Investigating the Learning Outcomes of an INQF-Based English Language Teaching Curriculum in Indonesia

Imroatus Solikhah[1] & Teguh Budiharso[2]

Abstract

This study revisits the structure of an English Language Teaching (ELT) curriculum for an undergraduate program based on the Indonesian National Qualification Framework (INQF). We investigated whether learning outcomes in ELT programs are effectively translated into the INQF. This study applied content analysis and grounded theory in its data analysis. As primary data sources, we used curriculum documents that were obtained online and conducted interviews with 60 respondents. The learning outcomes developed by the ELT Association, meanwhile, acted as secondary data. We found that the learning outcomes described in ELT curriculums are somewhat confused, and some revitalization is needed to make them effective. The matrix approach to developing a curriculum has made learning outcomes unfocused, while clusters of course groups remain undeveloped. The classification of learning outcomes is also not defined, and the course requirement of 144 credits is not distributed evenly through skill categories, semesters, and learning outcomes. This study is limited in that a relatively low number of respondents were recruited, implying that future research is needed with a wider range of participants if we are to use a course group matrix to revitalize their program learning outcomes, as well as their course and unit learning outcomes.

Keywords: learning outcomes, KKNI, competence, English language program

Introduction

The current focus of higher education curriculum reform in Indonesia is set on a proper formulation of the learning outcomes in adapting backward curriculum design and embedding the national qualification framework into the expected outcomes. In the formulation process, however, the backward model should adhere to the national standard as its basis for curriculum development and consider a wide range of factors from the geographic region to the possible implementation of innovative technologies (Korotchenko et al., 2015; Tadeu, Fernandez Batanero & Tarman, 2019).

[1] Dr. State Islamic Institute (IAIN) of Surakarta, Indonesia; Email: iimqueenoslo@gmail.com
[2] Prof. Dr. Mulawarman University, Samarinda, Indonesia; Email: proteguh@gmail.com

This study reviews the learning outcomes of an English Language Teaching (ELT) curriculum based on the INQF (the Indonesian National Qualification Framework or *Kerangka Kualifikasi Nasional Indonesia* [KKNI] in Indonesian). Indonesia's Ministry of Higher Education, Research and Technology (Kemenristekdikti, 2012) introduced the KKNI/INQF in 2012, and efforts to develop an INQF-based curriculum continue. However, there are various inconsistencies in the development and implementation of an INQF curriculum.

A review of the literature indicates that curriculum reform for higher education in Indonesia has transformed the Content-Based Curriculum (Ministry of National Education, *Kemendiknas*, 2000, 2002) into a Competence-Based Curriculum (Kemenristekdikti, 2006, 2012). This shift in the curriculum model essentially affects how curriculums are developed, as well as how their organization and contents are devised. From the perspective of ELT in Indonesia, issues pertaining to clustering of courses, the core curriculum, and the skills covered in each course's scope and qualification framework need to be urgently address, but the implementation varies from one university to another (Budiharso, 2018). The ministry demands that higher education institutions introduce the INQF into their entire higher curriculum planning and reform, however, so they will become INQF-based curriculums.

Unfortunately, we see there is a mismatched conceptualization for the new curriculum policy. First, learning outcomes are defined in a rather vague way. For example, they are defined as "learning attainment" (Kemenristekdikti, 2012), "competence," and "learning achievement" (Kemenristekdikti, 2015). Even the term "INQF curriculum" is debatable, because in the *Kemenristekdikti* guidelines (Endrotomo, 2014), it states that the INQF is an achievement criterion, so it is inappropriate to refer to the INQF as a "curriculum." That said, a curriculum may refer to the INQF (Kemenristekdikti, 2015). We can argue that the different views in the reference guidelines for the development of an INQF curriculum, as officially issued by the government, still contain ambiguous content.

Second, conceptually speaking, the government suggests that INQF curriculum development is conducted over four steps: formulating learning outcomes, developing material, determining course content and weighting course credit, and distributing courses over curriculum documents (Kemenristekdikti, 2015). This approach simply reflects the concept of backward curriculum design (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005) in a different way. This process is generally acceptable, but problems arise when a matrix approach for the learning outcomes of all subjects needs to be

defined in the first step (Solikhah, 2015), with classifications being made based on similarities in the learning outcomes arranged in the matrix approach (Budiharso, 2018).

Third, in the implementation stage, each curriculum developer uses his own style, resulting in confused concepts and internal quality assurance in each university. In addition, the national accreditation agency that supervises curriculum implementation applies different measurements for INQF-based curriculum practices.

Thus, investigating an INQF-based curriculum can help enhance its organization and establish in greater detail how an INQF-based curriculum for ELT in Indonesia can be strengthened. This will also contribute to theoretical perspectives concerning ELT as a foreign language, as well as its practice. As Korotchenko et al. (2015) assert, learning a foreign language as an academic subject has great potential in terms of education, development, and communication goals, thus potentially revitalizing the learning outcomes of an INQF-based ELT curriculum in Indonesia.

Research Questions

Drawing on the background problems in developing an INQF curriculum, the questions we sought to answer were:

1) How does the structure of an INQF-based curriculum for undergraduate ELT programs need to be revitalized?

2) How does the formulation of learning outcomes relate to an INQF-based curriculum as a reference standard for ELT programs in Indonesia?

