Available online:
https://journal.unismuh.ac.id/index.php/exposure
Exposure: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris

EVALUATING THE INTEGRATION OF ABCD BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES AND BLOOM'S LEARNING DOMAINS IN THE MERDEKA CURRICULUM LESSON PREPARATION: INSIGHTS AND CHALLENGES

Siti Rabiah Adawiyah[1], Mila Kamilasari[2], Dedi Sulaeman[3]
[1,2,3]English Language Education Department, UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia
rabiahsiti53@gmail.com

Received: July 03, 2024 Revised: August 12,2024 Accepted: November 10, 2024

ABSTRACT
Merdeka Curriculum has changed how teachers prepare the lessons. Leading to the necessary understanding of critical aspects of the teaching module making. This study characterizes the learning objectives of the Merdeka curriculum teaching module using Schwiers' ABCD behavioral objectives and Bloom's learning domains theory. It also explores the factors that hinder teachers from fully comprehending the three learning domains (cognitive, affective, and psychomotor) when designing a teaching module. This study utilized a qualitative approach with two junior high school teachers as participants. Analyzing the teaching modules and interviewing participants were performed. Using Schwiers' ABCD and Bloom's learning domains model, this study found that teachers had already focused on learner-centered activities. However, some inconsistencies arose in the presence of 'ABCD' components and three learning objectives statements. Factors like demotivation, lack of prior knowledge, insufficient practice and feedback, understanding gaps, time constraints, and overcrowded curriculum hindered teachers from applying the learning domains. In conclusion, integrating ABCD components and learning domains in a teaching module may facilitate effective instructional design, promote learner-centered approaches, set clear expectations, and optimize the learning environment.

Keywords: *Behavioral Objectives; Bloom Taxonomy; English; Merdeka Curriculum; Teaching Module*

INTRODUCTION

Education has a critical role in changing civilizations and empowering people. Students gain knowledge and abilities through excellent teaching approaches, allowing them to thrive personally and professionally. In Indonesia, the government has implemented the Merdeka Curriculum to reform the education system and promote autonomous and critical thinking among students (Zidan & Qamariah, 2023). With this in mind, it is critical to analyze the teaching modules offered to teachers to assess the curriculum's effectiveness. The lens of behavioral theory is one technique for critically analyzing the Merdeka Curriculum's teaching module. As a result, this research utilizes Schwiers' ABCD model and Bloom's learning domains theory to investigate the existence of the behavioral objectives and teachers' consideration of three learning domains in teaching modules in the Merdeka Curriculum. It further analyzes factors that hinder teachers from contemplating three learning domains.

Dan Schwiers (1998) proposes Schwiers' ABCD behavioral objectives model. It emphasizes the importance of focusing on four key components. Behavioral objectives consist of four main components: the audience, verb describing observable behavior, conditions, and degree as standards for acceptable performance learning processes. A message's recipient or learner is frequently referred to as the audience (Aithal, Shailashree, & Kumar, (2016). Another component is a behavior composed of verbs that characterize an observable behavior that the learner may pick to represent a result of the instruction or message (Jacobson, McDuff, & Monroe, 2015). According to McConnell, Conrad, and Uhrmacher (2020), the conditions section of learning objectives outlines a test scenario in which students are required to exhibit certain behaviors. Lastly, the fourth element, which consists of the minimally acceptable performance required as a result of the instruction, is described by the degree aspect of behavior objectives (McConnell et al., 2020). Thus, this model provides a comprehensive framework that enables teachers to evaluate and enhance their teaching strategies.

An educational psychologist, Benjamin Bloom, developed a taxonomy of learning domains in the mid-twentieth century. It involves cognitive, affective, and psychomotor. It provides a framework for teachers to design instructional materials (Bloom, Engelhart, Furst, Hill, & Krathwohl, 1956). Cognitive domains involve intellectual abilities like remembering information, comprehending, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating (Hoque, 2016). The affective domain encompasses the receiving aspect, responding, valuing, organization, and characterization that focus on interpersonal skills and ethical thinking (McCoach, Gable, & Madura, 2013). The psychomotor domain involves perception, set, guided response, mechanism, complex overt response, adaptation, and origination (Romiszowski, 2013). Bloom's taxonomy provides a framework for teachers to assess learning outcomes and encourage holistic development by addressing cognitive, affective, and psychomotor elements.

