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Abstract

This thesis is positioned against the context of the global changes sweeping the higher education system internationally. The reforms are motivated by a 21st century vision of higher education that is shared globally. The reforms and their underlying vision were also adopted by the Indonesian government and, somewhat broadly, by Indonesian universities. The integration of research and inquiry into undergraduate teaching is central to that vision. The study investigates the challenges of the new higher education reforms on the teaching and planning of English language teacher education (ELTE) undergraduate programs. In order to identify these challenges, the study adopted qualitative research methods as best suited for obtaining as many perspectives as possible from ELTE academics on the issue and to examine the concepts and methods that they apply when redesigning their teaching, as well as their own views on the subject matter. Diverse methods for data collection and data analysis were utilised in order to generate many points to provide a better understanding of the Indonesian ELTE context and the values and traditions from the perspective of which ELTE academics have responded to the new policies. The challenge, that the study identified as most critical to the integration of research and inquiry in teaching in ELTE is an overwhelming absence of explicit links between the lecturers’ personal research (i.e. what they research, how and why) and the manner in which they taught their subjects. This impacted on the pedagogy of their units, where the lectures, uncertain how to theorise investigation, did not know what investigative learning would entail and what needed to be investigated. On the basis of the study’s findings, a number of strategies were proposed to assist ELTE departments to build both a sustainable and empowering 21st century model of ELTE programs.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Study background

The current era of globalisation has brought with it a change in the ways in which universities all over the world construct their role in society and the specific functions that these roles imply. Universities are one of the oldest institutions. There, change takes place slowly, they are criticised for their tendency to keep away from the outside world and the broader needs and values of the people and communities within which they are actually embedded (Burawoy, 2011). Under pressure from outside forces – both budgetary and regulatory – the roles and the functions of universities are being questioned, including the very concepts of which knowledge should be created, for whom, why and how (Burawoy, 2017, p. 143). The push to consider universities as located “inside society” meant that the pressures which regulate the public sphere are now being applied to universities.

According to Burawoy (2017, pp. 141-142), universities find themselves gripped by four types of crisis to which they need to respond in order to maintain their role as leaders of innovation and social transformation. The fiscal crisis means that universities can no longer rely on state funding for their survival. Today, all over the world, and to a different extent, student fees are being both introduced or increased. The fiscal crisis has its roots in the legitimacy crisis. Since universities are no longer fully funded by the state, they find themselves challenged to define their place in society, establish credibility, and restore public confidence. As a consequence, the legitimacy crisis resulted in the identity crisis. Questions regarding the meaning of the university are being raised to safeguard that universities contribute to the goal of developing sustainable education systems that benefit from the broader community investment (Burawoy, 2017). The three crises gave rise to the crisis of governance that invoked the need for processes by which institutions rationalise their teaching and research (Burawoy, 2017, p. 142).

In response to these four crises, within academia, concerns were raised questioning the expansion of the bureaucracy that ensued. These voices of critique are still strong. For example, a recent study in Australia reports that a majority of academics see the interference with their teaching and research as “administrative blockage or roadblock” that is not helping them “to shape what they do or to improve [their teaching]”, and interfering with innovation
through compliance and “a tedious set of forms they have to fill out” (Tan, 2016, p. 98). An elaborate auditing culture emerged that resulted in academics distorting their output, be it in teaching or research, ticking the right boxes and publishing essentially the same studies in different venues to boost publication records (Burawoy, 2017). Restructuring of faculties, employing temporary instructors, outsourcing service work, raising student fees, moving to distance learning, inviting academic celebrities to teach courses, are all strategies that seek to tackle budget deficits (Burawoy, 2017).

Regulation, rationalisation and instrumentalisation turned higher education institutions (HEIs) into “a tool rather than a motor of the knowledge economy” (Burawoy, 2017, p. 150), “a means for someone else’s end” (Burawoy, 2011, p. 4). Their effects were obstruction of production (research), dissemination (publication) and transmission (teaching) of knowledge (Burawoy, n.d.). In a similar vein, Marginson and Considine (2000, p. 34) writes, “if we continue to subsume the academic functions of the university into its corporate identity, building institutions for the sake of the institutions themselves, and losing sight of the fact that it is in teaching, research and scholarship that universities make their distinctive social contributions, we will impoverish the university as an institution and pave the way for the shift of its academic functions into a generic corporate environment”.

Balancing the internal and external pressures will require universities to develop a culture that counters the reductionist concepts of knowledge in an increasingly corporatised university. To this end, Burawoy (2011) suggests that establishing an ongoing relation with the broader community is imperative for a dialogue to emerge that helps embed the university within the broader needs and values of the people, locally and internationally, “building society in the university and the university in society” (Burawoy, 2011). This view finds support in academia, with research arguing against simply following a narrow “managerialist agenda” (Star & Hammer, 2008, p. 241) and for refocusing on processes that support this dialogue. Certainly, developing modern education systems hinges on a commitment to this dialogue for universities to understand their own agency and the context in which they operate (Lor & Mak, 2018).

The present study is developed against the backdrop of the pressures described above and from the need for universities to make their transformative function in the society both visible and impactful. Among the different types of institutions of higher learning, research
universities play an important role in advancing science and new knowledge and are key institutions for generating social and economic development (Mohrmana, Mab, & Bakerc, 2008, p. 5). Undergraduate education remains a key component of research universities, as well as the training of professionals in a range of areas, provision of service to society, and engagement in applied work and technology transfer (Mohrmana et al., 2008, p. 6). A critical dimension of the higher education renewal agenda is the quality of the teaching programs and, especially, the development of research and inquiry skills as indicators of higher order learning. The object of this study is the impact of the higher education renewal agenda on curriculum development in universities in Indonesia and, specifically, on English Language Teacher Education (ELTE).

This chapter offers a brief overview of the recent developments in universities worldwide and in Indonesia relevant to ELTE. It does so with a view to demonstrating the need for the present study and its focus on investigating the impacts of global changes on ELTE in Indonesia. Study aims will be outlined as will research questions. The chapter closes with a brief overview of each chapter of this study.

1.2 Global context of research and inquiry skills in undergraduate education

Publication of the Boyer Report (Boyer Commission, 1998), Reinventing undergraduate education: A blueprint for America's research universities, marks a watershed in higher education developments. According to the vision laid out in the Report, research universities share a special set of characteristics, among them, that education must cater for higher order thinking and skills which support their learning. According to the Report (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 16), when these characteristics are not addressed, undergraduate students “can be denied the kind of education they have a right to expect, i.e. an education that provides opportunities to interact with ‘established scholar-teachers’”.

The Boyer Report (Boyer Commission, 1998), coincided with the resolutions of the World Conference on Higher Education at the UNESCO Headquarters in Paris in October 1998 that called for reforms that would result in higher education being “equally accessible to all on the basis of merit” (UNESCO, 2007, p.1). Further, it was noted that higher education is important to the whole society and that “a renewal of higher education … is essential for the
whole of society to be able to face up to the challenges of the twenty-first century, to ensure its intellectual independence, to create and advance knowledge, and to educate and train responsible, enlightened citizens and qualified specialists, without whom no nation can progress economically, socially, culturally or politically” (UNESCO, 2007, p. 2). Together, the Boyer Report and the resolutions of the Paris conference identified a direction of development for the 21st century. The change meant addressing quality of service and access.

As a result of the Boyer Report (Boyer Commission, 1998), research universities worldwide have undergone a substantial evolution in shifting undergraduate education to the forefront of their planning policies and changing many of its components (Katkin, 2003, p. 35). While discussions and recommendations on linking teaching and research often focus on the later years studies, this too is changing (Healey, 2014, p. 20). The requirement to integrate research and inquiry skills into undergraduate curricula is a direct outcome of the reforms that followed. Policies had been developed to ensure that higher order thinking is taught, and, upon graduation, students can demonstrate minimum levels of competency in relevant skills. It is now common practice to refer to these skills as graduate attributes or key capabilities (competencies). Graduate attributes are “orienting statements of education outcomes” formulated in order to inform curriculum design and the provision of learning experiences at a university (Barrie, Hughes & Smith, 2009, p. 1).

Graduate attributes are derived from various policy documents and research that specify the skills needed in the 21st century. Typically, Bloom’s taxonomy (1956) (and its later versions) and the 21st Century Skills (P21 Partnership, n.d.) are being used by academia. In Australia, the attributes were derived from the Employability Skills Framework (Department of Education, Science and Training, 2006) and, typically, refer to the following qualities: critical thinking, professional expertise, intellectual curiosity, problem-solving, independent thought, creativity, ethical practice, integrity, communication, teamwork, self-management, planning and organising, technology skills, life-long learning, initiative and enterprise (Oliver, Jones, Tucker & Ferns, 2007, p. 1). Benchmarking and standardisation of outcomes were adopted to ensure quality of undergraduate programs and comparability of higher education qualifications across HEIs worldwide (Feuer & Hornidge, 2015, p. 4).
Since the publication of the Boyer Report (Boyer Commission, 1998) universities worldwide engaged in a multitude of activities and processes in order to enhance learning experiences of their undergraduate students. Strategies, such as standardisation and, where possible, accreditation of teaching programs had been, or are being, implemented, with a view to encouraging student mobility and intercultural exchange (Feuer & Horndige, 2015, pp. 5, 19; Carter, Fazey, Geraldo, & Trevitt, 2010). Technological developments made it possible to individualise and to diversify university offerings, while free online courses and materials, such as MOOCs (Massive Online Open Courses) or university and personal YouTube channels, provide public with direct and just-in-time access to knowledge and, frequently, knowledge producers (Lian, A.-P., 2011). Yet, the interaction between this investment in pedagogy and other responsibilities of higher education is rarely addressed. This may be one of the reasons why lecturers tend to view curriculum renewal as reflecting “merely a narrow ‘managerialist’ agenda” (Star & Hammer, 2008, p. 241).

Pedagogic innovation in undergraduate curricula appears to be cosmetic in nature, rather part of a greater strategy of research universities “re-inventing” themselves. For example, experts in Australia focus on aligning key course and subject capabilities, assessments and experiences, generating assessment rubrics, implementing strategies to evidence student achievement of those standards through student portfolios and course review processes that are both internal and linking with other universities for comparison (Oliver, 2015). Teaching quality is constructed as a skill that should be reported on and also taught to present “clear direction” for “rapid uptake” (Oliver, 2015). Involving staff from careers service, library, students, graduates and industry representatives in course team conversations is seen as facilitating dialogue with stakeholders to meet their needs and, as a result, the accreditation standards of academia and professional bodies (Oliver, 2015). While all these developments are very important, it is not clear how they are embedded within the greater goals of universities in order for disciplines to progress and for universities to enhance their own relevance as community leaders.

Voices of critique point to the dangers of educational strategies that fail to balance compliance and innovation. Concerned with research and innovation, Pertiwi (in preparation) and Lian and Pertiwi (2017) draw on arguments presented by Professor Gary Thomas (2007), illustrating the causes and the effects of contexts where this balance is violated. Thomas made extensive contribution to the field of education as the Executive
Editor of Educational Review, the co-editor of the International Journal of Research and Method in Education, and the British Educational Research Journal, all high-ranking journals of education. In his early career, Thomas was advised to withdraw his publication to the British Educational Research Journal due to his rather different way of thinking. As reported by Thomas (2007, p. viii), the advice of the Editor of the journal was “to reconsider entirely my submission of the manuscript, since, she suggested, its publication would be bad for my reputation”. The same paper was then published by Harvard Educational Review, despite its apparently “opinionated” views. Today, as Lian and Pertiwi (2017) report, Thomas is highly critical of quality assurance processes established and followed in education, as, in his view, beliefs as to what signifies “quality” tend to be reinforced through various processes that universities develop, and, when not critically scrutinised, they tend to operate as a regulatory body, ensuring that “dissent is increasingly rare” and that status quo prevails.

Universities promote heavily their degrees on the international market and, in so doing, model their concepts of quality and the processes for its facilitation (Mok, 2012). Undergraduate teaching is regarded as one of the key processes by which HEIs engage in processes of social change and development (Brennan, Kim, & Lebeau, 2004, p. 7). The reduction in public funding of universities, at least in the US, Australia and the UK, means that, currently, costs are covered through a government loan which is paid to universities via its students (Frost, 2015). This means that more students equates to more money for universities. Universities compete for students, and efficiencies are encouraged. Yet, reports a worsening of undergraduate teaching both in North America and the United Kingdom, with lecturers feeling demoralised by “students who do not wish to study (the majority), who learn little, and who, flushed with a sense of entitlement, are increasingly litigious about their grades (a growing number)” (Baehr, 2011). Baehr cites a US study reporting that “three semesters of college education … have a barely noticeable impact [a seven percentile gain] on students’ skills in critical thinking, complex reasoning and writing (Arum and Roksa 2011: 35); nor do the subsequent five semesters have greater impact”.

In the light of the arguments presented thus far, undergraduate education continues to be a challenge even in the countries that initiated the move toward standardisation and quality assurance. An OECD report summarising the literature on quality teaching confirms the ambiguity of the term and the tendency for quality teaching to be disconnected from debates
on quality of culture in higher education (Henard & Leprince-Ringuet, 2007, p. 4). Similar sentiment was echoed by Professor James Wilkinson, Director of the Derek Bok Centre for Teaching and Learning, Harvard University, during his Menzies Oration on Higher Education (2007). For Wilkinson, the most important aspect of undergraduate education is for students to learn “the process of inquiry itself, modeled by the faculty in the course of their teaching”. Yet, he noted critically, “most discussions about undergraduate curricula focus almost exclusively on content”. In his speech, Wilkinson urged universities to model and teach “quality culture”, eloquently described by Charles Eliot in 1869, “The worthy fruit of academic culture is an open mind, trained to careful thinking, instructed in the methods of philosophic investigation, acquainted in a general way with the accumulated thought of past generations, and penetrated with humility”.

1.3 Quality Assurance in global higher education

The goal for universities to redesign their programs and to integrate research and inquiry skills into undergraduate curricula presents a challenge for many research universities around the world (Healey, 2014, p. 29). The governments and universities in Indonesia and other ASEAN member countries have accepted the need for standardisation of higher education as an indicator of progress and an inevitable product of globalisation, leading to a knowledge society and reform and encouraging mobility and intercultural exchange (Feuer & Hornidge, 2015, pp. 5, 19; Carter, Fazey, Geraldo, & Trevitt, 2010). This steady shift in Southeast Asia toward standardisation and various forms of Quality Assurance began in 1990s in response to the worldwide calls for higher education reform, including the 1998 World Conference on Higher Education at the UNESCO Headquarters in Paris (Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2009), publication of the Boyer Report (Boyer Commission, 1998) and the Bologna Process, all aiming to ensure comparability in the standards and quality of higher education qualifications (Feuer & Hornidge, 2015, p. 4). Issues relating to Quality Assurance were high on the agenda of all these initiatives and were subsequently followed by attempts to develop Quality Assurance schemes which would “support all kinds of cross-border activity-student mobility, joint degree programs, validation of professional qualifications, and others” (Altbach et al., 2009, p. 51).

However, defining what Quality Assurance is to look like is not without its problems. Governments are challenged to address the international requirements while also taking into
account objectives and practices that reflect unique local needs and limitations (Brennan et al., 2004, p. 54). This requires research and a thorough understanding of the specificity of the context in which universities are to exercise their role as leaders of innovation and social transformation (Brennan, King, & Lebeau, 2004, p. 7). Furthermore, as mentioned by Green, Hammer and Star (2009), graduate skills agenda also opens space for pedagogic discussions “which require a careful exploration of procedure or process”.

The problem is that while richer nations have a means to invest in capacity-building research and professional development, poorer countries struggle in this respect. Statistical data show that in 2007 (Altbach et al., 2009, p. 62), Indonesian Higher Education sector spent 4.6% on its Research Development, while, for comparison, countries like Australian universities spent 25.7%, Hong-Kong 45.3%, Malaysia 9.9%, China 8.5% and Thailand 38.3%. These statistics illustrate the gravity of the Indonesian sector. In order to address the equity issues, UNESCO and the World Bank created the Global Initiative for Quality Assurance Capacity (GIQAC) which aimed to allocate funding to "establish, develop, or reform Quality Assurance systems, processes, and mutual recognition arrangements" and to support universities in accessing relevant training (Altbach et al., 2009). It is thus evident that Quality Assurance is high on the agenda of governments and the international higher education community (Altbach et al., 2009, p. 62).

However, as Howe (2009, p. 386) shows, while universities in the developed countries work increasingly harder on establishing quality assurance processes and frameworks to address the demand for international quality control measures, this does not mean that this work is either completed or without its own challenges. For example, in relation to undergraduate research and inquiry, Barrie, Hughes, and Crisp (2014) found that, in Australia, while universities tend to include in their graduate learning outcomes skills such as critical thinking, analysis, problem-solving and research skills, other outcomes such as ethical development, intercultural competence and social responsibility are rarely addressed. According to Lian (2012), this ambiguity regarding what counts, why, when and what can be ignored must not be simply a matter of choice; some form of intellectual contextualisation of the learning outcomes is needed. This critique is also shared by Oliver (2010, p. 6), who suggests that it is critical for pedagogic research to focus on the accountability of the frameworks in which graduate outcomes are articulated and implemented.
1.4 Teacher education reform in Indonesia

In 2005, Indonesia reformed its teacher education programs. The key objective of the reform was to provide a more inclusive and better regulated professional degree, accompanied by an increased remuneration, at times exceeding that of lawyers or doctors (Chang et al., 2014, p. 181). Since 2005, a teaching degree takes 4 years to complete and involves mastery of the content-specific and pedagogy subjects (Chang et al., 2014, p. 182). In one sweep of legislation, the law changed the status of the teaching profession and, despite the initial challenges and criticism that the implementation of the reform attracted (Chang et al., 2014, p. 182), Indonesia is now better placed to engage in the provision of quality pre-service teacher training. The following stages illustrate current teacher training certification process:

- Stage 1: Completion of the coursework to obtain the four-year degree (granted by a higher degree institution).
- Stage 2: Completion of the newly mandated postgraduate, classroom-focused course of professional study (six months for primary school teachers, one year for secondary teachers).
- Stage 3: Gaining an authorised teaching post (as opposed to being hired on a school contract).
- Stage 4: Completion of a one-year probation (through what is meant to be a systematic process of induction and mentoring)

(Chang et al., 2014, p. 186)

1.5 Indonesian Qualifications Framework (IQF)

As part of its agenda to internationalise its higher education sector, IQF was officially launched in 2012 through the publication of Presidential Decree No. 8 (The Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2012). The Decree obliges the Ministry of Education and Culture to embed the IQF in all levels of education, formal, informal, and non-formal. In 2013, the IQF was formally ratified by The Minister of Education and Culture, Decree No. 73 (MOEC, 2013). Following Burawoy’s (2011) description of the four crises in higher education, implementation of the IQF is likely to take time and will require investment in building appropriate governance structures that satisfy quality assurance in terms of legitimacy issues, programs’ relevance, and staff capacity (Burawoy, 2011).
There are 9 levels in the IQF (The Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2013a). In regard to higher education, there are seven qualification levels, from level 3 to level 9. Every qualification level of the IQF contains two descriptions: general descriptions (for all levels) and specific descriptions (different for each level). Diploma 1 graduates at least should reach level 3 (operator position). Diploma 2 graduates at least should reach level 4 (technician/analyst position). Diploma 3 graduates at least should reach level 5 (technician/analyst position). Diploma 4, Applied Bachelor, and Bachelor graduates at least should reach level 6 (technician/analyst position). Applied Master or Master graduates at least should reach level 8 (expert position), and Applied Doctorate or Doctorate graduates at least should reach level 9 (expert position). Graduates from professional education at least should reach level 7 or 8 (expert position). Graduates from specialist education at least should reach level 8 or 9 (expert position).

Table 1.1: Learning Outcomes Equivalency of higher education graduates (Based on Presidential Decree No. 8 Year 2012 and Indonesian Qualifications Framework (2012)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>IQF level</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diploma 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>technician/analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>technician/analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>technician/analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Bachelor / Bachelor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>technician/analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Master / Master</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Doctorate / Doctorate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Education</td>
<td>7 or 8</td>
<td>Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Education</td>
<td>8 or 9</td>
<td>Expert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As per the IQF (The Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2012), undergraduate students in Indonesia are required to graduate with very specific competencies which refer to values based on two foundation of laws in Indonesia: Pancasila (Five basic pillars) and UUD 1945 (Basic Law 1945). The implementation of IQF “will embrace the process of
emergent character and identity of Indonesian people” (The Ministry of National Education, 2012, p. 25) in relation to the following objectives:

1. Students are devoted to One All Mighty God;
2. Students demonstrate excellent moral, ethics and personal identities in carrying out their duties;
3. Students act as citizens who are proud of and love their nation and have faith in world peace;
4. Students are capable of working in teams and demonstrate compassion to social, community and environmental issues;
5. Students embody values of diversity of culture, vision, beliefs and religion as well as appreciate patent and property rights;
6. Students esteem law enforcement and demonstrate spirit and the will to prioritise national and public needs.

Undergraduate programs with the bachelor’s degree qualification are located at level 6 of the IQF (The Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2012). Graduates of these programs are required to possess the following skills:

a. Capable of applying science, technology and art within her/his expertise and is adaptable to various situations faced during solving a problem.

b. Mastering in-depth general and specific theoretical concepts of specific knowledge and capable of formulating related problem-solving procedures.

c. Capable of taking strategic decisions based on information and data analysis and provides direction in choosing several alternative solutions,

d. Responsible for her/his own job and can be assigned responsibility of the attainment of organization’s performance.

(The Ministry of National Education, 2012, p. 27)

The IQF (The Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2012) is the main reference point for setting graduate competencies of academic education, vocational education, and professional education (MOEC, 2012, p. 24). Indonesia also has set the competency standards of graduates from higher education institutions based on the Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education Decree No.44 Year 2015 on National Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015) (upgrade version from the Ministry of Education and Culture Decree No. 49 Year 2014 on National Higher Education Standards (MOEC, 2014)).
regulation further expands and explicates graduate attributes identified in the IQF. According to this decree, bachelor’s degree graduates should possess general skills in the following areas:

a. Ability to apply logical, critical, systematic, and innovative thinking in the context of science and technology, ethically and humanly.
b. Ability to show independent and professional disposition.
c. Ability to study and critique the developments and applications of science and technology, apply ethical procedures in all aspects of learning, produce a research study in the form of a thesis or final project report, and upload it on the university website.
d. Ability to write scientific research study in the form of thesis or final project report and upload it on the university website.
e. Ability to solve problems in the area of expertise by analysing various information and data.
f. Ability to maintain and develop networks with supervisors, colleagues, associates.
g. Ability to work in teams and evaluate work of the team members.
h. Ability to do self-assess and conduct independent learning.
i. Ability to document, store, secure, and use safely data to guarantee its validity and to prevent unlawful practices.

(MRTHE, 2015, pp. 63-65)

The New Decree No. 50 Year 2018 was released to amend some articles in the Decree No. 44 Year 2015. The articles amended were mostly about the lecturer qualifications and workloads, leaving no changes in the graduate competencies.

Undergraduate students in English language teacher education programs (ELTE), and other subject areas, are required to complete a 1-semester long research thesis on a subject relevant to their profession. Research conducted by the students should be directed to the achievement of the graduate learning outcomes, thus fulfilling requirements and regulations of higher education institutions (MRTHE, 2015, p. 38). Building students’ capacity requires integration of research and inquiry skills into undergraduate curricula.
1.6 Accreditation in Indonesian universities

In Indonesia, Quality Assurance system of higher education institutions (Sistem Penjaminan Mutu Perguruan Tinggi (SPM-PT)) consists of three components: (1) Internal Quality Assurance system (Sistem Penjaminan Mutu internal (SPMI)), (2) External Quality Assurance system (Sistem Penjaminan Mutu Eksternal (SPME)), and (3) Higher Education database (Pangkalan Data Perguruan Tinggi (PDPT)). Government is responsible for supervising education organisations (vertical supervision) (DGHE, 2010, p. xvii). To ensure that institution control its quality internally, government set up Internal Quality Assurance system. The process assures quality of higher education institutions conducted by those institutions (internally driven), to supervise organisations of higher education on an on-going basis (continuous improvement). To have independent bodies reviewing institutions, External Quality Assurance system was developed. The process assesses feasibility of programs and/or higher education institutions by Higher-Education National Accreditation Board (in Bahasa Indonesia is BAN-PT) or other independent bodies accredited by government to supervise higher education organisations on behalf of public as a form of public accountability (DGHE, 2010, p. 8). In addition, the National Higher Education database serves to collect, tabulate, and restore data and information about higher education institutions.

Higher-Education National Accreditation Board is the main component of the Quality Assurance system in Indonesia, and the accreditation system is centered on the National Accreditation Board (BAN-PT in its Bahasa acronym) and is considered—along with faculty credentials and productivity—to be a main proponent of improved quality (Gao, 2015, p. 170). This board is financed by government, with complete budget control from the ministry, BAN-PT accredits mostly degree programs, including Bachelor, Master, and Ph.D. programs and institutional accreditation (Gao, 2015, p. 170). The accreditation process involves self-evaluation by a program using standardised questionnaires, desk review, and evaluation of these by BAN-PT assessors. After the visitation by the assessors from Higher-Education National Accreditation Board, accredited programs receive recommendations for development and improvement. By law, accreditation is compulsory and accredited courses are given a license to open a study program. Unaccredited courses are not allowed to award certificates to their graduates and their graduates will not be recognised by DGHE (Gao, 2015, p. 170).
The concept of graduate outcomes is still new in Indonesia and even the public feels doubtful about the changes and shows no active support in this aspect of government agenda (Sudarman, 2013, p. 114). Heads of departments have been known to encounter conflict and resistance from their colleagues against the curriculum renewal agenda (Sumbawati, 2015, p. 127). Also, some departments may choose to comply with graduate outcomes but neglect to concern themselves with issues relating to pedagogy, which then impacts on student enrolments (Sudarman, 2013, p. 121). Furthermore, not everyone agrees with the graduate outcomes outlined in the IQF (MOEC, 2013) and the Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education Decree No.44 Year 2015 on National Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015). For example, law departments in Indonesia challenged the terms in which the social justice competency was presented to them (Nalle, 2014). Also, tourism programs were found to be non-compliant with the fifth level of the IQF (Silitonga, Eriyatno, Sukandar, & Panjaitan, 2013, p. 88). Indonesian universities were also criticised for their perceived inability to generate research culture, publications and teaching methods suitable to provide adequate learning experiences and training (Musfah, 2015).

The accreditation that is currently underway is to ensure that all students in Indonesia complete their undergraduate studies with minimum competences as indicated in the IQF (MOEC, 2013). Each program has its own curriculum and methods of instruction (MOEC, 2012, pp. 27-28). A program is granted a license to operate by the Minister of Education if it fulfils minimum accreditation requirements (MOEC, 2012, p. 27). A program is managed by a “unit”, or group, which is appointed by a higher education institution (MOEC, 2012, p. 27). All programs should be reaccredited when the period of license is over and unaccredited programs will be suspended and their license will be withdrawn (MOEC, 2012, p. 27).

1.7 English language teacher education degree structure and research and inquiry skills in Indonesia

In the Indonesian context, English language teacher education (ELTE) degree takes four years to complete. According to the IQF (MOEC, 2013) and the Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education Decree No.44 Year 2015 on National Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015) higher order thinking skills, including research and inquiry, are to be integrated across the undergraduate degree structure. In addition, in their 4th year, ELTE
students are requested to conduct a research project and write a small thesis. The thesis needs to be published, at least on the university website (whether the abstract only, or the full e-thesis) (MOEC, 2014). Publishing is the requirement for the degree completion.

### 1.8 ELTE research in Indonesia

The educational reform and the graduate outcomes specified in the IQF (The Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2012) and the Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education Decree No.44 Year 2015 on National Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015), together, have set the direction for ELTE development in Indonesia. However, a brief review of recently published research in the field shows little attention being given to the standards set by the IQF and the National Higher Education Standards. This low number of studies investigating the implementation process of the new IQF and the National Higher Education Standards is an indicator of the many challenges that adopting international achievement standards presents to universities in Indonesia, and, especially, to those which traditionally have served local regional communities (Soejatminah, 2011, p. 70). ELTE research confirms this trend. ELTE studies continue to focus on more traditional aspects of the ELTE field, such as group work, causes of foreign language anxiety, the use of linguistics to teach reading and writing, classroom management and similar (Muamaroh, 2013; Anandari, 2015; Bumela, 2014; Emilia & Hamied, 2015; Ragawanti, 2015; Zacharias, 2014; Kuswandono, 2014; Astika, 2014). Left out of these studies are questions dealing directly with higher order thinking skills (e.g. understanding, applying and critiquing research studies, using problem-solving strategies, planning innovation) to ensure that ELTE lecturers design and implement investigative curricula (Lian, 2018) that assist pre-service teachers in developing (and teaching) a culture of lifelong learning, a critical disposition to knowledge construction and abilities to work with others in an ethical and culturally-sensitive manner.

A study on classroom management strategies by Ragawanti (2015) is an example of a “low level”, “itemized” (Maki, 2009) approach to the “job” of an English language teacher educator. Classroom management strategies, while undoubtedly important, when dissociated from the IQF (The Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2012) and, especially, the National Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015), their relevance to the new teachers and the field of ELTE altogether is not specified. In her study, Ragawanti sought to identify classroom management problems of pre-service teachers as revealed in their reflective
journal entries and to demonstrate how such journal can help them develop their classroom management skills. However, what students write and how best this reflects what actually happens in their classrooms, needs addressing in ways that can demonstrate the purpose of keeping a reflective journal. Yet, Ragawanti offers no criteria in relation to which students were expected to reflect on what they observed in class and how they could engage these observations critically. No pressure was placed on the students to identify the concepts that guide the selection of what is relevant, the possible approaches to frame problems and their solutions, and there was no requirement for students to critically reflect on all these aspects in relation to their own teaching experiences. Instead, the task that Ragawanti designed was instrumental in its nature, with students being encouraged to identify what they saw as problems and “what worked”, e.g. being patient and calm, (p. 124), or locating teaching creativity in making use of PowerPoint (p. 125). Furthermore, no follow-up activities were designed by Ragawanti in order to help students “reflect on their reflections” as a group and as individuals. Overall, the study does not address the need for ELTE students to integrate skills of understanding and applying concepts, using research to inform problem-solving activities, or planning for innovation. It follows for the reflective journal to serve its proper purpose, the task needed to be better integrated within the objectives of the National Higher Education Standards.