Literature Review

Backward Curriculum Design

Wiggins and McTighe (1998) introduced backward curriculum design. It begins with a considered statement of the expected results or outcomes to ensure that appropriate teaching activities and content result in effective learning (Richrads, 2013). In this backward design, the curriculum assumes an overall idea that encompasses the major knowledge structures in a subject area, and there is a great emphasis on assessment. In this backward curriculum design process, assessment assumes a high status where teachers are seen as "assessors" rather than "developers" (Wiggins & McTighe, 1998, p. 10).

Backward curriculum involves three stages: (1) identifying desired outcomes, (2) determining acceptable assessment evidence, and (3) crafting the learning plan experience (Wiggins and McTighe, 1998). Identifying the desired outcomes begins by formulating the program outcomes and determining the skills that students should acquire over the course (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). The program's content should adhere to the standard requirements for desired outcomes as laid down by the government, as well as meet the needs of university, industry, and other stakeholders (Korotchenko et al., 2015). To determine acceptable assessment evidence, the developer takes the desired outcomes that students should achieve and what evidence of this should be shown (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). This implies that when planning a curriculum, it is more important to think about assessing learning outcomes than speculating on the number of units and topics for students to study (Dinh, 2019; Etherington, 2019; Korotchenko et al., 2015; Vu, 2019).

Finally, the learning experience is developed through basic instructional activities and areas of focus in accordance with the expected learning outcomes, quality monitoring, and the learning outcome assessment system. In principle, backward design relies on the fact that instructional methods, the sequence of lessons, and resource materials should only be defined once the final learning outcomes, quality monitoring, and learning outcome assessment system have been identified (Korotchenko et al., 2015). The curriculum developer determines the essential knowledge (i.e., facts, idea, and laws) and skills (i.e., processes, procedures, and strategies) that students need to acquire as their final learning outcomes. So, what should be taught, and what are the best instructional activities with regards to the established goals? Which instructional materials and resources should be employed to accomplish the goals (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005; Parker, 2019).

The Development Approach for an INQF-Based Curriculum

Kemenristekdikti (2015) defines learning outcomes as achievements that are obtained by internalizing knowledge, attitudes, skills, competencies, and accumulated work experience. A learning outcome is a way of measuring what a person gains from a learning process, whether it is structured or unstructured. The formulation of learning outcomes is classified into four elements: attitudes and values, work ability, mastery of knowledge, and authority and responsibility.

The formulation of graduates' learning outcomes, as stated in the SKL (graduate competency standards), is defined through three elements: attitudes, knowledge, and skills. Skills comprise general and specific skills (Kemenristekdikti, 2015). For undergraduate programs that are categorized as level-6 KKNI, KKNI uses the following keywords:

Keywords for job competence:
Application, study, design, utilize science and technology, solve problems.

Keywords for knowledge management:
This involves mastering the theoretical concepts for certain fields of knowledge and skills in general, as well as the theoretical concepts of specific sections in the field of knowledge and in-depth skills (Kemenristekdikti, 2015, pp.7–9).

Kemenristekdikti (2015) also explains that in general, learning outcomes function as follows:

• Curriculum components and indicators of quality graduates;
• The characteristics of study program specifications;
• The magnitude of the qualification level;
• Referrals for curriculum evaluation;
• Referrals for the recognition of equality;
• The comparative achievement of education levels; and
• The main descriptions in the SKPI (Certificate of Companion).

Now, what is lacking in the instructions for Kemenristekdikti's (2015) learning outcomes presented above? The answers are twofold. Basically, the formulation of learning outcomes in an INQF-based curriculum comprise graduate learning outcomes and course learning outcomes, but the focus is more directed at graduate learning outcomes. These four learning outcomes equate to institution/university learning outcomes (ILOs), study program learning outcomes (PLOs), course learning outcomes (CLOs), and unit learning outcomes (ULOs). Thus, the learning outcomes that serve as benchmarks for quality are the PLOs and CLOs (Beaumont, 2005). Evidently, the matrix-based learning outcomes suggested by Kemenristekdikti (2015) complicate the preparation process, and it overlaps and lacks direction for two reasons.

1) A maximum of 144 credits must be completed at the undergraduate level (Ministry of National Education, Kemendiknas, 2000, 2002; Kemenristekdikti, 2012, 2015). Simply put, if every course awards two credits, there will be 72 courses, so the problem lies in creating a matrix for a list of 72 subjects in one series. This is not a problem that can be easily defined, however. Besides being inefficient, the principles of taxonomic analysis and domains do not apply here.

2) The process of selecting and sorting a curriculum that requires adoption, adaptation, and diversification suggests that the compiler should benchmark, observe, review, and select other institutional curricula as inputs when selecting materials (Budiharso, 2018; Parlindungan, Rifai, & Satriani, 2018). With this mindset, curriculum developers take several steps in the curriculum-evaluation process:

• Identify the types of courses that already exist and select courses to be taken.

• Establish groups of subjects according to the field's structure, such as literacy courses, linguistic knowledge, knowledge and teaching skills, curriculum, evaluation, and managerial and scientific development.

• Make groupings through taxonomic techniques and domains for all allied or similar subjects.

• Develop learning outcomes for each subject and develop learning outcomes for cognate subjects.