The significance of utilizing Schwiers' ABCD model and Bloom's learning domains theory lies in their ability to unravel the strengths and weaknesses of teaching modules. Latifa (2016) conducted research by analyzing the 2013 curriculum using Schwiers' ABCD model and Bloom's learning domains theory. Fadoli (2022) also conducted research examining English teachers' lesson plans.

Siregar, Sumanik, and Christianto (2022) studied teachers' ability to set learning objectives on the Merdeka curriculum. With this in mind, this research employs Schwiers' ABCD model and Bloom's learning domains theory to investigate the existence of the behavioral objectives and teachers' contemplation of three learning domains in teaching modules in the Merdeka Curriculum. It further analyzes factors that hinder teachers from contemplating three learning domains. By delving into the affective, behavioral, cognitive, and degree domains and evaluating cognitive, affective, and psychomotor development, this research aims to assess the teaching modules comprehensively.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

This study utilized a qualitative approach. Qualitative research emphasizes the exploration and interpretation of subjective meanings, context, and lived experiences. Qualitative research employs various techniques for data collection, including interviews, focus groups, participant observation, and document analysis (Ormston, Spencer, Barnard, & Snape, 2014). This study utilized document analysis to discuss the teaching module's objectives. The interview technique was also employed to explore the factors hindering teachers from fully comprehending the three learning domains when designing a teaching module. Furthermore, the researchers employed purposeful sampling in this study by reason to schools applying the Merdeka curriculum. Two teachers who taught English in junior high school in Tasikmalaya participated in this study. Following that, the interview was conducted with each participant. Then, two teaching modules from the seventh graders were analyzed to collect the data.

The data collected were examined using the ABCD behavioral objectives and Bloom's taxonomy approach. The "ABCD" mnemonic device was suggested by Zerwas (2008) to ensure that the objective statements are measurable. ABCD stands for A "audience," B "behavior," C "condition." and D "degree." For instance, at the end of the lesson, students [A] can identify five names of occupation [B] after being shown pictures [C] using correct pronunciation [D]. Fatimah and Rizaldi (2022) employed the ABCD objective model to investigate structured lesson preparation, particularly in online and hybrid education. In this study, the ABCD framework was used to analyze the structured teaching preparation of teachers in the Merdeka curriculum teaching module.

Furthermore, Bloom's taxonomy was used for a descriptive analysis that served as the primary basis for the lesson plan analysis. Fatmawati (2021) utilized Bloom's Taxonomy to identify character-building projects and targeted learning experiences that alleviate learning loss. In this study, the data collected were reviewed to determine the affective, cognitive, and psychomotor aspects. It further analyzes factors that hinder teachers from contemplating three learning domains.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The Presence of the "ABCD" Model in Teaching Module

A total of two teaching modules were reviewed. The data collected is presented to answer the research question of this study. Firstly, it responds to the question of the existence of ABCD (Audience, Behavior, Condition, and Degree) in the teaching module's learning objectives. Thus, Table 1 illustrates the presence of ABCD aspects in junior high school teaching modules.

Table 1. The Presence of "ABCD" Model as An Illustration of Behavioral Objectives in Teaching Module

	Learning Objectives
Teacher 1 (T1)	Students [A] interact and communicate in more diverse contexts and formal and informal situations using spoken, written, and visual texts in English [B], with different kinds of texts such as narratives, descriptions, procedures, specific texts (short messages, advertisements), and literary works becoming the primary reference in learning English in this phase [C]. Students [A] utilize English to express their desires and feelings [B]. Their grasp of written material grows, and inference skills emerge when they comprehend implicit information [C]. They [A] create written and visual messages [B] using a more diverse vocabulary [C] and organized English [D].
Teacher 2 (T2)	Students [A] use English to engage and discuss thoughts, experiences, interests, opinions, and ideas with teachers, peers, and others in formal and informal settings [B]. By repeating and modifying language [C], students [A] comprehend the key concepts and relevant details of debates or presentations on many known themes and in the context of school and home life [B]. They [A] participate in debates, for example, by offering comments, drawing comparisons, and expressing preferences [B]. They [A] explain and clarify their responses [B] with simple sentence structures and verbs [D]. Students [A] independently [C] read and respond to known and unfamiliar texts that contain taught structures and terminology [B]. They

	[A] seek out and assess the key concepts and specific information in various texts [B]. This text can be printed or digital, and it may include visual, multimodal, or interactive elements [C]. They [A] recognize the text's aim and begin to draw conclusions to grasp the implicit information [C].
	Students [A] express their ideas and experiences [B] in basic, structured paragraphs, utilizing specific language and sentence patterns [D]. Using samples [C], they design, produce, and deliver informational, imaginative, and persuasive writings [B], constructing arguments and explaining or defending an opinion [D].

