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Abstract
The objective of this research is to examine teachers’ resistance to curriculum changes occurring in Indonesia, which encompasses aspects of lesson planning, teaching implementation, and learning assessment. This research employed a qualitative approach with a case study design. Data were gathered through interview techniques using focus group discussions involving 20 teachers of Madrasah Ibtidaiyah. Additionally, it encompassed the study of lesson planning documents and learning task outcomes. On top of that, data condensation, data display, and conclusions drawn were also used for data analysis. Furthermore, to ensure the validity of the research findings, data triangulation among various sources was conducted. The research findings showed that teachers’ resistance to curriculum changes fell into the moderate category. This was primarily because teachers view curriculum changes as ordinary occurrences. In terms of lesson planning, teachers struggled to identify operational verbs relevant to competency achievement indicators, particularly those related to action verbs from the basic competencies or learning outcomes. Regarding teaching implementation, in addition, teachers still lacked experience in implementing the curriculum recommended, such as Project Based Learning (PjBL) and Problem Based Learning (PBL). Furthermore, in the aspect of learning evaluation, teachers encountered difficulties in generating questions that prioritized higher-order thinking Skills (HOTS). As a result, the role of the Institute of Teachers’ Education (LPTK) and the training institute for teachers’ pedagogical and professional competence development needs to be expanded.

Kata kunci: Resistance Guru, Perubahan Kurikulum, Problem-Based Learning, Higher Order Thinking Skills.
INTRODUCTION

Curriculum is an essential component in the implementation of educational programs as it serves as the foundation for education and governs educational and learning activities. This encompasses everything from formulating educational objectives to achieving them. Moreover, the curriculum involves numerous educational activities, such as planning, developing, implementing, and evaluating, all of which necessitate the use of educational resources. Jones (2022) asserts that a well-designed curriculum can result in a wealth of knowledge. In practice, changes in educational curriculum are unavoidable consequences of society’s rapid advances in science, technology, and the arts. Even though curriculum changes invariably give rise to pros and cons in the community, even among education experts, the prevalent reason for these changes by policymakers is to improve the quality and equitable distribution of education (Ciptaningsih & Rofiq, 2022; Nira & Fauziyah, 2021). This action is intended to make the education system more responsive to the constantly evolving needs of society, particularly regarding the Fourth Industrial Revolution and Society 5.0.

Resistance to change is common among stakeholders since it requires them to depart from old habits and embrace new ones. According to Law (2022), the duty of policymakers (curriculum developers) is to guarantee that stakeholder resistance to changes in the educational curriculum remains low. Additionally, when designing instruction, teachers must also focus on the individual needs of students to ensure that learning objectives can be effectively achieved. To accomplish this, numerous critical issues must be addressed, including potential concerns among teachers, as well as the availability of administrative and professional assistance (Komalasari & Yakubu, 2023). Resistance or a desire and intention to maintain existing practices when confronted with changes viewed as undesirable and threatening, is quite common. Among teachers, this resistance can occur when they fail to grasp or value the necessity for change (Rohmah, Widhyahrini, & Maslikhah, 2023; Septantiningtyas & Subaida, 2023). In such cases, they are more likely to maintain the status quo. Moreover, habits can also play a role because it may be more convenient to continue teaching in the same manner rather than attempting to develop new skills and techniques (Altinyelken, 2013). In the context of curriculum changes, teachers perceive these changes as disrupting their customary workflows, requiring considerable adjustments.

Based on research conducted by Kazakbaeva (2023), which aimed to understand the resistance encountered by six English language teachers working in both rural and urban public schools in Kyrgyzstan towards changes in English education in the country, it was found that the attempted changes had not yielded the expected results. This is because each element at various educational levels is formally and loosely related yet separated from one another. These findings provide insights into the resistance experienced by teachers towards curriculum changes (Azis, Abou-Samra, & Aprilianto, 2022; Sirojuddin, Amirullah, Rofiq, & Kartiko, 2022).