Arguably, the inconsistency of the terms contributes to unproductive practices. The development of the INQF-based curriculum was expected to inject fresh blood into the higher education by improving quality control through both internal quality assurance and quality control management. However, the following happened instead: When the BAN-PT assessors visited and assessed study programs for the accreditation process, the issue of having an INQF-based curriculum was never mentioned at all. Their assessment tool also does not specifically capture how an INQF-based curriculum is implemented (Solikhah, 2015).

Another aspect pertains to "a misunderstanding" when translating an INQF-based curriculum that has been developed autonomously by a study program or institution. Various evidences exemplify such cases. For example, a certain university intentionally eliminated its language science courses and replaced them with teaching courses (Canada College, 2017). The faculty members apparently held the flawed belief that the department's ELT program would be more rigorous if it dedicated more credits to teaching. Another example emerges when a professional teacher-development program is perceived as no longer needing courses for teaching practices, resulting in them being abolished. Other detrimental perceptions also arise, such as translation, literature, pragmatics, and discourse analysis courses belonging to the literature department because the ELT faculty is not deemed competent enough. In the field of thesis research, the ELT program faculty is

underestimated due to a belief that it is only capable in teaching fields and lacks the competences needed to conduct research in literary, translation, discourse, and pragmatic matters.

Learning Outcomes Formulation

For learning outcomes to be formulated and graded, Beaumont (2005) asserts that their development should not be separated from course design and program evaluation. Guilbert (1987) describes the process of preparing learning outcomes through four steps:

- The formulation of learning outcomes;
- Assessment and evaluation planning;
- Planning and implementing the education program; and
- Assessment and evaluation.

Good learning outcomes must meet the SMART criteria (Beaumont, 2005), which stands for Specific (i.e., using action verbs that are unambiguous), Measurable, Achievable (i.e., students can realistically achieve these targets), Relevant (i.e., related to the general objectives of learning), and Timed (i.e., it is clear when these outcomes should be achieved). Furthermore, Guilbert (1987) classifies learning outcomes into three categories:

- Cognitive (i.e., knowledge that must be mastered);
- Psychomotor skills (i.e., practical skills that can be developed); and
- Affective (i.e., a temperament that can be controlled).

According to Guilbert (1987), each domain in learning outcomes comprises a number of levels called taxonomies, with each level showing the level of difficulty that exists in each domain. Bloom (1956) formulates six taxonomies for learning, namely knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. Reece and Walker (1997) suggest that learning outcomes be arranged into four levels: (i) knowledge (i.e., learning and remembering facts), (ii) comprehension (i.e., interpreting or summarizing the provided information), (iii) application (i.e., using information to solve problems), and (iv) invention (i.e., comparing, contrasting, analyzing, and deciding). Guilbert (1987), meanwhile, suggests three levels: the recall of data, the interpretation of data, and problem solving. In addition, learning outcomes are developed through five stages: determining the initial step, arranging templates, developing learning outcomes, making a schedule, and conducting a review.

Saxton (1989) suggests that a curriculum compiler should initially refer to the contents of the traditional syllabus and develop learning outcomes based on the materials. Newble and Cannon (1994), meanwhile, propose the use of learning goals. Alternatively, learning outcomes can be developed at an early stage by referring to the objectives of the course, which are then broken down to produce learning outcomes. To make the learning outcomes easily understandable, Newble and Canon (1994) suggest the template below.

> As a result of students participating in ………………….., they will be able to …………………………

The next stage, according to Newble and Canon (1994), is to arrange the actual learning outcomes by considering the selection of appropriate action verbs, the level of learning outcomes, the number of learning outcomes, and the time assigned to achieve the learning outcomes before reviewing the students' progress. In practice, Newble and Canon (1994) suggest that when compiling learning outcomes, a curriculum developer can do the following:

• Focus on fewer high-priority learning outcomes.

• Arrange learning outcomes into broad categories.

• Make specific outcomes as clear and focused as possible.

In addition, Canada College (2017) propose a template for the preparation of learning outcomes, as shown in Figure 1.

How to get started writing learning outcomes

1. Begin by developing a department/service area mission statement. Make sure your mission supports or advances the broader college mission and is consistent with the college's espoused values.
2. Ask yourself: What are the most important things a student should know, be able to do or demonstrate after completing my program or from utilizing my office/services?
3. Make a list of these and try to write them as SLO statements using the examples and hints provided below. Relate them to the college's Strategic Plan and Action Plan.
4. Edit and review – refer to "How Do You Fix a Student Learning Outcome?" on page 3 of this handout, paying careful attention to the verbs used in your SLOs.
5. Meet with the college research office (which is all too eager to meet with you) to validate and, if necessary, refine the SLO into an authentic & useful assessment tool.

Figure 1. Template for developing learning outcomes (Canada College, 2017)

Learning outcomes should not be so general that they are difficult to evaluate. The examples in Figure 2 are quoted from the Canada College (2017) template, and they exemplify learning outcomes that are difficult or easy to evaluate.

TOO general and VERY HARD to measure…
1. …will appreciate the benefits of exercise.
2. …will be able to access resources at the Canada College.
3. …will develop problem-solving and conflict-resolution skills.
4. …will be able to have more confidence in their abilities.