The study by Astika (2014) follows a similar approach as the study by Ragawanti (2015). The study examined forty journals of pre-service teachers. Despite the realisation that teaching reflections may have legitimation issues, Astika designed his study regardless, asserting that “the guidance and supervision of more experienced teachers who promote reflective teaching at the host schools” will be sufficient for teaching reflection to be perceived as a way of improving teaching skills of student teachers (p. 19). Like Ragawanti (2015), Astika offers no criteria for students to engage for their reflections to be substantiated by research and a solid understanding of relevant concepts. Following literature review, Astika (p. 15) identified different forms of reflection: personal, interpersonal, contextual, and critical. The study showed that pre-service teachers focused mainly on the personal and contextual domains of teaching. The study does not elaborate on the significance of this finding. Rather, it demonstrates a weakness on the part of the researcher in his approach to the National Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015) and the integration of higher order skills into undergraduate curricula. In a similar vein, Zacharias (2014, p. 217) does not enable students to use research and inquiry skills in order to address some longstanding
questions in ELTE, such as what variety of English should be best taught in schools. Instead, the issue is presented as a personal preference. Terms like ‘English as International Language pedagogy’ are contrasted with “Native English Speakers (NES)/standard English as the desirable pedagogical models” (p. 217) and are used without regard for the criteria as to what makes up a pedagogic model and how such criteria would help students approach questions that emerge in the context of their teaching. The focus on the detail in the absence of a more global (abstract) perspective in Zacharias’ study is symptomatic of an academic culture where pedagogy is approached as rules and procedures (i.e. instrumental explanations), rather than a reflective engagement in concepts.

The few examples of research analysed thus far show that the newly established graduate standards bring with them new challenges and new perspectives from which higher order thinking skills will need to be addressed. The models of teaching presented above apply a narrow interpretation of students’ learning needs and outcomes and lack a more comprehensive outlook on the job of English teacher preparation. It seems that for ELTE lecturers to design and implement investigative, research and inquiry-based curricula, a critical and investigative approach to their own beliefs is mandatory if curriculum renewal is to result in changes that go beyond an application of simple cosmetic measures (Lian, 2018). As discussed earlier, these challenges are not pertinent to Indonesian academics only and the National Higher Education Standards can be approached by ELTE academics as an opportunity to bring about change that will result in an improved academic culture that, as Burawoy (2011) argues, integrates and impacts on the needs and values of the broader community, locally and internationally, through its teaching, research and scholarship.

1.9 Study aims

The above description of the global context of higher education reforms and their impact on Asia and, specifically, on Indonesia, revealed a number of challenges that universities need addressing in order to strengthen their role in society as leaders of innovation and social transformation. Among these is the concern for the quality of academic programs and curricula as a means by which universities engage in the process of shaping both global and local futures. The following issues emerged to be central to this process:
(a) Better understanding of the role of the university among all stakeholders, including the lecturers and the students.

(b) Development of relevant governance structures in universities that, through appropriate quality assurance processes, can respond effectively to the changing needs of the global community and stakeholders in Indonesia. Building stakeholder partnerships that inform the direction of change is part of this policy.

(c) Development of academic culture where teaching, research and scholarship are integrated in order for students to benefit from the forward-looking difference that this makes to their learning.

The instrumental approach to the “job” of an English language teacher educator revealed in the brief analysis of ELTE literature in Indonesia is disconcerting as it leaves both researchers and future teachers with no principles or framework for critically reflecting on what they do and why. This is troubling if ELTE programs are to respond to the international demands for quality benchmarks, specified also in the National Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015). The present study seeks to address this issue. Specifically, it seeks to engage with ELTE academics in Indonesia and investigate their own experiences in integrating research and inquiry skills identified in the National Higher Education Standards in their own university contexts. The study will seek to identify factors that impact on and interact with this process of embedding. To this end, the study will engage with academic ELTE staff in Indonesia in a shared, community-based, capacity-building context for academic staff to assess and build their competence and confidence in developing sustainable and empowering research and inquiry pedagogies in ELTE programs. The study will evaluate the impacts of the capacity-building interactions which will ensue in relation to the key challenges, identified above in points (a)-(c), as the key drivers of change in respect to the quality of curriculum design and teaching.

Overall, the study will contribute to a better understanding of the struggles that the integration of research and inquiry skills presents to ELTE academics in Indonesia. The study will also benefit institutions participating in this research project as engagement in activities that support continuous quality improvement is used by the DGHE (The Directorate General of Higher Education) to rank institutions within the system (Djanali 2007, cited in Soejatminah, 2009).
1.10 Research Questions

The study will investigate the following questions:

(1) What challenges does the integration of research and inquiry into undergraduate degree curricula present to ELTE academics in Indonesian universities?

(2) In what ways can the integration of research and inquiry contribute to the building of a 21st century model of ELTE programs relevant to the Indonesian context?

(3) What are the optimal conditions required to support research and inquiry in undergraduate ELTE degree structures?

(4) In what ways did the “community-building” approach of the study assist (or prevent) the academic ELTE staff in identifying and implementing models for working with research and inquiry in undergraduate programs?

(5) What strategies can be applied to change the culture and practices of pedagogy to contribute to the building of a 21st century model of ELTE programs relevant to the Indonesian context?

1.11 Study overview

The present study consists of 6 chapters.

Chapter 1 offers a global context of challenges that modern universities are now facing as a result of recent fiscal pressures. The increasing demands placed on higher education coupled with drastically reduced means for supporting research and innovation make the job of universities to maintain their leadership in society significantly more difficult. Integration of research and inquiry skills is one of the key policies that governments pursue in order to unify the quality of education internationally. Asian universities, including Indonesia, embrace the challenge in hope to be in step with education systems world-wide and to provide internationally competitive programs. Chapter 1 described the recent policy changes in higher education in general and in teacher education in Indonesia. A brief review of ELTE literature in Indonesia showed low level of engagement of research and inquiry skills, a narrow interpretation of students’ learning needs and outcomes and an absence of a comprehensive outlook on the job of English teacher preparation symptomatic of an academic culture where pedagogy is approached as rules and procedures (i.e. instrumental
explanations), rather than a reflective engagement in concepts. The chapter described study aims and research questions developed from those aims.

Chapter 2 aims at expanding the discussion on the issues highlighted in Chapter 1: globalisation; the Boyer Report (Boyer Commission, 1998); vision and action and framework for change and development in higher education (UNESCO, 2007); IQF (The Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2012), and National Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015). These issues, which shaped higher education policies all over the world, also are related to current issues surrounded universities, such as university’s identity, governance and academic culture (Burawoy, 2017). The chapter outlines the role of university in the globalization era, followed by brief discussion of the framework of the Boyer report and its recommendations. Next, it explores and critically analyse the impact of the new policies on research in ELTE programs and the role of research and inquiry in Indonesian English language teacher education research in relation to the framework outlined in the Boyer report, focusing on higher thinking skills as mandated by policies in Indonesia: IQF and National Higher Education Standards. Finally, the chapter examines the challenges that integration of research and inquiry presents to ELTE programs in Indonesia.

Chapter 3 describes the general intellectual framework of the study and the methods for data collections and data analysis that were assessed as appropriate for addressing the research questions. Briefly, the chapter explains the principles of a dialogic model of inquiry that forms its intellectual framing (methodology). The model is built on principles developed by scholars such as Calhoun (1996), Bourdieu (1995), and Latour (2004, 2003, 2010), as well as on the powerful critique of education research by Thomas (2007). All these scholars, while distinct from each other, share the understanding that for a study to approach its assumptions critically, it needs to adopt a variety of research tools and methods of data collection and analysis to provide the researcher with multiple perspectives on the issue that is being investigated. Questionnaires, practical exercises in syllabus design and follow-up interviews were used as data collection methods. The chapter provides justification for these methods and the detail as to how the instruments were designed. It also describes the rationale supporting the processes for data analysis. Data was analysed using three different methods. These were: (1) the architecture of a “job-to-be-done”, an adapted model for data analysis developed by the Harvard Business School (HBS, 2010) and used by its researchers, especially highly acclaimed Professor Clayton Christenson; (2) a CDU expert to analyse and
provide feedback on the syllabi designed by the study participants in the course of the project; and (3) a model for evaluating educational research from the perspective of its innovative value (Lian & Pertiwi, 2017). The chapter outlines the stages of the study and explains briefly the challenges that each of them presented to the researcher.

Chapter 4 includes the findings gathered in the course of the study to capture the impacts of the study on the participating Indonesian ELTE lecturers. The findings focus on the challenges that ELTE lecturers experience when integrating research and inquiry into their teaching and how these challenges change as the study progresses. Overall, the findings of Chapter 4 show that, while ELTE lectures participating in the study tended to be aware of the new policies of higher education and the need for change, they still need to develop generative practices and principles on which they could rely in order to build their new syllabi and curricula and, in the process, grow their own scholarship. Participation in this project may have helped to build a learning community interested in the subject of research and inquiry in ELTE programs. Initially, responses on each questionnaire tended to be vague, lacking elaboration and structure. However, with time, ELTE lecturers became more talkative and included more information in their responses. The present study is a case in point illustrating that learning communities are effective, and, with the help of good leadership skills, academics will cooperate; but change requires more of an intellectual shift, rather than change of practice only. In fact, as shown in this chapter, when lecturers begin to trust their own questions, they may begin to trust the questions that their students may have.

Chapter 5 discusses research findings from the perspective of the research questions posed in Chapter 1. Implications of the findings are developed and discussed in relation to issues identified in Chapter 2, such as a vision of higher education that ELTE teaching communicates to the students and across Indonesia and internationally; the investment that Indonesia and its universities make in order to implement the New Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015) and this includes integration of research and inquiry into undergraduate higher education programs; and the culture that dominates ELTE research in Indonesia and its impact on the process of implementation of the new higher education curriculum reforms. The challenge, that the study identified as most critical to the integration of research and inquiry, is an overwhelming absence of explicit links between the lecturers’ personal research (i.e. what they research, how and why) and the manner in which they taught their subjects. This impacted on the pedagogy of their units, where the lectures,
uncertain how to theorise investigation, did not know what investigative learning would entail and what exactly needs to be investigated.

Chapter 6 brings the thesis to conclusion. It summarises the study, identifies its limitations, justifies the contribution of the study to the field of ELTE, and more specifically, to a better understanding how its findings relate to a 21st century vision of higher learning advocated by, and reflected in, numerous international documents (Boyer Commission, 1998, UNESCO, 2007, Bradley, Noonan, Nugent, & Scales, 2008) and national policies. The chapter develops implications of the study for teacher education and professional development programs in ELTE and beyond.
Chapter 2: Literature review

2.1 Introduction

Chapter 1 identified a number of disruptors that since the 1990s continue to impact on all aspects of operation of higher education in Indonesia and globally. It was established that for HEIs to respond to these disruptors and maintain their leadership role in the society, it is necessary for HEIs to embed their work within the broader set of needs and values of communities, locally and internationally. Chapter 1 proposed a framework for investigating the processes that HEIs establish in order to integrate and impact on these needs and values. The framework emerged from the concerns identified in various higher education policies (Boyer Commission, 1998; UNESCO, 2007, p.1) and related to issues such as identity, governance and academic culture. The aim of Chapter 2 is to expand on these issues and to examine how universities, and academia in general, engage with the challenges that the new policies present globally and in Indonesia.

Chapter 2 provides the study with an in-depth understanding of issues which impact on, and interact with, the process of implementation of higher education reform in the context of ELTE degrees in Indonesia.

The understandings developed in the chapter will inform the method of data collection of the study, data analysis and will provide the necessary background to contextualise the findings of the study against the international developments.

2.2 The role of the university in the era of globalisation

2.2.1 Introduction

The “four crises” identified by Burroway (2017), i.e. the fiscal, legitimacy, governance and identity crises, generated forces that, it is claimed, hinder, rather than facilitate, the role of the university as leaders of innovation and social transformation (Sappey & Bamber, 2007; Burroway, 2017). It is generally accepted that as globalisation and the recasting of the university as a service oriented institution to meet clients' demands have advanced, the role of higher education has been transformed from “a pedagogical exchange to a market relationship founded on the notion of the student-as-customer” (Sappey & Bamber, 2007, p. 1). The sections below illustrate the trend toward a greater democratisation of knowledge
and education, decentralisation of the system and an increase in student mobility. Each of these trends is shown to be motivated by the need to meet the ever more complex demands of student population. The discussion also points to some challenges that the new trends generate with respect to higher education curricula.

2.2.2 Democratisation of knowledge and education

The current era of globalisation and increased accountability are changing the ways in which universities all over the world “do business” (Christensen & Eyring, 2011). Increasing worldwide interconnectedness and liberalisation of higher education resulted in competitiveness in the knowledge-based global economy and an increasingly differentiated higher education landscape with new regional and private higher education providers bidding for students and resources (Brennan et al., 2004, p. 39). Competition is considered as a key instrument that has produced a diversity/variety of higher education institutions and with more choices to the student. According to Brennan et al. (2004, p. 44), in most countries traditional public universities failed to meet the demands of the changing economies and the growing enrolments resulting from universal primary and secondary education schemes. Private institutions fill this gap, create new programs, frequently to upskill their new employees, and are amenable to adjust to the new world. It was also envisioned that the private sector would shift the burden of educational costs from the state to the private sector and the families of students (Brennan et al., 2004, p. 44).

The differentiation of higher education landscapes opened up opportunities for groups of students who, in the traditional system, had no reason to enrol in higher degree programs. This outcome is motivated by the general concern with upskilling of the general community. For example, in Australia, the government of South Australia envisions that by 2025, 40% of 25-34 year olds will have a qualification at Bachelor level or above (Government of South Australia, 2014). Worldwide, access of formerly disadvantaged groups to higher education is on the rise.

The differentiation of higher education landscapes is accompanied by policies which support professionals and off-campus students in obtaining their degrees. Furthermore, worldwide, access of formerly disadvantaged groups to higher education is on the rise. Once again, not all academic staff are in agreement with these developments, “many staff members, particularly those of the older generation, regard expansion as a threat to quality, or use the
“quality argument” to resist broader changes likely to threaten their own status” (Brennan et al., 2004, p. 52). Still, many academics turn the demand for change and the pressure for innovation and quality control into opportunities to build capacity and to strengthen the impact of their own work and that of their institutions, “the expansion of the consultancy industry in recent years, particularly with the rise of policy-related aid, has created opportunities to make a decent living without being totally disconnected from the world of learning” (Brennan et al., 2004, p. 52).

At the same time, HEIs are also active in promoting free education for all through their online contributions. In the 1990s, before the days of YouTube (youtube.com), using their own infrastructure, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and Harvard began to make available free of charge their educational materials, predominantly in science, philosophy, law and history. This included series of video lectures as well as entire course materials, often supported with transcripts. Today, academicearth.org is an extension of this initial project, bringing together elite American universities under the umbrella of a mission to share their intellectual outputs in almost every discipline, “In fact, we are morphing into an autonomous DIY (Do-It-Yourself) society where everyone is, essentially, a researcher” (A. P. Lian, 2017, p. 1). The term “proletarian autodidact” (A. P. Lian, 2017) captures the spirit of these developments, where knowledge is everywhere and where people “seek to educate themselves in all kinds of matters often, but not always, relating to high culture, something generally inaccessible to them by virtue of their social status and/or their profession (p. 2).

2.2.3 Student mobility and internationalisation of higher education

Increased student mobility is an outcome of the current decentralising policies which regulate higher education (P. Kell & Vogl, 2008, p. iv):

Global student mobility now involves over 2.7 million of students who study higher education in a country other than their own (OECD 2006: 283). This figure represents an 8% growth from the previous year and this growth has been steady from a starting position of 0.6 mil in 1975. The growth has been accelerated in the last decade from 1.9 mil in 2000 (OECD 2006).

Currently, it is estimated that, world-wide, more than five million students are travelling abroad for education when one factors in students pursuing language studies (ICEF Monitor, 2015). According to (P. Kell & Vogl, 2008, p. vii), who quote the Organisation for Economic
Cooperation and Development (OECD) statistics, “China and India make up the largest numbers of international students from outside the OECD”. The numbers include movement from developing countries to developed countries, as well as within the developing countries (Mok, 2012, p. 226). The statistics from 2015 show China drawing great numbers of students, with nearly 14,000 Indonesians currently studying over there (ICEF Monitor, 2015).

In Australia, the highest numbers of international students come from South-East and North Asia (P. Kell & Vogl, 2008, p. vii). Governments worldwide invest heavily in internationalisation policies of the Higher education sector (Mok, 2012). Multilateral networks with other countries create opportunities for scholarship and exchange programs. Universities also set up international campuses, virtual and real (Mok, 2012). Universities promote heavily their degrees on the international market and, in so doing, boost the quality and the reputation of their Higher education institutions (Mok, 2012).

In the context of Taiwan education, Chin and Ching (2009, p. 196) proposed twelve dimensions of internationalization of Taiwan’s HEIs. These included, “institutional commitments, strategic planning, funding, institutional policy and guidelines, organizational infrastructure and resources, academic offerings and curriculum, internet presence, faculty and staff development, international students and scholars, study abroad, campus life, and performance evaluation and accountability” (p. 196).

Institutional policy and guidelines, as an interpretation of institutional commitments, direct how internationalisation is expected to be achieved. The growing numbers of international students in undergraduate and postgraduate programs show that student mobility is part of internal quality assurance for systems within the higher education sector (Chin & Ching, 2009, p. 196).

2.2.4 Student mobility and internationalisation of higher education in Indonesia
Indonesia is an active participant in student mobility programs, both as a host for foreign students and with Indonesian students studying abroad. UNESCO (2013) statistics show a progressive rise in the numbers in relation to each of the mobility programs. In 2007, there were 5,310 foreign students studying in Indonesia, with this number growing to 6,932 in 2010 (UNESCO, 2013, pp. 32-33). In terms of outbound programs, historically, Australia
has been the most popular destination for Indonesian students, with 20,000 students enrolled in the country in 2016 (Higher Education Marketing, 2018). In addition, vocational education in Australia has a long history of providing training to Indonesian students, with the Australian government reporting over 8,000 Indonesian students enrolled in VET as of 2016. The U.S.A is also a popular destination for Indonesian students, with enrollments growing by 14% between 2009 and 2014, and maintaining year-over-year growth of approximately 6-7%. There are currently almost 9,000 Indonesian students pursuing higher education in the U.S. (Higher Education Marketing, 2018). Furthermore, the British Council reported that the number of study visas issued to Indonesian students increased 17% year-over-year from 2016 to 2017 (Higher Education Marketing, 2018).

2.2.5 **Quality Assurance and the curriculum renewal agenda**

Education and research have been regarded as key processes by which HEIs engage in processes of social change and development (Brennan et al., 2004, p. 7). In order to exercise their leadership role in these areas, as Howe (2009, p. 386) shows, universities work increasingly harder on establishing quality assurance processes and frameworks to address the demand for international quality control measures. Internationalisation, student mobility, competition and responsibility to the stakeholders (including the students) are the motivating force for increased Quality Assurance measures in the Higher education sector (Kell & Vogl, 2012, pp. 64-65):

In the context of globalisation and internationalisation, these emerge both not only as an exercise in comparing or benchmarking Australia’s performance relative to other nations but also as a response to anxieties that standards are dropping.

Furthermore, as noted by Brennan et al. (2004), the diversification of the higher education sector, “with the multiplication of regional universities, non-university institutions and private institutions” create problems “for the compatibility of awards within national higher education systems” (Brennan et al., 2004, p. 42). Hence references to clearly articulated standards and processes are needed (Kell & Vogl, 2012, p. 64). Introduction of graduate attributes is part of the quality assurance processes that universities develop for students to reach standards that can be interpreted internationally (Barrie, 2006, p. 3). Other than a concern with employability skills, as agents of social change, universities ensure graduate attributes also include values that help students better understand what it means to live well in society. As such, graduate attributes are an instrument for universities to guarantee that their students can be “agents of social good” (Bosanquet, Winchester-Seeto, & Rowe, 2012,
Bosanquet et al. (p. A76) identify two dimensions of the meaning of “being agents of social good”. These include (a) “educating about social inclusion, such as social justice, Indigenous perspectives and history”, and (b) “educating for social inclusion, including social responsibility, diversity, tolerance, global perspectives and so on” (Bosanquet et al., p. A76).

Yet, the implementation of curricula developed around graduate attributes has its challenges, some of them being attributed to the novelty of the concept (Maki, 2009; Oliver, 2011), others to the various interpretations of the concept of quality teaching and the form of evidence that would validate it (Barrie, 2006, p. 3; Oliver, 2013). According to Rawolle and Lingard (2015), policy does not specify a method of its implementation as each of the areas of concern belong to different fields of practice; challenges are to be expected. In Australia, research confirms a general resistance of academia to the teaching of skills and values that go beyond professional competencies (Barrie et al., 2014; Oliver, 2013, p. 453), or to the concept of teaching that is more focused on process, rather than a disciplinary content where skills are interpreted as isolated “learning points”. According to Maki (2009, p. 19), the danger is that academia reverts to an itemised teaching practice, which turns “learning into skill sets that [do] not realistically represent how students actually think, act, solve problems, engage questions, take risks, propose new ways of looking at a problem, create an original work, or design research” (Maki, 2009, p. 15).

Identifying discipline-specific graduate attributes is also not free from controversy. In their study on the development of a national soil science curriculum (McBratney et al., 2012), the researchers engaged in a consultation process with a wide array of stakeholders in the hope of identifying the kinds of attributes, skills and knowledge that they saw of value in relation to the field of soil science. The consultation process neither followed any framework nor was evaluated in relation to criteria that would enable the researchers to assess the relevance of the perspectives that they gathered. Thus, absent are statements regarding the terms in which the discipline of soil sciences was framed, its stakeholders, and therefore the issues around which it was constructed. From the perspective of research and inquiry skills in undergraduate programs, and in view of the troubling comments made by Thomas (2007) in the context of education, understanding the terms that define the scope of the soil science curriculum is crucial if students are to develop a critical stance.
The soil science study used its own survey as a trigger for the project (McBratney et al., 2012, p. 12). No argued case was made as to why its questions were the right questions. In the absence of any supporting conceptual framework, the link between the nature of the questions of the survey, the respondents involved, and the objectives of the project is not clear. Instead, the initial survey relied upon sentiments and beliefs, potentially stereotypes and idées reçues, developed and interpreted by an arbitrarily selected panel. This process necessarily restricted the ways in which the initial data was approached and worked with.

In the next step, the teaching principles for soil science were somehow inferred from that data collected by the survey (McBratney et al., 2012, pp. 14-15) (a technique reminiscent of grounded theory’s Open Coding, Axial Coding and Selective Coding, Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 96), and later further re-formulated, to account for the specificities of soil science, an issue raised during the consultation with parties identified as interested stakeholders (McBratney et al., 2012, p. 12), who felt that the teaching principles, of themselves, were too general and therefore insufficient. From those now expanded teaching principles, the list and definitions of relevant soil science graduate attributes were developed (p. 15). The outcome was a product of beliefs, something that the project was supposed to investigate, rather than only “discover”. The teaching principles and the graduate attributes which were developed served to shape the community consultation process and the recommendations constructed as a result.

The example of the Soil Science Curriculum project (McBratney et al., 2012) points to some more generic challenges in curriculum design. First, what are the outliers or outlier opinions that are suppressed/eliminated in studies and what impact does that have on the development of the teaching of the discipline and on the discipline itself? Does that process reinforce the status quo? Does it eliminate the opposition to the dominant group(s)? Does it create a new generation of disciples for the dominant group(s)? Does any of this matter? The critique of education research by Professor Thomas (2007) would suggest that these questions need raising, if only to demonstrate the importance of the new curriculum agenda for the profession and the discipline itself. Second, the methodology of the Soil Science Curriculum project did not resolve the long-standing problem of curriculum projects which acknowledge that lists alone do not provide curriculum designers with a clear way of illustrating how graduate attributes interact with one another to enhance students’ learning experiences (Maki, 2009, p. 15). Third, in the Soil Science Curriculum project, graduate attributes are
developed self-referentially, by excluding potentially valuable voices. This strategy points to a danger of approaches to curriculum design which are highly contextualised and embedded in the disciplines. In the absence of theoretically-derived and independent criteria, the curriculum designers are left with no basis to ensure that the learning experience which they design are critically-informed and therefore lead to expansive learning, i.e. “with the interdisciplinary knowledge, skills and capabilities relevant to the needs of Australia” (McBratney et al., 2012, p. 4).

While, without a doubt, the Soil Science Curriculum project (McBratney et al., 2012) set out to resolve a number of challenges present in its field, it also generated some more, as shown above. The following points emerged as relevant:

(a) The development of higher order skills must be planned and not left to chance (Barrie et al., 2009, p. 7).

(b) The boundaries of disciplines are discursive. Therefore, the act of planning must be firmly based in criteria which prioritise the process of inquiry, not the content as such, for students to develop the capacity to approach issues critically. a link between assessment and learning.

(c) Assessment, as pointed out by McBratney et al., (2012, p. 4) should target students’ capacity to draw on the interdisciplinary knowledge, skills and capabilities relevant to their contexts of work. This will also make it possible for curricula to acknowledge the diversity of cultural wealth of the graduates.

To sum up, the discussion so far makes it apparent that, if the new curriculum agenda is to impact positively on the relationship between teaching and research, it is important that academia does not approach it as a cosmetic change or as a means for standardising the learning outcomes only. Instead, scholars should see it as an opportunity for identifying the uniqueness of their own contribution to the respective disciplines and, therefore, the value of their courses to the overall project of universities maintaining their role as leaders of innovation and social transformation.
2.3 The Boyer Report and its global impact

2.3.1 Introduction

The Boyer Report (Boyer Commission, 1998) is one of the key policy documents that governments, especially in the U.S., Australia and UK, used to redefine higher education. In order to fully appreciate the impact of the Report, this section describes briefly its recommendations and the challenges that its implementation created in respect to developing relevant governance structures for universities to respond effectively to the need for integration higher order thinking skills, that support learning through research and inquiry, into subject curricula.

2.3.2 Key recommendations of the Boyer Report

The key recommendation, which had the greatest impact on the higher education sector, was the emphasis of collaborative, inquiry-based learning in undergraduate programs, and the need for students to develop effective communication skills in order to share and disseminate academic information. According to the Report, these skills, “need to characterize the whole of a research university education” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 21).

At all levels of learning, it was advised that “a supervised research or creative undertaking be incorporated into the undergraduate experience” (Katkin, 2003, p. 24). The Boyer Report provided a framework which identified research as “a cornerstone for knowledge generation, which in turns requires capacity building for its tools and techniques” (Bhardwaj et al., 2013, p. 1). The implementation of the recommendations of the report involved (and continues to do so) investment in the infrastructure and processes able to provide the necessary advice and multi-levelled support, as well as the willingness of the faculty staff to participate (Katkin, 2003, p. 36).

The following points summarise the key recommendations of the Boyer Report in regard to the integration of research and inquiry skills at each level of students’ learning.

**Communication and dissemination skills**

Written and oral communication skills are identified as a foundation for effective dissemination of study results (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 24). Communication skills are seen as critical to support students in their capacity to analyse, explain information and do

Inquiry-based learning
Inquiry-based learning is proposed as a model of learning that best supports students in developing their critical thinking skills. It can function as stimulus for intellectual growth and a firm grounding of a university experience (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 19). Inquiry-based learning is also expected to help undergraduate students undergo academic transition from a structured program of high schools into a system where students are required to take personal responsibility for their learning (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 19). Qualities of the inquiry process, such as curiosity and creativity, are seen as the essence of higher order thinking and, therefore, cultivating the skills of question-asking and problem-solving (Blessinger & Carfora, 2014, pp. 7-8). Inquiry-based learning is advised to be introduced from the very beginning of students’ candidature. This would assist the students to be adequately prepared to meet the intellectual challenges of the course (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 21).

Collaborative and cross-disciplinary learning
The design of undergraduate courses should include collaboration as a key element of an inquiry-based learning and allow for joint projects and collaborative efforts (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 18). It is argued that in traditional, lecture-based teaching formats, where note-taking takes place and examinations follow, inquiry-learning may not happen. In contrast, collaborative forms of study support discovery learning through research, interaction and skills, which allow students “to enter a world of discovery in which they are active participants, not passive receivers” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 11). This should include interactions which engage disparate faculties and disciplines, with undergraduate students given the possibility to raise unexpected questions and offer fresh approaches on problems relevant to their learning (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 10). This cross-disciplinary learning should result in students being given chances to appreciate arts, humanities, sciences, and social sciences, and “the opportunity to experience them at any intensity and depth the student can accommodate” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 12).
Interdisciplinary study is seen as the core of critical thinking, “researchers find that pushing the limits of their field takes them into new territories” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 23). Interdisciplinary research supports creativity as researchers find themselves engaging the tools, methods and concepts from seemingly disparate areas of study (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 21).

2.3.2 Strategies proposed for implementation of the recommendations of the Boyer Report
The suggestions below outline implementations strategies identified in the Boyer Report.

**Capstone courses/senior projects**
Capstone courses/senior projects involve students in research activities once students received sufficient training in using inquiry-based approaches with collaborative learning and communication skills practice. Capstone courses/senior projects engage students in independent research projects with the view to supporting students in developing skills such as framing of a significant question, or a set of questions, problem exploration, and dissemination of research results to audiences, which include both expert community and people who are not initiated in the subject matter (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 27). For best results, senior scholars need to be involved for students to experience good quality mentoring, “the mentorship of a seasoned scholar-teacher who understands the joys and frustrations of a major project” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 28). In other words, when supervised by experienced research staff, students are more likely to be exposed to strategies and skills which assist them in learning to cope with project demands and challenges (Stanford, Rocheleau, Smith, & Mohan, 2015, p. 2).

**Quality mentoring**
The Boyer Report recommends that undergraduate students are exposed to the newest research and become “an active part of the audience for research” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 17). Undergraduate students should also become junior members of research teams, working side-by-side with expert professors and graduate students (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 17). Teaching models, which integrate students in the current projects of the research teams of the faculty staff, create first-hand opportunities for students to see how to shape research projects, identify its methodology, and analyse data as well as see how the results can inform future research (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 17). This close collaboration
between undergraduate students and experienced research teams is expected to provide students with opportunities for deep and critical thinking, to evaluate the relevance of their own projects in relation to larger issues, as well as access to most current thinking and methods in research.

**Professional or community-based internships**
Professional or community-based internships create a concrete context for students’ research projects (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 18). Internships can function at least in two ways. First, internships provide students with experiences which cannot be replicated in classroom and which also allow them to apply their study into practice (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 18). Second, the internship contexts provide opportunities for interdisciplinary learning and real-life problem solving (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 18). Students benefit from internship as “carefully constructed internships can turn inquiry-based learning into practical experience” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 19).