In the context of education in Indonesia, curriculum changes have occurred from 2004 to 2022 as follows: (1) Competency-Based Curriculum (KBK) in 2004, (2) School-Based Curriculum (KTSP) in 2006, (3) Curriculum 2013 (K-13), and (4) Merdeka Curriculum. These curriculum changes often entail modifications in content and organizational structure, pedagogical approaches, and assessment methods. These changes have a substantial impact on teachers’ roles in developing instructional materials, conducting teaching sessions, and assessing student learning. Additionally, the results of a mapping study conducted by Harfiiani dan Desyta (2023) indicate differences in the development of instructional materials between Curriculum 2013 and Merdeka Curriculum, variations in the pedagogical approaches employed during teaching, and differences
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in learning assessment procedures. These changes frequently generate diverse responses from teachers.

This undoubtedly gives the impression that curriculum changes are a common occurrence in the community, with teachers at the forefront of implementing these changes. Hence, teachers who have gotten accustomed to well-established work methods tend to express strong opposition. Furthermore, this research aims to uncover resistance to the shift from Curriculum 2013 to Merdeka Curriculum, notably in terms of lesson planning, teaching implementation, and learning assessment, which are the primary responsibilities of teachers as educators.

METHODS

This research aims to examine teachers' resistance to curriculum changes in the Indonesian education system, specifically those encountered and perceived during the transition from Curriculum 2013 to Merdeka Curriculum. Teachers were invited to share their experiences regarding what they felt and encountered during the implementation of curriculum changes, as well as how they responded to this resistance. To achieve this, a qualitative approach with a case study design was employed in 20 Madrasah Ibtidaiyah locations throughout Indonesia. Each school was represented by a teacher who had undergone Professional Teacher Education at the Institute of Teachers’ Education within the Faculty of Education and Teacher Training (FITK) at Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University Malang in the 2023, batch I.

Data was gathered through interview techniques using focus group discussions with 20 Madrasah Ibtidaiyah teachers involved. The participants consisted of 10 males and 10 females from various regions, with 14 teachers from East Java, three from West Nusa Tenggara, and one each from East Nusa Tenggara, South Kalimantan, and East Kalimantan. The average length of service for the teachers was 23.38 years. Furthermore, data collection included a study of lesson planning documents and learning tasks, as well as observations of the online learning process that took place over 20 days, with the researcher acting as a learning facilitator. Learning activities were conducted every day with an average duration of two hours of face-to-face interaction via Zoom Meetings. Teachers also engaged in self-directed learning by completing daily assignments. Data analysis procedures included data condensation, data display, and conclusions drawing methods. To ensure the validity of the research findings, triangulation data were employed.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Teachers’ Resistance to Changes in Lesson Planning

Teacher resistance to curriculum changes in the development of lesson planning was quite common because they perceived that the core of planning remained the same as in the previous curriculum. However, teachers expected that curriculum changes did not occur too frequently, as had been the case over the years, such as the Competency-Based Curriculum (KBK) in 2004, the School-Based Curriculum (KTSP) in 2006, Curriculum 2013 or the National Curriculum, and the Merdeka Curriculum in 2022. According to them, changes in terminology within the curriculum were often confusing because each change in terminology also affected the terms used in the components of lesson planning that they needed to develop, including how to approach them. For example, terms like competency standards, core competencies, basic competencies, and competency achievement indicators were used in the previous curriculum. However, new terms such as learning outcomes, learning objectives, and the flow of learning objectives emerged in the
Merdeka Curriculum, and all of these terms were related to the learning objectives that had to be achieved.

Teachers must have a solid understanding of the terminology used in new curriculum components and how to put them into practice. This mastery is a key factor in determining their success in developing effective teaching materials. According to Hatch and Clark (2021), effectiveness in the teaching process is primarily dependent on teachers' ability to actively and accurately comprehend what their students know and can accomplish within a particular subject area. Furthermore, these teachers strive hard to achieve a profound understanding of the teaching process. Highly effective teachers devote most of their planning time to deeply understanding 'who' they are teaching and 'how' they will deliver the learning materials.

Based on the analysis of lesson planning, it was found that most teachers struggled to ensure whether the competency achievement indicators (particularly in the cognitive domain) formulated in the learning objectives aligned with the level of thinking indicated in the basic competencies. Nevertheless, precise learning objectives are required for successful learning since they serve as guidelines in developing subsequent planning steps, such as developing learning activities and determining assessment methods. Wibowo et al., (2023) asserted that the primary issues in adopting self-directed curriculum in the classroom were detailing the flow of learning objectives and designing learning scenarios.