Still general and HARD to measure…
1. …will value exercise as a stress-reduction tool.
2. …will be able to develop and apply effective problem-solving skills that would enable one to adequately navigate through the proper resources within the college.
3. …will demonstrate ability to resolve personal conflicts and assist others in resolving conflicts.
4. …will demonstrate critical thinking skills, such as problem solving as it relates to social issues.

Specific and relatively EASY to measure…
1. …will be able to explain how exercise affects stress.
2. …will be able to identify the most appropriate resource that is pertinent to their college concern.
3. …will be able to assist classmates in resolving conflicts by helping them negotiate agreements.
4. …will demonstrate the ability to analyze and respond to arguments about racial discrimination.

Figure 2. Sample learning outcomes

Student learning outcomes are embedded within the CLOs, PLOs, and ILOs (Larsen, 2011). ILOs are developed based on a university's vision, mission, and general objectives, which typically reflect scientific achievements and certain academic values. They contain the achievements of all learning programs/levels being managed by the institution. PLOs, meanwhile, show the achievement of a program within a certain level, such as a Bachelor's, Master's, or Doctoral program. The PLOs therefore embody the achievements that students must attain at a certain degree level. As Larsen (2011) explains, PLOs include knowledge of the prerequisites that together form a scientific discipline, the values of a scientific professional, critical and logical thinking skills, communication skills, critical decision-making abilities, and special abilities in the field of expertise. CLOs, meanwhile, comprise the achievements for one subject or groups of similar or related subjects. Achievements can be formulated in the form of overall achievements for the subject or group of subjects and the achievements of a unit or lesson in a course. The following example is quoted from Larsen's explanation (2011) when distinguishing between ILOs, PLOs, and CLOs.

Institutional Outcomes

A university establishes a general vision and mission to guide its operations. In addition, a university also builds a family of knowledge that acts as the mainstay of its university program. It has the general goal of educating students, so they will gain critical thinking skills, be highly ethical, understand the value of globalization, and become masters of information literacy (Larsen, 2011). For this reason, Larsen (2011) exemplifies the ILOs shown below.

In completing their programs, graduates will be able to:

- Engage in purposeful reasoning to reach sound conclusions (Critical Thinking);
- Demonstrate the ability to make informed decisions based on ethical principles and reasoning (Ethics);
- Exhibit a sense of social, cultural, and global responsibility (Global Awareness); and
- Demonstrate the ability to find, evaluate, organize, and use information (Information Literacy).

Furthermore, the university formulates achievements in the field of science as follows:

Natural sciences: Demonstrate comprehension of fundamental concepts, principles, or processes about the natural world.

Mathematics: Demonstrate an understanding of mathematical concepts to solve real-world problems.

Program Outcomes

Program outcomes are broader than course outcomes and focus on the outcomes that represent a program's mission (Larsen, 2011). Example PLOs include:

Our graduates will:
1. Have the knowledge required to be successful in their fields;
2. Have the skills needed to be able to function successfully in their fields;
3. Be able to analyze problems in their fields and develop solutions or strategies to solve those problems;
4. Be able to communicate effectively;
5. Be able to apply the discipline's code of ethics when making decisions; and
6. Be able to design experiments and analyze data.

Course outcomes

Course outcomes are achievements for certain courses or groups of similar or cognate subjects. These achievements can be formulated to guide the share of each unit for all courses or groups of courses. Course outcome formulation relates to the use of Audience, Behavior, Condition, and Degree (ABCD) formulas (Larsen, 2011; Aorola, 1985). In addition, these achievements are measured through responses that can be observed when targets reach *threshold values* (Canada College, 2017). For example, a lecturer may set a target where his students on a research course will be able to compile research proposals in accordance with the lesson plan and the assessment rubric at a 75% level of compliance. If the target of 75% is not achieved, a 70% level must be attained at the very least. Examples CLOs—quoted from Newble and Canon (1994), Larsen (2011), and Canada College (2017)—are given below.

> By completing this course, students will be able to:
> 1. Demonstrate an inferential statistic to test the effect of vocabulary size on reading comprehension up to 90% (unit outcome);
> 2. Explain the procedures for using quantitative and qualitative approaches in language teaching research at 80% (course outcome); and
> 3. Apply teaching methods, evaluate the outcomes, and design teaching materials appropriate to the students' needs at 80% (course group).

Methods

This research is a qualitative study using content analysis (Holsti, 1952) and applying grounded theory (Straus & Corbin, 1996) for its data analysis. The main data for this study were the curriculum documents of ELT Programs in Indonesia (which were available online), written curriculum documents from five universities in Central Java, and the online curricula of various foreign universities. The documents for the curriculum dissemination issued by Kemenristekdikti (2012, 2015, 2016) were also reviewed as secondary data sources. Some 60 participants were involved in this study, including 50 English lecturers who were members of the Study Program Association, 5 deans, and 5 assessors. Participants took part in in-depth interviews about the contents of an INQF-based curriculum, basic preparation, the accuracy of content, the formulation of objectives, learning outcomes, constraints, and processes to overcome obstacles in the development of an INQF-based curriculum.