**Freshman foundation programs**
Freshman foundation programs are recommended to integrate information technology, interdisciplinary study, professional or community-based internships and research skills (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 21).

**The use of Information Technology**
Students need to be familiar with the capacities of Information Technology and different modes of learning, e.g. virtual environments, in order to engage in virtual forums, and to access and disseminate information via the internet. Staff need to be up-to-date with technology developments as new forms of sharing and collaboration can “alter the manner of teaching at every educational level and in every conceivable setting” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 25).

**2.3.3 Boyer Report and Quality Assurance**
Boyer Report acknowledges the need for Quality Assurance processes and resources that are needed to facilitate implementation of its vision.

**Quality Assurance targets**
Quality Assurance in undergraduate programs of research universities refers to student quality, staff quality, and program quality (ESG, 2015). Student quality relates to remediation processes before admission. Staff quality addresses the need for professional training. Program quality refers to processes for synergising of teaching and research, and teaching evaluations.

- Student quality concerns itself with factors which impact on students’ readiness to enter university life. In the American system, “Freshmen programs” play a key role in this regard as they prepare students with skills which ensure quality transition into higher education learning. Exposure to research-based learning is critical. To this end, as argued in the Boyer Report, strategies need to be developed for freshmen to be integrated into the atmosphere of the research university (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 22).

- Academic staff quality expectations address the need for staff to show high commitment to research and pedagogy. University teachers are pedagogues and teaching excellence needs to be pursued and valued (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 29). Teaching can be enhanced through professional training. This is especially relevant in freshman programs, when students need the best teaching and mentoring. Staff working in these programs, when unprepared, are vulnerable to stress, which may lead to early burnout and poor teaching (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 29).

- Synergising teaching and research. Other aspects of quality program address strategies for synergising of teaching and research, and teaching evaluations. Effective integration of research and teaching needs to be made explicit (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 33). Teaching evaluations can take a number of forms, including student evaluations, alumni testimonials, and reliable self-evaluations. Quality teachers should to be rewarded for their excellence and appropriately remunerated (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 33). A critical aspect of teaching excellence is the ability to inspire students, especially in large classes (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 34).

**Resources (including human capital)**

University can take advantage of its resources to strengthen undergraduate programs (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 7). University resources are classified into two categories: human and non-human resources. Human resources include academic staff and graduate and
undergraduate student community (off- and on-campus). Non-human resources cover budget, technology, and diversity.

- Academic staff build students’ knowledge by engaging students in their own fields of expertise. Academic staff are expected to conduct research in order to deepen their professional knowledge. Research and teaching are to inform one another and, where appropriate, academic staff and students may collaborate on research projects. It is critical that students are taught by academic staff who are research active and who engage in activities which support the discovery of new knowledge, the construction of new concepts and frameworks as well as dissemination of their research outcomes (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 16). In order to promote change, old concepts need to give way to new formats of teaching, research and new ways of counting workload (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 15).

- Graduate students are another resource. Universities can take advantage of graduate students, who can teach and collaborate with undergraduate students or take on other professional roles. These forms of participation are not new and graduate students have played important roles in research programs and undergraduate instruction as teaching assistants and research mentors (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 10). Graduate students can also support undergraduate students in creating learning communities which link undergraduate students with graduate students, senior scholars and external networks (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 28).

- Undergraduate students, whether on- or off-campus, are all an important part of university community. Off-campus students need to be included in university community activities and feel that they can contribute to the life of the university. Off- and on-campus students alike need to know that they are needed and valued members of the academic community (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 35). Such activities may include interactions with graduate students and with academic staff through collaborative learning, co-curricular activities, and shared rituals and celebrations (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 35).

- Budgeting reflects the goals of research universities. It is important for research communities to create faculty reward structures that validate their commitment to research and teaching (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 31). The rewards should be an incentive to activities which go beyond the interests of single departments and should
address concerns with interdisciplinary research and learning. This recommendation is counter to the traditional budget arrangements in universities that are based on the principle of departmental hegemony (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 14).

- Technology impacts on education in respect to delivery and modes of learning (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 14). It is important that technology is not seen as a substitute for a direct interaction between people, thus the issues of balance need to be addressed (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 14). When used creatively, technology can enhance the learning outcomes through facilities which make room for both synchronous and asynchronous learning (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 14). Developing educational technology is the job of the university (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 14).
- Diversity is critical to the sustainability of societies and this also applies to universities. It is vital that universities develop inclusive approaches to research and education. This relates to strategies which help maximise opportunities which the diversity of student population makes possible (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 34).

2.3.4 The aftermath of the Boyer report

The vision, the values and the strategies outlined in the Boyer Report (Boyer Commission, 1998) informed the curriculum renewal agenda discussed above. The sections below examine the literature with respect to the challenges that universities in the developed countries, such as Australia, the U.S. and UK, experienced when implementing the recommendations of the Report.

2.3.4.1 U.S.A

This section draws on two key studies that analysed developments in the U.S. in the aftermath of the Boyer Report (Boyer Commission, 1998). One study is a report published by the Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University, *Reinventing undergraduate education: Three years after the Boyer report* (Kenny et al., 2001). The second is *The Boyer Commission report and its impact on undergraduate research* (Katkin, 2003). The two studies reviewed the key recommendations of the Boyer report (communication skills, inquiry-based learning, collaborative learning and the context of capstone/senior project) and the targets and resources which were part of its Quality Assurance recommendations. Table 2.1 summarises the findings.
**Pedagogy: Inquiry-based learning**

Three years after the publication of the Report (Boyer Commission, 1998), not all universities were able to incorporate the recommendations proposed by the Boyer commission. This is understandable as, according to Kenny et al. (2001, p. 2), universities have limited resources and may not be able to respond this quickly. As Kenny et al. (2001) point out, improving undergraduate education needs to be a priority and needs to be accounted for in budgetary planning (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 30). Kenny et al.’s (p. 6) study showed research universities promoting their own versions of inquiry-based learning, but overall, the use of inquiry-based teaching remained limited. The study by Katkin (2003, p. 31) pointed to the lack of consensus regarding the meaning of the term “inquiry-based learning” and where it may best apply. On the other hand, Kenny et al (2001, p. 6) suggested that inquiry-based learning might not be limited to ‘the completion of specific projects”, but it can take place whenever faculty and students share the act of discovery.

**Pedagogy: Collaborative and cross-disciplinary learning**

Collaborative learning is another element of undergraduate programs that was not equally developed across all fields (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 18). Three years after the Boyer Report (Boyer Commission, 1998), “[c]ollaborative learning experiences are being developed through departments, not as a university-wide initiative” (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 18). Furthermore, while many faculty staff do collaborative research, ironically, most do not incorporate collaborative student work into their pedagogy (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 18). Equally, most of capstone projects are designed by departments, and do not foster interdisciplinary learning. Yet, in the Boyer Report it was envisioned for capstone projects to be utilised in order to for students to further “develop the research and communications skills students have learned throughout their university careers” (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 18).

**Pedagogy: Professional or community-based internships**

Regrettably, neither of the two evaluation reports (Katkin, 2003; Kenny et al., 2001) provide data on the integration of internships into undergraduate programs. Yet, internship programs are really important for students to engage in professional contexts and practice.

**Pedagogy: Communication and dissemination skills**

Universities support the dissemination of undergraduate research projects by developing different kinds of events. More than half focus attention on offering public events or
symposia for the presentation of projects, and a third offer opportunities for undergraduates to publish research papers or abstracts (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 9). Special programs for high-achieving students are fairly common (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 9).

Quality Assurance targets: Student (and program) quality
The evaluation reports proposed also that undergraduate programs in research universities may need to be restructured in order to revise “the general education curriculum and writing programs, expanding inquiry-based and experiential learning, improving pedagogy, improving the first-year experiences, and developing capstone experiences (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 28). The reports show that universities develop “freshman programs”, although not all universities apply this policy (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 9).

Quality Assurance targets: Academic staff
Maximising academic staff expertise for teaching undergraduate students can increase students’ motivation in learning. Yet, professional training for academic staff to integrate research in their teaching was not addressed well by universities (Katkin, 2003, p. 33). This may have changed since those early days.

Quality Assurance targets: Synergising teaching and research
As a result of the Boyer Report, increasingly, academic staff was being involved in teaching first-year students to introduce freshmen to the intellectual life of a research university (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 12). Still, it was noted that staff had low interest in teaching undergraduate students. This might have been due to the perception that the promotion and tenure do not reward undergraduate teaching (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 24). Hence, synergising teaching and research did not receive due attention from staff and universities. Teaching and research seem to be two separate activities and “many faculty do not yet give teaching a high priority despite administrative efforts (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 24).

Resources: Graduate students
The evaluation reports showed that graduate students are trained to support undergraduate student learning as part of their graduate education and “[m]ost of those that do not offer mandatory orientation provide optional orientation” and a few “offer semester-long seminars for all teaching assistants (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 23).
**Resources: Undergraduate students**
The evaluation reports (Katkin, 2003; Kenny et al., 2001) offer no data regarding the engagement of on-campus and off-campus students in an equally effective or intensive manner. No strategies were reported.

**Resources: Diversity**
The evaluation reports (Katkin, 2003; Kenny et al., 2001) offer also no data on supporting diversity and the building of sustainable communities.

**Resources: Technology**
Also, no information was given on creative use of technology. Possibly, this would have changed by now, at least to some degree, considering the explosion of the Internet which was still in its early stages in years 2001-2003.

Overall, the two evaluation studies (Katkin, 2003; Kenny et al., 2001) showed an uneven approach to the implementation of the recommendation of the Boyer Report (Boyer Commission, 1998), with universities adopting a flexible approach to change and its management.

**Fifteen (15) years after the Boyer Report**
The 2014 conference in Arlington, Virginia, *Engaged Learning and the Ethos of Discovery – Achieving the Promise in a Tumultuous Era* (Reinvention-Center, 2014, p. 1) showed that the Boyer Report (Boyer Commission, 1998) is still relevant and universities around the U.S. continue to view it as a reference framework informing their strategic plans. However, the conference presentations showed universities continuing with the “flexible approach” to change, focusing more on the national context than on international developments in higher education.

New developments reported during the conference included preparatory “Signature Courses”, i.e. courses that some universities developed to facilitate first-year students’ interactions with experienced faculty members and peers (Reinvention-Center, 2014, p. 38) and new honours, designed to support students in communication skills through interdisciplinary perspectives (Reinvention-Center, 2014, pp. 75-76). Interdisciplinary
forms of collaboration were discussed, and presenters argued that progress depended on those collaborations.

So by bringing undergraduate students from electrical engineering, neuroscience, medicine, medical doctors and medical students, and bringing in engineers from different fields we can create lab devices that in vitro can mimic how the blood cells flow.

Reinvention-Center, 2014, p. 31

Collaboration was viewed as a means to facilitate interdisciplinary dialogue, but the strategy to achieve this goal was less clear. “Flipped classrooms” (Reinvention-Center, 2014, p. 33, p. 38) were proposed as a strategy to create spaces for implementing theory, rather than for its re-interpretation through different disciplinary frameworks and interests. Quality Assurance processes, such as mentoring, were proposed as key to student success (Reinvention-Center, 2014, p. 25). The preoccupation with national developments in the higher education sector and the disregard for international achievements and challenges continue to hinder a systematic and critical approach to a number of issues mentioned by the Boyer Report, including pedagogy, technology, internationalisation and diverse ways for building learning communities.

Over half the students wish they had spent more time on things like real-world issues and internships and work experience … And then we have this other group that just don’t plug in. They don’t engage. They drift. And it’s not a few students. It’s a lot of students.

Reinvention-Center, 2014, p. 15

Regarding the various aspects of Quality Assurance targets, conference presentations showed American universities still in the process of developing their own systems (Reinvention-Center, 2014, p. 19). The conference did not illustrate the presence of a systematic and well-funded approach to change (Reinvention-Center, 2014, p. 40):

Funding for programming and student mentors/peer advisors was the most common challenge brought up in the small group discussions.
Table 2.1: The aftermath of the Boyer Report, U.S.A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key recommendations</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students’ communication skills</strong></td>
<td>“All student grades should reflect both mastery of content and ability to convey content” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 25)</td>
<td>“Considerable attention to writing, but much less to oral communications.” (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Courses throughout the curriculum should reinforce communication skills by routinely asking for written and oral exercises” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 25)</td>
<td>“Few universities have implemented campus-wide requirements to develop oral communication skills.” (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Students must learn how to convey the results of their work effectively both orally and in writing” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 18)</td>
<td>More than half of surveyed universities focus attention by offering public events or symposia for the presentation of projects, and a third offer opportunities for undergraduates to publish research papers or abstracts (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inquiry-based learning</strong></td>
<td>“The freshman program should be carefully constructed as an integrated, interdisciplinary, inquiry-based experience by designs” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 21)</td>
<td>“The use of inquiry-based teaching is limited.” (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Inquiry-based courses should allow for joint projects and collaborative efforts” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 18)</td>
<td>There does not always seem “to be a clear consensus on what actually constitutes inquiry-based pedagogy.” (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“… the number of undergraduates engaged in research and creative activities varies among campuses” (p. 4)</td>
<td>“… the number of undergraduates engaged in research and creative activities varies among campuses” (p. 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                     | “To continue to develop opportunities for research-based learning, universities need to focus greater attention on the social sciences and humanities.” (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 4) | }
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborative learning and teaching</th>
<th>“Every freshman experience needs to include opportunities for learning through collaborative efforts, such as joint projects and mutual critiques of oral and written work.” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 21)</th>
<th>“Not equally developed across all fields.” (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Inquiry-based courses should allow for joint projects and collaborative efforts.” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 18)</td>
<td>“Being developed through departments, not as a university-wide initiative.” (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The inquiry-based learning, collaborative efforts, and expectations for writing and speaking that are part of the freshman experience need to be carried throughout the program.” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 22)</td>
<td>“Most faculty do not incorporate collaborative student work into their pedagogy.” (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone/senior projects</td>
<td>“Senior seminars or other capstone courses appropriate to the discipline need to be part of every undergraduate program.” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 28)</td>
<td>“Generally established as departmental, rather than university-wide initiatives.” (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Ideally the capstone course should bring together faculty member, graduate students, and senior undergraduates in shared or mutually reinforcing projects.” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 28)</td>
<td>“Almost three quarters of the research universities represented in the survey require a senior seminar or capstone course in some majors or programs.” (p. 29).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Whenever possible, capstone courses need to allow for collaborative efforts among the baccalaureate students.” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 28)</td>
<td>“Interview respondents cited honors programs and engineering departments as common locations for these courses.” (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The capstone course should prepare undergraduates for the expectations and standards</td>
<td>No information found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No information found</td>
<td>No information found</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of graduate work and the professional workplace.” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Assurance Targets</th>
<th>Program design</th>
<th>Staff quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program design</td>
<td>“Research universities must redesign graduate education to prepare students for teaching undergraduate students as well as for other professional roles.” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 28)</td>
<td>“Many research universities have made this commitment, but only to selected students.” (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Lower division courses should introduce students to interdisciplinary study.” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 23)</td>
<td>“Provision of carefully constructed internships can turn inquiry-based learning into practical experience; internship opportunities need to be widely available” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 19)</td>
<td>“Most research universities (70%) provide mandatory orientation programs to train teaching assistants, and 66% provide special programs for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Beginning in the freshman year, students should be able to engage in research in as many courses as possible” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 18)</td>
<td>“The lack of quantitative information about undergraduate activity on some campuses” (Katkin, 2003, p. 26).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Provision of carefully constructed internships can turn inquiry-based learning into practical experience; internship opportunities need to be widely available” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 19)</td>
<td>No information found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student quality</td>
<td>“A student embarking upon a degree program at a research university should be adequately prepared to meet the intellectual challenges of that program; if remediation is necessary, it should be completed before entering the program” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 20)</td>
<td>“The apparent disinterest among faculty in science disciplines.” (Katkin, 2003, p. 32).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Graduate apprentice teachers should be assisted by one or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
more of the following means: seminars in teaching, thoughtful supervision from the professor assigned to the course, mentoring by experienced teachers, and regular discussions of classroom problems with other new teachers” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 31)

“Many [in the] faculty do not yet give teaching a high priority despite administrative efforts” (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 24)

| Resources |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Academic staff build students’ knowledge by engaging students in their own fields of expertise. |
| Graduate students can collaborate with undergraduate students, or work as TAs and mentors. |
| Undergraduate students on and off-campus need to be included in university community activities. |
| Budgeting reflects the goals of research universities. |

| Academic staff build students’ knowledge by engaging students in their own fields of expertise. |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| “Students should be taught by those who discover, create, and apply, as well as transmit, insights about subjects in which the teacher is expert.” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 16) |
| “Graduate students should be made aware of their classroom roles in promoting learning by inquiry. They should not be limited to knowing the old modes of transmission of knowledge without understanding the role of student and faculty as joint investigators” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 31) |
| “Commuting students must be integrated into university life by making their participation easy and attractive” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 36) |
| “The correlation between good undergraduate teaching and good research must be recognized in promotion and tenure decisions” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 33) |

| Graduate students can collaborate with undergraduate students, or work as TAs and mentors. |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| “A “culture of teaching” within departments should be cultivated to heighten the prestige of teaching and emphasize the linkages between teaching and research” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 33) |

| Undergraduate students on and off-campus need to be included in university community activities. |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| “The perception that the promotion and tenure process does not really value undergraduate teaching.” (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 24) |
| “Most of those that do not offer mandatory orientation provide optional orientation” (Kenny et al., 2001, p. 24) |
| No information found |

| Budgeting reflects the goals of research universities. |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| “[… ] several interviewees commented that many faculty do not yet give teaching a high priority despite administrative efforts. They cited several reasons: insufficient time, greater interest in research […] the perception that the promotion
| **Technology can enhance a learning environment.** | “Enriching Teaching Through Technology” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 26)  
“Planning for academic units, such as block-scheduled courses for freshmen or required courses for individual majors, should include conscientious preparations for exercises that expand computer skills.” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 27) | No information found |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity is critical to the sustainability of societies and needs to be appropriately engaged.</strong></td>
<td>“Enriching experience of association with people of diverse backgrounds, ethnicities, cultures, and beliefs must be a normal part of university life” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 36)</td>
<td>No information found</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.4.2 Australia

This section identifies the impact of the Boyer Report (Boyer Commission, 1998) on the Australian higher education sector as reflected in the Review of Australian Higher Education (Bradley Report) (Bradley, Noonan, Nugent, & Scales, 2008). The report covers three important elements of the renewal process of the higher education system in Australia, which includes program design, Quality Assurance, and resource management, i.e. a similar set of targets as recommended by the Boyer Report.

Table 2.2 summarises the analysis of the review (Bradley et al., 2008). It shows that, similarly to the U.S., in Australia, research is the foundation of Australian higher education institutions. In a nutshell, the policies outlined in the review (Bradley et al., 2008) indicate that universities are to conduct “teaching and learning that engage with advanced knowledge and inquiry” (p. 240); academic staff are to be “active in scholarship that informs their teaching” (p. 240); students are to acquire a command of skills that are sought out by the employers (p. 210); public funding is to be “directed only to those institutions that encourage both students and staff to engage in critical enquiry” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 7); scholarship is both sought out and rewarded, and close links between teaching and research are to be cultivated (p. 83). Overall, it is expected that Australian universities will play “a pivotal role in the national research and innovation system through generation and dissemination of new knowledge and through the education, training and development of world-class researchers across a wide range of intellectual disciplines” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 6).

Among the key skills identified by the employers, communication ranks high and the Bradley report (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 102) identifies communication and interpersonal skills as essential. In the McBratney et al. study (2012, p. 18), discussed earlier, the soil science industry placed communication skills first and ahead of any other graduate skills, including professional knowledge. It needs to be said that in a somewhat discriminatory fashion, international student cohort is singled out in the Bradley report (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 102) as especially in need of these skills, “This expectation applies to all graduates, but is especially relevant to international students where English is not their first language”. This singling out takes a narrow perspective on the communication skills and presumes that Australian residents have an advantage.
Inquiry-based learning is supported in the Bradley report (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 78) as is a commitment to fund improvement and maintenance of the highest quality teaching and learning. Free intellectual inquiry, advanced knowledge and learning (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 240) and the need for “well-designed and engaging courses that lead to good vocational outcomes (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 79) are the terms used by the report.

The relevance of collaboration is shown through statements which value “cross-sectoral initiatives, outreach and early education programs involving partnerships between universities, colleges and schools, the establishment of national targets and major investments in improving retention (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 37). Funding is to be directed to support “good-quality teaching and learning spaces and library and information technology support, … an accessible and sophisticated online learning environment, […] responsive administrative and student support services” (p. 79).

In terms of Quality Assurance, the report calls for “strengthening the sector’s general regulatory, accreditation and quality assurance systems [as this] will also enhance Australia’s position in international education” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 115). The report suggested adopting a framework for higher education accreditation (Australian Qualifications Framework), quality assurance and regulation, which features accreditation terms of all providers. The establishment of an independent national regulatory body responsible for regulating all types of tertiary education was proposed (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 16). The recent decade saw Australian universities and professional bodies engaging in these recommendations and developing relevant quality processes (Radloff, Coates, James, & Krause, 2011).

The report recommends incentives and support “for high performing” international and domestic students to undertake research degrees in Australia (Bradley et al., 2008, p. xvi), and forms of academic support which encourage a “two-way communication about matters that pertain to their academic progress” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 79). Other issues included in the Boyer report on matters relating to student support are captured in Bradley report by the broader agenda of quality management.

Qualified teaching staff is described as able to innovate (Bradley et al., 2008, p. xvi) and build a commitment to the students’ chosen disciplines (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 79), with a
doctorate degree being a required qualification (Bradley et al., 2008, pp. 83, as “high-quality academics are critical to successful research and innovation, as well as to provision of quality teaching and learning” (Bradley, 2008, p. 83). Regulatory processes are to be introduced for “measuring and monitoring the quality of teaching and learning” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 79).

Regarding the quality of student overall learning experience, the report stresses the need for friendly and inclusive spaces, “physical places and facilities that allow informal socialisation”, “presence of a supportive peer group”, and “access to extra-curricular activities such as clubs and societies” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 79). Learning environments need to enhance peer engagement and processes for “measuring and monitoring the level of student engagement” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 78). ICT is recognised as relevant in all these aspects but face-to-face teaching and learning is to continue (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 72). National and international internship programs, or practicum are recognised as a means to cement partnerships and support collaboration and students’ (on-site) learning (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 210), with funding priority to be given for nursing clinical placements and teaching practicum (Bradley et al., 2008, pp. 102, 166).

The report acknowledges the value of international students to Australian higher education. The contribution is to be maintained by supporting international students with subsidy scholarships, largely at the postgraduate level (Bradley et al., 2008, p. xix). In relation to undergraduate education, the report leaves issues of diversity to be resolved within the broader framework of its recommendations. No specific comments were found on the issue of the needs of the international undergraduate student cohort and their interactions with and impact on the day-today learning.

Overall, the report is a relatively comprehensive response to the Boyer report recommendations. It provides a national framework for change and, as such, does not always address all issue in detail. Thus, a lot of decisions is left to individual universities.
Table 2.2: The aftermath of the Boyer Report, Australia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key recommendations of the Boyer Report</th>
<th>Strategies proposed by the Boyer Report</th>
<th>Australian context, Bradly Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ communication skills</td>
<td>“All student grades should reflect both mastery of content and ability to convey content” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 25)</td>
<td>“Technical skills and generic employability skills (such as communication and language skills) were considered to be of equal importance” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Courses throughout the curriculum should reinforce communication skills by routinely asking for written and oral exercises” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Students must learn how to convey the results of their work effectively both orally and in writing” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry-based learning</td>
<td>“The freshman program should be carefully constructed as an integrated, interdisciplinary, inquiry-based experience by designs” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 21)</td>
<td>“Encourage both students and staff to engage in critical enquiry.” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Inquiry-based courses should allow for joint projects and collaborative efforts” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative learning and teaching</td>
<td>“Every freshman experience needs to include opportunities for learning through collaborative efforts, such as joint projects and mutual critiques of oral and written work.” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 21)</td>
<td>No information found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Inquiry-based courses should allow for joint projects and collaborative efforts.” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone/senior projects</td>
<td>“The inquiry-based learning, collaborative efforts, and expectations for writing and speaking that are part of the freshman experience need to be carried throughout the program.” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Senior seminars or other capstone courses appropriate to the discipline need to be part of every undergraduate program.” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Ideally the capstone course should bring together faculty member, graduate students, and senior undergraduates in shared or mutually reinforcing projects.” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Whenever possible, capstone courses need to allow for collaborative efforts among the baccalaureate students.” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The capstone course should prepare undergraduates for the expectations and standards of graduate work and the professional workplace.” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance Targets</td>
<td>No information found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program design</td>
<td>“Research universities must redesign graduate education to prepare students for teaching undergraduate students as well as for other professional roles.” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Students must be provided with the highest quality teaching and learning and a stimulating and rewarding higher education experience.” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 78)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Strengthening the sector’s general regulatory, accreditation and quality assurance systems will also enhance Australia’s position in international education” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 115)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student quality</strong></td>
<td>“A student embarking upon a degree program at a research university should be adequately prepared to meet the intellectual challenges of that […]” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 210)</td>
<td>“Develop more rigorous criteria for accrediting universities and other higher education providers based around strengthening the link between teaching and research as a defining characteristic of university accreditation and reaccreditation” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. xxi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“An independent national regulatory body responsible for regulating all types of tertiary education.” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 116)</td>
<td>“Lower division courses should introduce students to interdisciplinary study.” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Beginning in the freshman year, students should be able to engage in research in as many courses as possible” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 18)</td>
<td>Providing “well-designed and engaging courses that lead to good vocational outcomes” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 79).</td>
<td>“Improving the engagement of students with their learning environment.” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Provision of carefully constructed internships can turn inquiry-based learning into practical experience; internship opportunities need to be widely available” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 19)</td>
<td>“[…] successful projects have often involved cross-sectoral initiatives, outreach and early education programs involving partnerships between universities, colleges and schools” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 37)</td>
<td>“Coordinated internship programs and increased funding for clinical placements were two suggestions on how to increase technical skills and generic employability skills (such as communication and language skills).” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Academic staff build students’ knowledge by engaging students in their own fields of expertise.</td>
<td>Academic staff in any provider must be active in research when engaged in research student supervision.” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Students should be taught by those who discover, create, and apply, as well as transmit, insights about subjects in which the teacher is expert.” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 16)</td>
<td>“Most definitions suggested that community engagement involved collaborative or two-way relationships with parties external to the higher education provider” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate students can collaborate with undergraduate students, or work as TAs and mentors.</td>
<td>“Graduate students should be made aware of their classroom roles in promoting learning by inquiry. They should not be limited to knowing the old modes of transmission of knowledge without understanding the role of student and faculty as joint investigators” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff quality</td>
<td>“Graduate apprentice teachers should be assisted by one or more of the following means: seminars in teaching, thoughtful supervision from the professor assigned to the course, mentoring by experienced teachers, and regular discussions of classroom problems with other new teachers” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 31)</td>
<td>“The base qualification for a stable academic career is now a doctorate and thus increasing the stock of people available to enter this career is tightly tied to the number in training to acquire this qualification.” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“A “culture of teaching” within departments should be cultivated to heighten the prestige of teaching and emphasize the linkages between teaching and research” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 33)</td>
<td>“Accreditation of all providers based on their capacity to deliver on core requirements.” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 116)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>support for domestic research degree students.” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. xvi)</td>
<td>“Measuring and monitoring the level of student engagements.” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Measuring and monitoring the quality of teaching and learning.” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 79)</td>
<td>&quot;Accreditation of all providers based on their capacity to deliver on core requirements.” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 116)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Program: if remediation is necessary, it should be completed before entering the program” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 20)
- "Academic staff in any provider must be active in research when engaged in research student supervision.” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 124)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate students on and off-campus need to be included in university community activities.</th>
<th>“Commuting students must be integrated into university life by making their participation easy and attractive” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 36)</th>
<th>“Australia’s higher education institutions provide students with stimulating courses and teaching, a good-quality learning environment, access to support services and the opportunity to engage informally with staff and fellow students as part of a learning community, whether it is on-campus or off-campus using the latest available communication technologies” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 10).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting reflects the goals of research universities.</td>
<td>“The correlation between good undergraduate teaching and good research must be recognized in promotion and tenure decisions” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 33)</td>
<td>“Commonwealth block grant programs which provide funding for infrastructure, the indirect costs of research and research education. The main block grant programs are the Research Infrastructure Block Grants (RIBG) Scheme, Institutional Grants Scheme (IGS) and the Research Training Scheme (RTS).” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 124).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology can enhance learning environment.</td>
<td>“Enriching Teaching Through Technology” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 26)</td>
<td>“[…] the use of ICT to enhance the learning experience and to provide flexibility.” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity is critical to the sustainability of societies and needs to be appropriately engaged.</td>
<td>“Enriching experience of association with people of diverse backgrounds, ethnicities, cultures, and beliefs must be a normal part of university life” (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 36)</td>
<td>“Internationalisation of education through developing personal international networks, gaining access to new knowledge through exposure to the diverse viewpoints of international students.” (Bradley et al., 2008, p. 104)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.4.3 The UK and the renewal agenda

In the UK, the Continuum Model of Scholarship (Collins, 2016) has been developed in alignment with the UK Professional Standards Framework (UKPSF) for Teaching and Supporting Learning in Higher Education (revised in 2011), and various other documents (e.g. The UK Quality Code for Higher Education, QAA, 2013a; Guidance on scholarship and the pedagogical effectiveness of staff; Expectations for Foundation Degree-awarding powers and for taught degree awarding powers, QAA, 2013b). The new regulations specified the rules regulating higher education, the relationship between scholarship and learning and teaching, and the responsibilities of academic faculty.

In the UK, undergraduate research is mostly conducted in the form of a final-year thesis. The thesis is a requirement for graduation equivalent in Australia to the honours year (Healey & Jenkins, 2009, p. 19). The focus of the dissertation is for the students to produce “an extended written report featuring a discussion of research methodology and results” (Healey & Jenkins, 2009, p. 19). It is largely an independent project though supervised by a senior academic and within his or her research area/expertise and publication (Healey & Jenkins, 2009, p. 20). However, there is no expectation or obligation on the students to publish their work or disseminate its result (Healey & Jenkins, 2009, p. 19).

Inquiry-based learning is considered in the UK to be the most suitable model in research universities for their critical and expansive values to learning and thinking (Healey & Jenkins, 2009, p. 22). The aspects of the inquiry process include theoretical study of research methodology, methods and design, an explicit link to specific disciplines and the compliance with the “forms of knowledge creation and dissemination in their disciplines and professional areas” (Healey & Jenkins, 2009, p. 23).