Examples of competency achievement indicators formulated by teachers can be seen in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Competency Cognitive</th>
<th>Competency Achievement Indicator</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BC Grade I</strong> Recognize (C-1) objects in the surroundings (names, colors, sizes, patterns, characteristics, sounds, textures, functions, and other attributes)</td>
<td>Recognize objects by connecting one object with another</td>
<td>In Bloom's Taxonomy, the verb &quot;recognize&quot; is classified as a cognitive level 1 (C-1) verb. The competency achievement indicators should reflect observable student activities that demonstrate students' ability to recognize, such as naming, showing, listing, and so on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BC Grade IV</strong> Analyze (C-4) what is already known and what is newly learned from non-fiction texts</td>
<td>Mention (C-1) information by using KW table (know-what do you want to know)</td>
<td>The action verb 'analyze' in the Basic Competency was at level C-4, while the operational verb for the Competency Achievement Indicator was only at level C-1. This obviously indicates that an error occurred, which in turn impacted the type of assessment used and hindered the achievement of the expected competencies. The operational verbs for the Competency Achievement Indicator should be 'compare,' 'relate,' 'predict,' and so on. Furthermore, the action verbs for competencies at the cognitive level (C-4) should already reflect Higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BC Grade IV</strong> Analyze (C-4) Hindu and/or Buddhist and/or Islamic kingdoms in the local region, as well as their influence on contemporary society</td>
<td>Mention (C-1) the legacies of Hindu, Buddhist, and Islamic kingdoms in the present time and their influence on the local community in the region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BC Grade VI</strong> Identify (Analyze) (C-4) geographic characteristics and socio-cultural</td>
<td>Mention (C-1) the socio-cultural life of two ASEAN countries related</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Examples of competency achievement indicators formulated by teachers
economic, and political aspects of life in the ASEAN region.
their geographical condition accurately
Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) in the learning evaluation

These findings emphasize the significance for teachers to receive guidance and support to ensure that the levels of thinking formulated in the competency achievement indicators they create are truly appropriate for measuring the attainment of the basic competencies they develop. The difficulties that teachers encounter in developing competency achievement indicators were also highlighted in the findings of Nurtanto et al., (2021), who surveyed 957 teachers in the Banten Province. It was revealed that teachers’ readiness, as measured in their ability to analyze core competencies and basic competencies, stood at 45.31%, while their ability to develop learning program evaluations was at 36.78%. Moreover, Artawan et al., (2022) observed that a lack of information and training had led teachers to create plans that did not align with the current curriculum requirements. Furthermore, Alhikmah et al., (2021) stated that the difficulties teachers faced in structuring their lesson implementation plans stemmed from two key factors: (1) their inability to select appropriate operational verbs and (2) their limited understanding of the components that should have been included in formulating learning objectives.

When it comes to developing lesson plans, including introduction, core, and closing activities, it yields excellent results because the sequence of learning events is a well-established practice, and their formulations remain unchanged. However, most teachers struggle to adopt curriculum-recommended models such as Problem-Based Learning (PBL) and Project-Based Learning (PjBL). Therefore, it is important for teachers to receive training in designing PBL dan PjBL models. According to Suradika et al., (2023), the incorporation of Problem-Based Learning (PBL) syntax encourages students to learn, guide individual and group investigations, generate and perform tasks, as well as assess the problem-solving process. Meanwhile, the syntax for Project-Based Learning (PjBL) entails initiating learning with fundamental questions, designing project plans, creating schedules, monitoring students and project progress, assessing outcomes, as well as evaluating. Their research findings revealed that students demonstrated identical levels of critical thinking and creativity with both syntaxes, resulting in no significant difference in their learning outcomes.