Table 1 shows teachers included the ABCD components in designing the teaching module. T1 input the A, B, and C components in her first lesson objective. The audience is the students. Then, the expected behavior that wishes to be done is to use English to interact and communicate in more diverse contexts and formal and informal situations. The condition component involves using several types of text. Furthermore, T1 attached the A, B, and C components in her second lesson objective. The audience is the students.

The expected behavior is to use English to discuss and convey desires. The condition component is entailing an understanding of implicit information. Moreover, T1 input the A, B, C, and D components in her third learning objective. The audience is the students. Then, the desired behavior that wishes to be done is to produce written and visual texts. The condition component involves using a more diverse vocabulary. Lastly, the degree component entails using the correct English structure. Among the three learning objectives, T1 attached one Degree component. Here, the ABC component was utilized frequently.

Followingly, T2 attached the ABCD component to her lesson objectives. In her first learning objectives, T2 involved the ABCD component. The audience is the students. Then, the expected behavior that wishes to be done is to use English to interact and exchange ideas with teachers or peers. It also involves understanding the main idea, entangling in the discussion, and explaining their answer. The condition component includes repeating and changing vocabulary. As for the degree component, students are expected to use correct verbs with simple sentence structure. Moreover, T2 input the ABC component in her second learning objective. Students are the audience of the lesson. The desired behavior that a teacher wishes to have in her students is to read, respond, look for, and evaluate various texts' main

ideas and specific information. As for the condition component, the text can be in print or digital form, including visual and multimodal.

Furthermore, T2 attached the ABCD component to her third learning objective. The audience is the students. The expected behavior that wishes to be done is to communicate their experience, make plans, and write informational, imaginative, and persuasive texts. Students must also construct arguments and depend on or explain their opinions. The condition is to use the samples provided. The Degree component involves using specific vocabulary and simple and compound sentence structure. It also required the use of simple paragraphs. Although T2 inputs three Degree components among the three learning objectives, the ABC component was utilized frequently.

The Presence of Three Learning Domains

The teaching module was further analyzed to answer the second question. It was held to determine the selection vocabulary used to formulate the learning objectives. The following Table 2 depicts the learning domains in the teaching module. Furthermore, it shows which domain between cognitive, affective, and psychomotor was emphasized by the teacher.

Table 2. Teachers' Contemplation of Three Learning Domains in Designing Teaching Module

Participant	Cognitive	Affective	Psychomotor
Teacher 1 (T1)	*Remembering:* identify *Comprehending:* explain *Applying*: use *Analyzing*: distinguish *Evaluating*: conclude *Creating*: write, tell	*Receiving:* ask *Responding*: Express ideas, perform, answer	*Perception*: detect *Guided response*: respond *Mechanism*: produce
Teacher 2 (T2)	*Remembering*: identify *Comprehending*: explain *Applying*: use *Evaluating*: evaluate *Creating*: write, arrange, tell	*Receiving*: ask *Responding*: present, answer	*Perception*: detect *Guided response*: respond *Mechanism*: construct, display

Table 2 illustrates the analyzed results of the presence of three learning domains in the teaching module. It discovered that the cognitive domain appeared more frequently than the affective and psychomotor domains. As there are six levels of cognitive domain knowledge, T1 completed all cognitive domain knowledge levels with the selected action verb. For the first level, "*Remembering,"* the teacher chose the word *"Identify."* Students were asked to identify a particular lesson. The second level is *"Comprehending."* The teacher chose the word *"Explain."* Students were expected to explain the lesson learned.