The contents of the documents were sorted taxonomically based on their themes according to a thematic analysis (Cresswell, 2007; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Furthermore, the results of the

study were analyzed using a grounded theory analysis framework, namely open coding, axial coding, and the theoretical perspective. Open coding examined all data that were obtained from content analysis, and the interview results were coded openly. This process makes it easy for researchers to identify the types of data and their categories. In axial coding, the researchers conducted a study of the data that was previously coded. The results of this analysis included a general classification of data types, with each datum being grouped into the appropriate domain. Through this technique, the researcher obtained a description of the features of an INQF-based curriculum and its problems. At the theoretical perspective stage, the researcher incorporated the learning outcomes, the INQF-based curriculum, the description of courses, and other related matters into the theoretical framework. The theory was then tested with data and formulated into a theory statement.

Findings and Discussion

Revisiting the ELT Curriculum

The INQF-based ELT curriculum structure requires revitalization, because variations manifest here and there, and there are discrepancies in the competences of curriculum developers and institutions. From an interview with the assessors on May 5, 2018, a striking difference when formulating the curriculum structure revealed how some curriculum developers are less competent. Indeed, their course structures do not demonstrate how well their study programs guarantee their graduates the same achievements as the level 6 INQF. As a result, study program heads dislike courses that are deemed hard to handle, so they replace them with their preferred courses without considering quality standards (from the interviews with faculty officials on June 23, 2018). Because of this, there is a less positive perception of some subjects. For example, the teaching practice course (PPL) is omitted, while teaching subjects are increased at the expense of scientific subjects that are deemed "less preferable" (from an interview with a Head of Study Program). If a revitalization is to be carried out, it is suggested that it cover the following areas:

1) The 144 credits, as a maximum graduate requirement, can be achieved in seven semesters. Students are allowed to finish their studies in seven semesters based on a formal document that is in line with the content standards of higher education and an INQF-based curriculum.

2) Establish courses in groups of academic concern that have similar domains to facilitate the formulation of subject learning outcomes, the proposal of literacy courses, linguistic knowledge, teaching, evaluation and the curriculum, learning methods, and research.

3) Formulate standard content of the materials for each subject and subject groups.

4) Re-formulate the statements of learning outcomes in stages by dividing learning outcomes based on academic group learning outcomes, course program learning outcomes, and unit learning outcomes.

This revitalization has implications for the reform process in the following ways:

1) What will actually be formulated in learning outcomes is competence (Kemenristekdikti, 2014). The formula operationally uses verbs from Bloom's taxonomy. The achievements consist of three domains: attitude, knowledge, and performance/skill. There are similarities that are theoretically and practically found in the learning outcomes of foreign universities and those of the INQF. Both refer to competence and the measuring of attitude, knowledge, and performance. One difference, however, lays in how the formulation of learning outcomes in the INQF version is vague because of the technique used to prepare the course matrix.

2) The classification of courses in the INQF is mentioned in the Competency Based Curriculum (CBC). The CBC identifies groups of subjects in areas like personality development, scientific subjects, work skills, and community courses. The INQF names them attitude, ability in the field of work, knowledge, and managerial ability. Examples grouping models have been well established at the State University of Malang. If this grouping is made more specific, this research arrives at the following:

   a. *Literacy courses*: grammar, vocabulary, listening, speaking, reading, and writing. What literacy means here is the ability to achieve basic competencies in communicating in English at a minimal level. So far, attention to vocabulary mastery is not of particular concern. Objectives for mastering 3,000 general word lists in other EFL countries are of special concern. In Indonesia, however, due to an understanding of a communicative competence that is less focused on vocabulary and grammar, vocabulary courses are eliminated, but no alternative courses are provided that can properly fill that vocabulary void.

   b. *Scientific subjects in ELT*: This covers methods for teaching English, developing curricula, using textbooks, and evaluating, as well as variations like EAP (English for academic purposes), teaching English to young learners, and breaking practices.

   c. *Linguistic science courses*: This includes areas such as translation, general linguistics, pragmatics, semantics, syntax, discourse analysis, and literary understanding and

appreciation. This subject is the scientific basis of broad language understanding. Such courses serve to give a broad understanding of the language while at the same time providing curriculum flexibility vertically and horizontally. Vertically, once equipped with language science courses, ELT program undergraduates can continue on to higher levels in ELT program majors or something other than ELT. Horizontally, the ELT program undergraduates of an institution do not miss out on scientific knowledge when compared to other graduates with other majors in the field of English.

On the other hand, flexibility must also provide opportunities for below the undergraduate level, such as in high school, MAN (Senior Islamic Secondary School), vocational schools, and courses that will progress to ELT majors. Knowledge, skills, and competencies obtained at the intermediate level will be useful when graduates proceed to an ELT program. Thus, there are no claims of selfishness that, for example, demand that literary courses belong exclusively to the faculty of literature because only they are competent enough in literature. Likewise, in thesis writing, the ELT program should not assert that it is the best in the field of education. Taken together, this would mean literary majors should not study education. Likewise, literature majors should not claim that mastering literature is the only concern of the literature department.

d. *Research and development of scientific works*: Research-related courses are the most important means for developing research skills. The subject of research methods must absolutely be strengthened in areas like statistics, data analysis, qualitative research, and writing scientific papers and theses.