Research findings in the aspect of learning assessment planning indicated that the majority of teachers expressed their inability to generate Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) oriented questions. This is a fair outcome of teachers’ inability to create exact learning objectives, particularly when it comes to elaborating competency achievement indicators from basic competencies. This aligns with the research finding from Wahidmurni et al. (2021), which stated that teachers’ inability to design HOTS-oriented questions stemmed from their difficulty in transforming action verbs within the basic competencies into relevant competency achievement indicators. Similarly, Kurnia et al., (2021) indicated that teachers struggled in developing competency achievement indicators and learning objectives due to their limited ability to analyze the cognitive levels within competency standards and basic competencies, which served as the foundation for elaborating competency achievement indicators and learning objectives. Teachers tended to rely more on examples of lesson plans found on the internet without critically analyzing their authenticity or applicability.

Another adjustment that needs to be considered is the elaboration of the content to build character and the Competency Profile of Pancasila Learners, which includes six dimensions: (1)
faith, devotion to the One Almighty God, and ethical behavior, (2) independence, (3) mutual cooperation, (4) global diversity, (5) critical thinking, and (6) creativity (Badan Standar, Kurikulum dan Asesmen Pendidikan, 2022). Furthermore, as Madrasah Ibtidaiyah teachers are under the guidance of the Ministry of Religious Affairs, they are required not only to develop projects that strengthen the Pancasila Learner Profile but also to develop projects that strengthen the Rahmatan Lil Alamin learner profile, which encompasses ten dimensions: (1) civility (ta’addub), (2) exemplariness (qudwah), citizenship and nationalism (muwaṭanah), (4) following the middle path (tawassut), (5) balance (tawāżūn), (6) straightness and firmness (I’tidāl), (7) equality (musāwah), (8) consultation (syūra), (9) tolerance (tasāmuh), and (10) dynamism and innovation (tathawwur wa ihtikâr) (Direktorat KSKK Madrasah, 2022).

In such circumstances, this is also a primary concern. Aside from being a novel concept that teachers must incorporate into their activity planning, extensive training and mentoring activities must be considered. This is due to research findings indicating that the support provided to exemplary schools in developing Pancasila Learner Profiles still encountered difficulties, particularly in designing learning modules and Pancasila Learner Profile project modules. Moreover, teachers also expressed confusion in selecting the appropriate projects (Rizal et al., 2022). Hence, training and mentoring programs for teachers and schools/madrasahs are essential to support the successful development of a national-religious character through the strengthening of Pancasila and Rahmatan Lil Alamin learner profile projects.

Teachers’ Resistance to Changes in Learning Implementation

According to research findings, when it comes to teaching implementation, teachers expressed that they were accustomed to performing student-engaging learning, as outlined in the concept of student-centered learning, where they utilized a variety of teaching methods such as lectures, discussions, and assignments. At this point, the concept of student-centered learning still entails students actively working on assignments, with the teacher providing explanations beforehand, and after that students will proceed to work on tasks either independently or in groups. These findings align with the research findings of Nurtanto et al., (2021), who discovered that traditional teaching practices were still dominated by teacher-centered lecture-based approaches, with well-designed lesson plans rarely being implemented. Furthermore, Ngaziah et al., (2021) also indicated that teachers' pedagogical competencies still needed improvement in the context of learning, including the design of teaching methods and learning models.

Although the majority of teachers are generally accepting of the curriculum changes, they did express a lack of experience in implementing the recommended curriculum, specifically Project-Based Learning (PjBL) and Problem-Based Learning (PBL) in their teaching practices. Additionally, a substantial number of teachers admitted to never having received training on these PjBL and PBL teaching models. It is somewhat paradoxical, given that these two teaching models have the potential to improve student result if applied in the classroom. This aligns with the research conducted by Astuti et al., (2022), who found that students who learned using the PjBL model improved their creative thinking skills. In creative thinking exams, they displayed excellent problem-solving skills, as well as competence in creative thinking, fluency, flexibility, and originality. Consequently, the experimental class outperformed the non-experimental class in terms of grades.
The success of implementing the PBL model was also confirmed by Ssemugenyi (2023) who concluded that both qualitative and quantitative analyses he conducted indicated that PBL genuinely enhanced students' cognitive development over time. Furthermore, Ishlahul'adiilah and Haryanti (2023) also asserted that the development of students' thinking skills could be enhanced through the implementation of the PBL model because students were engaged in the process of independent knowledge discovery through group work to solve representative problems. Hence, applying PBL and PjBL teaching models is of utmost importance for teachers, and they should undergo training to acquire these skills. This is because many teachers admitted that they had not yet incorporated PBL and PjBL approaches into their teaching methods, instead, relying on lecturing, discussions, and assignment. Consequently, this conventional approach hampered effective learning and inhibited the achievement of optimal objectives.

