by research subjects is still not detailed. This means that the formulated objectives do not yet indicate the actual objectives to be achieved by the material to be studied. This is because indicators of competency achievement are not formulated in advance. The learning objectives formulated by research subjects also often do not contain the elements of conditions and degrees. In the formulation of the learning objectives formulated, the research subject only contains elements of audience and behavior, even though the elements of degree are important in providing limits to the extent to which learning can be said to be successful or the extent to which students are said to be able or unable to master the teaching material. In the absence of this level, research subjects do not have minimum criteria for when learning can be said to be successful or not. (J. Nasution, 1996) Apart from that, degree will be able to provide clarity and become a limitation for research subjects in creating questions for evaluation tools.

3. Instructional Analysis in Formulating Indicators

KD is essentially a statement about competence. As a statement about competency, KD shows what students can do at the end of learning activities. Thus, the formulation of good KD is operational KD. What is meant by an operational KD formulation is KD which contains a statement about a competency; using the verbs domains of application (C3), analysis (C4), synthesis (C5), and assessment (C6); consists of only one competency; and

can be achieved with one short stage of learning activities, not with several prolonged meetings. (Susanto, 2008)

It is important for the operationalization of a KD formulation to be easily translated into indicators of competency achievement. Based on the results of the analysis of the description of KD as an indicator of competency achievement developed by research subjects, in some of the KDs for class V Civics subjects, a number of KDs were found whose formulations were already operational. This certainly makes it easier for teachers to describe KD into a number of learning indicators, because operational KD indicators can be easily identified. However, in a number of KDs analyzed, it was also found that there were KD' whose formulations were not operational. It is said to be non-operational because the KD contains more than one competency and is not a statement about competency because it uses action verbs in the domain of knowledge (C1). This is what then causes several errors in the instructional analysis of a number of KDs carried out by research subjects, because for KDs whose formulation is not operational, more careful steps must be developed to be able to identify the indicators. (Depdiknas, 2008a)

Instructional analysis of the KD formulation which contains more than one competency (KD 2.1) to identify the indicators is by first elaborating the KD through the sub-KD and sub-sub-KD identification stages. KD whose formulation is complex (more than one competency) requires different elaboration steps from operational KD. Non-operational KD cannot be directly translated into indicators, but the sub-KD must be identified. (Susanto, 2008) The steps that can be taken are first, create a tree diagram; second, reviewing KD to determine sub-KD or sub-sub-KD, and third identifying indicators for each sub-KD or sub-sub-KD.

KD 2.1 Explain the meaning and importance of central and regional laws and regulations

Indicator:

- a. State the meaning/definition of regulations (C1)
- b. Explain the meaning of statutory regulations (C2)
- c. Describe the meaning of central and regional level legislation (C2)
- d. State the reasons for the importance of central and regional level legislation (C3, A3)
- e. Demonstrate a positive attitude towards the importance of central and regional legislation (C3, A5)

Instructional analysis of KD formulations that are too specific (KD 2.2 and KD 3.2) to identify the indicators is to first create a competency map that covers these KD. KD basically contains the minimum competencies that students must achieve at the end of learning. However, schools (*in this case teachers*) can develop indicators that exceed these minimum standards. (Depdiknas, 2008b) So that competency achievement can be carried out completely, a comprehensive instructional analysis must be carried out in order to determine relevant indicators of competency achievement. KD whose formulation is specific (*only covering the domain of knowledge*) requires different elaboration steps from operational KD. The steps that can be taken are **first**, carrying out an analysis to determine

the place of KD in the competency map that covers it; **second**, formulate KD and its indicators; and **third**, determining competency achievement indicators that contain main indicator content. Ibrahim as follows. (Ibrahim, 2010)

"After finding the indicators, we need to see any overlap between the indicators. If this happens, we can choose indicators that are more inclusive. This means that indicators that can be represented by other indicators can be removed or removed."

KD 2.2 Provide examples of central and regional laws and regulations, such as taxes, anti-corruption, traffic, smoking bans.