The third level is *"Applying."* The teacher utilized the word *"Use."* Students were requested to use the lesson learned in a particular situation. The fourth level is *"Analyzing."* The teacher used the word used the word *"Distinguish."* Here, students were expected to be able to distinguish certain situations where they could apply the lesson they learned. The fifth level is *"Evaluating."* The teachers chose *"Conclude"* as students were asked to conclude the lesson they learned. The sixth level is *"Creating."* The teacher utilized the words *"Write" and "Tell."* Here, students were expected to be able to write and communicate what they had learned in a proper English structure.

Meanwhile, T2 inserted almost all cognitive domains with the desired action verb besides the analyzing level. For the first level, *"Remembering,"* the teacher selected the word *"Identify."* The task required of the students was to name a specific lesson. The second level is called *"Comprehending." "Explain"* was the word the teacher selected. Students were required to explain the knowledge they had gained. The third level is *"Applying."* The teacher referred to the word *"Use."* The students were expected to apply the lesson in a specific scenario. Specifically, T2 managed not to attach the fourth level, *"Analyzing."* After that, she continued to the *"Evaluating"* level. The students were prompted to draw conclusions from the lesson they had learned. Thus, the teachers selected *"Conclude"* as the word attached. Level six is *"Creating."* Three words that the teacher used were *"Write," "Tell,"* and *"Arrange."* In this context, the students were required to be able to write, construct sentences, and explain their learning using appropriate English grammar.

Furthermore, regarding the affective domain, T1 and T2 inserted only two levels of the affective domain, namely receiving and responding. T1 inserted the word *"Ask"* in the *"Receiving"* level. Students were analyzed to see if they received

the lesson by asking the teacher for something they still did not apprehend. Furthermore, for the second level, namely *"Responding."* The teachers utilized the words *"Express ideas," "Perform,"* and *"Answer."* Here, students' understanding of the lesson was examined by their ability to express ideas. It was further investigated by their performance, as they came forward before their friends to show what they had learned. Lastly, students' understanding and confidence were seen by their ability to answer the questions given by the teacher before their friends.

Moreover, T2 also attached the word *"Ask"* in the *"Receiving"* level. Students were assessed to determine whether they understood the lesson by requesting the teacher to explain anything they were still uncertain about. For the second level, *"Responding,"* the teachers chose two words, namely *"Present"* and *"Answer."* Finally, students' understanding and confidence were demonstrated by their ability to answer questions posed by the teacher in front of their peers. Furthermore, T1 and T2 attached three levels in the psychomotor domain with the preferred action verb. However, they managed not to attach the second level of the second level and proceeded to the third level, which is *"Guided response."* Thus, it involved perception, guided response, and mechanism level.

In the first level of psychomotor *"Perception,"* T1 chose the word "Detect." Here, students were guided to use their senses to detect non-verbal communication cues regarding the lesson taught. Then, in the "Guided response" level, she utilized the word "Respond." Here, students are analyzed in terms of their ability to respond to their teacher despite trial and error. Following that, at the "Mechanism" level, the teacher used the word "Produce." Students were required to execute motor activity, namely producing a text as the outcome of their understanding of the lesson.

T2 chose the word "Detect" in the first level of psychomotor "Perception." In this case, students were instructed to use their senses to pick up on nonverbal indications about the topic being delivered. The word "Respond" was then used by the teacher at the "Guided response" level. The ability of students to respond to their teacher despite trial and error is examined in this instance. Following that, at the "Mechanism" level, the teacher used the words "Construct" and "Display." Students were required to execute the motor activity, namely constructing a text as the outcome of their understanding of the lesson. It further displays their work before the class to their classmates.

Factors Hinder Teachers from Contemplating Three Learning Domains in Designing a Teaching Module

Interview results showed that several factors contributed to a lack of understanding of teachers' three learning domains (cognitive, affective, and psychomotor) when designing a lesson plan. These factors varied from individual student characteristics to instructional practices teachers implement. Firstly, there is limited prior knowledge and experience. The teachers' prior knowledge and experiences greatly influence their understanding of new concepts. T1 stated that in applying this teaching module, she still lacked understanding and still trained herself as this is a new curriculum. Secondly, there is inadequate motivation and engagement within the teachers. T2 said she needed great motivation to construct a teaching module after teaching in many classes. T1 added that she was motivated to write the teaching module if the lesson topic was interesting. Teachers' affective domain, motivation, interest, and attitudes toward the subject matter significantly impact their learning outcomes.