Recently, universities in the UK introduced new formats for capstone research projects. In order to ensure that students engage more critically with the research process and its dissemination, they encourage interdisciplinary projects, which can have different outputs than a written thesis. This may even be a research paper, a conference paper, conference posters linked to dissertation, exhibitions and other hands-on projects to link students with research communities (Healey & Jenkins, 2009, pp. 20-21). Other alternatives in capstone projects include participation in a research-based consultancy. (Healey & Jenkins, 2009, p. 30). These take a form of a sequence of lectures over a period of time. At the end of the year,
students compile reports for the clients who requested the consultancy (Healey & Jenkins, 2009, p. 30). Also, concentrated study projects engage students in reviewing research literature, do experimental planning and experimental work, conduct analysis of results and share their work with others to illustrate their own input into the subject of their study (Healey & Jenkins, 2009, p. 31).

The reports evaluating the final year capstone courses showed very promising results, indicating growing numbers of students wanting to do research and to pursue a research career (Healey & Jenkins, 2009, pp. 30-31).

2.3.4.4 Comparing the U.S., Australia and the UK
The discussion thus far showed the U.S., as a country, being only partially impacted by the Boyer Report (Boyer Commission, 1998). This may be because the surveys of the academic programs happened too close to the publication of the report, or, possibly, because the fragmentation of the U.S. higher education sector is not amenable to change in a more global sense of the word.

Australia and the UK are countries where governments regulate the higher education sector. The comparisons show a rather significant impact of the Boyer report (Boyer Commission, 1998). Despite the brief review of the UK system, it is clear that neither Australia nor the UK put great emphasis on research skills in the early years of undergraduate study. It is arguable that each country defers the responsibilities in this area to individual institutions, but, as in the case of Australia, other than the reference to the generic skills and inquiry process as a suitable method of learning, no specific recommendations are made to ensure that a systematic attempt is made to integrate from Year 1 onwards the culture of research of the same kind and impact as argued for in the Boyer Report (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 22), starting with the freshmen programs.

2.4 Research and inquiry skills in Indonesian ELTE research literature
2.4.1 Introduction
As in the developed countries, in the developing countries, lifting the profile of universities depends on internationalisation of the research and student communities (Altbach et al., 2009, p. 24), the inclusion of the global and local perspectives (Altbach et al., 2009, p. 25),
and forms of dissemination that impact on the local and global growth. Qualified human resources are needed in the developing countries (Altbach et al., 2009, p. 23). Professional expertise and full-time professors are required to build research cultures in research universities (Altbach et al., 2009, p. 23). To support their activity of teaching and research, these professors need to have high salaries so that they can focus on their work (Altbach et al., 2009, p. 23). Yet, proper funding is an issue.

Despite the recent developments in the higher education sector in Indonesia and a shift towards New Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015), the ELTE literature is rather silent as to how these changes are to impact on teacher preparation courses and, therefore, on the ELTE discipline as such. This suggests that the new standards are being imposed top-down, with little if any consultation with ELTE academia to enhance the buy-in from the faculty staff and their involvement in the implementation of the new policies. Indeed, there is some criticism in the literature suggesting that this sudden push for internationalisation of the higher education sector in Southeast Asia has less to do with integration and more with reinforcing the domination of international higher education providers (Feuer & Hornidge, 2015).

The section that follows examines the research culture of ELTE departments in Indonesia with respect to research and inquiry skills with a view to illustrating how faculty staff embrace New Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015) in order to better understand their impact on their teaching and the “job” of teacher preparation.

2.4.2 Research and inquiry skills in ELTE studies

The key agenda that underpins the integration of the New Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015) into ELTE curricula is for faculty staff to build synergies between teaching and research. However, the implementation of this objective is not free of challenges.

In Indonesia, the general tendency is for ELTE scholars to appreciate the need for students to engage with research. However, less attention is given to the theory of the inquiry process, and the skills that are needed for students to see the need for working with professional literature. A case in point is a study by Kuswandono (2014) that looked at reflective practice as a tool for building students’ professional identities. The study drew data from “reflective journals, individual interviews, focus group discussions, and some autobiographical writing
by pre-service teachers” (p. 187). The study points to the literature claiming that identity is formed by the stories we tell about ourselves and the values we hold. Yet, it fails to offer a literature review on how the process of reflection can be utilised (a) by pre-service teachers in order to critically examine these stories and their impact on them, and (b) by the author of the study when examining pre-service teachers’ beliefs for the purpose of his study. No criteria for interrogating or evaluating those beliefs were developed or proposed by the Kuswandono study. While the students were given some questions for engaging in the reflective process, no mention is made of the connection that these questions make with the learning outcomes of ELTE curricula and the processes that are taught for pre-service teachers to achieve those outcomes. In fact, the researcher says nothing about the ELTE curriculum and the new challenges of initial teacher preparation in the modern era. This is a major weakness of the study as it does not explore the impact of the New Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015) on ELTE curricula and, thereby, on the students’ ability to use reflection in order to evidence their learning and engagement in the issues of the profession.

The discussion section of the study (Kuswandono, 2014) reverts to the traditional, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation categories (p. 194). Judgments regarding perceived low self-efficacy of pre-service teachers were correlated with low motivation, lack of experience and an assumed lack of capabilities (p. 195). The researcher engaged also in speculations about the prospects of some students continuing with the profession. None of these conclusions offered insights on ELTE practice. The recommendations that followed simply urged educators to “develop curriculum, pedagogy and mentoring programs which can enhance PSTs’[pre-service teachers] motivations for their work as teachers” (p. 198). Yet, the absence of a literature review, that would link the curriculum, pedagogy and motivation, makes it difficult to understand which aspects of these components are an issue and how they interact together in order to propose effective pedagogic solutions. The study is an example of a methodology where the demands of the new higher education agenda continue to be interpreted through traditional models of thinking, with researchers appearing to approach their own beliefs somewhat uncritically and utilising research to confirm those beliefs, rather than challenging them.

In a paper addressing the recent shift in higher education toward competency-based learning Lian (2018, p. 17) raises the issue of change and what is needed for ELTE scholars to embrace the new agenda as an opportunity that supports growth, rather than as a threat. In
her view, change “is not a matter of the application of ready-made steps for success” (p. 22). Lian explains that new policies call for a new kind of teachers, i.e. professionals that are "imaginative, innovative and intellectually engaged leaders" (p. 17). For researchers to engage in the process of change and to present alternatives, it is imperative that scholars expand, not narrow, their knowledge base, take risks, and, in general, "embark on a change in their own educational practices in order to inspire change in their students’ learning” (p. 22). This means exploring the old disciplinary “truths”, putting to test their relevance in the face of new findings from a broad range of disciplines, in general, daring to be informed, rather than complying with “what has been”. While the new higher education policies present numerous challenges as old habits persist and new role models are missing, remaining within traditional frameworks and perspectives perpetuates the problem and, inevitably, weakens both the discipline of ELTE and its practitioners (p. 22). The sources of evidence on which to base new thinking about ELTE are plenty (p. 22). They include cutting-edge findings from fields such as biology, neuroscience, sociology, psychology, to mention but a few (p. 22). Failing to integrate these findings will result in an isolation of the ELTE field from the major discussions that occupy modern intellectuals, “instead of joining the global community of intellectuals, the field may find itself unable to provide leadership for 21st-century learning” (p. 22).

The shift toward a modern, interdisciplinary view of research and disciplines, as discussed by Lian (2018), may present something of a learning curve in Indonesia. The study by Suharmanto, Hidayati, and Zen (2014) reflects the isolationist tendencies of disciplines, against which Lian warned in her study. Suharmanto et al designed two unit outlines for two subjects, Introduction to Linguistics and Introduction to Literature, with the aim of including “the teaching, learning assessment strategies, quality indicators and methods in relation to ELT program specification” (p. 2). The Introduction to Linguistics unit outline claims to target Level 2 learning outcomes, based on Bloom’s (1956) taxonomy, while, in actual fact, the subject focuses mainly on students learning the basic linguistic structures, i.e. level 1 on Bloom’s taxonomy. The learning outcomes make the claim that the subject will assist students in developing knowledge and skills in English language teaching (p. 5). For example, it is asserted that, “by introducing students to English sound structures as a piece of the whole structure of the English language, they will be able to teach how to pronounce English sounds accurately” (pp. 4-5). The unit outline makes no mention of how its content relates to the process of language learning and concepts and evidence in relation to which
this process was defined. The outline does not role model opportunities that different perspectives present to problems or how to work with those perspectives. While group work was advocated to assist reflection, teaching how to work with perspectives would help illustrate how to address the complex learning outcomes of the New Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015) that require students to engage with research and to develop inquiry skills. Suharmanto et al’s study also fails to present a literature review on developing units outlines. This has weakened the study and its value to ELTE curricula.

“Isolationist” tendencies and poor integration of the literature are not rare in research addressing integration of New Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015). Arifin (2015), in the evaluation of the ELTE curriculum in his own university, praises strategies of “Learner autonomy, Cooperative Learning, Curricular integration, Focus on meaning, Diversity, Thinking skills, Alternative assessment, Teachers as co-learners” (p. 24) as indicators of a “paradigm shift” toward a more learner-centred and post-positivistic pedagogy (Jacobs and Farrel, 2004 in Arifin, p. 23) especially in the context of project-based learning (p. 37). None of the strategies were explained through a literature review. This omission has an impact on how Arifin assesses the context of ELTE teaching. The interviews conducted with the lecturers made Arifin conclude that the main problems faced by ELTE academics relate to (a) the academic policy of the university that does not explicitly support project the process of learning and (b) inadequate infrastructure. A poor explanation of what the eight strategies imply for a paradigm shift to take place short-changes the understanding of the challenges that the new policies present.

Understanding the challenges of the shift toward an outcome-based curriculum is important if research is to assist policy-makers, universities and academics in addressing the demands of the change. A study by Budiharso (2016) is another example of how the difficulties of the change are not always appreciated enough to send the correct message to the stakeholders in order to receive the necessary support. Budiharso reported on the development of the ELTE curriculum of an Islamic private university in East Java based on the new IQF (The Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2012) and the New Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015). The study presents thoroughly the new policies, yet offers no rationale for its program structure, nor does it specify what needs to change for academics to engage in the reforms in order to meet their objectives. The impression that Budiharso’s study makes is that the changes are rather cosmetic and no profound implications need to be drawn
regarding the academic culture of the ELTE department and how it locates itself on the international scene. Yet, the reforms are not only about teaching, but also about improving the standards of academia and of research in general.

Mentoring of undergraduate students is one of the challenges that integration of research and inquiry skills presents to ELTE pedagogues and academics in general. In his study, Basthomi (2015) focused on the subject of writing and its role in the process of building of students as critical users of academic genre. For Basthomi (p. 118), academics tread a fine line to balance their roles as both “discourse gate-keepers” and teachers whose role is to inspire students and support their enthusiasm for learning and research. His experience as an examiner of students’ projects shows that balancing the two roles is not only not easy, but that students’ work demonstrates gaps largely in the area of students learning to be critical and innovative researchers, over and above staying true to the rules of “proper writing”. For example, undergraduate students have a tendency to produce definitions of terms in their writing, however, less focus is devoted to working with those definitions critically (p. 123). The same applies to research methods and methodology. According to Basthomi (p. 123), students pay far more attention to labels and prescribed methods at the expense of creativity in research design and thinking. This absence of critical and engaged thinking is also visible during the oral defence of undergraduate theses. The majority of students use viva voce as a place to explain their research, not their writing (p. 123). Basthomi (p. 124) believes that it is important for mentors of undergraduate students to appreciate that while norms do apply, at such an early stage of education, students need to develop creativity in order to approach their discipline with curiosity and personal involvement as the field grows only when students can see that these qualities are welcomed and, indeed, desired.

As indicated in Chapter 1, Indonesian ELTE researchers rarely take heed of the message of Basthomi’s (2015) study. On the subject of mentoring, especially in the context of thesis writing in the final years of undergraduate studies, Alwasilah and Punciochar (2015) proposed new guidelines for thesis writing that would enhance the thesis standard, “result in more publications for faculty members and graduate students” and support timely completion (p. 19). Alwasilah and Punciochar (p. 20) propose that, upon consultation with the research advisor, students consult the website with the new guidelines, select the topic, identify thesis or dissertation committee members, perform an initial literature review, and identify the direction of research and the research questions. Final projects are difficult,
especially if, in the previous years, students have not had enough practice involving research. While the guidelines support diversification of assessment tasks, no attention is given to student support. The assumption is that individual lecturers can rely on their own experience, an idea that Basthomi’s (2015) study vehemently contradicted.

Providing support is tough, especially when researchers are unclear regarding the issues and processes that need to be developed. Interested in improving students’ ability in academic writing, Harjanto (2014) proposed the use of the I-Search approach. The approach consists of four parts, they are (1) selecting a topic (what I already know), (2) finding teaching practice information (what I want to find out), (3) using information (the search), and (4) developing a final product (what I learned) (pp. 151-152). Harjanto was not able to specify where the I-Search approach comes from or what empirical evidence supports its steps. The positive responses from his students (p. 155) say more about how students fared in his pedagogy, rather than about the pedagogy itself. A clearer, research-supported process would most likely enable Harjanto to further develop his model and make a positive contribution to the ELTE discipline.

Other scholars looked into Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) to support students’ academic writing. Emilia, Habibi, and Bangga (2018) conducted a text analysis using the SFL model in order to identify gaps in the cohesion of exposition texts written by eleventh graders. However, the researchers offer no process that ELTE lecturers could model to pre-service teachers for addressing the shortcomings in this aspect of writing beyond the traditional strategy of explicit teaching of the linguistic structures. How different this pedagogy is from the grammar translation method, they do not explain. The same recommendation is proposed by the study by Aunurrahman, Hamied, and Emilia (2017). Their study showed that ELTE pre-service teachers had “little control over the schematic structure and linguistic features of an argumentative writing” and showed “some limitations” in their “critical thinking capacity” (p. 72). The researchers suggest that the lecturers should use, and thereby role model, “explicit teaching and cooperative learning activities to alleviate the students’ difficulties and [to] develop their academic writing and critical thinking capacity” (p. 72). However, it does not follow that the same tools of analysis can be applied in order to remedy issues.
National examinations also impact on the teaching and learning of English at schools and, indirectly, on what the teaching profession values, including initial teacher preparation courses. Saukah and Cahyono (2015) examined teachers’ attitudes towards national exams. Their study showed that the recent changes in the exams that emphasise more broadly-defined learning outcomes encouraged teachers working in high-ranking schools to adjust their teaching materials and strategies “from teaching to the test to teaching according to the curriculum” (p. 250). This was not the case with teachers teaching in low-ranking schools. Saukah and Cahyono do not expand on the reasons that would make teachers believe that modern curriculum and teaching would fail their students on exams. This is wide-spread belief, also present in Australia (Lingard, Thompson, & Sellar, 2016), making teachers fear anything new and relapse to old traditions of teaching. Furaidah, Saukah, and Widiati (2015, p. 52) also observed that national exams made teachers spend allocated time on English “on practicing answering, listening [to] and reading multiple-choice questions, disregarding the teaching of the other skills, [such as] speaking and writing” (p. 52). Like Saukah and Cahyono, Furaidah, Saukah, and Widiati called for changes in national policies, although they were less specific as to the exact direction of change.

Other studies looked into professional development of ELTE teachers. Cahyono’s (2014, p. 263-264) study led him to suggest that teachers engage with other qualified English teachers to help them develop their knowledge and skills. Other suggestions involved the use of technology, especially Edmodo, using easy and attractive materials in class and engagement with the professional literature. These are all positive hints provided that teachers do not abandon their initial training only to search for easy tips as to ‘what works’. As pointed out by Basthomi (2015), professional practice requires innovation that is based on sound and critical knowledge in order to prevent the bias of hasty solutions. The study by Cahyono would benefit from statements that would identify a common set of principles for thinking about pedagogy in an informed and critical manner. While this is missing in his study, in another publication, Cahyono, Kurnianti, and Mutiaraningrum (2016) look for solutions in the TPACK (technological pedagogical content knowledge) framework.

The TPACK model was proposed by Mishra and Koehler (2006) to “characterize teachers’ expertise with respect to the integration of information and communication tools (ICT) into teaching and learning activities” (Koh & Sing, 2011, p. 736). The TPACK model revives the rather outdated idea of ‘pedagogical’ content, be it grammar or any other area, whereby the
pedagogue invents rules that in his or her view are best suited for the students, although “on the whole, the area of rule formulation is one that is relatively unexplored” (Newby, 2000, p. 1). The entire reasoning behind the TPACK idea is that learning depends on the instruction. While the idea may have been useful some time ago, new findings (Lian, 2018) point to strong evidence in the literature that the best instruction cannot bypass students’ own internal rules that are largely invisible to the eye of the teacher. In regard to TPACK, it is worth keeping in mind that the focus of pedagogy should include not only the use of ICT, but, more importantly, an informed understanding of the role of the learner in the entire process. For example, are they an object of instruction, with ICT or is the pedagogy to be understood in more general terms? TPACK itself presents no alternatives that would offer reasons for a more agentive construct of students. Suherdi’s (2015) study also fails to address the issue of student agency despite its links with the multiliteracies model (New London Group, 1996).

Following the thread of professional development, Suherdi (2016) is critical of ELTE teachers in Indonesia. According to Suherdi, they tend to resist innovation and are reluctant to take active part in continuing professional development (p. 95). If true, this points to weaknesses in the initial teacher education training, with pre-service teachers seeing little need for self-improvement. In his study, Suherdi (p. 95) draws on religion and claims that a religious attitude requires that teachers feel motivated to build professional learning communities (PLCs) that support their professional engagement. However, the findings of his study show that teachers find it difficult to maintain enthusiasm, quit PLCs and return to their own zones of comfort (p. 97). Why are teachers tired of professional development? Widiati and Hayati (2015) analysed a one-year pre-service teacher professional education program where selected undergraduates could undertake professional education as pre-service teachers to obtain a professional teacher certificate. The study concluded that the pre-service teachers benefited from the program, especially “in terms of their developing more hands-on skills in designing lesson plans, instructional materials and media, and assessment procedures in accordance with the curriculum of secondary schools” (p. 140). Yet, none of the benefits listed by the researchers mention how the program helped pre-service teachers design curricula and lessons plans that integrated higher order thinking skills, or cultural and ethical values. However, the researchers did acknowledge that the program was pitched to integrate learning outcomes that targeted research and inquiry skills, teamwork, leadership, and the use of ICT (pp.133-134).
In another study, Rohmah (2018) sought to address the issue of nurturing research and higher order thinking skills in novice teachers. Rohmah’s research involved monthly workshops, classroom observations and pre-and post-teaching conferences over a period of five months. The study showed that novice teachers enjoyed the support (p. 90). The support offered an opportunity for teachers to learn new knowledge and to apply, and reflect upon, new teaching strategies and techniques in the classroom (p. 105). While the study sounds promising, it would benefit from more theoretical detail, including the strategies that the mentor used to build a positive relationship with mentees. On the other hand, the study by Zein (2015) investigated factors affecting professional development of elementary English teachers in Indonesia. Because of the high demand, English teachers, especially in primary schools, continue to lack proper qualifications (Zein, 2015, p. 2). As in Rohmah’s (2018) study, Zein (2015) focused on in-service professional development. Her research confirmed inadequacy of in-service training of elementary English teachers (p. 9). In her recommendations, Zein (p. 13), following Nunan (2003), argued for “special training in the needs of younger learners”. Still, as in Rohmah’s (2018) study, it is important for teacher educators to take a broader perspective on those needs, theorise the role of students in the learning environment and integrate their learning of English within a set of objectives that can give primary school students the foundations necessary for building on this knowledge in the contexts of their lives and future studies.

2.4.3 Policy, leadership and change management

In his investigation of leadership and change management in education contexts, Ramsden (1998, p. 6) identified “maintaining quality with diminished resources, or ‘doing more with less’” to be the most nominated area by the leaders of many universities in the Asia-Pacific region. The second most mentioned area was “the management and leadership of academic people at a time of rapid change, named by sixty per cent of heads [of Departments or Schools]” (pp. 6-7). Among others, this included areas such as “helping staff through change, developing new skills, setting clear goals, mentoring younger staff, helping staff to cope with increased workloads …”. The third most nominated issues included those that accompany change in the environment of higher education, such as the need for vision and innovation in teaching and research, problems of technological change, and information overload (p. 7). The problems of attracting more students, teaching standards as well as teaching students who were less academically motivated and less well-prepared were also equally strongly
represented (p. 7). Figure 2.1 summarises these factors, with the goals of enabling and focusing on change being presented as the constituents of quality leadership.

Figure 2.1 Ramsden’s (1998, p. 7) model of academic leadership

According to Ramsden, the key to quality leadership in universities has to do with how people relate to each other and academic leadership can be enhanced through studying the experiences of academic staff (p. 6). Listening and consulting are key strategies on his list (p. 9). Goals like a joint responsibility for progress and establishing a set of shared aims, methods and procedures would fuel these discussions and promote culture of quality and positive attitudes (pp. 178-179). On the other hand, conflicting messages, feelings of isolation and lack of collegial support destroy progress (p. 180). Collaboration on project tightens the links between colleagues and their networks, thus supporting implementation of constructive ideas and the development of new ones. In short, in a collaborative environment, compliance and standardisation are turned into a project, rather than rules, thus making change not only possible, but also inspiring and modeling inspiration to students. Table 2.3 summarises the qualities of a collaborative change management workplace discussed by Ramsden (p. 196) and contrast those with their negative equivalents.
Table 2.3 Qualities of collaborative processes in higher education (Ramsden, 1998, p. 196)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Working'</th>
<th>'Non-working'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straight and open communication, including non-judgemental criticism</td>
<td>Faultfinding attitude prevails among colleagues and discourages openness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on future successes and strengths</td>
<td>Focus on past errors and weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity encouraged by rewarding receptiveness to new ideas</td>
<td>Creativity discouraged by punishing 'incorrect' procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempts to minimise distance between rhetoric and behaviour</td>
<td>People manipulated and made to feel incompetent by hidden deals and secret messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration recognised and intellectual challenge encouraged through questioning</td>
<td>Questions inhibited; staff feel they must defend territory to compete successfully against each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders seek feedback including bad news as well as good</td>
<td>Leaders certain they are right; unwilling or frightened to listen to bad news</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders invite comment and consult on goals and plans</td>
<td>Leaders do not share goals and plans, only solutions and requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmosphere of joint problem-solving</td>
<td>Atmosphere of accusation and censure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.4 Summary

The review of ELTE literature focused on studies conducted recently and with a view to responding to the new higher education policies demanding greater professionalisation of ELTE and a more rigorous addressing of graduate competencies throughout the education of pre-service teachers. Following Lian (2018), the review began with the understanding that for pre-service teachers to feel motivated to draw on research and to build investigative skills, it is necessary for ELTE lecturers themselves to cultivate an investigative mind and be interested in issues that interact with and impact on learning.

The examples of research discussed above show that while Indonesian ELTE academics do engage in research in order to support their students in developing a reflective and critical disposition to their own learning, the newly established graduate standards continue to be a challenge in at least three ways.
Firstly, the studies typically fail to theorise the inquiry process, and research appears to refer to applying ready-made categories of the world to objects and phenomena whose nature is both transparent and free of cultural and experiential ambiguities. Researchers thus feel justified in reading reality through the categories of their choice, without attempting to create distance between what they see how else the same phenomena could be interpreted. This makes findings appear both definitive and single-dimensional. Little is learned in terms of the factors that interact with the learning process, while recommendations tend to draw on traditional ‘wisdom’ of the discipline, valuing explicit instruction, a narrow set of learning outcomes and narrow choices of learning activities.

Secondly, the inquiry skills are never clearly mentioned in any of the readings analysed in this chapter. None of the studies elaborates on the methodology that would be most appropriate for teaching how to identify and interrogate perspectives and concepts, develop library and internet skills, or understand issues of plagiarism and the value of referencing. On the other hand, building and linking with professional learning groups and communities was addressed, although how to motivate teachers and students to engage in professional learning was not investigated.

Thirdly, the New Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015) are rarely mentioned. Research tends to follow traditional areas of concern, such as reflection on practice, academic writing, professional development, each from the perspective of narrowly defined objectives. The studies presented in this chapter do not address the concept of research and inquiry as involving multiple skills that interact with one another in order to give rise to a critical learning process.

Fourthly, the discussion of the challenges that change management in universities cannot take place without explicit assistance from the universities themselves. Other than the establishment of the relevant support structures that help individual academic units understand and engage in change, proper support must also be given to the managers of academic units for academic staff to better understand the purpose of the change and its implications for their work in teaching and research.

In summary, the academic culture in ELTE in Indonesia appears to be well underway, with scholars researching diverse aspects relating to teacher education. However, the critique
offered in this literature review indicates that ELTE research is still lacking in theoretical frameworks and concepts that would free it from its dependency on traditional views of what constitutes research. ELTE studies point to many important issues but do not offer principled models that would result in practices that could be replicated in other contexts and further investigated. It follows that the discipline needs to investigate its own coherence in order to remain relevant.

2.5 Conclusion

This chapter set out to investigate the policies that have resulted in new higher education reforms and their impact on the identity of the HEIs, their governance systems and research.

The review showed HEIs worldwide responding to the “four crises” identified by Burroway (2017) with strategies resulting in the diversification of the higher education landscape and an increased access to higher education and student mobility. Furthermore, the decentralising of higher education brought with it a demand for stricter quality control. Tables 2.1 and 2.2 provide the study with categories for investigating and analysing the impacts of internationalisation and the integration of the new IQF (The Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2012) and the New Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015) on ELTE curricula in Indonesia. The review of ELTE research indicated a number of challenges that characterise ELTE academic culture, including isolationist tendencies of the ELTE discipline and a general weakness in modelling research skills. The present study develops from the concerns identified in the course of this chapter and seeks to further investigate the engagement of ELTE scholars in Indonesia in the new curriculum agenda together with the actual challenges encountered in the process.
Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Introduction

Chapter 3 describes the general intellectual framework of the study and the methods for data collections that were assessed as appropriate for addressing the research questions.

Briefly, the study follows a dialogic model of inquiry, built on principles developed by scholars such as Calhoun (1996), Bourdieu (1995), and Latour (2004, 2003, 2010), as well as on the powerful critique of education research by Thomas (2007). All these scholars, while distinct from each other, share the understanding that for a study to approach its assumptions critically, it needs to adopt a variety of research tools and methods of data collection and analysis to provide the researcher with multiple perspectives on the issue that is being investigated.

The following sections describe the intellectual underpinnings of a dialogic model, and the choice of research methods and instruments for data collection and analysis that were informed by the dialogic framework.

3.2 Qualitative and quantitative inquiry methods

Education research distinguishes between two contrasting forms of research methods, qualitative and quantitative. Essentially, qualitative methods are used to describe an event (Abusabha & Woelfel, 2003); they are exploratory and inferential, and result in the development of categories (variables) that are believed to capture the event in question (Walsh, 2003).

In contrast, quantitative methods are deductive and seek to generalise and control the variables. Typically, a qualitative approach serves to make sense of phenomena, while a quantitative approach is used to work with the variables established in a qualitative investigation (Walsh, 2003). In quantitative approaches, the researcher already knows the object of his or her investigation and explores it further, either by describing the distribution of what they are looking for throughout a population (by examining samples of that population) or in experimental situations where they set up an experiment to test a specific hypothesis (known as the null hypothesis - which states that there is no difference between
two means or values) (Creswell, 2013; Lowhorn, 2007). Statistics are then used to analyse the probability of detected differences. If they do exist, then the researcher rejects the null hypothesis and adopts an alternative hypothesis (e.g. a specific teaching method that may appear to make a change to learning) (Lowhorn, 2007).

Despite these differentiating factors, each research begins with a worldview that is fundamentally qualitative, i.e. it takes a perspective on a world (process or event) that it creates by drawing on a multitude of evidence, both qualitative and quantitative. One may say that research concerns itself with developing tools, qualitative or quantitative, to better understand these initial perspectives. Each study changes the cumulative understandings of disciplines, at times resulting in a drastic paradigm shift as was the case with Einstein: changing what people understand of reality, which is not the same as understanding the reality as it is (Fuchs & Schack, 2015). To paraphrase Fuchs & Schack, information is not in the world, but in the understandings that researchers bring with them into their context of study. In applied linguistics, similar views were expressed by Candlin (1990, p. 479):

[the qualitative] “postponement of theory merely reinforces the assumption that the object can be directly revealed. In fact, we cannot view any object “untheoretically”.

The next section examines the distinction from the perspective of the role that a researcher plays in each of the approaches.

3.3 Ontological and epistemological framing of the study

It is a norm in educational studies to believe that the distinction between the qualitative and quantitative paradigms is sufficient for distinguishing between the varied world views and forms of knowledge that they create.

A constructivist paradigm, which tends to be associated with qualitative studies, assumes that meanings are social (Creswell, 2013) and subjective (Walsh, 2003). This then implies that meanings that were created in relation to some theory or measurement are not (Latour, 2003). As pointed out by Candlin (1990, p. 479), this is not the case, because each method of measurement is a conceptual tool produced by humans, not the product of a “divine” eye.

Latour (2003) makes a similar point arguing that the very act of study is an act of interference that targets a specific problem that the “eye” of the researcher claims to be relevant and
worth examining. The point of research is for a researcher to obtain a greater clarity in relation to the initial problem that s/he identified. The result is a more informed perspective on that problem. Essentially, all descriptions produced by research, whether qualitative or quantitative, are “interested” and, therefore, take a perspective on the object of their study. In other words, there is no neutral point from which a researcher would interact with the participants or events. All action is purposeful and therefore constrained by, and constraining, the elements that form its “point of view”.

It follows that one not only cannot obtain data with “[a]s little intrusion as possible” (Lowhorn, 2007; Creswell, 2013; de Vaus, 2001); one can also not generate an understanding of that data that would be neutral or perspective-free. This is why how the data are collected and how they are interpreted, both processes, need justifying in relation to terms that define the point of view that was applied, i.e. the point of view that constrains what was selected as relevant data and that is constraining the “points of view” that will be investigated: “We select what we should value from among those things we must value” (Peterson, 1999, p. 43). The processes by which data are obtained (e.g. questionnaires and the questions they ask) are not accidental: one never captures everything, “consciousness plays a centrally important role in the generation of the predictable and comprehended world from the domain of the unexpected (Peterson, 1999, p. 52). Hence, what is seen as data, it is already a product of a process of selection and, therefore, of some act of theorising: there is no such a thing as a theory-free information, questions, data or perspective.