Indicator:

1. Identify various examples of statutory regulations (C1)
2. Mention examples of central level legislation (C1)
3. Mention examples of regional level legislation (C1)
4. Differentiate between examples of central level and regional level regulations (C2)
5. Analyze examples of central and regional legislative regulations such as taxes, anti-corruption, traffic, smoking bans (C4)
6. Classify laws and regulations at the central level and regional level (C4)
7. Create a national legislation sequence chart (C4)
8. Demonstrate a positive attitude towards the importance of national legislation (C3, A5)

Based on the opinion above, the inclusive nature of the KD 2.2 indicator above can be found, for example in indicators (2) and (3) that when someone (student) mentions examples of central and regional level legislation, then the student has been able to identify various examples of statutory regulations, because an example of statutory regulations at the central and regional levels is an example of statutory regulations. Thus, indicator (1) does not need to be included in the RPP. This inclusive nature can also be found in indicator (5) so that indicator (4) may not be included in the RPP. However, in instructional analysis, identification of all these indicators needs to be carried out because this will provide clear direction for teachers to develop other components of the RPP, such as selecting teaching materials, determining methods, media, and determining the assessment of learning outcomes. Apart from that, the results of this analysis are important to help students overcome learning difficulties, for example in the KD 2.2 analysis it is to differentiate between the concepts of regulations and laws, as well as other concepts. This is in line with what was stated by Susanto (Susanto, 2008) that:

"Identification of sub-indicators needs to be done to determine the learning activity items and prerequisite learning items that students need. With sub-indicators, the

causes of students' difficulties in mastering competencies can be tracked and appropriate assistance can be provided."

KD 2.2 Provide examples of central and regional laws and regulations, such as taxes, anti-corruption, traffic, smoking bans

Indicator:

1. Mention examples of central level legislation (C1)
2. Mention examples of regional level legislation (C1)
3. Analyze examples of central and regional level legislation such as taxes, anti-corruption, traffic, smoking bans (C4)
4. Classifying laws and regulations at the central level and regional level (C4)
5. Create a national legislation sequence chart (C4)
6. Demonstrate a positive attitude towards the importance of national legislation (C3, A5)

Likewise, as stated in the research results section, the instructional analysis of KD 3.2 can identify a number of indicators (14 indicators). However, all the indicators identified do not necessarily have to be included in the RPP. The next analysis is to determine indicators of competency achievement that contain main indicator content. This means that if there are a number of indicators that can represent other indicators (main indicators), then the indicators that have been represented can be omitted or do not need to be written and do not need to be included in the RPP.

Likewise, if the competency achievement indicators are too broad, they can be simplified while still paying attention to the minimum competencies that students must achieve as stated in the KD. Instructional analysis helps map learning activities down to the smallest unit of a competency. With this mapping, the earliest point of learning activities can be known so that difficulties in mastering a competency or part of a competency can be tracked and overcome (Susanto, 2008)

In the explanation of KD 3.2 as indicators above, a number of indicators can be omitted or do not need to be written, for example if the expected competency is more directed towards active participation in every organization in the school environment.

Thus, the indicator formulation for KD 3.2 is as follows. KD 3.2 Mention examples of organizations in the school and community environment Indicator:

- a. Identify the types of organizations in the school environment (C1)
- b. Identify the types of organizations in society (C1)
- c. Analyze the goals, membership, structure and rules of organizations in the school environment (C4)
- d. Explain the procedures for selecting class administrators (C2)
- e. Practice how to select class administrators (C3, P2)
- f. Create a class organizational structure chart (C5)
- g. Show a positive attitude towards the importance of organizations in the school environment (C3, A5)

Conclusion

From the results of the instructional analysis and discussions that have been carried out on a number of lesson plans for Class V Elementary School Civics subjects developed by research subjects, it is known that:

1. In explaining KD as an indicator in the ten lesson plans analyzed, research subjects have described KD as a good indicator in preparing RPPs for Class V Elementary School Civics subjects. However, based on the results of the analysis, it was still found that the research subjects formulated indicators in a non-detailed, comprehensive, and unsystematic manner. This finding applies to three KD, namely KD 2.2, KD 2.3, and KD 3.2. The formulation of the indicators is said to be not detailed because the research subjects did not explain in detail and clearly in the indicators the material elements contained in the KD. It is said to be not comprehensive because the indicators created only contain limited knowledge, and the indicators were not created completely. It is said to be unsystematic because the formulation of the indicator does not yet reflect the actual content of the KD. This means that the indicators formulated do not yet describe the material contained in basic competencies.
2. In a number of KDs in the Civics class V elementary school subjects analyzed, it is known that the KDs in the Civics class V elementary school subjects consist of KDs whose formulation is operational and non-operational. Except for the operational formulation, 3 KD were found whose formulations were not operational, namely KD 2.2, KD 2.3 and KD 3.2. It is said to be non-operational because the KD formulation contains more than one competency or complex KD (KD 2.1) and KD that are too specific (KD 2.2 and KD 2.3) because the KD is not actually a statement about competency because it uses action verbs in the realm of knowledge (C1). . This then led to several errors in the instructional analysis of a number of KDs carried out by the research subjects. This error occurred because for KD whose formulation was not operational, the research subject (teacher) should have developed more careful steps to be able to identify indicators of KD that were not operational. The results of the

analysis then show that the steps for instructional analysis of KD to identify the indicators are as follows.