Third, insufficient practice and feedback are the other factors that contribute to this matter. T1 conveyed that in applying all the cognitive styles, she had to practice and see which activity suited her students. In the same vein, T2 added that she needed to practice the activity that would be used in class. She also asked for other teachers' opinions of her class. Fourth, there are knowledge gaps in teacher preparation. T1 stated that as this is a new curriculum, she tried to be involved in workshops and teacher training to fill the gap in her understanding of the teaching module. T2 added that in the early stage of the Merdeka Curriculum, she was pretty confused about how to make the teaching module, but she developed her ability by practicing and training. Teachers' understanding of the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains can also impact their ability to design effective lesson plans.

Lastly, it is regarding the time constraints and overcrowded curriculum. T1 said that in Indonesia, the education curriculum has often changed over the past several years; some teachers, schools, and students found it challenging to adapt to the changes. T1 further explained that those changes made teachers unfocus on the learning domain and outcomes. The current education system often places significant time constraints on teachers, resulting in an overcrowded curriculum.

This study found that the amount of ABC components was more frequently utilized than the Degree component. This is in line with the study conducted by Latifa (2016), which studied the utilization of behavioral objectives in the lesson plan of K13. It found that teachers still lack an understanding of creating learning objectives with complete ABCD aspects. Furthermore, Laia (2019) also highlighted that "Degree" was the lowest aspect inserted by the EFL teachers. Additionally, Sari, Luardini, and Asi (2020) discovered that EFL teachers struggled to formulate the Condition and Degree aspects. The absence of the Degree component in a lesson plan can lead to various issues, including unclear expectations, inconsistent assessment techniques, limited differentiation, diminished responsibility, and difficulties in assessing goal completion. Therefore, to address these difficulties, teachers should ensure that learning objectives are complemented by detailed degree specifications indicating the level of mastery or competency required of students.

In this study, students were discovered to demonstrate critical thinking by asking questions and expressing their ideas, occasionally showing signs of the affective domain. In order to foster positive attitudes toward studying, the affective domain also infused students with the value of being appreciative of their class participation. Writing and conversing provided sufficient support for the psychomotor domain. In conclusion, although the affective and psychomotor domains were mentioned in the objective statements, they occurred less frequently than the cognitive domain. It is in line with Latifa (2016), who studied teachers' considerations in implementing the three domains in the lesson plan of K13. Susanti and Mahaputri (2022) also discovered that English teachers used the Cognitive domain the most in their lesson plans.

Moreover, this study revealed that teachers often struggle with understanding the three domains due to insufficient exposure to fundamental concepts. Lack of exposure or understanding of fundamental concepts in the cognitive domain can hinder their ability to comprehend complex ideas (Kelleghan, Madaus, & Airasian, 2012). Syahidah, Hizriani, and Nor (2022) also discovered that pre-service teachers encountered challenges utilizing Bloom's taxonomy vocabulary effectively. They further suggest that the pre-service teachers seek guidance and familiarize themselves with the lesson plan format. Furthermore, Smith and Ragan (2005)

stress in their study how crucial it is that teachers comprehend the fundamentals of instructional design, particularly how to handle the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains in lesson planning. They contend that by having this knowledge, teachers might be able to give students compelling and productive learning opportunities.

Guskey (2009) argues that educational practices that cater to the varied needs of students should be emphasized in addition to subject matter competence in the professional development of teachers. In order to assist teachers in incorporating the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains into their teaching techniques, he contends that continuous training and assistance are crucial. Additionally, Huitt (2011) emphasizes the importance of teachers in promoting holistic learning experiences and the connectivity of the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains. To encourage in-depth and meaningful learning, he contends that teachers need to possess the information and abilities to handle all three domains at once. Addressing this issue through professional development programs can bridge the knowledge gap and enhance teachers' confidence.

Furthermore, teacher motivation significantly impacts their ability to create effective lesson plans. A lack of motivation or interest can result in a superficial understanding and disengagement from the learning process (Kunter, Frenzel, Nagy, Baumert, & Pekrun, 2011). Additionally, teachers who are not motivated may also feel disengaged from their work and the learning objectives they are trying to accomplish. This lack of personal commitment can be seen in shallow lesson plans that do not take into account the many requirements of students in the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains (Brock & Grady, 2014). Followingly, teachers' confidence in their capacity to have a significant influence on students' learning can be undermined by low motivation and engagement. As a result, rather than creating activities that promote holistic growth across all three domains, teachers may take a passive approach to lesson planning, concentrating only on covering insights (Guskey, 2022).