So far, the matrix-based subject development technique poses a complicated problem because the matrix can only be effectively used for courses that are generally known, and grouping related fields is considered as violating the principles of the INQF. Substantially, the formulation of matrix-based learning outcomes is indeed still vague because the learning outcomes in question tend to be forced. Instead, the learning outcomes should have been formulated as a subject's learning outcomes rather than a graduate's. In addition, the courses compiled by learning outcomes differ in the domains in which they should be grouped rather than being "forced" into one domain.

The Standardization of Learning Outcomes Formulation

The results of this study indicate that there are four types of standard learning outcomes, namely institutions, programs, courses, and graduates. However, the INQF tends to emphasize the graduate learning outcomes. The results also found that the learning outcomes of courses received less attention because the preparation process was carried out in "bulk" through a matrix, and there was "pressure" for allied subjects or similar contents to be put together within a portion of the study area.

This study proves that there have been difficulties in integrating the INQF curriculum guidelines, namely in that administrators must translate the meaning of learning outcomes as competencies, attitudes, and knowledge into indicators whose concepts can potentially be misinterpreted. Templates for the attitude aspect help the general formulation, but on the other hand, they also restrict the creative process.

The results of the learning outcomes analysis of the INQF template are exemplified in a sample to show that the learning outcomes in the general knowledge and special knowledge template indicates PLOs or ILOs, so the formulation of CLOs and ULOs is required.

> 1# CP Program 1 General Knowledge, Template No. 1
> "Mastering the theoretical concepts of the language and techniques of oral communication and general writing (general English) in the daily/general, academic, and occupational contexts equivalent to the post-intermediate level."
> **(CP 75 English Study Documents, unpublished)**
>
> 2# CP Template Special Knowledge for S1 Program No. 5
> "Planning, implementing, managing, evaluating, learning, and improving methods and the process of learning English as a foreign language in accordance with the characteristics and needs of students and stakeholders according to process and quality standards."
> **(CP 75 English Study Documents, unpublished)**

If measured using the learning outcomes criteria, CP 1# and 2# show formulations that are too general, vague, and difficult to measure. The main aim of a CP is that it must be capable of being measured and demonstrated. For CP 1# and 2#, this can be demonstrated, yet it is difficult to measure. Evidently, these two CPs are examples of ILOs or PLOs. To be useful, both CPs must be reduced to something more specific, demonstrable, and measurable. The use of verbs like "master" and lists like "planning, implementing, managing, evaluating, learning…" indicates that the actions are broadly defined and difficult to measure.

The standardized learning outcomes of a group of courses are set out in Table 1, while a summary of the revitalized learning outcomes is presented in Table 2.

Table 1.
Suggested learning outcomes based on course groups

No	Course group	Courses	Suggested LO
A	English Literacy	1. Vocabulary 2. Grammar 3. Pronunciation 4. Listening 5. Speaking 6. Reading 7. Writing 8. Journal article writing	1. Demonstrate English mastery with a 4,000 word vocabulary and appropriate grammar for oral and written communication up to advanced level 2. Demonstrate mastery of academic English verbally and in writing for formal and informal purposes.
B	Language contents	1. Introduction to linguistics 2. Syntax 3. Phonology 4. Semantics 5. Pragmatics 6. Sociolinguistics 7. Discourse analysis 8. Literature 9. Translation 10. EAP	1. Explain scientific concepts of language and their application in reviewing linguistic problems. 2. Apply the results of a theoretical analysis of linguistics to a context related to literature, translation, social interaction, and academic goals.
C	Language teaching	1. TEFL 2. Teaching methodology 3. Classroom management 4. E-learning & teaching methods 5. Language curriculum 6. Materials development 7. Assessment and testing 8. Instructional design 9. Apprenticeships 10. Micro-teaching 11. PPL 12. Community Outreach Program (KKN) in teaching	1. Explain the concept of methods of design for language learning, the development of teaching materials, choosing methods, and learning and practice in the classroom. 2. Demonstrate competence to teach English in the classroom and community contexts using technology, information-based learning and appropriate managerial principles.
D	Research	1. Quantitative research in language teaching 2. Qualitative research in language teaching 3. Data analysis in qualitative & quantitative research 4. Research proposal 5. Proposal seminar 6. Undergraduate Thesis	1. Implement procedures and processes of scientific work logically using qualitative and quantitative approaches. 2. Compile written reports and communicate the results of the study verbally and in writing in the academic forum.

Table 2.
Proposed PLOs for an ELT curriculum for an undergraduate program

No	Course group	Suggested LO
A	English Literacy	1. Demonstrate English mastery with a 4,000-word vocabulary and appropriate grammar for oral and written communication up to advanced level.
		2. Demonstrate mastery of academic English verbally and in writing for formal and informal purposes.
B	Language contents	1. Explain the scientific concepts of language and their application in reviewing linguistic problems.
		2. Apply the results of a theoretical analysis of linguistics into various contexts related to teaching and learning, literature, translation, social interaction, and academic purposes.
C	Language teaching	1. Explain the concepts of teaching methods in language teaching, the development of teaching materials, teaching methods selection, instructional design, and practice in the classroom.
		2. Demonstrate English teaching competences for teaching in the classroom and society using technology, information-based approaches, and the appropriate managerial principles
D	Research	1. Apply procedures and scientific processes logically using quantitative and qualitative approaches.
		2. Develop written reports correctly and communicate the results of a research verbally and in writing in an academic forum.