In the light of the reflections above, the key issue in a research study is not only whether it follows a qualitative (inductive) or a quantitative (deductive) method, but also how it constructs its ontological framework (“What makes things true?”), what role does it attribute to the knowledge it engages or rules out (“What counts as evidence or knowledge?”) and, therefore, which processes (methods) it will choose to further inform or contest what it knows (both its ontology and epistemology/evidence). In other words, the ontology is not obvious. Rather, it is a battlefield where the wars about the truth and about things being right or wrong happen, like the battles about what makes our behaviour moral, or, in education, what makes our pedagogies right, or, to paraphrase Peterson (1999, p. 43), what must be.

It is understood that ontology concerns itself with statements, positions or worldviews which identify what is possible to know/learn (the boundaries of truths), i.e. “what it is possible to
know about the world” (the WHY?) (Al-Saadi, 2014, p. 1). Such statements are about the nature of reality itself and, by implication, about the researcher’s place and role in the context of his or her research (Crotty as cited in Al-Saadi, 2014, p. 1). The ontological framework attributes epistemological (knowledge/meaning) value to different phenomena/events (the WHAT?). This is how a researcher can decide “what is (or should be) regarded as acceptable knowledge in a discipline” (Bryman, 2008, p. 13). Epistemological gaps occur when there is lack of alignment between the ontology and the explanation of an observed phenomenon.

The present study draws on the principles of a dialogic model of inquiry explicated by Lian (2006, 2012). Lian herself draws on Calhoun’s model (1995), that he developed for the purpose of critical social sciences, and on Latour (2004, 2003, 2010) in the philosophy of science. As illustrated by Lian (2012, p. 2), from the perspective of ontology, a dialogic inquiry resists the temptation to “seek [...] the umpire’s chair” (Calhoun, 1995, p. 11) and the idea that researchers “move simply from false propositions to true ones” (Calhoun, 1995, p. 7), “claim[ing] – like Sherlock Holmes – to be working with “nothing but the facts” (Calhoun, 1995, p. 5). Instead, conscious of its own historicity1, it draws a distinction between the interpretations which guide researchers’ questions and those of his or her informants (who have different stakes than the researcher). The inquiry serves as a tool for the researcher to identify the possibilities as well as the limits of his or her perspectives. A dialogic inquiry therefore neither represents voices nor gives voice; it explores the relevance of its own voice: “You and your informants have different concerns—when they intersect it’s a miracle, and miracles, in case you don’t know, are rare” (Latour, 2003, p. 71).

In terms of epistemology, this self-reflective (critical) process originates in the perception of conflict between the elements that “should be” in order to learn more about “what must be”. Dialogic researchers purposefully seek out conflict by comparing and contrasting widely different phenomena in order to evaluate their impact on what they see or value (Latour, 2004). This process results in the construction of the points “from which positions, or possibilities, become more perceptible” (Hobson 1998, cited in Lian, 2012, pp. 2-3). Lian (2012, p. 3) explains, this process is oriented toward “discovering our limits rather than affirming our possibilities” (Calhoun, 1995, p. 13), i.e. an objective which gives the inquiry

---

1 That is, “its place in a dialogue and among cultures, its irreducibility to facts, and its engagement in the practical world” (Calhoun, 1995, p. 11.)
its critical dimension. A dialogic model literally sets out conditions for dialogue and its research tools and methods create “conversations” between the different data points.

The reflections above are critical for the framing of the present research. A dialogic approach provides the researcher with a conceptual framework enabling it to contextualise the purpose of the study and the methods of data collection and analysis. In accordance with the dialogic premises, the present study approaches the concept of “integration of research and inquiry into ELTE curricula in Indonesia” as its objective, what “must be”, a goal that needs breaking down in order for its different aspects to emerge for the researcher to make sense of higher education contexts, i.e. the different factors that impact on, and interact with, the methods that ELTE academics apply when translating this objective into concrete plans of action in their own teaching contexts.

While Chapter 1 presented the study with a rationale explaining the context of higher education reforms in Indonesia, Chapter 3 will identify the different methods and tools for data collection and analysis that will be used for the researcher to obtain relevant information. A relatively broad range of methods for data collection will be used and a variety of interpretive systems will be applied in order to generate many points that, when compared and contrasted, can provide the researcher with a better understanding of the ELTE context in Indonesia and the values and traditions from the perspective of which ELTE academics respond to the new policies articulated in the new IQF (The Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2012) and the National Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015). The sections below explain the choices made, the reasons behind those choices, and the sequence of events in relation to which the study developed.

### 3.4 Study design and instruments for data collection

This is a case study research (CSR) as it concerns itself with an in-depth analysis of the challenges that ELTE academics experience when integrating research and inquiry into undergraduate ELTE curricula.

#### 3.4.1 A case study approach

A case study (Case Study Website, n.d.) is a research method involving an up-close, in-depth, and detailed examination of a subject of study, as well as its related contextual
conditions. In other words, it is the study of a CASE, not a population, as a way of getting insights into the population in general (Yin, 2009, p. 18). Case study research is not used to determine cause and effect, but to explore and describe a phenomenon. It is assumed that examining the context and related conditions are integral to understanding the case. Typically, case study research is qualitative in nature, describing a behavior or experience. A case study may involve interviewing staff on specific aspects of relevant to a company’s success. For example, Hayes & Lemon (1990, as cited in Hayes 2000, p. 134), in their own case study, illustrated to company directors “how very different employee attitudes were from those that they had expected, ... and highlighting areas about which staff were concerned” which resulted in the development of management systems where employers listen to their employees and take their ideas into account (Banyard, 1994, p. 383). The case study method involves the researcher in collecting data from in “natural settings”, not relying on derived data’, and examining “What is happening or has happened?” or “How or why did something happen?” (Yin, 2012, p. 5). CSR can be descriptive or explanatory. The researcher is encouraged to go beyond the traditional methods of questionnaires and surveys in order to enrich his/her insights on the subject of interest. The researcher collects data, studies the data, analyses the data, and presents and reports the findings. CSR is narrowly focused and provides a high level of detail to result in an in-depth understanding. Some of the questions that a researcher may ask include: (1) focusing on what his/her subjects perceive; (2) framing what they perceive; (3) interpreting what they have done, including how they solve problems (Woodside, 2010, p. 6).

In accordance with the principles of CSR, the present study approached the subject of integrating research and inquiry in ELTE departments in Indonesia as the case, a unit of analysis, that it sought to investigate. The aim was for the study to inquire about the progress that ELTE departments in Indonesia make with the implementation of the new curriculum agenda and how the new policies impact on their development and sustainability. The intention was to acquire an in-depth understanding of the thoughts on the subject, the processes that are being developed and applied in different universities to support new curriculum policies, and the skills that ELETE academics draw on to cope with the change. The aim was to “illustrate” the factors that impact on and interact with the implementation process and to do so from the perspective of tightly, or as tight as possible, developed processes for data collection and analysis to minimise ambiguity. The study adopted an embedded, multiple-case study, where after the initial survey of universities across Indonesia, the
researcher worked with a cohort from three different universities. Initially, the plan was to work with six universities, but this did not eventuate. The details of the challenges that the researcher encountered are described in Chapter 4 as part of the findings. This choice to work with a number of universities enriched the data and enabled the researcher to verify what otherwise could have been only a single institution phenomenon.

In order for the study to be of benefit to all involved, a process needed to be developed that would offer the study participants immediate rewards. Keeping this goal in mind, once the initial questionnaire (Questionnaire 1) was completed and data on the subject of research and inquiry in undergraduate ELTE programs was collected from across Indonesia, the study invited academics teaching in undergraduate ELTE programs in six universities (eventually only three took part in the project) to participate in professional development activities on the subject of research and inquiry. In the course of the study, ELTE lecturers were involved in describing, evaluating, constructing, implementing and re-evaluating conceptual frameworks and strategies that they apply in order to create critical and investigative learning experiences for their own undergraduate ELTE students.

Questionnaires, practical exercises in syllabus design and follow-up interviews were used as data collection methods. At all times, care was taken in order to record the process of developing questionnaires, justifying the questions based on the literature review from Chapter 2, applying methods for data analysis that were transparent and that could be replicated, without hijacking meaning from the future research. The study itself draws on previous case studies conducted at Charles Darwin University examining the curriculum renewal agenda in Australia (Tan, 2016; Hak, 2016). In this way, it contributes to their value on the subject and also to contribute to the sharpening of the instruments for data analysis that were applied each time. The study paid attention to not confuse evidence with interpretation. Evidence was data obtained by organising the data obtained with the help of various methods for data analysis that were applied. Interpretation was developed in the Discussion chapter (Chapter 5), where the researcher interrogated the findings from the perspective of the research questions (Chapter 1).

Data was analysed using three different methods. These were: (1) the architecture of a “job-to-be-done”, an adapted model for data analysis developed by the Harvard Business School (HBS, 2010) and used by its researchers, especially highly acclaimed Professor Clayton
Christenson; (2) a CDU expert to analyse and provide feedback on the syllabi designed by the study participants in the course of the project; and (3) a model for evaluating educational research from the perspective of its innovative value (Lian & Pertiwi, 2017). Once analysed, the findings provided the researcher with detailed insights that were then discussed with a view to identifying gaps that still need closing and successes that have been achieved.

The study extended over a period of eleven months and was divided into four different stages. In that period, different challenges emerged for the researcher and they were met sufficiently for the study to culminate with quality data. Overall, responses to four questionnaires were collected, with the numbers of respondents varying from thirteen to seven. The sections below describe each of the stages in detail, the data collection and analysis processes, and the challenges that the researcher encountered and overcame for the project to continue to its final stages.

3.4.2 Stage 1: Questionnaire 1

In Stage 1 involved development and administration of a questionnaire to just about all, over a hundred, ELTE academics in Indonesia teaching in fifteen (15) universities. The academics were identified from mailing lists of one of the biggest and oldest international conference in Indonesia (TEFLIN International conference) and from the researcher network. Time given to fill out the questionnaire was about 10 weeks; from 15 August 2016 to 30 October 2016. Thirteen academic staff responded to the message, were willing to join the questionnaire, and filled out the questionnaire. The data collected from this initial questionnaire was analysed in October 2016.

The aim of Questionnaire 1 was to collect information about the general understanding of the new curriculum policies, their impact on teaching, research, the lecturers, ELTE departments and their respective universities. In the questions themselves, the concept of integration of research and inquiry was never mentioned. Instead, Questionnaire 1 used the term of graduate competencies, in order to elicit lecturers’ understandings of what the introduction of graduate competencies into the undergraduate degree programs meant to them and if and how they went about the task of integrating graduate competencies into their teaching practices. Findings from Questionnaire 1 informed Stage 2 of the study, when the researcher engaged with ELTE lecturers in professional development activities.
Questionnaire 1 development

Figure 3.1 describes the process of Questionnaire 1 development.

In order for the responses to the questionnaire to provide the study with relevant information covering all kinds of impacts that the study was interested in exploring, the researcher developed questions for Questionnaire 1 by analysing the different dimensions of the Boyer Report (Boyer Commission, 1998, USA) and the Bradley Report (Bradley, Noonan, Nugent, & Scales, 2008), and linking those to the Indonesian policy documents. Table 3.1 illustrates the spread of the themes and subthemes elicited in this process (staff, students, community, implementation of the IQF and the Decree 49 (MOEC, 2014) and its impacts, research culture and undergraduate research). Next, target areas were identified from which questions were to be developed. Initially twenty-five questions were developed that integrated all target areas. Pilot questionnaire (Appendix 1, Table 3.2) was designed for the questions to be tested.

Table 3.1: Initial questionnaire question topics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Target areas for Questionnaire 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff profile</td>
<td></td>
<td>Length of teaching, subjects taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the IQF &amp; the Decree 49</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Feelings, participation in accreditation, description of the IQF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MOEC, 2014)</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Students’ awareness &amp; feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the IQF &amp; the Decree 49</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Academic and non-academic community feelings about the introduction of the IQF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the IQF and the Decree 49 and its impacts</td>
<td>Embedding of the IQF &amp; the Decree 49 into curricula, impacts of the implementation of the IQF &amp; the Decree 49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People doing research in this area</td>
<td>Conceptual understanding (Interpretation and engagement of graduate competencies), Stakeholders (engagement with stakeholders in research, research conducted by stakeholders), Culture/history (accounting for traditional values and how they impact on education; the relevance of change to the communities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaping undergraduate research</td>
<td>Communication skills, dissemination of research findings, approach to support students’ research, collaborative research, final-year thesis support, curriculum renewal agenda, interdisciplinary study, students’ engagement in research, preparation course, students’ involvement in projects of experienced researchers, budgeting for change, ICT, diversity, capstone projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pilot questionnaire was sent to four academic staff working at ELTE departments in Indonesia. Two senior lecturers (Level C), one junior lecturer (Level A), and one experienced lecturer (Level B) agreed to complete the questionnaire and provide comments and suggestions. In response to the obtained feedback, the number of questions was reduced, the wording was changed, while the thematic scope of the questions was maintained (Appendix 1, Table 3.3). Furthermore, the researcher also ensured that Questionnaire 1 was able to elicit responses on the different aspects of the policy implementation process against which the data collected was to be analysed. This process of verifying the suitability of the questions warranted that the questions were informed and that their source was identified. Questionnaire 1 consisted of open-ended questions and was distributed via Survey Monkey®. Open-ended questions are favoured when researchers look for elaborated responses and online questionnaires are seen as a suitable tool for this purpose (Schonlau, Fricker Jr. & Elliott 2002, p. xv). On the other hand, closed-ended responses “fail to uncover
the deep nuances and dynamic interactions between thoughts and actions within and between individuals that occur within […] contexts” (Woodside, 2010, p. 3).

Following the process approved by the CDU Ethics Committee, an anonymous questionnaire was sent to ELTE university departments across Indonesia from the public and private sectors, with both secular and religious missions.

3.4.3 Stage 2: A three-day workshop. Questionnaire 2

In order to generate opportunities for critical reflection on the subject of integration of research and inquiry into ELTE subject curricula, the researcher organised a three-day workshop. To make the study manageable and yet to be mindful of diversity, a sample of six universities was invited from both the public and private sectors. The title of the workshop was, *IQF, Graduate Competencies, and Undergraduate Research & Inquiry in English Language Teacher Education Programs*. Invitation letters on behalf of the Dean of the Faculty of Education and Teacher Training of IAIN Syekh Nurjati Cirebon were sent out to the English Language Teaching (ELT) Departments of invited universities. After some negotiations with different universities and their ELTE departments, it was agreed that lecturers from three different universities would take part in the workshop and would continue with the project through all its stages. The workshop was conducted from 20 to 24 December 2016 with seventeen participants. Three days was the longest it was possible to keep the lecturers away from their daily schedules. Due to some personal issues, only 13 lecturers arrived for the workshop.

To assist the discussions, the participants were given readings on research and inquiry in curricula by Healey and Jenkins (2009) and Healey, Jenkins, and Lea (2014). Examples of unit curricula from Australia, with unit description, unit outcomes and assessment were distributed to assist further reflections. During the workshop days, the participants were invited to:

- Learn about this project, its aims and strategies for data collection and analysis, for investigating the “case” of integrating research and inquiry in ELTE curricula.
- Participate in a lecture, given by the researcher, reviewing international literature concerning the implementation of graduate attributes and its challenges. The discussions that followed focused on the international policy documents, e.g. The Boyer’s Report (Boyer Commission, 1998) and the Bradley Report (Bradley,
Noonan, Nugent, & Scales, 2008), and on the impact of the curriculum renewal agenda on the teaching practices in research universities in Australia gathered especially in a study by Tan (2016) and Oliver (2010), and UK (Healey & Jenkins, 2009). These materials were used as a background for the discussions about Indonesia and its implementation issues. The aim was for ELTE colleagues to

- Build awareness as to the relevance of the new changes in higher education curriculum from the perspective of the needs of Indonesian ELTE programs.
- Explore together and discuss the new IQF (The Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2012) and the New Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015), with a view to better understand what they involve and imply to their practices.
- Discuss the relevance of the findings of Questionnaire 1 to the participants‘ contexts as English language teacher educators and researchers.
- Discuss strategies for improving their own teaching by integrating research and inquiry into subject curricula.
- Identify strategies for future collaboration and discussions regarding research and inquiry.

Each day the participants would review the most important issues and material discussed on the previous day. This would help relate the discussions from the previous day(s) to those that were to ensue.

At the end of the workshop,

- It was agreed that the discussions from the workshop would be extended to the participants‘ home universities to inspire reflection and better implementation of research and inquiry.
- It was agreed that the participants would devise new syllabi (Unit Information) of the subjects they teach with the view to integrating research and inquiry.
- The participants identified questions that they wanted to respond to once the whole project ended. (These questions were utilised in the final stage of the project, the follow-up interviews)

3.4.4 Questionnaire 2

A new questionnaire was distributed among the participants on the last day of the workshop. Evaluation questionnaires are important, because as (Jolles, 2005, p. 261) states, “One of the
biggest problems any training department must take on is the notion from the field that the training department is out of touch with what is really happening within the company. Therefore, we must confront problem one: relevance within a training department”.

While the questions (Appendix 1, Table 3.4) focused on workshop evaluation, they also prompted the participants to elaborate on what they have learned and what their views were on the subject of research and inquiry in ELTE curricula. To this end, the questions of the questionnaire focused what was learned and what still needs to be done. Other areas, although related, included asking for opinions about the workshop and its materials. The participants could include free comments.

All thirteen (13) participants completed Questionnaire 2.

3.4.5 Syllabus design as evidence of learning
Immediately after the workshop, but also weeks and sometimes months after, the workshop participants sent to the researcher redesigned syllabi for analysis and feedback from a CDU expert. The feedback involved a detailed analysis of all aspects of syllabus design and suggestions for change in those aspects. Feedback and analysis focused of the following components:

1. Unit description as an overview or outline of the unit, describing what the unit will teach, how the teaching and learning processes will happen, what are the expected outcomes.
3. Assessment as a tool to evaluate if the learning outcomes have been achieved

Eleven syllabi were received. Only two participants sent their syllabi immediately after the workshop for feedback from a CDU expert. Data from the remaining nine syllabi were included in evaluation.

3.4.6 Questionnaire 3
Since, initially, only two participants sent their syllabi for feedback and analysis, the researcher contacted the lecturers whose syllabi were still missing, and they explained they
had no clear direction. To help the participants cope with the task, after the workshop, the researcher visited them at their universities. Discussions and sharing were conducted to generate learning and reflection activities. During the process of the syllabus development, the researcher visited each university participating in the study, every two weeks, to provide assistance with questions and materials that were utilised during the workshop, as well as with feedback examples given on the two syllabi that were submitted on time. One to one discussions or group discussions were conducted where the participants shared their syllabus, received and discussed feedback from the researcher or other participants, and negotiated how to improve their planning. It needs to be added that each of these meetings is an extra burden on the lectures’ time and the researcher tried to make the meetings pleasant, including buying food to create a warm atmosphere.

Questionnaire 3 (Appendix 1, Table 3.5) was designed to capture the challenges that the lecturers experienced when dealing with the task of redesigning their units in ways that include research and inquiry. The questions were developed based on the important elements of syllabi. Nation and Macalister (2010, p. 11) identify seven steps in developing curricula. They involve (i) examining the environment; (ii) assessing the needs; (iii) deciding on principles; (iv) setting goals and choose and sequence content; (v) designing the lesson format; (vi) including assessment procedures, and (vii) evaluating the course. Questionnaire 3 sought to identify the participants’ thinking processes as they struggled with the task at hand.

This questionnaire was distributed online. From the 13 participants who were to return the syllabi, only even participants responded to Questionnaire 3.

3.4.7 Questionnaire 4

Once the syllabi were completed, new units were taught and the teaching semester ended, Questionnaire 4 was designed to review what the project participants have accomplished so far in relation to the integration of research and inquiry into their own unit curricula. In July 2017, Questionnaire 4 (Appendix 1, Table 3.6) was distributed online and targeted all elements of syllabus design. The aim was for the questions to be clear in intent while also encouraging elaborate responses, describing processes or reasons for the choices that academics were making.
Ten participants completed Questionnaire 4

3.4.8 Follow-up interviews

Follow-up interviews were conducted in order to shed additional light on responses to Questionnaire 4 and the syllabi analysed at an earlier stage. The interviews enabled the participants to talk freely about their experiences in the project. It was important to obtain “live” reflections from the participants in a relaxed manner and, for the first time, in Indonesian. It is not clear if using the first language made the discussion easier, but the participants could switch the languages, as needed. The follow-up interviews were conducted face-to-face and via phone to respect the participants’ confidentiality. To guide the discussion, the following features of good interview questions were used (Tracy, 2013, p. 144-145):

- They are simple and clear, […] not double barreled but rather inquire about one thing at a time, […] promote answers that are open-ended and complex, […] are straightforward, neutral, and non-leading, […] uphold rather than threaten the interviewees’ preferred identity, and […] are accompanied by appropriate follow-ups and probes.

Data from six interviews was transcribed and analysed. A sample of the six interviews selected for transcribing had the most elaborated responses. The data from the interview was transcribed using “semi transcription” technique (Edmonds & Kennedy, 2017, p. 323), where the transcription does not provide full description of the interviewees’ words. Instead, main ideas of the respondents’ answers to the questions given were transcribed. The purpose in doing this is to make sure that the respondents’ answers are more readable. Grammatical errors and word misuses from the participants’ talks can be minimised through this technique as the interviewer (researcher) can provide the main ideas of the talk for he understands better the context of the content of talks and interviews. Bias was reduced by listening to the interview several times and recheck of the transcription whether it has been correct.

The questions in the follow-up interviews were designed at the end of the three-day workshop by the participants and were identified as relevant to them. During the workshop, the participants decided to brainstorm ideas about what they would like to report on at the end of the project, and listed issues that they felt needed addressing in the current and future studies. Having done this, the lecturers turned the list into questions and revised them to eliminate repetitions and to agree on the final look. Appendix 1, Table 3.7 illustrates the
choices that were made. The questions served as trigger points for a deeper discussion during the interviews.

The interviews were conducted one by one, either face to face or via telephone call (one participant). Twelve participants were willing to be interviewed.

3.5 Data analysis

The next step was data analysis, “using the reassembled material to create a new narrative” (Yin, 2011, p. 178). Content analysis was used to see patterns in the data from questionnaires, interviews, and syllabus designs. Content analysis was chosen to “identify patterns, themes, assumptions, and meanings” (Lune & Berg, 2017, p. 182). Lune & Berg (2017, p. 84) highlight the process of qualitative data analysis as follows:

a) Data is collected and made into text or otherwise organized to be “read” (e.g., field notes, transcripts, image sequences, news reports). The same applies to visual materials, such as photographs, drawings, cartoons, cartoon strips and graphic novels, film, or architecture.

b) Codes are analytically developed and/or inductively identified in the data and affixed to sets of notes or transcript pages. R stands for Respondent, followed by the number, e.g. R1 refers to Respondent number 1, R2 refers to Respondent number 2, and so on.

c) Codes are transformed into categorical labels or themes. Lecturers’ ranks are added for respondent information in Questionnaire 1 and Questionnaire 4. Senior lecturers are labelled with Level B, C, and D, while junior lecturers are labelled with Level A.

d) Materials are sorted by these categories, identifying similar phrases, patterns, relationships, and commonalities or disparities.

e) Sorted materials are examined to isolate meaningful patterns and processes.

f) Identified patterns are considered in light of previous research and theories, and a small set of generalizations is established.

3.5.1 Questionnaire analysis

Two methods for questionnaire data analysis were used: the architecture of a “job-to-be-done” model (Christensen, 1997; 2010; Christensen, Hall, Dillon & Duncan, 2016; Weise & Christenson, 2014) and thematic analysis.
3.5.1.1 “Job-to-be-done”

Professor Clayton Christensen is credited with developing the “job-to-be-done” to better understand what jobs there are to be done that companies could target to stimulate their growth (Christensen, 1997; Christensen et al, 2016). The concept is very well suited to CSR as its method is designed to investigate phenomena, rather than examining variables whose connections to any events may be only statistical. The general assumption of Christensen is that “jobs exist” and understanding “the job to be done” enables companies to know their purpose better (Christensen et al, 2016, p. 37):

Each company will have to understand the Job to Be Done in all its rich complexity. Then they’ll have to consider and shape their offerings around the experiences that consumers will seek in solving their jobs—and help them surmount any roadblocks that get in their way of making progress. Competitive advantage will be granted to whoever understands and best solves the job.

Christensen et al’s (2016) research was based on the observation that companies which were widely regarded as successful over time lost their share of the market or completely disappeared. His conclusion was that it is not understanding of the customer that is the fundamental unit of analysis in understanding and planning for success. Instead, it is what he calls the “job to be done”, i.e. the purpose of the company. In his view (Christensen, 2012), once the “job to be done” is clear [what it involves], the company can begin to make decisions regarding all the experiences in purchasing and using the product that will need to be provided “so that they will sum up to nailing the job perfectly”: if we understand experiences that we need to provide that then tells us what we need to integrate and how we need to integrate it so that we can provide the experiences to get the job done perfectly. Measuring is important and knowing what to measure cannot be left to chance, “What gets measured, gets done … but data also creates a model of the external world” and, it turns out, “in the modern world, there’s so much you can easily measure” (Christensen et al, 2016, p. 148)

Christensen et al (2016) developed the framework for “job-to-be-done” analysis while drawing on the experiences of companies which, like Sony or mini mills, were able to embrace emerging technologies, but not in order to do the same things differently. Instead, they used new technology to create new experiences, new needs and desires, and, in this sense, new markets and new customers. Christensen et al also make a comparison with the iPhone which allowed Apple to grow at the time when economic growth was stunted, with iPhone being able to facilitate experiences for a market which, in his view, was not there yet.
The idea apparently is not new. Already argued in 1959 by Ted Levitt from the Harvard Business School, who advocated that the job of business is not to make products or services, but to “create and keep a customer” (Christensen, Eyring & Gunther, 1986, p. 216). In terms of the notion of “the job to be done”, Levitt’s principle can be translated as follows: “People don’t want a quarter-inch drill, they want a quarter-inch hole” (Weise & Christensen, 2014, p. 9; Christensen et al, 1986, p. 216). In other words, people do not want a product, they want an experience or an outcome (Christensen et al, 1986, p. 216). In Christensen’s et all (2016, p. 129), too many companies identify themselves in terms of their product, not job: “Even in some of the best companies, the Job to Be Done that brought them success in the first place can somehow get lost in the shuffle of running and growing the business. They define themselves in terms of products, not jobs. And that makes a very big difference”.

In terms of the present study, a similar question may be asked: The policies are in place but what is the job that needs to be done for the systems that the Indonesian government has put in place to generate the desired “product”? In other words, what is the job that needs to be done for the new policies to be both meaningful to, and enacted by, those who implement them?

In order for this question to be addressed, it was necessary to break down the “job” of research and inquiry skills into its many components for its many dimensions to reveal themselves and to relate them to the various themes and subthemes that a thematic analysis would help identify. To this end, the data from each questionnaire were organised in relation to each of the three levels of the architecture of a “job-to-be-done” (Weise & Christenson, 2014, p. 9; Christensen et al, 2016, p. 129). As defined by Christensen (2010), the questions interrogating the different dimensions of the “job” are:

i. What is the fundamental job or problem the customer is facing? (political, functional, emotional and social)

ii. What are the experiences in purchase and use which, if all provided, would sum up to nailing the job perfectly?

iii. What are the product attributes, technologies, features that are needed to provide these experiences?

Christensen et al (2016) explain:
The foundation of our thinking is the Theory of Jobs to Be Done, which focuses on deeply understanding your customers’ struggle for progress and then creating the right solution and attendant set of experiences to ensure you solve your customers’ jobs well, every time.

The model as presented by Christensen et al (2016, p. 148) makes it evident that learning about the “job-to-be-done” does not translate into “a single piece of data”, hence the three-step method of analysis. It is necessary to measure whether a system is “providing the experiences in purchase and use” that customers (here, higher education stakeholders) are seeking in “hiring” higher education institutions:

When we buy a product, we essentially “hire” something to get a job done. If it does the job well, when we are confronted with the same job, we hire that same product again. And if the product does a crummy job, we “fire” it and look around for something else we might hire to solve the problem.

Christensen et al, 2016, p. 8

In the context of this study, these questions from the three-step method of analysis were modified as follows:

i. “What does the job of integrating research and inquiry skills into ELTE curricula involve?”;

ii. “What experiences need to be provided for the job of integrating research and inquiry skills into ELTE curricula to be done?”; and

iii. “What has been achieved in the area of your responsibility?”.

When combined with thematic analysis, as applied in this study, the three questions made it possible to capture a range of issues that impact on new policy comprehension and its implementation and map them out around the concept of the “job-to-be-done”.

3.5.1.2 Thematic analysis

The thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 78) involved “identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data”. The process includes the following steps (adapted from Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 87):

(a) Familiarising with data: Transcribing data, reading and re-reading the data, noting down initial ideas.

(b) Generating initial codes: Coding interesting features of the data in a systematic fashion across the entire data set, collating data relevant to each code.

(c) Searching for themes: Collating codes into potential themes, gathering all data relevant to each potential theme.
(d) Reviewing themes: Checking if the themes work in relation to the coded extracts (Level 1) and the entire data set (Level 2), generating a thematic ‘map’ of the analysis.

(e) Defining and naming themes: Ongoing analysis to refine the specifics of each theme, and the overall story the analysis tells, generating clear definitions and names for each theme.

(f) Producing the report: The final opportunity for analysis. Selection of vivid, compelling extract examples, final analysis of selected extracts, relating back of the analysis to the research question and literature, producing a scholarly report of the analysis.

Thematic analysis is “not a linear process of simply moving from one phase to the next. Instead, it is more recursive process, where movement is back and forth as needed, throughout the phases” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 86). Thematic analysis enables the researcher to organise information as neatly as the data permits, into categories that together share a framework that renders the patterns meaningful.

The patterns detected in the data in each questionnaire were compared with those identified in the previous studies on the issue of curriculum renewal agenda by Hak (2016) and Tan (2016) The vocabulary identifying the themes within each question was cross-checked with that used by Hak (2016) and Tan (2016). This facilitate triangulation of the data with the findings obtained in Australia.