Lastly, teachers who are burned out or have an excessive workload may find it difficult to muster the excitement and vigor required to write dynamic and captivating lesson plans. Under such circumstances, teachers could give priority to assignments that seem more urgent, ignoring the time and energy needed to include

exercises that target the affective and psychomotor domains (Klusmann, Richter, & Lüdtke, 2016). Thus, there can be major obstacles to successfully incorporating the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains into lesson planning if teachers lack enthusiasm and involvement. Institutions should prioritize strategies to reduce teacher burnout and foster intrinsic motivation to ensure more comprehensive lesson plans.

Both T1 and T2 emphasized the need for practice and constructive feedback in developing effective lesson plans. Mastering the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains requires practice and constructive feedback (Dettmer, 2005). Without adequate opportunities for practice and feedback, teachers may struggle to develop the necessary skills (Mulawarman, 2021). With consistent chances for lesson design and delivery practice, teachers may find it easier to successfully acquire the competencies required to integrate the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains. To effectively engage students in all learning domains, teachers must practice experimenting with various methods of instruction and evaluating their efficacy (Hattie & Timperley, 2007).

Furthermore, teachers demand rapid and detailed feedback on their teaching methods to find opportunities for growth and make the required changes. Teachers could keep using inefficient teaching strategies that ignore how the three learning domains are interconnected if they do not receive feedback from peers, mentors, or instructional coaches (Guskey & Yoon, 2009). Additionally, teachers must engage in reflective practice to assess their approaches critically and think through better ways to meet their students' cognitive, affective, and psychomotor requirements. By setting aside time for introspection and self-evaluation, teachers can improve their lesson designs and produce more thorough educational materials (Zeichner & Liston, 2014). Lastly, DuFour and Reeves (2016) highlight the value of collaborative learning environments for fostering successful integration of the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains in lesson plans. They also discuss the advantages of professional learning communities in fostering teacher development and enhancing instructional practices. Therefore, significant obstacles to successfully integrating the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains into lesson planning can arise from teachers receiving insufficient practice and feedback.

Teachers' lack of training in integrating cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains into lesson planning was another barrier. In this study, teachers found providing engaging activities for students in all subject areas challenging. It aligns with Bransford, Brown, Cocking, Donovan, and Pellegrino (2004), who state that teachers find it difficult if they do not have a firm grasp of constructivism, social learning theory, and other pertinent frameworks. Following that, certain teacher preparation programs may place more emphasis on content knowledge than pedagogical training, which leaves aspiring teachers unprepared to convert their subject-matter expertise into efficient teaching methods. In the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains, teachers may find it challenging to meet the unique needs of students if they are not trained in differentiated instruction and instructional design concepts (Darling-Hammond, Burns, Campbell, Goodwin, Hammerness, Low, & Zeichner, 2017).

Additionally, the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains may not be sufficiently integrated into teacher training programs to expose new teachers to various teaching approaches. Teachers may fall back on traditional lecture-based education focusing primarily on cognitive growth without hands-on experience with cooperative learning strategies, active learning tactics, and other pedagogical approaches (Wilson, Petaja, & Mancil, 2011). Thus, closing the knowledge gaps in teacher preparation is crucial to giving teachers the tools they need to successfully incorporate the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains into their lesson plans.

The demands of an overcrowded curriculum and frequent changes in educational policy pose significant challenges. Due to these time constraints, T1 noted that these changes often shift focus away from comprehensive learning outcomes, particularly affecting the affective and psychomotor domains (O'Connell, 2018). Moreover, teachers often need more time for lesson planning and preparation due to competing demands such as administrative tasks, meetings, and extracurricular responsibilities. As a result, they may struggle to develop comprehensive lesson plans that effectively address cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains (Darling-Hammond, 2017).