- a. Instructional analysis of the operational KD formulation can directly identify the indicators by breaking down the KD into relevant indicators.
- b. Instructional analysis of KD formulations that contain more than one competency to identify the indicators is by first elaborating the KD through the sub-KD and sub-sub-KD identification stages. The steps that can be taken are (1) making a tree diagram, (2) reviewing the KD to determine the sub-KD or sub-sub-KD, and (3) identifying indicators for each sub-KD or sub-sub-KD.
- c. Instructional analysis of KD formulations that are too specific to identify the indicators is to first create a competency map that covers the KD. The steps that can be taken are (1) carrying out an analysis to determine the place of KD in the competency map that covers it, (2) formulating KD and its indicators, and (3) determining indicators of competency achievement that contain main indicator content.

From the research findings above, it can be concluded that the teacher has described KD as a good indicator in preparing RPPs for Class V Elementary School Civics subjects. KD for the Class V Elementary School Civics subject consists of an operational KD formula and a non-operational KD formula. Except for the operational KD formulation, there are instructional analysis errors made by teachers in describing KD into indicators, namely in the non-operational KD formulation.

References

- Arends, R. (1997). *Classroom Intruction and Management*. McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Arikunto, S. (2006). *Prosedur Penelitian (suatu pendekatan praktik)*. Rineka Cipta.
- Depdiknas. (2005). *Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 19 tahun 2005 tentang Standar Nasional Pendidikan*. Depdiknas.
- Depdiknas. (2007). *Permendiknas Nomor 41 Tahun 2007 tentang Standar Proses*. Depdiknas.
- Depdiknas. (2008a). *Panduan Pengembangan Indikator*. Direktorat Jendral Manajemen Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah.
- Depdiknas. (2008b). *Panduan Pengembangan RPP*. Jakarta: . Direktorat Jendral Manajemen Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah.
- Desmita. (2009). *Psikologi Perkembangan Peserta Didik: Panduan bagi Orang Tua dan Guru dalam Memahami Psikologi Anak Usia SD, SMP, dan SMA*. Rosdakarya.
- Dick, W. & C. Lou. (2009). *The Systematic Design of Instruction*. Pearson Education, Inc.
- Djahiri, K. (2006). *Esensi Pendidikan Nilai Moral dan PKn di Era Globalisasi*". *Dasim Budimansyah dan Syaifullah Syam (Ed). Pendidikan Nilai Moral dalam Dimensi Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan*. Laboratorium Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan (PKn) FPIPS-UPI.
- Ibrahim, M. dkk. (2010). *Dasar-dasar Proses Belajar Mengajar*. Unesa University Press.

- Ibrahim, Muslimin. 2005. (2005). *Asesmen Berkelanjutan, Konsep Dasar, Tahapan Pengembangan dan Contoh*. Unesa University Press.
- Kemp, J. E. Kemp. (1994). *The Instructional Design Process*. Publisher, Inc.
- Moleong, L. J. (1991). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mulyasa, E. (2006). *KTSP: Sebuah panduan Praktis*. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Nasution, J. (1996). *Penelitian Masyarakat*. Intermedia.
- Nasution, S. (2005). *Berbagai Pendekatan dalam Proses Belajar Mengajar*. Bumi Aksara.
- Nur, M. (2004). *Teori-teori Perkembangan Kognitif*. Pusat Sains dan Matematika Sekolah, Universitas Negeri Surabaya.
- Pidarta, M. (2007). *Wawasan Pendidikan*. Surabaya. Unesa University Press.
- Popham, J. dan B. E. (2005). *Teknik Mengajar Secara Sistematis*. Rineka Cipta.
- Semiawan, C. (2008). *Belajar dan Pembelajaran Prasekolah dan Sekolah Dasar*. Indeks.
- Sugiyono. (2008). *Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
- Sunarto. (1990). *Metodologi Penelitian Sosial dan Pendidikan (Pendekatan Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif)*. Unesa University Press.
- Suparno, P. (2001). *Teori Perkembangan Kognitif Jean Piaget*. Kanisius.
- Susanto. (2007). *Pengembangan KTSP dengan Perspektif Manajemen Visi*. University Press.
- Susanto. (2008). *Penyusunan Silabus dan RPP berbasis Visi KTSP*. Unesa University Press.
- Tilaar, H. A. R. (2003). *Kekuasaan dan Pendidikan*. IndonesiaTera.
- Wahab, A. (2004). *Materi Pokok Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan (PPKn), Modul 1-6*. Universitas Terbuka.