CP, Vision/Mission, General Purpose, and Learning Objectives

The findings of this study also show how respondents respond to developing learning outcomes and the factors underlying the background. A good learning outcome is able to help better understand how to help students learn and provide feedback, so that institutions can take steps to enable students to explain what they have learned from an institution, both inside and outside the classroom. If students can explain what they can do and what they know, it helps them to identify what they specifically need to focus on learning, whether it be knowledge, skills, attitudes, or values. The second CP formulation has therefore not met the criteria for a good CP formula.

When questioned about the learning outcome drafting process and its relation to vision, mission, and objectives, the respondents stated that they did not know, so they wrote the CP following an existing example. Operationally, there are five stages for formulating a CP, namely referring to the vision and mission of the institution, setting the most important targets that should be learned and later demonstrated by students, making a CP statement list along with examples, editing and reviewing CP statements, and discussing statements with the quality assurance department or other related institutions. According to the respondents, they were unaware of the five steps, so they had worked on none of them. What they did know is that a CP shows the expected learning outcomes, but when it came to how the process is formulated, they said they did not know about this. The

respondents also said that they knew the prescribed operational verbs to use, yet they did not know that each verb must be demonstrated as a learning outcome by students and must be measurable. Learning outcomes can be developed based on four sources: government, universities, study programs, and courses. When asked about the four learning outcome sources, respondents claimed to understand them, but they found it difficult to distinguish how the formulation of learning outcomes corresponded to each source. According to the respondents, the relationship between learning outcomes must show a relationship between the mission, goals, learning outcomes, and learning objectives that is difficult to distinguish. When explaining the meaning of each term, one respondent said that he knew but it was not clear. The mission is a holistic vision of the values and philosophy of an institution, program, or department. The purpose, broadly put, is to create a general statement about the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that students are expected to master. The outcome is clearly an operational definition specifically formulated for that purpose. Outcomes are student oriented. The learning objectives are the learning strategies expected from learning opportunities, which is teacher-centered.

When asked whether the learning outcomes they formulated helped support the learning objectives and clearly showed the aspects to be measured—including attitudes, knowledge and skills—the respondents generally answered hesitantly. For the respondents, learning outcomes are a statement about the competence of graduates, but how can such statements support their learning objectives? As for describing the knowledge, attitudes, and skills, the respondents answered that they quoted from the KKNI curriculum guidelines.

Framework for Formulating Learning Outcomes

A standardized formulation of learning outcomes was agreed unanimously by all respondents, with them mentioning some points to be revisited and reformulated. The respondents' comments included:

- Creating a template for formulating statements of learning outcomes;
- Choosing operational verbs with an emphasis on words like remembering, explaining, evaluating, and formulating;
- Making groupings according to the following groups: literacy, teaching science, language science, and research;
- Developing knowledge and competencies that must be mastered in each group of subjects;

• Spreading the 144 credits over seven semesters.

• Developing a thesis guidance model, trial examinations, and thesis examination stages;

• Supporting each other by exchanging articles that will be published in scientific journals in each institution, either from a thesis or an original paper;

• Creating an inventory of the names and types of courses needed to obtain 146 credits;

• Formulating models for institutional learning outcomes, subject learning outcomes, and the gradual learning outcomes of graduates;

• Encouraging the head of each study program to use these models in an efficient manner together with the formulation of standard competency courses;

• Incorporating technology-based teaching materials into each learning activity and each subject using gadgets, such as Android devices; and

• Using technology-based, blended-learning in learning, assignment, and assessment.

Conclusion and Implications

The objective of this study is to examine the formulation of learning outcomes in an INQF-based ELT curriculum for undergraduate students, with particular reference to learning outcome statements for ELT programs in Indonesia. In brief, this study found that in general, a revitalization of the formulation for an INQF-based ELT curriculum is urgently needed. Typically, the matrix approach to developing learning outcomes is disorganized and results in learning outcomes that are unfocused, overly general, and missing the expected professional outcomes of ELT programs. The existing learning outcomes are PLOs, so definite learning outcomes that indicate CLOs and ULOs are urgently required. The formulation of content for an ELT curriculum lacks flexibility and vertical and horizontal continuity. Vertically, the curriculums do not identify how the knowledge of high school graduates (or equivalent) can be accommodated in an ELT program. Indeed, the contents of these ELT curricula are still so diverse that continuity with graduate and postgraduate programs is even less effective. Horizontally, these ELT curricula do not yet have a clear linkage when they are associated with a literature major, a certified undergraduate program, an overseas EAP program, or an international curriculum for ELT. In particular, this study revealed a wide diversification in ELT study programs throughout Indonesia, such as differences in the number of credits, the types of courses, the quality of the formulation of learning outcomes, the

differences that require understanding to compile grouping guidelines, and the re-forming of the subject learning outcomes.

This study is limited in terms of the number of respondents and their distribution. Considering this limitation, the researcher suggests the following theoretical and practical implications. Theoretically speaking, this study finds that the concept of learning outcomes, as issued by Kemenristekdikti, needs changing. Learning outcomes should definitely be developed in adherence with ILOs, PLOs, CLOs, and ULOs, with this being a top priority. The definition of learning achievement derives from the term "learning outcomes," and this is actually a scientific umbrella for the learning outcomes themselves, so it does not need to be forced into something different.