Table 3.8 illustrates the themes, based on Tan’s (2016) and Hak’s (2016) studies that were utilised in this research. Seven themes identified in the current study were drawn from Tan (2016) and compared with Hak’s (2016) study to ensure alignment. The first theme, **Global Relevance** (external scoping in Tan, 2016, p. 46, 85), includes data relating the impacts of new policies to international contexts. The theme, **National Relevance**, includes data relating the impacts of new policies to the national context. In Tan (2016, p. 44), this theme belongs also to external scoping as he used internal scoping to refer to the context of a specific university only. The third theme, **Course and Unit Design** (Tan, 2016, p. 94), includes data relating the impacts of new policies on course and unit design. The fourth theme, **Pedagogy** (Tan, 2016, p. 92), includes data on learning activities that integrated the new policies. The fifth theme, **Stakeholders’ Awareness** (Tan, 2016, p. 96), addresses the
importance of accountability of pedagogic design to the stakeholder community. The sixth theme, *University Funding, Workload and Support*, addresses investment in and recognition of the need for professional development. Finally, the seventh theme, *Personal Research*, interrogates the links between lecturers’ ELTE research and the new higher education curriculum policies. Of course, the researcher was open to new themes, if the need emerged. However, all data in the study fitted the same theme categories. Within each of these themes, subthemes were developed. The researcher used Tan’s (2016) and Hak’s (2016) studies as a guide. There was a close match between the present study and Tan’s study. Nonetheless, new subthemes were also established. Table 4.1 in Chapter 4 lists all themes and subthemes.

For each of the three questions of analysis based on Christensen’s (1997) model of the job-to-be-done”, e.g. “What is involved …?”, a separate thematic analysis was conducted. So, each of the questions of analysis has its own thematic analysis, reflecting the data that was found that relates to the question of analysis and a specific theme and subtheme.

Table 3.8: Themes development based on Tan (2016) and Hak (2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Tan (2016)</th>
<th>(Hak, 2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Relevance</td>
<td>External scoping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Relevance</td>
<td>Internal scoping (only addressing a specific university)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and Unit Design</td>
<td>Curriculum design and assessment</td>
<td>Identifying &amp; teaching relevant skills and attributes, Quality assurance processes relating to course currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Innovation and best practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders awareness</td>
<td>Stakeholders accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Funding, Workload and Support</td>
<td>Setting up relevant support &amp; infrastructure</td>
<td>Resources and finance; Integrating work experience, Teaching workload; the need of support for balancing academic, administrative, and professional identities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Research</td>
<td>Need for integration of research into QA in regards harmonising research and teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5.2 Syllabus analysis

The syllabus components (unit description, learning outcomes, and assessments) frame the syllabus planning, they are process, content, and product goals (O’Brien, Millis, & Cohen, 2008, p. 16). In the syllabus, how a unit will be run and how it relates to the professional development of students is described in unit description. The skills, concepts and methods of learning should be reflected in the learning outcomes. Product goals are measured in assessments.

A CDU expert was engaged in order to assist with the syllabi analysis. The expert offered detailed feedback on the syllabi that were sent on time, just after the workshop. This feedback involved suggestions for each aspect of Unit Information. No feedback was offered for weekly activities as the initial aspects, such as learning outcomes, unit description and assessment tasks needed to be agreed upon first.

The CDU expert evaluated all eleven (11) syllabi by addressing the following aspects of design

**Problem posing** – A clearly stated purpose of the unit that is contextualised in relation to the broader goals of the unit.

**Intellectual context of the unit** – Specific concepts or approaches identified to be investigated by the students.

**Method of study** – Activities that result in investigative learning experiences.

**Outcomes** – Learning outcomes drawn from policies and related to the purpose of the unit.

**Long-term benefits** – Benefits to the students and the values and goals in relation to which they construct themselves as future teachers.

3.5.3 Follow-up interviews' analysis

Data from the follow-up interviews were analysed using the model developed by Lian and Pertiwi (2017) designed to analyse critically education research. In a nutshell, this method of analysis applied seeks to identify the processes, or the lack of thereof, that the lecturers showed to rely on when designing each stage of their new units. The aim is to establish how the lecturers construct the process of research and inquiry when integrating it into their units. This is a very different process of analysis than simply using thematic methods. The analysis still organised data into themes and subthemes but the categories against which the themes
were related were the six questions of analysis proposed by Lian and Pertiwi. For each question, it was possible to have data addressing all themes. However, this has not happened.

Table 3.9 illustrates the original questions posed by Lian and Pertiwi (2017) and developed by analysing studies critical of education research (e.g. Thomas, 2007; Thomas, G. & Pring, R. (2004) and how they were adapted for the purpose of this study.

Table 3.9: Follow-up interviews method of analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lian and Pertiwi (2017)</th>
<th>Present study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. The object of study: What new perspectives were engaged to describe the object of study?</td>
<td>Framing the object of study: How were research and inquiry utilised for students to identify and understand the key concepts of units? (i.e. what is important for the students to learn about or understand?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. The method of study: What new understandings were identified to devise the method of investigation?</td>
<td>The method of study How were research and inquiry utilised for students to understand how to work with the key concepts of the units? (i.e. how are the students to learn?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. The beneficiaries of the study: Who was the beneficiary of the study? What new understandings of the research participants’ contexts were engaged and how were they impacted by the study?</td>
<td>The beneficiaries of the study How were research and inquiry utilised for students to understand their benefits to their personal and professional goals? (i.e. for whose benefit?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. The critical perspective: How was the world integrated into the study?</td>
<td>The critical perspective Did the lectures approach the job of integrating research and inquiry critically?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. The political perspective: How were the policies integrated into the study?</td>
<td>The global and local context How did the global and local policy context inform the implementation of research and inquiry?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. The generative perspective: What new forms of practice emerged as a result of the new ways of theorising?</td>
<td>The generative perspective What new practices were conceptualised for integrating research and inquiry as a result of the project?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.4 Drawing conclusions

The conclusions were drawn in relation to research questions by interrogating the findings that emerged following each stage of research.
3.6 Ethical considerations

The study complies with the ethics processes approved by the Ethics Committee of Charles Darwin University. The study engaged tertiary adult teachers. All data have been collected and stored according to the confidentiality processes approved by Charles Darwin University. The questionnaires and the interviews did not ask for personal information. Any information that might indicate the identities of the participants was removed from any documents publishing the data and the findings. No references to any specific institution involved in the study were made.
Chapter 4: Findings

4.1 Introduction

Chapter 4 includes the findings gathered in the course of the study to capture the impacts of the study on the participating Indonesian ELTE lecturers. The findings focus on the challenges that ELTE lecturers experience when integrating research and inquiry into their teaching and how these challenges change as the study progresses. The chapter consists of the following five sections.

First, the findings from Questionnaire 1 are presented. The questionnaire was sent out to one hundred ELTE academics teaching across Indonesia with a view to learning about their experiences with integrating research and inquiry skills into undergraduate units. The data were analysed using questions adapted from the architecture of a “job-to-be-done” model developed by the Harvard Business School (HBS, 2010). The categories of analysis helped displayed the concerns that academics take into consideration when designing new curricula based on the New Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015) and the new IQF (The Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2012).

Next, Questionnaire 2 illustrates findings from a three-day workshop organised to discuss Questionnaire 1 findings and research on integrating research and inquiry skills with ELTE lecturers. The data from thirteen participants captures their views on what they learned in the course of the workshop and its value to them as teacher educators. Once again, the data are presented using questions adapted from the architecture of a “job-to-be-done” model (HBS, 2010). The findings from Questionnaire 1 and 2 are compared in order to reflect any changes that the workshop may have helped generate.

Questionnaire 3 findings follow and are based on the third stage of the study, which involved a group of seven volunteering ELTE academics in developing their own unit designs for teaching. Lecturers felt challenged by this task and Questionnaire 3 was designed in order to identify aspects of design that they found difficult to address.

Next, examples of two newly designed syllabi, sent to the researcher for comments from a CDU expert, are presented; comments from a CDU expert are included. The critique offered
by a CDU expert is discussed in view of the findings from Questionnaire 3 using the criteria of unit design applied by the CDU expert. It is important to compare these data in order to better understand the different cultures in which ELTE academics operate and the different elements that they focus on when integrating research and inquiry into their teaching plans.

Subsequently, Questionnaire 4 data are analysed and the findings compared with those from Questionnaire 1. Questionnaire 4 was designed to capture views of ELTE lecturers, who participated in the study, on how much they learned in the course of the project. Once again, the data are presented using questions adapted from the architecture of a “job-to-be-done” model (HBS, 2010). This model of analysis enables the study to illustrate the range of conceptual issues that lecturers addressed and compare it with the range covered in Questionnaire 1 in order to examine if any progress was done when compared with data from across Indonesia.

Finally, the data from follow-up interviews are presented enabling the participants to contribute further information on the value of the project to their professional learning. This time, the data are analysed using Lian and Pertiwi (2017) criteria for evaluating research in education. The aim of the analysis is to identify the processes that ELTE lecturers applied when integrating research and inquiry into their new units in order to achieve learning outcomes that comply with the New Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015) and the IQF (The Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2012). The findings are compared with the thinking reflected in the two syllabi that were examined earlier. The data from the follow-up interviews is compared with the findings from Questionnaire 4 in order to illustrate patterns in achievements and challenges that still need addressing. The chapter concludes with a summary of all findings.

4.2 Questionnaire 1: Research and inquiry in ELTE in Indonesia

This section presents findings from the initial questionnaire administered to ELTE academics teaching across Indonesia. The questionnaire sought to understand better the issues that academics identify as relevant to the process of the integration of the learning outcomes that specifically target research and inquiry skills that are the key change in the new curriculum policies.
The questionnaire was sent out to one hundred ELTE academics teaching across Indonesia. The response to Questionnaire 1 was low, only thirteen ELTE lecturers responded. The invitation was sent twice, on 29 August and 20 September 2016. This pattern of low interest continued throughout the study. Not one respondent to Questionnaire 1 volunteered to be involved in the next stage of the study (a three-day workshop).

4.2.1 Themes and subthemes

Table 4.1 illustrates all themes and subthemes identified in the data collected throughout all the stages of research. The themes were appropriated from the previous studies (Hak, 2016; Tan, 2016) investigating the impacts of the curriculum renewal agenda on higher education. No new themes were added.

Table 4.1: Themes and subthemes of the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Global Relevance: Illustrating the relevance of research and inquiry to global contexts and research agenda | • International reputation  
• International standardisation  
• Expanding professional networks  
• Standardisation and employability  
• International degree recognition  
• Challenge: Implementation issues |
| National Relevance: Illustrating the relevance of research and inquiry to national contexts and research agenda | • Degree quality and student quality  
• Degree quality & employability  
• Challenge: Implementation issues |
| Course and Unit Design: Illustrating the relevance of research and inquiry to the degree structure and students’ professional learning goals | • Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and the IQF  
• Content-based approach to unit design  
• Building connections between the unit components  
• Program evaluation  
• Linking assessment with learning outcomes  
• Content-oriented assessment goals  
• Competence oriented assessment goals  
• Content-oriented assessment activity  
• Competence-oriented assessment activity  
• Diversifying assessment activities  
• Challenge: Degree quality and student quality  
• Challenge: Difficulty in building connections between the unit components  
• Challenge: A need to improve degree design  
• Challenge: Program evaluation |
| Pedagogy: Research and inquiry in learning activities                | • Planning teaching  
• Teacher’s role  
• Teaching R&I skills |
| Stakeholders Awareness: Understanding the relevance of research and inquiry to the professional community | • Raising students’ awareness  
• Raising lecturers’ awareness  
• Challenges: Change is not popular  
• Neglect to raise students’ awareness  
• Accounting of the schools’ culture  
• Accounting of the university departmental culture  
• Neglecting departmental culture  
• Accounting for the needs of stakeholders |
| University Funding, Workload and Support: Investment in and recognition of the need for professional development | • Understanding the process of learning R&I skills  
• Funding research in QA  
• Administrative support  
• Shared learning  
• Challenge: Time for capacity-development  
• Challenge: Conceptual, workload and PD funding  
• Challenge: Need for research in QA  
• Challenge: No capacity building/Insufficient administrative support  
• Challenge: Too much emphasis on QA and not enough support for research  
• Challenge: Excessive workload |
| Personal Research: Linking one’s own ELTE research with the new higher education curriculum renewal agenda | • Research addressing R&I in higher learning  
• Challenge: Disregarding graduate competencies and research skills |

### 4.2.2 General data distribution

Table 4.2 illustrates the general distribution of all responses to Questionnaire 1 in relation to all themes and subthemes. Thirteen (13) academics responded to the questionnaire, eight (8) senior academics (equivalent to Level B, C, and D.) and five (5) junior academics (equivalent to Level A). The academics identified their rank in the questionnaire.

Figure 4.1 offers a graphic representation of all responses in relation to themes and seniority of the participating academics. In Figure 4.1, R stands for Respondent. Senior Academics are identified as R1, R5, R6, R7, R8, R9, R11, R13. Junior Academics are R2, R3, R4, R10, R12.
Table 4.2: Questionnaire 1: Distribution of responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Total comments/theme</th>
<th>% comments/all comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Relevance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Relevance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and Syllabus Design</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders' Awareness</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Funding, Workload and Support</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Research</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total comments</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, Figure 4.1 shows that, on average, all academics addressed only some of the themes and two Junior Academics addressed the greatest number of themes. The following list represents the number of themes addressed by each respondent (R): Senior Academics R1 (1), R5 (2), R6 (4), R7 (4), R8 (4), R9 (3), R11 (4), R13 (3); Junior Academics: R2 (1), R3 (1), R4 (5), R10 (4), R12 (3).

Figure 4.1: Questionnaire 1: General distribution of all responses, across all respondents and themes.
4.2.3 Data presentation

The data from Questionnaire 1 are organised in relation to each of the three levels of the architecture of a “job-to-be-done” adapted from the Harvard Business School (HBS, 2010). These included the questions: (a) “What does the job of integrating research and inquiry skills into ELTE curricula involve?”; (b) “What experiences need to be provided for the job of integrating research and inquiry skills into ELTE curricula to be done?”; and (c) “What has been achieved in the area of your responsibility?”. The findings from Questionnaire 1 are presented for each of these questions of analysis.

The data reflects respondents’ beliefs. Where the respondents expressed a need for change in relation to specific issues, these opinions are tagged as “challenges”.

4.2.4 Question 1: What does the job of integrating research and inquiry skills into ELTE curricula involve?

Table 4.3 illustrates themes and subthemes identified by senior and junior academics in relation to this question. The responses of the participants addressed only four out of seven themes, Global Relevance, National Relevance, Course and Unit Design and Stakeholder’s Awareness. For each theme, the following subthemes were addressed: (a) Global Relevance (Subthemes: International reputation; International standardisation; Standardisation and employability; International degree recognition); (b) National Relevance (Subtheme: Degree quality and student quality), (c) Course and Unit Design (Subtheme: Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and the IQF); (d) Pedagogy (Subthemes: Planning teaching); and (e) Stakeholders’ Awareness (Subthemes: Raising students’ awareness). Appendix 2 includes detailed responses for each of the themes and subthemes.

Table 4.3 shows that senior academics, i.e. those with a higher academic rank, identified a greater range of themes than their junior counterparts. Furthermore, senior academics listed a greater range of issues for each of the themes. For example, in the theme of Global Relevance, senior academics identified issues such as International Reputation, International Standardisation, Standardisation and Employability, and Course Equivalency. On the other hand, junior academics focused on one issue only, i.e. International Standardisation.
Table 4.3: Questionnaire 1: Distribution of responses to Question 1 by academic rank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subthemes Senior Academics</th>
<th>Subthemes Junior Academics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Relevance</td>
<td>International reputation; Standardisation and employability</td>
<td>International standardisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 comments altogether</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Relevance</td>
<td>Degree quality and student quality</td>
<td>Degree quality and student quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 comments altogether</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and Unit Design</td>
<td>Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and IQF</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 comments altogether</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Planning teaching</td>
<td>Planning teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 comments altogether</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders Awareness</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>Raising students’ awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 comment altogether</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Funding, Workload and Support</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Research</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When compared with Table 4.1, it is evident that the range of sub-themes covered is rather poor across all themes.

Table 4.4 illustrates examples of responses for each theme and subtheme (Appendix 2).

4.2.5 Question 2: What experiences need to be provided for the job of integrating research and inquiry skills into ELTE curricula to be done?

Table 4.5 illustrates themes and subthemes identified by senior and junior academics in relation to Question 2. Once again, senior academics identified a greater range of themes and subthemes involved in the integration of research and inquiry.

When compared with Table 4.1, it is evident that the range of sub-themes covered is rather poor across all themes.

Table 4.6 compares data from Question 1 with that from Question 2. Ideally, it is expected that all themes and subthemes addressed in Question 1 would emerge also in Question 2. This is not the case. Instead, in Question 2, Stakeholders’ Awareness is no longer mentioned, and the theme of University Funding, Workload and Support was introduced. In addition, in Question 2, the subthemes of Global Relevance are fewer than in Question 1, while in other themes the number of subthemes got increased. For example, Course and
Unit Design includes Program evaluation, Challenge: A need to improve degree design; Pedagogy has Planning teaching and Teacher’s role; and the theme of University Funding, Workload and Support mentions challenges such as: Need for research in Quality Assurance and No capacity building/Insufficient administrative support.

Table 4.5: Questionnaire 1, Question 2: Distribution of responses by academic rank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subthemes Senior Academics</th>
<th>Subthemes Junior Academics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Relevance</td>
<td>International reputation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 comments altogether</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National relevance</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>Degree quality and student quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 comment altogether</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and Unit Design</td>
<td>Challenge: A need to improve degree design</td>
<td>Program evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 comments altogether</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Planning teaching</td>
<td>Teacher’s role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 comments altogether</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders awareness</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Funding, Workload and Support</td>
<td>Challenge: Need for research in QA; Challenge: No capacity/Insufficient administrative support</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 comments altogether</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Research</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is worth noting that neither senior nor junior academics make mention of personal research and its role in informing the quality of their teaching.

Table 4.6: Questionnaire 1: Comparing responses from Question 1 with Question 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1: What is involved?</th>
<th>Q2: What needs to be provided?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Global Relevance Subthemes:</td>
<td>(a) Global Relevance Subtheme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• International reputation,</td>
<td>• International reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• International standardisation,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Standardisation and employability, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• International degree recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) National relevance Subtheme:</td>
<td>(b) National relevance Subtheme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Degree quality and student quality</td>
<td>• Degree quality and student quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Course and Unit Design Subtheme:</td>
<td>(c) Course and Unit Design Subtheme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and IQF</td>
<td>• Program evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Challenge: A need to improve degree design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(d) Pedagogy
Subtheme:  
• Planning teaching

(d) Pedagogy
Subthemes:  
• Planning teaching  
• Teacher’s role

(e) Stakeholders’ Awareness
Subthemes:  
• Raising Students’ Awareness

(e) University Funding, Workload and Support
Subthemes:  
• Challenge: Need for research in QA  
• Challenge: No capacity building/Insufficient administrative support

(f) Personal Research
No comments

Table 4.7 lists examples of respondents’ comments (Appendix 2).

4.2.6 Question 3: What has been achieved/done in your area of responsibility?
Table 4.8 illustrates themes and subthemes identified by senior and junior academics in relation to Question 3. Six out of seven themes were addressed. National Relevance was no longer mentioned, and the theme of Personal Research was introduced. Appendix 2 includes detailed responses for each of the themes. Once again, senior academics identified a higher number of subthemes.

The responses of the participants were organised into six (6) themes: (a) **Global Relevance** (Subtheme: *International reputation*), (b) **Course and Unit Design** (Subtheme: *Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and the IQF, Program evaluation*), (c) **Pedagogy** (Subthemes: *Planning teaching, Challenge: Lack of understanding how R&I work*), (d) **Stakeholders Awareness** (Subthemes: *Raising students’ awareness, Challenges: Change is not popular; Neglect to raise students’ awareness*), (e) **University Funding, Workload and Support** (Subthemes: *Funding research in QA; Administrative support; Challenges: Conceptual, workload and PD funding; Time for capacity-development; No capacity building/Insufficient administrative support; Excessive workload*), and (f) **Personal Research** (Subthemes: *Research addressing R&I in higher learning; Challenge: Disregarding graduate competencies and research skills*).
When compared with Table 4.1, it is evident that the range of sub-themes covered is rather poor across all themes.

Table 4.8: Questionnaire 1, Question 3: Distribution of responses by academic rank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subthemes Senior Academics</th>
<th>Subthemes Junior Academics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Relevance</td>
<td>1 comment altogether</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td>International reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and Unit Design</td>
<td>4 comments altogether</td>
<td>Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and the IQF; Program evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>3 comments altogether</td>
<td>Planning teaching; Challenge: Lack of understanding how R&amp;I work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders awareness</td>
<td>8 comments altogether</td>
<td>Raising students’ awareness; Challenge: Change is not popular; Neglect to raise students’ awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Funding, Workload</td>
<td>10 comments altogether</td>
<td>Administrative support; Challenges: Conceptual, workload and PD funding; Challenge: No capacity building/Insufficient administrative support; Challenge: Excessive workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding research in QA; Administrative support; Challenge: Time for capacity-development; Challenge: No capacity building/Insufficient administrative support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Research</td>
<td>15 comments altogether</td>
<td>Challenge: Disregarding graduate competencies and research skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Challenge: Disregarding graduate competencies and research skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 illustrates examples of responses for each theme and subtheme to Question 3 on Questionnaire 1. Table 4.9 shows that the majority of responses focused on the themes of Stakeholders’ Awareness and University Funding, Workload and Support (Appendix 2).

4.2.7 Summary of Questionnaire 1 findings

Figure 4.2 compares all responses in Questionnaire 1 by theme and number.

Table 4.10 compares all the themes and subthemes in respect to each other for Questions 1, 2 and 3. When examined in conjunction with Figure 4.2, Table 4.10 reflects the following pattern:
• The participants’ comments address mainly the role of University Funding, Workload, and Support. This impact is mostly visible as “Challenge”, indicating that the respondents felt left alone to their own devices to “fix” the problem of addressing the new standards and the IQF requirements.

• The issue of drawing on Personal Research, when implementing the new policies, comes second. This finding is slightly skewed by the fact that the researcher included a question about research areas of academics in Questionnaire 1, hence everyone responded. However, the data shows that ELTE academics do not explicitly identify integrating research and inquiry skills as one of the key foci of their own research.

![Figure 4.2: Questionnaire 1: All responses compared by theme and number.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>What is involved?</th>
<th>What experiences need to be provided?</th>
<th>What was achieved?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global relevance</td>
<td>International Reputations</td>
<td>International reputation</td>
<td>International reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 sub-themes (Table 4.1)</td>
<td>International Standardisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standardisation and Employability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International degree recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Relevance</td>
<td>Degree quality and student quality</td>
<td>Degree quality and student quality</td>
<td>Degree quality and student quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and Unit Design</td>
<td>Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and the IQF</td>
<td>Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and the IQF</td>
<td>Program evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Planning teaching</td>
<td>Planning teaching</td>
<td>Planning teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Teacher’s role</td>
<td>Challenge: A need to improve degree design</td>
<td>Program evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders’ Awareness</td>
<td>Raising students’ awareness</td>
<td>Raising students’ awareness</td>
<td>Neglect to raise students’ awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders’ Awareness</td>
<td>Challenge: Change is not popular</td>
<td>Challenge: Lack of understanding how R&amp;I work</td>
<td>Challenge: Change: Lack of understanding how R&amp;I work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Funding, Workload, and Support</td>
<td>Funding research in QA</td>
<td>Shared learning</td>
<td>Challenge: No capacity building/Insufficient administrative support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Funding, Workload, and Support</td>
<td>Administrative support</td>
<td>Challenge: No capacity building/Insufficient administrative support</td>
<td>Challenge: No capacity building/Insufficient administrative support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Funding, Workload, and Support</td>
<td>Challenge: Excessive workload</td>
<td>Challenge: Need for research in QA</td>
<td>Challenge: Need for research in QA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Research</td>
<td>Challenge: Disregarding graduate competencies and research skills</td>
<td>Challenge: Disregarding graduate competencies and research skills</td>
<td>Challenge: Disregarding graduate competencies and research skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.3 Questionnaire 2: Workshop evaluations**

Due to the low response to Questionnaire 1 and the fact that no one volunteered to participate in the study, in order to interest ELTE participants in a three-day workshop and the remaining stages of the project, the researcher visited six universities that offer ELTE programs from
five different cities. These universities belong to the type of higher learning instructions that Soejatminah (2011) described as traditionally serving local regional communities. The project was discussed with the departmental heads and, while everyone saw the benefits of the project to the participants, reaching agreement was not easy, with many lecturers being reluctant to participate despite the support of their Heads of Department, who personally encouraged the lecturers by sending out information about the project and viewing the participation as part of colleagues’ professional development. The researcher guaranteed to provide the workshop participants with learning materials, lunch, and transport fee from their home institution to the workshop venue. However, once the workshop started, not everything went according to plan, with some universities not being represented at all, and others with minimal numbers. All in all, thirteen (13) colleagues arrived to participate in Stage 2 of this project.

This section reports on the participants’ responses to a questionnaire administered at the end of a three-day workshop on the integration of research and inquiry skills into ELTE programs. The workshop sought to identify what the participants had learned in the course of the workshop and what they believed needed to be done to improve their syllabus design and teaching. The questionnaire functioned as a reflection tool for both the researcher and the participants. To this end, the data from Questionnaire 2 are organised in relation to the first two questions interrogating the “job-to-be-done” (HBS, 2010). These included the questions: (a) “What does the job of integrating research and inquiry skills into ELTE curricula involve?”; (b) “What experiences need to be provided for the job of integrating research and inquiry skills into ELTE curricula to be done?”.

The data reflects respondents’ beliefs. Where the respondents expressed a need for change in relation to specific issues, these opinions are tagged as “challenges”.

4.3.1 General data distribution
Table 4.11 illustrates the general distribution of all responses to Questionnaire 2 in relation to all themes and subthemes. Thirteen (13) volunteering academics participated in the workshop and responded to the questionnaire. These were not necessarily the same participants as in Questionnaire 1. Due to confidence issues, the data analysis does not distinguish between senior academics (Level B, C, and D.) and junior academics (Level A). This is because all participants were known to the researcher. The participants provided
responses to all themes, with the theme of University Funding, Workload and Support being addressed by far most frequently.

Table 4.11: Questionnaire 2: General data distribution by theme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Total comments</th>
<th>% comments/all comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Relevance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Relevance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and Syllabus Design</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders' Awareness</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Funding, Workload and Support</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Research</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total comments</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.3 illustrates graphically the data distribution by theme in Questionnaire 2.

Figure 4.3: Questionnaire 2: General data distribution by theme.
4.3.2 Question 1: What does the job of integrating research and inquiry skills into undergraduate ELTE curricula involve?

Table 4.12 illustrates themes and subthemes identified in Questionnaire 2 (workshop evaluation) in relation to the question of ‘What does the “job” of integrating research and inquiry skills into ELTE curricula involve?’. All themes were addressed by the participants. Nonetheless, when compared with Table 4.1, it is evident that the range of sub-themes covered is rather poor across all themes.

Table 4.12: Questionnaire 2, Question 1: Distribution of responses by theme and subthemes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global relevance</td>
<td>5 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 sub-themes (Table 4.1)</td>
<td>International standardisation; Challenge: Implementation issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Relevance</td>
<td>4 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 sub-themes (Table 4.1)</td>
<td>Degree quality and student quality; Challenge: Implementation issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and Unit Design</td>
<td>8 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 sub-themes (Table 4.1)</td>
<td>Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and the IQF; Building connections between the unit components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>6 comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 sub-themes (Table 4.1)</td>
<td>Planning teaching; Teaching research and inquiry skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Stakeholders’ Awareness**
8 sub-themes (Table 4.1)

- 5 comments
  - Raising lecturers’ awareness

**University Funding, Workload, and Support**
10 sub-themes (Table 4.1)

- 6 comments
  - Shared learning;
    Challenge: Conceptual, workload and PD funding

**Personal Research**
2 sub-themes (Table 4.1)

- 3 comments
  - Research addressing R&I in higher learning

Table 4.13 illustrates examples of responses for each theme and subtheme to Question 1 in Questionnaire 2 (Appendix 2).

### 4.3.3 Question 2: What experiences need to be provided for the job of integrating research and inquiry skills into ELTE curricula to be done?

Table 4.14 illustrates responses to Question 2 in relation to responses to Question 1 in order to make visible any gaps between what the participants believe is involved in the “job” of integrating research and inquiry skills and what factors they see as needing addressing. It is evident that gaps exist. The theme of **University Funding, Workload and Support** had the most comments, while **Personal Research** was left unaddressed. Figure 4.5 presents the data graphically.

Table 4.14: Questionnaire 2: Comparing responses to Questions 1 and Question 2 by themes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1: What is involved?</th>
<th>Q2: What needs to be provided?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Global Relevance (5 comments)</td>
<td>(b) National Relevance (4 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtheme:</td>
<td>Subthemes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- International standardisation</td>
<td>- Degree quality and student quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Challenge: Implementation issue</td>
<td>- Degree quality and employability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) National Relevance (4 comments)</td>
<td>(b) Course and Unit Design (4 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subthemes:</td>
<td>Subthemes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Degree quality and student quality</td>
<td>- Building connections between the unit components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Challenge: Implementation issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Course and Unit Design (8 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subthemes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and the IQF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtheme</td>
<td>Number of Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building connections between the unit components</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge:</strong> A need to improve degree design</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge:</strong> Program evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge:</strong> Program evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge:</strong> Program evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge:</strong> Program evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogy</strong> (6 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subthemes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching R&amp;I skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogy</strong> (4 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subthemes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching R&amp;I skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taking account of published research</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholders’ awareness</strong> (5 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subthemes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Raising lecturers’ awareness</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change is not popular</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accounting for the departmental culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accounting for the needs of stakeholders</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Funding, Workload and Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtheme:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge:</strong> Conceptual, workload and PD funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Funding, Workload and Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subthemes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understanding the process of learning R&amp;I skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge:</strong> Time for capacity-development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge:</strong> Conceptual, workload and PD funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal research</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtheme:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research addressing R&amp;I in higher learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.5:** Questionnaire 2: Comparing responses to Questions 1 and Question 2 by themes.
Table 4.15 shows examples of respondents’ comments from Questionnaire 2 (workshop evaluation), analysed in relation to the question about the experiences that need to be provided for the “job” of integrating research and inquiry skills into ELTE curricula to be “done”.

4.3.4 Summary of Questionnaire 2

Responses to Questionnaire 2 show lectures addressing all themes identified in this study, however, doing so poorly, by covering a narrow range of sub-themes covered in each theme. The theme of University Funding, Workload and Support had the most comments, with academics appreciating the opportunity of learning together (Shared learning) and learning more as a result (Understanding the process of learning R&I skills). Still, respondents also flagged the need for workshops of this kind to be conducted in their university, time being allocated for participation. Personal Research was addressed partially, with no implication being drawn for its relevance to the process of designing students’ investigative learning experiences.