Additionally, an overcrowded curriculum frequently needs more room for teachers to investigate interdisciplinary connections or possibilities for experiential

learning or to stray from the required learning objectives. Rigid curriculum requirements that prioritize material coverage more than students' overall development may feel restrictive to teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2010). Subsequently, teachers may find it difficult to address each student's distinct interests and strengths due to time constraints while implementing tailored learning experiences (Tomlinson, 2014). Thus, to overcome these factors and promote a comprehensive understanding of the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains, teachers can employ various instructional strategies, including scaffolding, differentiation, and formative assessment (ElSayary, 2021). Teachers must consider these factors and better incorporate effective techniques into their lesson planning process to address students' learning needs in all three domains.

CONCLUSION

Teachers in the Merdeka curriculum have been able to create objective statements aligned with learner-centered activities, but the "Degree" aspect has been less frequently used than the other three domains. Factors such as limited prior knowledge, inadequate motivation, and insufficient practice and feedback contribute to teachers' lack of understanding of the three learning domains. To improve classroom instruction, teachers should employ instructional strategies like scaffolding, differentiation, and formative assessment. They should also modify materials, activities, and content to fit the audience's needs and align behaviors with learning objectives and standards.

Teachers should outline the circumstances in which intended actions are anticipated, including group size, time limits, materials accessibility, and the type of learning environment. They should also specify the standards for students' ability to exhibit desired behaviors and employ quantifiable metrics. Teachers should also participate in workshops, set aside time for lesson planning, and explore resources to enhance student involvement. To address cognitive, affective, and psychomotor learning outcomes, teachers should be given direction and assistance in creating assessment techniques, cultivate a collaborative school culture, and demonstrate effective integration strategies through case studies and demonstrations.

REFERENCES

Aithal, P. S., Shailashree, V., & Kumar, P. M. (2016). ABCD analysis of Stage Model in Higher Education. International Journal of Management, IT and Engineering, 6(1), 11-24.

Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals*. London: Longmans, Green.

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., Cocking, R. R., Donovan, M. S., & Pellegrino, J. W. (2004). *How People Learn*. Washington, DC: National academy press.

Brock, B. L., & Grady, M. L. (2014). *The School Principals' Guide to Successful Daily Practices: Practical Ideas and Strategies for Beginning and Seasoned Educators*. Simon and Schuster.

Darling-Hammond, L., Burns, D., Campbell, C., Goodwin, A. L., Hammerness, K., Low, E. L., ... & Zeichner, K. (2017). *Empowered educators: How high-performing systems shape teaching quality around the world*. John Wiley & Sons.

Dettmer, P. (2005). New blooms in established fields: Four domains of learning and doing. *Roeper Review*. https://doi.org/10.1080/02783190609554341

DuFour, R., & Reeves, D. (2016). The futility of PLC lite. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 97(6), 69-71. https://doi.org/10.1177/0031721716636878

ElSayary, A. (2021). Transdisciplinary STEAM Curriculum Design and Authentic Assessment in Online Learning: A Model of Cognitive, Psychomotor, and Affective Domains. *Journal of Turkish Science Education*, 18(3), 493-511.

Fadoli, J. (2022). Exploring Lesson Plans Through Learning Objectives Written by English Teachers. *Journal Of Education and Teaching Learning (JETL)*, 4(3), 265-273. https://doi.org/10.51178/jetl.v4i3.917

Fatimah, S., & Rizaldi, D. (2022). The simplification of the 2013 curriculum in Indonesia during the pandemic. International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction, 15(1), 260–271.

Fatmawati, I. (2021). The Merdeka Curriculum: A step towards education recovery post-pandemic. Education Journal Indonesia, 7(3), 185–198

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers college record*, 103(6), 1013-1055. https://doi.org/10.1111/0161-4681.00141

Guskey, T. R. (2009). Closing the knowledge gap on effective professional development. *Educational horizons*, 87(4), 224-233.

Guskey, T. R. (2022). *Implementing mastery learning*. Corwin Press.

Guskey, T. R., & Yoon, K. S. (2009). What works in professional development?. *Phi delta kappan*, 90(7), 495-500. https://doi.org/10.1177/003172170909000709

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of educational research*, 77(1), 81-112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Hoque, M. E. (2016). Three domains of learning: Cognitive, affective and psychomotor. *The Journal of EFL Education and Research*, 2(2), 45-52.

Huitt, W. (2011). Bloom et al.'s taxonomy of the cognitive domain. *Educational psychology interactive*, 22, 1-4.