Practical implications, meanwhile, relate to the method of developing matrix-based learning outcomes. This method proves difficult, and it even "misleads" curriculum developers, because they become stuck in a matrix configuration that forces several courses to be integrated. A middle way could be found where a matrix can still be created, but courses could be grouped according to a general taxonomy. For ELT programs, the following taxonomic groups are recommended: literacy, teaching science, language science, and research. With this concept, ELT program management associations need to develop a new formula for defining learning outcomes for ILOs, PLOs, CLOs, and ULOs. ILOs and PLOs could be achieved in the form of templates. In addition, the formulations that need to be emphasized are CLOs and ULOs. Management associations also need to formulate guidelines for determining types of courses, competency standards, and assessment processes that can be applied throughout Indonesia, all while respecting the possibility for certain study programs to offer different courses while still adhering to the formulation guidelines. In addition, it is suggested that further research look at a larger number of respondents with heterogeneous backgrounds. It is also suggested to involve students and other stakeholders, such as teachers and school administrators.

References

Beaumont, R. (2005). *Learning outcomes: A practical guide*. Newcastle: University of Newcastle.

Budiharso, T. (2017). Developing Prompts of Argumentative Essay Writing for EFL College Students. *IJOTL-TL, 2*(3), 227–244.

Budiharso, T. (2018). Pembelajaran Menulis Esai dalam Disertasi: Kajian Metakognitif. *Cendekia, 12*(2), 141–152.

Canada College. (2017). *A guide to developing measurable students learning outcomes.* Toronto: Office of Planning, Research and Student Service.

Course, Program, Institution: Connecting Learning Outcomes. (2017). Retrieved from http://www.studentlife.utoronto.ca/bts/learning-outcomes on July 23, 2018.

Cresswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication.

Dinh, H. (2019). Towards a Knowledge-rich Curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies Research*, *1*(1), 54-70. Retrieved from https://curriculumstudies.org/index.php/CS/article/view/6

Endrotomo. (2014). *Pengembangan Kurikulum Pendidikan Tinggi Mengacu pada KKNI dan SN Dikti*. Jakarta: Direktorat Pembelajaran dan Kemahasiswaan.

Etherington, M. (2019). The Challenge with Educational Transformation. *Journal of Culture and Values in Education*, *2*(1), 96-112. Retrieved from http://cultureandvalues.org/index.php/JCV/article/view/33

Guilbert, J.J. (1987). *Educational handbook for health personnel*. Geneva: WHO.

Holsti, O. R. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Larsen, R.W. (2011). *Developing Program Learning Outcomes*. Thousand Oaks: Prentice Hall Inc.

Ministry of National Education (Kepmendiknas). (2002). *Pedoman Penyusunan Kurikulum Pendidikan Tinggi dan Penilaian Hasil Belajar Mahasiswa*. Dirjen Dikti.

Kemenristekdikti. (2012). *Kurikuum Pendidikan Tinggi: Pendekatan Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi dan Kurikulum Berbasis Capaian*. Jakarta: Belmawa Dikti.

KemenRistekdikti. (2015). *Paradigma Capaian Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Belmawa Dikti.

Korotchenko, Tatiana; Matveenko, A Iriana; Strelnikova, B, Anna & Phillips, Chris. (2015). *Backward Design Method in Foreign Language Development Curriculum*. Procedia-Social and Behaviorial Sciences 215, 213-217. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.624

Miles & Huberman. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sources*. New Jersey: Francis Bacon Inc.

Kemenristekdikti. (2016). *Panduan Penyusunan Kurikulum Pendidikan Tinggi*. Jakarta: Dirjen Belmawa.

Newble D & Cannon R. (1994). *A handbook for medical teacher*. Kluwer: Dordrecht.

Parker, J. (2019). Second language learning and cultural identity. *Journal of Curriculum Studies Research*, *1*(1), 33-42. Retrieved from https://curriculumstudies.org/index.php/CS/article/view/7

Parlindungan, F., Rifai, I., & Satriani, A. (2018). The representation of Indonesian cultural diversity in middle school English textbooks. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 8*, 289–302.

Reece, I. & Spencer W. (1997). *Teaching, training and learning a practical guide*. Sunderland: Business Educational Publishers.

Senior College and University Commission. (2017). *Six steps assessment process: Student learning outcomes*. California: CSUF.

Solikhah, I.. (2015). KKNI dalam Kurikulum Berbasis Learning Outcomes. *Lingua, 12*(1), 1-22.

Strauss, A. & Corbin J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Tadeu, P., Fernandez Batanero, J., & Tarman, B. (2019). ICT in a Global World. *Research in Social Sciences and Technology*, *4*(2), i-ii. Retrieved from https://ressat.org/index.php/ressat/article/view/431

Tim Pengembang Kurikulum Pendidikan Tinggi. (2012). *Modul 2 Tahapan Penyusunan Kurikulum Pendidikan Tinggi.* Jakarta: Belmawa Dikti.

Vu, T. (2019). Theoretical Constructs and Practical Strategies for Intercultural Communication. *Journal of Curriculum Studies Research*, *1*(1), 43-53. Retrieved from https://curriculumstudies.org/index.php/CS/article/view/3

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (1998). *Understanding by design*. Alexandria,

VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by Design*. Alexandria: ASCD.