According to Utari et al., (2019), one of the external factors contributing to student learning difficulties is teacher's insufficient variation in teaching methods and utilization of teaching media. This is supported by Imaroh et al., (2022), who stated that there is a significant correlation between creative thinking abilities and the implementation of the PBL model, with a significance level of 0.000 and a correlation coefficient of 0.719, indicating a strong and positive relationship. These findings suggest the need for specialized training to provide teachers with hands-on experiences with the the PjBL and PBL models. Furthermore, Kusumawati et al., (2022) also argued that when the PBL model is applied in the classroom, students' critical thinking skill can develop. This is because this teaching model enhances motivation and curiosity, which in turn leads to the development of higher-order thinking skills (Firmansyah, Ubaidillah, & Busriyanti, 2023; Wardiyah, Budianti, Farabi, & Sirojuddin, 2023).

Aside from the lack of competency in applying PBL and PjBL models, another concern arises regarding teachers' limited skills in utilizing Information and Communication Technology (ICT) for teaching. This became evident from the length of time it took to accomplish activities related to recording their online peer teaching sessions. Not only that, the recorded sessions, which were originally intended for teaching videos, predominantly featured the teacher's image throughout the teaching process (Arista, Mariani, Sartika, Murni, & Harahap, 2023). When teachers used their laptops, they frequently sought assistance from others to record teaching sessions. Additionally, the practice of sharing instructional materials through screen sharing during lessons or discussions was infrequent. Furthermore, since the teaching and learning process primarily centered on explanations and question-and-answer sessions, student engagement during instruction remained limited. These findings complemented the research conducted by Batubara's (2023), which underscored the numerous obstacles faced by Islamic educational institutions in designing ICT-based learning materials. Alongside teacher competency issues, these institutions encountered significant budgetary and infrastructure constraints. This aligns with the findings found by Syafryadin et al., (2022), who highlighted the challenges faced by teachers due to their inadequate skills in utilizing ICT-based learning tools. These challenges were further exacerbated by poor internet connectivity, the diversity of student characteristics, and a lack of support from school policy makers. It is somewhat paradoxical that these challenges exist, given that students nowadays have an affinity for ICT-based media due to their familiarity with using ICT in their daily lives (Ghorbani, et al., 2023).

Therefore, programs focused on empowering teachers to enhance their skills in creating and utilizing ICT-based learning media need to be strengthened. Additionally, the involvement of the Institute of Teachers' Education, Educational and Training Centers, particularly for lecturers...
in the field of Education, is highly anticipated to provide training through community service activities. There is strong evidence that training programs can help teachers develop their skills in developing ICT-based learning media, ultimately contributing to improved student academic performance (Bhuana et al., 2022; Maryani, 2023). This is crucial because, as ICT advances, the available learning resources continue to diversify, and teachers have the responsibility to adapt, including honing their skills in integrating the latest educational technology into the learning process. This requirement aligns with the findings of Kadioğlu-Akbulut et al., (2023), which emphasized that teachers with ICT competence can generate the best alternative solutions to learning issues.