4.3.5 Comparing Questionnaire 1 and Questionnaire 2

The findings from Questionnaire 1 and 2 are compared in order to reflect the impact of the three-day workshop on the participating academics in relation to the data collected from across Indonesia. Only Question 1 and Question 2 of analysis are depicted since Questionnaire 2 did not require responses relevant to Question 3. Question 3 was object of research and development to be analysed later in the course of the study.

Table 4.16: Questionnaire 1 and 2 compared by themes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes (Questionnaire 1)</th>
<th>% Questionnaire 1 Questions 1 &amp; 2 Across Indonesia</th>
<th>% Questionnaire 2 Questions 1 &amp; 2 13 ELTE Lecturers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Relevance</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Relevance</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and Syllabus Design</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders’ Awareness</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Funding, Workload and Support</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.16 shows that, as a result of the workshop, (a) the role of University Funding, Workload and Support increased significantly; (b) the importance of stakeholders’ awareness increased; (c) ELTE lecturers began considering addressing research and inquiry skills in their personal research; (d) responses regarding pedagogy decreased; and (e) the need to understand the new curriculum agenda in relation to the global context of higher education decreased. Figure 4.6 presents the findings graphically.

![Figure 4.6: Questionnaire 1 and 2 compared by themes.](image)

### 4.4 Redesigning unit syllabi: Questionnaire 3

During the three-day workshop, the participants endeavoured to redesign their unit syllabi. The researcher assisted the lecturers in this process by providing examples of unit designs from Charles Darwin University.

In order to obtain as large a number of the syllabi as possible, the researcher contacted the workshop participants, offered help, visited the universities previously contacted in hope to obtain data, including the lecturers who failed to attend the workshop but agreed to participate. The researcher supplied those lecturers with all workshop information, explained what was done and what needed to be accomplished.
From thirteen lecturers who participated in Stage 2 of the study, only two lecturers sent their designs on time to obtain feedback. The two syllabi are analysed in this section. More syllabi were sent to the researcher after the lecturers completed their teaching. Analyses of these syllabi are included in Appendix 2.

Due to the low timely response rate, the researcher devised Questionnaire 3 in order to explore the challenges that the lecturers were experiencing when re-designing their units. As explained in Chapter 3, all questions of the questionnaire targeted issues specifically relevant to syllabus design. Seven (7) lecturers responded to the questionnaire, with their responses showing that they did make amendments even if they did not send their syllabi for feedback.

Section 4.4. analyses responses to Questionnaire 3 and illustrates feedback offered by a CDU expert on the two syllabi sent for comments.

4.4.1 Questionnaire 3 analysis
Table 4.17 presents the findings from seven (7) lecturers in relation to the themes and subthemes. The data reflects respondents’ challenges in the process of redesigning their syllabi. Where the respondents expressed a need for change in relation to specific issues, these opinions are tagged as “challenges”.

Once again, the data from Questionnaire 3 are organised in relation to each of the three levels of the architecture of a “job-to-be-done” adapted from the Harvard Business School (HBS, 2010). These included questions such as, (a) “What does the job of integrating research and inquiry skills into ELTE curricula involve?”, (b) “What experiences need to be provided for the job of integrating research and inquiry skills into ELTE curricula to be done?”; and (c) “What has been achieved in the area of your responsibility?”. The findings from Questionnaire 3 are presented for each of these questions of analysis simultaneously in order to make evident the links that lecturers create, or fail to do so, between the three aspects of the “job”.

Overall, when compared with Table 4.1, it is evident that the range of sub-themes covered is rather poor across all themes, although there is a partial overlap and continuity. The column displaying what was achieved contains fewer responses than the previous columns.
It is worth noting that lecturers’ Personal Research is not recognised as important to their teaching, at least not in the data obtained.

Table 4.17: Questionnaire 3: Comparing themes and subthemes across Questions 1, 2 and 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Q1: What is involved? Sub-themes</th>
<th>Q2: What experiences need to be provided? Sub-themes</th>
<th>Q3: What was achieved? Sub-themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 sub-themes (Table 4.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 sub-themes (Table 4.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and Unit Design</td>
<td>0 comment altogether</td>
<td>2 comments altogether</td>
<td>20 comments altogether</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 sub-themes (Table 4.1)</td>
<td>Linking assessment with learning outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and the IQF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversifying assessment activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content-based approach to unit design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building connections between the unit components</td>
<td>Building connections between the unit components</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content-oriented assessment goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competence-oriented assessment activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>1 comment altogether</td>
<td>4 comments altogether</td>
<td>13 comments altogether</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 sub-themes (Table 4.1)</td>
<td>Differentiated learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Challenge: Lack of understanding how R&amp;I work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individualised instruction, time on task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit material choice and organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit material choice and organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.2 Syllabi analysis

The purpose of this section is to demonstrate how the ELTE academics, who volunteered to share their newly redesigned syllabi, interpret the requirement to integrate research and inquiry skills in practice. This section illustrates a unit outline as redesigned by one of the ELTE lecturers, the corrections that were proposed by a CDU-based expert and his/her feedback to ELTE academics. It is important to compare these interpretations against those proposed by a CDU expert in order to better understand the different cultures in which ELTE academics operate and the different elements that they focus on when integrating research and inquiry into their teaching plans.

4.4.2.1 Syllabus 1: Reading for Academic Purposes unit

As mentioned in Chapter 3, the corrections focused on unit description, learning outcomes, and assessment tasks as the key components that frame the syllabi (O’Brien, Millis, &
Cohen, 2008, p. 16). It is expected that the designer establishes coherent links between these components.

As evident in Table 4.19, a CDU expert focused more explicitly on research and inquiry skills, while his/her Indonesian counterpart appears to approach the subject as a “language-learning class”, rather than an academic unit that engages students in the process of working with, comparing, contrasting and evaluating the impact of different techniques based on different theories for students to experience and to understand the different impacts that they have on their reading and writing processes. In this regard, while the Indonesian scholar focused on the “building blocks” of texts and aimed to take students on a sequenced journey designed to study research papers, his/her CDU counterpart made the processes of comparing, contrasting and evaluating central to the design as well as the students’ own experience with the value of different techniques, and the beliefs that underpin them, to their own reading and writing. In assessment, the Indonesian lecturer expects students to “demonstrate the newly acquired understandings” (feedback by a CDU expert), while a CDU expert aims for students to “develop an informed perspective”, a skill that requires both referencing to research and engagement in an inquiry process for students to form their own views. It needs to be added that in his/her detailed description of the unit, the Indonesian lecturer did include concepts like diversity, critical thinking, or problem solving. However, as demonstrated above, the learning process that the unit committed itself to follow does not make it explicit how exactly the lecturer aims to work with these skills for students’ benefit.

Table 4.20 compares the learning outcomes defined by the Indonesian lecturer and suggestions made by a CDU expert. Unlike the Indonesian lecturer, the CDU expert kept his/her focus on research and inquiry skills that s/he then related to the context of learning to identify, search for, construct and analyse academic texts, as well as to assess the pedagogic value of different approaches to reading.

Table 4.19: Unit Introduction by ELTE lecturer and comments from a CDU expert.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit: Reading for Academic Purposes</th>
<th>Comments for the ELTE lecturer by a CDU expert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Introduction by ELTE lecturer Reading for Academic Purposes</td>
<td>I am excited to be teaching this class, and excited about the environment we will be working in together. This unit is a crucial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The comments below refer to the following aspects of writing unit introductions:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
class, as it teaches you the academic reading skill to succeed in your college career, regardless of your chosen discipline. The unit is designed to develop your critical reading and academic writing skills (reading-writing integrated skills). Both theoretical and practical aspects as they apply to reading will be presented. The unit will be orchestrated into sequences of research-oriented reading instruction that engage and allow you to both understand the building blocks and expand your use of language. I hope the class will be fun and engaging to you as you work through it. Please feel free to contact me if you have questions or concerns. I look forward to working with you!

| **Problem posing** – A unit needs to have a clearly stated purpose that is contextualised in relation to the broader goals of the unit. Here, it is academic reading skills to benefit students in their own college careers, regardless of the chosen discipline. No clear idea emerges as to the concepts that frame the unit purpose and that the students are to investigate. |
| **Intellectual context of the unit** – This is not specified in the Unit Introduction. It makes a vague promise to integrate both “theoretical and practical aspects [of what?] as they apply to reading”; no concepts or approaches are identified. |
| **Method of study** – The unit promises to use “sequences of research-oriented reading instruction”. Since it is not clear what problem the students are to solve, it is also not clear what the solution proposed by the syllabus actually implies: “to both understand the building blocks [of texts] and [to] expand your use of language”. |
| **Outcomes** – It is not clear what the process of research and inquiry will help address and why it is important. |
| **Long-term benefits** – The lecturer claims that the unit will develop students’ academic reading skills to succeed in college career. However, a more precise definition of the concept of “academic reading skills” would clarify what it is that the students are expected to learn and how this knowledge is to help them in their college studies. |

---

| **Unit Introduction proposed by CDU expert** |
| **Reading for Academic Purposes** |
| I am excited to be teaching this class and am excited about the environment in which we will be working together. This unit teaches students academic reading skills, and, specifically, how to approach academic texts critically. The unit aims to equip students with theoretical and practical understandings that can benefit students in their own college careers, regardless of the chosen discipline. The unit will introduce key literacy theories and techniques proposed by research to assist reading (and writing). Students will |

---

| **Comments for the ELTE lecturer** |
| The comments below refer to the following aspects of writing unit introductions: |
| **Problem posing** – A unit needs to have a clearly stated purpose that is contextualised in relation to the broader goals of the unit. Here, the context is learning academic reading skills to benefit students in their own college careers, regardless of the chosen discipline. |
| **Intellectual context of the unit** – Students can be requested to explore, compare and evaluate the impact of key literacy theories and their pedagogic techniques on their own reading (and writing). |
analyse and compare the value of these theories and techniques to their own contexts of reading (and writing) in order to develop an increasingly informed perspective on the process of text construction. Students are expected to demonstrate the newly acquired understandings by analysing academic texts from their own discipline. I hope the class will be fun and engaging to all students. Please, feel free to contact me if you have questions or concerns. I look forward to working with you!

Method of study – Students will analyse those key literacy models in relation to the different concepts of literacy that underpin them. Students’ evaluation of the usefulness of those models in their own contexts of learning should be argued in relation to those concepts.

Outcomes – Students will be able to discern between different concepts of (academic) literacy and demonstrate the ability to evaluate their implications to their own learning to read.

Long-term benefits – Students will develop an informed perspective on the process of academic text construction.

Table 4.21 illustrates assessment tasks proposed by the Indonesian lecturer. Provided that Assessment 3 requires that students explore professional literature, as per Unit Learning Outcome 4, the assessment tasks are consistent with all Learning Outcomes. However, the Learning Outcomes do not include research and inquiry skills where students approach information critically by drawing on the literature and their own personal experience. This reduces the academic level of the unit and the workload required from the students taking the unit.

Table 4.20: Learning Outcomes proposed by ELTE lecturer and a CDU expert.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading for Academic Purposes</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit objectives by ELTE lecturer</strong></td>
<td><strong>Revised Unit objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Comprehend different types of academic texts (essay, opinion paper, journal articles, reviews)</td>
<td>1. Demonstrate the ability to distinguish between different approaches to reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Respond to some academic texts</td>
<td>2. Evaluate critically the relevance of different approaches to reading to students’ own contexts of learning to read (and write) academic texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Get familiar with reading strategies (identifying authors’ point of view, purpose and tone, intended audience, summarizing, paraphrasing and synthesizing)</td>
<td>3. Identify attributes of good academic texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Get familiar with Journals dedicated to</td>
<td>4. Analyse the structure of academic texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Become familiar with academic journals on reading and related</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

reading and related
issues
issues, and utilise ICT to
search for academic texts
and help with reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Comprehend different types of academic texts (essay, opinion paper, journal articles, reviews)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Respond to some academic texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Get familiar with reading strategies (identifying authors' point of view, purpose and tone, intended audience, summarizing, paraphrasing and synthesizing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Get familiar with Journals dedicated to reading and related issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment 1: Quizzes: 3 x 10% = 30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment 2: Writing Task: 2 x 15% = 30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment 3: Final Task (Response Paper) = 40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.21: Reading for Academic Purposes: Assessment tasks proposed by ELTE lecturer.

Table 4.22 includes assessment tasks proposed by a CDU expert, an e-portfolio, feedback to peers, and a critical evaluation of a published academic text from a selection supplied by the lecturer. As explained by a CDU expert, Assessment 2 (hurdle assessment) is an opportunity for students to get feedback from each other and from the lecturer on their progress before they embark on drafting Assessment 3. Additionally, for each assessment task, criteria of assessment need to be supplied for students to know what is expected from them. For example, in e-portfolio, a CDU expert suggested the inclusion of theory, practical activities, and reflections enabling students to summarise their thoughts and learning. Assessment 2 is a practical exercise. Assessment 3 requires that students display their ability to apply theory in the context of an expanded practical task.

Table 4.22: Reading for Academic Purposes: Assessment tasks proposed by a CDU expert.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Demonstrate the ability to distinguish between different approaches to reading for academic purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evaluate critically the relevance of different approaches to reading to students’ own contexts of learning to read (and write) academic texts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identify attributes of good academic texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Analyse the structure of academic texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment 1: Design a personal academic literacy e-portfolio illustrating your capacity to distinguish between two contrasting approaches to teaching reading for academic purposes and critically evaluate their relevance to your own context of learning to read and write academic texts. (LO: 1, 2, 3) (40%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Assessment 2: Provide feedback to your peers on their corrections of abstracts of
5. Become familiar with academic journals on reading and related issues, and utilise ICT to search for academic texts and help with reading published papers supplied by the lecturer (LO: 3, 4) (10%)

Assessment 3: *Critically evaluate an academic text* chosen by you from a list of publications provided in the unit for this purpose. Identify the problem that the text sets up to address and compile a list of publications on the same issue to assist your better understanding of that paper. Analyse the structure of selected text using your preferred reading model. Annotate the changes that, in your view, need to be done in that text. Justify your views using the selected approach. (LO: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) (50%)

### 4.4.2.2 Syllabus 2: Curriculum and Materials Development

Table 4.23 illustrates the Unit Description, Learning Outcomes and Assessment tasks for a unit, Curriculum and Materials Development. Unlike in the previous syllabus, the ELTE lecturer of this unit identifies the Learning Outcomes of the unit and its assessment tasks in relation to research and inquiry skills emphasised in the new higher education policies. However, as was the case with the previous unit, the lecturer here finds it challenging to offer a method of study that would ensure that his/her students learn the process of critical analysis and, thereby, are given the opportunity to attain the desired Learning Outcomes. As explained in the Table 4.23, judging by the Unit Description, the unit adopts an additive model of knowledge building. It offers no central concepts, frameworks or values that would provide students with criteria that students could explore through research and that would offer focus points for engaging with the unit content critically.

Table 4.23: Unit Design by ELTE lecturer and comments from a CDU expert.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit: Curriculum and Materials Development</th>
<th>Brief comments by a CDU expert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Description by ELTE lecturer</strong></td>
<td><strong>Problem posing</strong> – No single purpose of the unit emerges from the provided description in relation to the leading concepts to be investigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This unit aims to cover the following topics: (1) the definition and evolution of second language curriculum, (2) needs and situation analysis, (3) different syllabus designs, (4) curriculum theorizing, (5) curriculum implementation, (6) materials adaptation, selection, &amp; evaluation, (7) hidden curriculum &amp; morality, (8) curriculum inquiry (research approaches), &amp; (9) curriculum evaluation.</td>
<td><strong>Intellectual context of the unit</strong> – No mention is made of approaches that students are to investigate and evaluate in relation to the concepts that will be studies and goals to be attained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method of study</strong> – The list gives an impression that the unit adopts an additive</td>
<td><strong>Method of study</strong> – The list gives an impression that the unit adopts an additive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These concepts will be taught by research-based learning approach. model of knowledge building. There is no mention of a process that would engage students in research and inquiry. Outcomes – This is unclear. It appears that are expected to acquire knowledge presented by the lecturer, rather than demonstrating the ability to apply their understandings critically in contexts that matter to them as future ELTE teachers. Long-term benefits – This is unclear.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcomes by ELTE lecturer</th>
<th>Brief comments by a CDU expert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students can critically analyze language curriculum/syllabus/course and teaching materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students can critically select, analyze and evaluate teaching materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students can articulate and develop their own theories/philosophy of language curriculum designs &amp; materials evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students can write a scholarly academic paper presentable at a national or international conference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment tasks by ELTE lecturer</th>
<th>Brief comments by a CDU expert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Attendance &amp; Participation (10%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Oral Presentation (Leading Discussion) (2 times) (20%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Group Project (GP) (2-3 students) (Oral Presentation with brief summary &amp; outline) Analyze two sets/volumes of English textbooks (20%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Summary &amp; Critique (2 pages) (2 times) (20%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Final Term Paper (TP) (12-15 pages in English) on one of the following topics: (30%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct a needs survey with a particular group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Design a language program/workshop/course for a particular group of students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluate a language program or a teacher education program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.24 (Appendix 2) includes the remaining eleven (11) syllabi that were sent to the researcher after the teaching was completed. An analysis of the syllabi included inside the table shows that every syllabus sent to the researcher had exactly the same problems as those discussed in this section.
Comparing ELTE syllabi and Questionnaire 3

The data from ELTE syllabi and Questionnaire 3 are compared in order to get a better grasp of the challenges that the academics reported on when finalising their syllabus designs. The analysis follows the structure of critique used by a CDU expert who commented on the syllabi. The references to Questionnaire 3 focus mainly on Question 3 of analysis (“What was achieved?”) since the discussion concentrates on comparing aspects of design that ELTE lecturers felt that they included in their syllabi. For each aspect of unit design, the discussion below depicts the key themes to illustrate the relationship better between the themes and the process of design. Overall, the analysis shows an overlap in the data collected by the two different methods (syllabus design and questionnaire), with ELTE lecturers providing responses to a very narrow set of subthemes in four (4) out of seven (7) themes identified in this study.

The analysis that follows illustrates two major points: (a) when linking Questionnaire 3 findings with the CDU expert’s feedback, it was identified that Personal Research was shown to play no role in the framing of the new syllabi, and (b) all other aspects of syllabus design hinged on the conceptual framing of the unit. In other words, once it was not clear what the students were to investigate and to what effect, it was not possible to assess the relevance of pedagogic activities proposed for supporting research and inquiry skills as a method of learning. In some other cases, research and inquiry were replaced with traditional approaches to unit design, with students being expected to learn/memorise, not investigate. The analysis utilises the criteria applied by the CDU expert for evaluating ELTE syllabi:

i. **Purpose of a unit (problem-posing)** – According to the CDU expert, the leading concepts of the syllabi, to be investigated by the students, were not specified. This made the purpose of the unit defined either imprecisely (Syllabus 1) or not defined at all (Syllabus 2).

   In Questionnaire 3 (Appendix 2, Table 4.18), the key theme relating to this component of unit design is Personal Research (linking one’s own ELTE research with the new higher education curriculum renewal agenda). Yet, in the theme of Personal Research, no responses were found.

ii. **Rationale (intellectual context of the unit)** – According to the CDU expert, neither of the two syllabus designs addressed this component. No approaches were specified for
comparing and contrasting their impact on the concepts to be investigated by the students.

In Questionnaire 3 (Appendix 2, Table 4.18), the key theme relating to this component is **Course and Unit Design** (illustrating the relevance of the unit to the degree structure and students’ professional learning goals). Most responses in this theme focused on Question 3 of analysis, “What was achieved?”. In this respect, six subthemes were addressed altogether in the subthemes: *Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and the IQF*, *Diversifying assessment activities*, *Content-oriented assessment goals*, *Building connections between the unit components*, *Competence-oriented assessment activity*, and *Content-oriented assessment activity*.

Responses in all the subthemes are general in nature, with lecturers focusing more on the mechanics of the process of designing units, and less on the actual intellectual sources on which they drew in order for their units to result in students learning through research an inquiry. In the subtheme of *Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and the IQF*, Question 3 of analysis, Lecturer (R1) describes developing learning outcomes directly from policy documents, Lecturer (R2) from “the unit description and standard competencies that are discussed in our department”, and Lecturer (R7) offers a confusing model where “[t]he learning outcomes are systematically designed in each session to [ensure] the[ir] implementation, demonstration or the practice of accumulated three aspects: attitude, knowledge and skill”. The descriptions vary while neither lecturer offers a tangible reason for why their students would use research and inquiry when responding to assessment tasks. This lack of precision is indicative of the challenges evident also in syllabi analysis. Especially in Syllabus 2 (Table 4.23), the CDU expert showed that the learning outcomes listed, while great in number, failed to indicate why and how the students would engage in research and inquiry.

The tendency to avoid detail impacts on other subthemes. For example, in the subtheme, **Content-based approach to unit design**, also in Question 3 of analysis (Appendix 2, Table 4.18), Lecturer (R4) describes the purpose of the unit in terms of a topic, rather than specific skills and levels of knowledge that students should attain”, “[…] culture, it's the main point of my delivered unit approach”. Furthermore, in the subtheme of
Building connections between the unit components, Lecturer (R1) offers no detail as to the source of the aims of the unit around which s/he designed all other unit components, “I translated the aims of the unit into learning objectives and then developed activities that need to follow, including research activities” (R1). Given that the designers of Syllabus 1 and 2 showed difficulties in explicating both the purposes of their units and outcomes and long-term benefits in terms that would relate their significance to students professional and course objectives, this omission of detail appears to be indicative of problems, rather than success. Within the same subtheme, other Lecturer (R5) is also vague and argues that it is important to “connect[…] the outcomes to the activities, principles and theories”. Again, while these are correct processes, to ensure their correct translation into practice, more detail is needed.

In Questionnaire 3 (Appendix 2, Table 4.18), Lecturer (R3) stands out as he offers more precise information on the processes of unit design than most. For example, in the subtheme Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and the IQF, Question 3 of analysis, Lecturer (R3) links the outcomes with learning and assessment activities, “The unit will develop students' skills to think critically, creatively and constructively through activities including reading, discussions, critique, evaluation and design. While, once again the relevant detail relating to the specifics of his/her unit is missing, the description that students need to engage in investigative activities involving reading and discussions in order to reflect (evaluate) and apply their newly developed understandings to some contexts (design) is in line with the comments made by the CDU expert. Other responses of Lecturer (R3) shed more light on the clarity of his/her understanding. In the subtheme of Building connections between the unit components, Lecturer (R3) offers a general principle how units should be structured. For example, Lecturer (R3) does not speak about aims developed from a unit description, as others do, but about concepts, “The unit focuses on key concepts”. S/he develops this further, pointing to the need for units to engage students in activities that make it possible for them to evaluate the impacts of different approaches/perspective on the needs that emerge from their contexts as future teachers: “The unit focuses on key concepts, recognises and engages students as active participants, and provides them with multiple opportunities to source, review and analyse information, and then to apply their knowledge to the teaching of ESP in diverse classrooms”.
iii. **Method of study** – According to the CDU expert, both the drafts of unit syllabi submitted to the researcher failed to describe the method of students’ work in the unit, let alone making references to research and inquiry. Specifically, of concern was an absence of strategies that would enable students to compare, contrast and evaluate models, concepts or theories in relation to their own needs as future teachers.

**In Questionnaire 3** (Table 4.18), the key theme relating to this component is **Pedagogy** (e.g. activities). In the theme of Pedagogy, Question 3 of analysis shows responses in the following subthemes: *Challenge: Lack of understanding how R&I work* (1 response); *Planning teaching* (5 responses), and *Unit material choice and organisation* (1 response).

Following from the comments of the CDU expert, in the theme of **Pedagogy** (Appendix 2, Table 4.18), it is expected that lecturers identify links between the concepts that the students are to investigate and the activities that are to result in students appropriating these concepts in assessment activities that further their professional expertise and target appropriate levels of complexity as specified by the IQF. In this regard, the lack of precision detected in the previous points above, shows its impact on pedagogy, even in the responses offered by Lecturer (R3). In the subtheme of *Planning teaching*, Lecturer (R3) is vague on the exact concepts that mattered in his/her unit and how their relevance will be investigated by the students to inform their goals as language learners and future language teachers: [Students will] analyse pedagogical approaches for English [for] Specific Purposes across the curriculum with particular reference to the needs of students within the teaching and learning context”. When taking into account feedback offered by a CDU expert on the two syllabi, detailing the concepts that will be investigated by the students will provide the unit with (a) clearly articulated learning outcomes and long-terms benefits, developed in relation to a vision that informs the entire degree structure and the IQF complexity levels, (b) learning activities with a clear focus, and (c) students’ inquiries with meaning in relation to where they had been and where they are going. Without this detail, as per the CDU expert’s comments, it is difficult to assess whether a lecturer can provide this focus and, thereby, help students locate the relevance of his/her unit in relation to other units and their own professional goals. The study area, English for Specific Purposes itself does not provide such a focus nor do the many approaches in relation to which the subject can be “analysed”.
In the subtheme *Planning teaching* (Appendix, 2, Table 4.18), lack of precision was a common trait. For example, while Lecturer (R7) explained the type of research that students were expected to do (interviewing teachers to develop implications for their own teaching in schools), in relation to the method of study, no information is provided, “Later, after findings are elaborated, students are geared to design learning strategies as well as designing the lesson plan based on the findings” (R7). Elaborations on the findings do not specify how research and inquiry were planned to assist this process. In a similar manner, Lecturer (R5) chooses for the students to “identify strategies which authors use to make texts appear clear and coherent [and] analyse their own writing in relation to the attributes of good texts”. How exactly research and inquiry are to be assisted in this activity, it is not explained. In the subtheme, *Challenge: Lack of understanding how R&I work*, Lecturer (R2) admits having problems with the Pedagogy aspect of design, “Actually I still couldn’t find the way how to implement or order my students to do research in my course, speaking for Group Activities”. The response is general in nature and does not address any precise issue that challenged the lecturer in this respect.

In Questionnaire 3, in the theme of *Pedagogy*, Responses to Questions 2 and 3 of analysis do not contribute more to the theme. There, the lecturers emphasise that students are different, without developing clear implications to the practice of research and inquiry.

iv. **Outcomes and Long-term benefits:** The CDU expert noted an absence of precise references on the expected impact of research and inquiry skills on students’ learning outcomes and long-term benefits to their professional and/or personal goals.

In Questionnaire 3 (Appendix 2, Table 4.18), the key themes relating to this component include *Global and National Relevance* (illustrating the relevance of the unit outcomes to global and national policies and research agenda) and *Stakeholders’ Awareness* (e.g. understanding the relevance of the unit outcomes to the professional community). In the themes of *Global and National Relevance*, Questionnaire 3 shows no responses. No lecturer saw it as important to integrate the implications of global and local policies into their thinking about the design. On the other hand, in the theme of *Stakeholders’*
Awareness, Questionnaire 3 shows one response in the subtheme of Accounting of the university departmental culture, a concern that had more to do with internal collaboration than relating the outcomes to some specific needs relevant to students’ as language users or future teachers. In Question 1 of analysis, Lecturer (R4) mentions the need for linking units with the needs of schools. This important comment is not developed further to illustrate the lecturer’s capacity to show how research and inquiry as a process of learning can assist students to make links between their learning and industry context.

4.5 Questionnaire 4: Evaluation of the participants’ own success in the project

Questionnaire 4 included responses from ten lecturers. The number increased as the researcher was eager to draw on as many workshop participants from Stage 2 of the study as possible.

This section presents findings from the final questionnaire administered to ELTE academics in Indonesia participating in the last stages of the project six months after the workshops ended and after the lecturers implemented their new unit designs. The questionnaire assisted the participants in looking back at their experiences and reflecting on what they had achieved and learned in the course of their participation in the project.

The same questions were asked of the lecturers in Questionnaire 4 as in Questionnaire 3 in order to gauge progress. The data from the Questionnaire 4 included responses that were organised only in relation to the question: “What has been achieved in the area of your responsibility?”. No data relating to other questions of analysis applying the model of the “job to be done” (HBS, 2010) were found.

4.5.1 General data distribution

Table 4.25 presents an overview of the findings from Questionnaire 4. The overwhelming majority of responses are in the themes of Course and Syllabus Design, and Pedagogy, with a few comments addressing the theme of Stakeholders' Awareness. Almost no data was found in the theme of University Funding, Workload and Support. No lecturer made references to Global and National Relevance or Personal Research.
Table 4.25: Questionnaire 4: Global representation of data by theme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Total comments/theme</th>
<th>% comments/all comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Relevance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Relevance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and Unit Design</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders' Awareness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Funding, Workload and Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Research</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total comments</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.7 illustrates graphically data distribution in Questionnaire 4.

An overwhelming proportion of responses (95%) addressed two themes only, Course and Syllabus Design and Pedagogy, with a few comments addressing the theme of Stakeholders' Awareness. Almost no data was found in the theme of University Funding, Workload and Support. No lecturer made references to Global and National Relevance or Personal Research. The list below outlines the number of comments made by each academic. No
additional pattern emerges from this distribution. The most comments were given by a junior academic, R5.

R1 – 10 comments (3 themes) (including Stakeholders’ Awareness)

R2 – 8 comments (2 themes) **Senior Academic**

R3 – 8 comments (2 themes)

R4 – 12 comments (3 themes) (including Stakeholders’ Awareness)

R5 – 15 comments (2 themes)

R6 – 11 comments (2 themes)

R7 – 13 comments (3 themes) **Senior Academic** (including Stakeholders’ Awareness)

R8 – 9 comments (2 themes)

R9 – 6 comments (2 themes)

R10 – 9 comments (3 themes) (including University Funding, Workload and Support)

Total: 101 comments

Figure 4.8 illustrates data distribution in Questionnaire 4 organised by academic rank. R stands for Respondent, each respondent is tagged with a number. Senior academics are identified as B. Junior academics are identified as A.

Figure 4.8: Questionnaire 4: Distribution of responses by theme and academic ranking.
4.5.2 Question 3: What has been achieved/done in your area of responsibility?

Table 4.26 illustrates the themes and the subthemes addressed in Questionnaire 4 and organised by academic rank. The key pattern that emerges is that senior and junior academics addressed the same issues (subthemes). Any differences are minor.