Jacobson, S. K., McDuff, M. D., & Monroe, M. C. (2015). *Conservation education and outreach techniques*. Oxford University Press.

Kelleghan, T., Madaus, G. F., & Airasian, P. W. (2012). *The effects of standardized testing (Vol. 1).* Springer Science & Business Media.

Klusmann, U., Richter, D., & Lüdtke, O. (2016). Teachers' emotional exhaustion is negatively related to students' achievement: Evidence from a large-scale assessment study. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 108(8), 1193. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000125

Kunter, M., Frenzel, A., Nagy, G., Baumert, J., & Pekrun, R. (2011). Teacher enthusiasm: Dimensionality and context specificity. *Contemporary educational psychology*, 36(4), 289-301. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2011.07.001

Laia, S. A. (2019). The analysis of English teachers' lesson plans through objectives theory. *ICEAP 2019*, 64-68.

Latifa, I. S. (2016). The analysis of teachers' lesson plan through behavioural objectives theory. *In Ninth International Conference on Applied Linguistics (CONAPLIN 9)*, 6-11. https://doi.org/10.2991/conaplin-16.2017.2

McCoach, D. B., Gable, R. K., & Madura, J. P. (2013). *Instrument development in the affective domain*. New York, NY: Springer.

McConnell, C., Conrad, B., & Uhrmacher, P. B. (2020). *Lesson planning with purpose: Five approaches to curriculum design*. Teachers College Press.

Mulawarman, W. G. (2021). Overcoming Obstacles in Implementing 2013 Curriculum Policy. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 16(3), 967-980. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1308979

O'Connell, M. (2018). The power of cognitive ability in explaining educational test performance, relative to other ostensible contenders. *Intelligence*, 66, 122-127. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2017.11.011

Ormston, R., Spencer, L., Barnard, M., & Snape, D. (2014). *The foundations of qualitative research. Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers.* SAGE Publication Inc.

Romiszowski, A. (2013). *The development of physical skills: Instruction in the psychomotor domain. In Instructional-design theories and models* (pp. 457-481). Routledge.

Sari, P. P., Luardini, M. A., & Asi, N. (2020). An Analysis of Learning Objectives in English Teacher Lesson Plans Based on Abcd Aspects. *Journal Compound*, 8(3), 21-43.

Schwier, R. A., & Misanchuk, E. R. (1993). *Interactive multimedia instruction.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

Schwier, R. A. (1998). *Schwiercourses, EDCMM 802*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Saskatchewan at Saskatoon, Canada.

Siregar, L. F., Sumanik, N. B., & Christianto, H. (2022). Analysis of Teacher's Ability in Setting Learning Objectives, Flow of Learning Objectives, And

Modules in The Merdeka Curriculum. *SHS Web of Conference*. https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202214901005

Smith, P. L., & Ragan, T. J. (2005). *Instructional design (3rd ed.)*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Son

Susanti, R., & Mahaputri, D. S. (2022). Bloom Taxonomy Used by Teacher in Lesson Plan. *ELP (Journal of English Language Pedagogy)*, 7(2), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.36665/elp.v7i2.637

Syahidah, R. S., Hizriani, N., & Nor, H. (2022). Enhancing Language Awareness of Student Teachers through Lesson Plan Creation. *LET: Linguistics, Literature and English Teaching Journal*, 12(2), 352-373. https://doi.org/10.18592/let.v12i2.10010

Wilson, B. J., Petaja, H., & Mancil, L. (2011). The attention skills and academic performance of aggressive/rejected and low aggressive/popular children. *Early Education & Development*, 22(6), 907-930. https://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2010.505258

Zidan, M. R., & Qamariah, Z. (2023). A Literature study on the implementation of merdeka curriculum. *Jurnal Riset Rumpun Ilmu Bahasa*, 2(2), 153-167. https://doi.org/10.55606/jurribah.v2i2.1576

Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. P. (2014). *Reflective teaching: An introduction*. Routledge.

Zerwas, S. (2008). *Looking at the first year objectively*. Annu. Conf. First Year Assess.

How to find the Article to Cite (APA style):
https://scholar.google.com/citations?hl=en&user=J7RwxxgAAAAJ&view_op=list_works&sortby=pubdate