Teachers’ Resistance to Changes in Learning Evaluation

Based on the findings from Focus Group Discussions (FGD) with teachers, it was discovered that nearly all teachers struggled with formulating Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS)-oriented questions, as shown in Table 1. This could be attributed to the teachers’ limited ability to translate action verbs from basic competencies into competency achievement indicators. Moreover, inaccuracies in the formulation of competency achievement indicators led to errors in the creation of learning objectives and assessment items by teachers. Examples of such errors are presented in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students understand the characteristics of living things (Second-level cognitive)</td>
<td>Mention the characteristics of living things</td>
<td>Understanding is a second-level cognitive domain, and it should include operational verbs such as explaining, providing examples, and so on. The questions created are irrelevant because they remain at the first-level cognitive domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to analyze the implementation of norms in daily life (First-level cognitive)</td>
<td>Explain the meaning of norms in daily life</td>
<td>The question is not irrelevant as it remains at the second cognitive level, whereas analysis belongs to the fourth cognitive domain, which requires operational verbs such as comparing and connecting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to recognize uppercase and lowercase letters and pronounce their sounds (First-level cognitive)</td>
<td>Distinguish between uppercase and lowercase letters</td>
<td>Identifying is a first-level cognitive domain, and it should use operational verbs such as indicating, listing, and so on. The question provided is not suitable as well, as it belongs to the second cognitive level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mistakes are not limited to the mismatch between the phrasing of verbs in learning objectives and the created knowledge test items, however, they also extend to the verbs chosen when constructing learning objectives. The verbs that should be used in formulating learning objectives are operational verbs that can be measured and observed. When formulating learning
objectives, using verbs such as "understand" (C-2), "analyze" (C-4), and "recognize" (C-1) is inappropriate. The correct approach involves verbs like "explain," "provide examples," "differentiate," and so on (which are operational verbs for C-2), "compare," "criticize," "connect," and so forth (which are operational verbs for C-4), and "mention," "define," "show," and so forth (which are operational verbs for C-1).

Based on the research findings, teachers struggle to formulate relevant competency achievement indicators based on the action verbs in the basic competencies that students are expected to achieve. This is in line with a study conducted by Wahidmurni et al., (2021), which revealed that action verbs in the curriculum texts for junior high schools were heavily focused on higher-order thinking Skills (HOTS), accounting for a substantial 66.67%. However, when it came to actual test items, they predominantly assessed lower-order thinking skills, particularly remembering (C-1) and understanding (C-2). This discrepancy arose from the ongoing issue of teachers’ limited ability to design assessments aligned with HOTS principles. This is validated by Nurtanto et al., (2021), who identified it as a consequence of teachers’ low ability to develop program evaluations, which only stood at 36.78%. Furthermore, teachers also encountered difficulties in creating authentic assessments. This situation aligns with the conclusions of Ngaziah et al., (2021), who emphasized that teachers exhibited unsatisfactory pedagogical competence in the field of online learning, particularly in the areas of conducting learning outcome assessments and evaluating instructional materials.

Kurnia et al., (2021) discovered various challenges encountered by primary school teachers in developing assessment tools are due to difficulties in (1) aligning basic competencies, indicators, and materials, (2) matching questions with basic competencies, indicators, and materials, (3) creating multiple-choice questions, essay questions, true-false questions, matching questions, and fill-in-the-blank questions, and (4) designing attitude assessments and skill assessments. This suggests a link between the difficulties teachers encounter when developing competence achievement indicators in learning objectives and their ability to generate relevant assessment questions or instruments.

CONCLUSION

The resistance of Madrasah Ibtidaiyah teachers to curriculum changes is quite common or categorizable as moderate since teachers often experience frequent curriculum changes throughout their careers. Teachers still struggle to ensure the accuracy of the competence accomplishment indicators they create in achieving the learning objectives, which are needed by the fundamental competencies as the expected learning results. During the course of teaching, teachers' responses are typically in a relatively typical manner because they believe they have already implemented active student learning methods. However, complying with the curriculum's requirement to implement Problem-Based Learning (PBL) and Project-Based Learning (PjBL) models is regarded as intricate or difficult, and teachers find it difficult to create HOTS-oriented questions. As a result, the active involvement of the Institute of Teachers’ Education is needed. These institutions, which train future teachers, and teacher training organizations should offer support to teachers in enhancing their pedagogical and professional competencies to effectively achieve the objectives of curriculum change.

The result shows support for the results of previous research that every time there is a change in the curriculum, the problems faced by teachers revolve around developing learning implementation plans, implementing recommended learning models, and developing HOTS-
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oriented assessments. The limitation of this research lies in the minimal number of research subject, only 20 Madrasah Ibtidaiyah teachers who are currently participating in the professional teacher education program. For this reason, further research is needed with a wider scope, both in terms of the number of samples and research subjects, variations in educational school (including Madrasah Ibtidaiyah, Madrasah Tsanawiyah, Madrasah Aliyah), variations in teacher characteristics, variations in research locations, variations in research methods applied, so that an understanding is produced. With the results of more in-depth and comprehensive research, it can be formulated an appropriate recommendation for policy making.
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