Table 4.26: Questionnaire 4: Themes and the subthemes by academic rank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subthemes Senior Academics</th>
<th>Subthemes Junior Academics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Relevance</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National relevance</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and Unit Design</td>
<td>Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and the IQF;</td>
<td>Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and the IQF;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content-based approach to unit design;</td>
<td>Content-based approach to unit design;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building connections between the unit components;</td>
<td>Building connections between the unit components;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linking assessment with learning outcomes;</td>
<td>Linking assessment with learning outcomes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content-oriented assessment goals;</td>
<td>Content-oriented assessment goals;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content-oriented assessment activity choice;</td>
<td>Content-oriented assessment activity choice;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competence-oriented assessment goals</td>
<td>Competence-oriented assessment goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Teaching R&amp;I skills;</td>
<td>Teaching R&amp;I skills;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individualised instruction, time on task;</td>
<td>Individualised instruction, time on task;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit material choice &amp; organisation</td>
<td>Unit material choice &amp; organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders awareness</td>
<td>Accounting for the departmental culture</td>
<td>Accounting for the departmental culture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>Neglecting departmental culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Funding, Workload</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>Challenge: Conceptual, workload and PD funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Support</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>Challenge: Conceptual, workload and PD funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Research</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.27 illustrates examples of respondents’ comments in Questionnaire 3 (Appendix 2).
4.5.3 Comparing findings from Questionnaire 1 and 4

Table 4.28 compares findings from Questionnaire 1 (13 respondents) and 4 (10 respondents) in relation to Question 3 (Q3) of analysis (“What has been achieved?”). Each of the questionnaires involved different questions, however, all questions related to integrating research and inquiry in ELTE undergraduate teaching. Comparing the findings from the two questionnaires is interesting because, if only approximately, they offer an overview of the range of issues that were addressed prior to the beginning of the study and at the end. While, correctly, not all responses in each questionnaire for each theme and subtheme are an indicator that the lectures already had, or developed in the course of the project, the necessary skills to comply with the new higher education policies, Table 4.28 makes it possible to note changes, without drawing too many conclusions.

The key differences between the two questionnaires is a far greater number of responses to Questionnaire 4 (101), which took place at the end of the project. Questionnaire 1 had 42 responses in total. This may be due to the questions, yet, in each questionnaire, the number of questions was more or less the same as was the nature of the questions. For one, this finding shows that the lecturers said more in the subject in Questionnaire 4 that in Questionnaire 1. This is a positive finding, of only, because, in all questionnaires, the lecturers tended to be short, their responses not elaborated. The fact that they spoke more about their experiences at the end of the project is taken to show that they got involved more and had experiences to report on. The study notes this as a change in the right direction.

On a less positive note, both, Questionnaire 1 and Questionnaire 4 are poor on comments relating unit design with policies (themes Global and National Relevance). The same applies to Personal Research. This finding is consistent with Questionnaire 3 data. Analysis of Questionnaire 3 data showed that the inability to link unit design to personal research resulted in designs that failed to specify the concepts that framed the units for students to investigate in order to build their professional competence. Accordingly, the lack of references to the themes of Global and National Relevance impacted on the ways in which the lecturers built the link between what they taught and the outcomes and long-term benefits that the units were to offer to the students. Integrating Personal Research and Global and National Relevance shows to be critical when planning for integrating research and inquiry.

Table 4.28: Comparison of findings from Questionnaire 1 and Questionnaire 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Questionnaire 1, Q3 13 respondents</th>
<th>Questionnaire 4, Q3 10 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Relevance</td>
<td>International reputation (1 comment)</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Relevance</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and Unit Design</td>
<td>Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and IQF (2 comments)</td>
<td>Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and the IQF (5 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content-based approach to unit design (6 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building connections between the unit components (13 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Linking assessment with learning outcomes (8 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content-oriented assessment goals (7 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content-oriented assessment activity choice (11 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Competence-oriented assessment goals (1 comment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program evaluation (2 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Planning teaching (1 comment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching R&amp;I skills (23 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individualised instruction, time on task (10 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit material choice &amp; organisation (12 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenge: Lack of understanding how R&amp;I work (2 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders awareness</td>
<td>Raising students’ awareness (3 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neglect to raise students’ awareness (2 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenge: Change is not popular (4 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accounting for the university departmental culture (3 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neglecting departmental culture (1 comment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Funding, Workload and Support</td>
<td>Funding research in QA (1 comment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared learning (1 comment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administrative support (3 comments)  Challenge: Conceptual, workload and PD funding (1 comment)  Challenge: Conceptual, workload and PD funding (1 comment)

Challenge: No capacity building/Insufficient administrative support (3 comments)  Challenge: Excessive workload (1 comment)

Personal Research  Challenge: Disregarding graduate competencies and research skills (15 comments)  No comments

Total comments: 42  101

### 4.6 Follow-up interviews, syllabi and Questionnaire 4

Follow-up interviews were conducted in order to clarify data from Questionnaire 4 and to enable the participants to talk freely about their experiences in the project. Data from six interviews was transcribed and analysed. The analysis links findings from the interviews, with those in Questionnaire 4 and the feedback provided by a CDU expert on the syllabi (Section 4.4.2). In this way, an attempt is made to triangulate the data in order to better understand the findings.

As explained in Chapter 3, the questions in the follow-up interviews were designed at the end of the three-day workshops by the participants as the most relevant for them. These questions served as trigger points for a deeper discussion during the interviews. This time, a different process for data analysis was used. The aim of the analysis was to identify the processes that the ELTE lecturers apply in order to integrate research and inquiry into their syllabi to achieve learning outcomes that comply with the New Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015) and the IQF (The Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2012).

#### 4.6.1 Data analysis

Data from the follow-up interviews were analysed using the model developed by Lian and Pertiwi (2017) designed to analyse critically education research. In a nutshell, this method of analysis applied seeks to identify the processes, or the lack of thereof, that the lecturers showed to rely on when designing each stage of their new units. The aim is to establish how the lecturers construct the process of research and inquiry when integrating it into their units.
Table 4.29 (Appendix 2) presents the data from the follow-up interviews. All responses are included. Care was taken to offer comments for each response for the analysis to illustrate the challenges that integrating research and inquiry skills present at each level of thinking about course and unit design. In Table 4.28, \( R \) stands for Respondent. However, the numbering of respondents does not match the numbering in the previous tables, where the data was confidential. As in the questionnaires administered earlier, not all lecturers addressed all themes or subthemes identified and/or applied in the course of this study.

As in Questionnaire 4, the themes of Course and Unit Design, and Pedagogy had the greatest number of responses. A small number of comments related to University Funding, Workload and Support. Even less comments were found under Personal Research and Global and Local Relevance. Overall, the findings from the interviews show that integrating research and inquiry is still a challenge for ELTE academics, and that participation in this project was not enough to assist them in developing skills necessary to overcome the difficulties that the new policies entail.

An analysis of the follow-up interviews (Table, 4.29, Appendix 2) shows the following patterns:

(a) **Framing the object of study**

Responses to this question were obtained in relation to a number of themes, such as Course and Unit Design, Pedagogy, and University Funding, Workload and Support.

**General pattern in the follow-up interviews:**

No links were made to Personal Research. In the data, there is generally no mention of the criteria or principles for determining concepts that would frame a unit to be taught. This omission results in teaching plans, where students are given tasks (writing a report (R3), responding to texts (R7)) without the lecturer developing the value of these activities from any specific vision that would link the unit to a broader set of values and concerns, i.e. the ontology and epistemology of the unit, that students then can investigate from the perspective of their relevance to their own professional contexts. Development and understanding of this vision hinge on the lecturers’ engagement in research that would grapple with issues of its own relevance from the perspective the ontology and epistemology that frame it. Lecturer (R4) is
aware of the challenge and proposes a shared approach to the problem as a solution, “We have not found a good concept in integrating the skills. The challenge is the synchronisation of unit content or learning materials” (theme University Funding, Workload and Support). Lecturer (R4) does not justify his/her proposal. Yet uninformed discussions are likely to result in poor outcomes. Lecturer (R6) also finds it difficult to control at least the units s/he designs and expresses frustration about the quality of internal communication, “It is difficult to make the same goals with my colleagues”. From the perspective of the unit and in terms of research and inquiry skills, absence of ontologically and epistemologically validated concepts and values makes students’ progress within and across units an object of arbitrary judgments, unrelated to a system of thought that the units assist students to increasingly better comprehend and evaluate.

Comparing with the syllabi examined in Section 4.4.2: The problem of framing was also noted when examining the syllabi of ELTE lecturers. In English for Academic Purposes, the focus of the unit was on arbitrarily selected knowledge points (“the building blocks [of text] and the use of language”), rather than, for example, on different theories of texts that students could investigate from the perspective of their relevance to their own contexts of learning to read and write, or of teaching to read and write. The key theme relating to the framing component is Personal Research (linking one’s own ELTE research with the new higher education curriculum renewal agenda). In Questionnaire 4 no responses were given to this theme.

(b) Method of study

Responses to this question were obtained in relation to a number of themes, such as Course and Unit Design, Pedagogy, and University Funding, Workload and Support.

General pattern in the follow-up interviews:

Failure to acknowledge that Learning Outcomes alone do not specify the purpose of a unit in relation to the degree structure impacts also on the pedagogy of the unit. A method of study that integrates research and inquiry needs to identify the comparing and contrasting activities that will enable students to evaluate the impact of different approaches on the key concepts that they investigate in relation to what they mean to their professional contexts. However, when the key concepts of the unit are missing,
as indicated in *Framing the object of study*, it is not evident why the proposed tools of analysis (e.g. an inquiry chart (R1) or observational or interview guidelines/checklists (R4 & R5)) or resources (e.g. books, internet access, R3, R4, R5, R6) would be adequate for students to attain the unit objectives. For example, an activity of analysing the register of texts from different contexts, such as public speaking, speech, debate, seminar (R4) alone does not engage research and inquiry skills. To do so, students would need to approach the activity with an investigative mindset, analysing different methods of text analysis from the perspective their value to their own professional contexts and, also, guided by a purpose that is informed by levels of complexity derived from the IQF. This critical element is missing in Lecturer (R4)’s activity, where no approaches are identified and no activities are specified that would help students make relevant comparisons, in more than none way, to ensure deeper analysis, “They had to find and identify registers of Speaking for Academic Purposes from videos in YouTube, including public speaking, speech, debate, seminar. After that, they were asked to analyse the videos and see what they could learn from the videos and found out how to do as what they saw in the videos. They were also asked to observe using an observational guidelines/checklist” (R4). Because the critical component was absent, students were requested to learn from the activity, not to analyse and describe what understanding they could draw on from their evaluations. They were asked to “see what they could learn from the videos” (R4). The expectation was from students to replicate what they saw in their texts.

Comparing with the syllabi examined in Section 4.4.2: Similar concerns were flagged in the discussion examining the syllabi submitted for review. In English for Academic Purposes, the method of study, selected by an ELTE lecturer, was not investigation, but a reference to a process that was vaguely described, claiming to integrate research and inquiry but not specifying the process (“sequence of research-oriented reading instructions”). On another note, it needs to be added that improving quality of teaching is demanding on resources and some lecturers raised the issue of limited access to basic tools of research like books, journals or the internet. The key theme relating to the *method of study* component is *Course and Unit Design* (illustrating the relevance of the unit to the degree structure and students’ professional learning goals).
In Questionnaire 4 (Appendix 2, Table 4.27), the majority of all responses fell into Course and Unit Design category. Yet, the responses are instrumental in nature. In other words, the lecturers identified what was done, but did not specify what different approaches their students investigated in order to build an increasingly informed perspective on the issues that framed the units. For example, in the subtheme of Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and the IQF, the lecturers speak about “identify[ing] unit outcomes from the course description given from university guidance” (R1) or “identify[ing] unit outcomes by drawing on the unit description … with the unit prepar[ing] students to be able to be involved in academic fora (such as presenting papers, becoming moderators in discussions, questioning, answering questions, arguing, etc.” (R7).

In the subtheme of Building connections between the unit components (Questionnaire 4, Appendix 2, Table 4.27), both lecturers agree that “All the learning outcomes must align with the course description and the contents of the syllabus” (R1), with the Lecturer (R7) explaining that s/he first designs “the learning outcomes, integrate[s] them into [a] learning description, then develop[s] [them] into teaching activit[ies]”. Neither lecturer speaks in detail on the concepts, that students were to investigate, nor on the different approaches that would be used to assist them in this process. The responses are vague and provide very little information about the learning process.

In the subtheme of Linking assessment with learning outcomes (Questionnaire 4, Appendix 2, Table 4.27), once again, Lecturer (R1) speaks in general terms, “assessment is one of the ways in evaluating students' progress in learning so it shouldn’t go beyond the learning outcomes”, without explaining what his/her statement actually implies to learning. Along similar lines, Lecturer (R10) talks about the skill of listening in vocational terms, i.e. without specifying the academic content that a listening unit (like an academic writing unit) would involve. In his/her unit, students are “mastering” listening, where quizzes and some unexplained assignment task form “step by step” pathway to learning. There is no mention of investigation as a means of learning, no theories are specified, no contrasting techniques. Accordingly, in the subtheme, Content-oriented assessment goals, Lecturer (R10)
explains the assignment as asking students “to analyze the content of listening material”, while another lecturer (R9), explains that, in his/her unit, assessment criteria for essay evaluation included “organization, idea development, grammar and vocabulary choice, and technical writing”. The assessment criteria are structural in nature, no reference is made to the actual components of the “idea” that the students are to develop. In the subtheme of **Content-oriented assessment activity choice**, similar challenges are present. For example, students “tell[ing] their opinion of something controversial in a story” (R2) does not yet explain what perspectives on the concept critique the students are learning, testing and evaluating.

(c) **The beneficiaries of the study (Outcomes and Long-term benefits)**

Responses to this question were obtained in relation to a number of themes, such as **National Relevance, Course and Unit Design, and Pedagogy**.

**General pattern in the follow-up interviews:**

With no processes proposed that would link students’ learning to their professional contexts, students’ journey through the units is likely to lack direction and, therefore, meaning. Indeed, as data shows, students’ motivation was an issue reported by the lecturers during the interviews. In the theme **National Relevance**, subtheme **Challenge: Degree quality and student quality** (Appendix 2, Table 4.29), Lecturer (R1) acknowledges his/her difficulties in working with the IQF for the benefit of students and reflects on the role of motivation, skills and also his/her own capacities, “Sometimes the students were enthusiastic in analyzing the journals or articles but at other times they did nothing. It may be motivational problems, but I also think it is skills problems. Maybe in the future when we apply IQF-based curriculum, the students will feel more enthusiastic in studying with integrating research and inquiry”. In the theme **Pedagogy**, subtheme **Challenge: Lack of understanding how R&I work**, Lecturer (R2) also reports lack of students’ motivation being a factor in his/her units, “The main challenge was the students’ motivation. I think we should work together so students can work better in doing research. When students got bored, I tried to motivate them, but it did not work”.

Understanding how a unit design and research and inquiry are to assist students professionally, and maybe also personally, was a problem to Lecturer (R5). Also, in the theme of **Pedagogy**, subtheme **Challenge: Lack of understanding how R&I work**, Lecturer (R5) explains how s/he sought to help students but, in the end, all s/he did
was modify the learning materials, “This is something new for me and I found it hard to implement, especially in my unit (TEFL). I tried to implement the inquiry and research process but then in the reality I modified the materials”. This example shows that, in the absence of clear processes that make the unit structure coherent in all its aspects and that help lecturers to raise relevant questions, problems are likely to arise.

Comparing with the syllabi examined in Section 4.4.2: The problem of **Outcomes and Long-term benefits** was also pointed out, when discussing syllabus designs, with lecturers either failing to outline long-term outcomes/benefits of students’ learning or offering imprecise definitions, making it difficult for students to know what exactly they will learn and why this knowledge is important to them. The key themes relating to this component are **Global and National Relevance** (illustrating the relevance of the unit outcomes to global and national policies and research agenda) and **Stakeholders’ Awareness** (e.g. understanding the relevance of the unit outcomes to the professional community).

In Questionnaire 4 (Appendix 2, Table 4.27), **Global and National Relevance** are not addressed. The theme **Stakeholders’ Awareness** is barely addressed, with all responses focusing more on collaboration in the process of unit design, “if we usually discuss the outcomes with colleagues who teach the same course, we decide on the outcomes based on the level of the course and the industrial needs” (R1). No responses elaborate on the impact of the units on students’ professional goals and needs.

**(d) The critical perspective**

Responses to this question were obtained in relation to the theme, **Stakeholders’ Awareness**.

**General pattern in the follow-up interviews**

The points of critique outlined above make it evident that teaching by integrating research and inquiry requires that academics approach their own practices critically. This would benefit not only the students, but also their own work as scholars and field leaders. The responses offered by the lecturers in Questionnaire 4 and in the follow-up interviews show the lecturers experiencing difficulties to demonstrate that a reflective and critical process was applied. In fact, as the follow-up interviews show (Appendix 2, Table 4.28), developing a critical mindset is not always a priority.
among ELTE academics (subtheme: *Change is not popular*), “Staff are not interested enough to join this project due to something else, their business. It is also about the culture here. They are not ready to prepare something systematically or earlier (beforehand); they do not like to be challenged, they like to play safe. They love to do what they have now. They do not like to be challenged to do new things” (R1). The lecturers participating in the study expressed also a desire for shared learning, seeing collaboration as critical to everyone’s success, “I need support from all lecturers in the department/university, we need to work together” (R4). Yet, discussions alone do not generate a critical stance. As demonstrated in the points above, the lecturers do not show to possess techniques or the knowledge of how to contend with the problematic of the field of ELTE and do not teach students to do the same by example. Instead, too often, units continue to be organised around traditional concepts and criteria that emphasise the “job” of a language teacher as oriented toward perfecting the language skills, not reflecting critically on, and experimenting with, the concepts and approaches in order to become better users of English and better teachers of the subject. Effective integration of research and inquiry into teaching depends on the degree to which the lecturers themselves practise the skills that these involve.

(e) **The global and local context**

Responses to this question were obtained in relation to the theme, **University Funding, Workload and Support**.

**General pattern in the follow-up interviews**

In the follow-up interviews, and in Questionnaire 4, the lecturers tended to not see it as important to embed their unit design in relation to issues, policies or practices. Conscious of the challenge, in the subtheme, *Challenge: No capacity building/no administrative support* (Appendix 2, Table 4.28), Lecturer (R5) expresses a need for a greater connection with administrative bodies, “Clear rules and good supports from the faculty”, for staff to learn and to be able to implement new policies for change to take place. This also includes formalisation of links with industry and professionals, for example, by “making of letter of recommendations or letter of permissions addressed to schools to collect data” (R5).
(f) The generative perspective

Responses to this question were obtained in relation to the themes, Course and Unit Design, and Stakeholders’ Awareness.

General pattern in the follow-up interviews

When lecturers depend more on a systematic process, rather than trial and error, they are more likely to approach ideas, their own or those of others, critically in order to make informed decisions. Learning never stops, but the method of this learning process needs to be put in place for learning to continue and for the lecturers to seek learning. In view of the critique presented above, it can be said that the ELTE lecturers show to be aware of the need to change and began implementing the vocabulary of the new curriculum agenda as well as the unit design structures that this agenda necessitates. These are the changes that the findings show that have already happened and, increasingly, can become standard practice. This is a positive finding and the responses of Lecturers (R1), (R2) and (R5) (Appendix 2, Table 4.29) revolve around the new concepts of design. However, their responses also show that they are still to develop processes that would enable them to approach challenges from the position of principle and, therefore, strength. For example, in the theme of Course and Unit Design, subtheme Challenge: Differentiated instruction, Lecturer (R1) believes that adjusting pedagogy to suit the diversity of needs of the student cohort and their levels of managing the workload showed to be a challenge, “I learned from some other syllabuses and I tried to design my own. I made some small changes [as] the unit was running, based on the students’ responses and capabilities. In the beginning, the project was planned to end with the students writing an article, but we could not make it because the students thought it was too hard for them, and there was no support from other lecturers in co-authoring students’ articles”. Yet, he proposes no framework for resolving the problem: no process that would assist him/her to better understand what individual differences imply and whether changing assessment was the best response on his/her part.

Accordingly, in the theme of Stakeholders’ Awareness, subtheme Raising students’ awareness and Accounting for the needs of stakeholders (Appendix 2, Table 4.29), Lecturers (R2) and (R5) describe their experience in an informal, anecdotal way; missing are references to formal processes that underpin the rationale that they generate: “In the beginning, they were scared. They questioned why the unit came
with more activities than previous units. After I explained in more detail, and I give them examples, they started to understand and work actively” (R2), and “They had mostly positive responses: the students, the teachers in schools, and my colleagues. One student told me that a [school] teacher was happy to see the students coming to the teacher’s class and asking about problems in his/her teaching” (R5). The responses illustrate an ongoing challenge that the participants experienced throughout the project: inability to draw on research, including their own, in order to better understand what is required of them in the light of new policies. Focusing on redesigning units only, as it is happening right now, is insufficient to generate new practices, new thinking and new futures.

4.7 Conclusion

Chapter 4 presented the findings of the study. The data from Questionnaire 1 were collected from ELTE lecturers across Indonesia on the issue of integrating research and inquiry into ELTE undergraduate programs. The data framed the study by providing it with seven themes and the key subthemes for organising data in the following questionnaires. The data in Questionnaire 1 was also organised by academic rank and, overall, across Indonesia, the tendency was for ELTE academics with a higher academic rank to identify a greater range of themes and subthemes relevant to integrating research and inquiry into undergraduate programs than their junior counterparts. In terms of uptake, the data showed that the participants’ comments addressed mainly the theme of University Funding, Workload and Support. This impact was mostly visible in the area of “Challenge”, indicating that the respondents felt left to their own devices when integrating research and inquiry, while universities and their administration offered no support, thus communicating a message that investigative learning is not optional and universities do not invest in the process. Furthermore, the theme of drawing on Personal Research showed that ELTE academics do not explicitly identify integrating research and inquiry skills as one of the key foci of their own research.

Questionnaire 2 findings illustrated the perspectives of thirteen lecturers on their learning experiences during the three-day workshop organised by the researcher. The findings show lectures addressing all themes identified in this study, however poorly. This is a change from Questionnaire 1. Also, the importance of Stakeholder Awareness increased when compared
with Questionnaire 1. Once again, the theme of **University Funding, Workload and Support** had the most comments, with academics appreciating the experience of shared learning and expressed the need for more workshops of this kind. **Personal Research** was addressed partially, with no implications being drawn for its relevance to the process of designing students’ investigative learning experiences.

Questionnaire 3 data were collected from a group of seven ELTE academics, who participated in Stage 3 of the study. The findings illustrate the challenges that they experienced when re-designing the syllabi of the units that they teach in order to account for research and inquiry. The data from Questionnaire 3 were compared with the feedback of a CDU expert on two designs that were sent to the researcher. The two methods of data collection were analysed using different approaches in order to examine if the findings correlated. Indeed, overlaps were identified. In Questionnaire 3, ELTE lecturers provided responses to a very narrow set of subthemes in four (4) out of seven (7) themes identified in this study. **Global and National Relevance** and **Personal Research** were not addressed. When viewing these findings against the CDU expert’s feedback, it was established that **Personal Research** played no role in the framing of the new syllabi. This was not a positive outcome. The syllabi lacked references to concepts and visions of the ELTE discipline that students could investigate and evaluate in order to build critical, professional mindsets. This omission was shown to have an impact on other investigative aspects of syllabus design, making it difficult to see what students were to interrogate and what value did research and inquiry have to their professional goals. In Questionnaire 3, in the theme of **Course and Unit Design**, competence-oriented assessment activities, although mentioned, offered no tangible reason for why their students would use research and inquiry when responding to assessment tasks. In general, across all themes that were addressed, Lecturer (R3) showed exceptional clarity in his/her descriptions, yet the persistent lack of precision was also present in his/her responses, a factor that makes it difficult to ascertain how the lecturer applied his/her thinking in practice.

Feedback from a CDU expert on the two syllabi offered by ELTE lecturers for comments created an opportunity to obtain more practical insights on the planning skills of the lecturers. According to the CDU expert, in the syllabi provided, the lecturers favoured study methods that focused more on the understanding of concepts presented by the lecturers, not on investigation. This was also a finding of Questionnaire 3. In the theme of **Pedagogy**,
lecturers felt challenged as to this aspect of design and, while some activities did look like research, no mention was made as to how students are to use research and inquiry for these activities to result in informed perspectives. In relation to **Global and National Relevance**, themes that concerned themselves with the relevance of units to global and national contexts, it was found that their absence in Questionnaire 3 also had a significant impact on the design. Students’ learning outcomes and long-term benefits, when disconnected from those global and national contexts, are lacking in connections with policies and perspectives on general education. This issue was also shown to be a problem in the syllabi, which failed to contextualise learning outcomes against the changes that are sweeping across Indonesia and beyond. Students could only benefit from an opportunity to make such connection in order to better understand their roles as teachers in 21st century.

Questionnaire 4 (ten respondents) and follow-up interviews (six transcripts) concluded the study. Two different methods for analysing data were applied to better understand the concluding perspectives of the lecturers. In Questionnaire 4, the data were analysed using questions adapted from the architecture of a “job-to-be-done” model developed by the Harvard Business School (HBS, 2010). Specifically, Question 3 was used, “What has been achieved in the area of your responsibility?” (HBS, 2010), was used. In follow-up interviews, Lian and Pertiwi’s (2017) criteria for evaluating research in education were applied.

Data from Questionnaire 4 showed that lecturers focused on two themes only, **Course and Syllabus Design** and **Pedagogy**. Responses were found to be instrumental in nature, i.e. the lecturers identified what was done, but did not specify what different approaches their students investigated and how, and in what ways would the students’ learning be beneficial to them. Once again, no lecturer made references to **Global and National Relevance** or **Personal Research**. This finding, as discussed in earlier stages of research, correlates with ELTE academics having difficulties in embedding their units within an overarching framework that would give unit activities purpose and, therefore, meaning. When applying Lian and Pertiwi’s (2017) framework to the data from follow-up interviews, it was possible to demonstrate that, overall, lecturers tended to avoid references to any processes when addressing unit design. They also tended to approach disciplinary knowledge as facts, rather than perspectives to be contended with, investigated, and evaluated in the light of new ideas and evidence. This approach to knowledge was reflected in unit designs, where it was never really shown how to plan students’ learning experiences so as to help build critically
informed perspectives. Lack of support from university administration was also reported in the final stages of the study.

Overall, the findings of Chapter 4 showed that, while ELTE lectures participating in the study tended to be aware of the new policies of higher education and the need for change, they still need to develop generative practices and principles on which they could rely in order to build their new syllabi and curricula and, in the process, grow their own scholarship. Participation in this project may have helped to build a learning community interested in the subject of research and inquiry in ELTE programs. Initially, responses on each questionnaire tended to be vague, lacking elaboration and structure. However, as illustrated in Table 4.29, with time, ELTE lecturers became more talkative and included more information in their responses. The present study is a case in point illustrating that learning communities are effective, and, with the help of good leadership skills, academics will cooperate; but change requires more of an intellectual shift, rather than change of practice only. In fact, as shown in this chapter, when lecturers begin to trust their own questions, they may begin to trust the questions that their students may have.
Chapter 5: Discussion

5.1 Introduction
Chapter 5 discusses research findings from the perspective of the research questions posed in Chapter 1. Implications of the findings are developed and discussed in relation to issues identified in Chapter 2, such as a vision of higher education that ELTE teaching communicates to the students and across Indonesia and internationally; the investment that Indonesia and its universities make in order to implement the New Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015) and this includes integration of research and inquiry into undergraduate higher education programs; and the culture that dominates ELTE research in Indonesia and its impact on the process of implementation of the new higher education curriculum reforms. The chapter concludes with a summary of the key points of the discussion.

5.2 Responses to research questions
The study was organised around five research questions:

(1) What challenges does the integration of research and inquiry into undergraduate degree curricula present to ELTE academics in Indonesian universities?
(2) In what ways can the integration of research and inquiry contribute to the building of a 21st century model of ELTE programs relevant to the Indonesian context?
(3) What are the optimal conditions required to support research and inquiry in undergraduate ELTE degree structures?
(4) In what ways did the “community-building” approach of the study assist (or prevent) the academic ELTE staff in identifying and implementing models for working with research and inquiry skills in undergraduate programs?
(5) What strategies can be applied to change the culture and practices of ELTE pedagogy to contribute to the building of a 21st century model of English teacher education programs relevant to the Indonesian context?

The sections that follow discuss research findings presented in Chapter 4 by addressing each of the questions respectively. Response to Research Question 1 is relatively detailed, since Research Question 1 addresses the key research issue of the study. Responses to the subsequent research questions are implications developed from Research Question 1.
5.2.1 Research Question 1: Challenges in implementation of research and inquiry

Findings from Chapter 4 show that ELTE academics were challenged, and many also felt being challenged, in just about every aspect of the process of integrating research and inquiry into their curricula.

Figure 5.1 illustrates the total of all responses on all four questionnaires. The distribution of responses shows an imbalance in favour of comments on issues such as Course and Unit Design and Pedagogy. This disproportional distribution of responses is indicative of ELTE lecturers viewing the issue of research and inquiry as a design problem, not as a question that needs to be addressed from the perspective of a framework, or rationale, that would locate the units they teach and the pedagogy that they apply within a larger context of issues that render their units both relevant and timely. The discussion that unfolds below contextualises this concern by illustrating the links that lecturers made, or failed to make, when reporting on, or designing, curricula integrating research and inquiry.

Figure 5.1: General distribution of data across the four questionnaires.

Table 5.1. illustrates all comments per questionnaire, in total per theme, and percentages.
### Table 5.1: All comments per questionnaire, in total per theme, and percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Q 1</th>
<th>Q 2</th>
<th>Q 3</th>
<th>Q 4</th>
<th>All Comments</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Relevance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Relevance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and Unit Design</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders' Awareness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Funding, Workload and Support</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Research</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total comments</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.1.1 **Personal Research and research and inquiry in undergraduate ELTE programs**

The most striking challenge identified in Chapter 4 was an overwhelming absence of links between lecturers’ personal research and the higher education curriculum renewal agenda. Consistently, the data from all sources that were employed in the study (questionnaires, syllabi and follow-up interviews), showed no responses that would elaborate on the role of personal research in generating investigative learning experiences in students and, therefore, unit designs. In Questionnaire 1, lecturers’ responses about their own research were discussed by them in isolation from any issues that would relate to new curriculum requirements. Questions 1 and 2 of analysis (“What is involved in integrating research and inquiry?” and “What experiences need to be provided in order to integrate research and inquiry?”) showed that lecturers made no connections between their descriptions of what they do as research and the impact of this research on their teaching. This was an alarming finding because the process of building investigative mindsets requires that lecturers both approach the discipline of ELTE as questions rather than answers and present it to the students as such. While in relation to Question 3 in Questionnaire 1 (Appendix 2, Table 4.9), lecturers identified concepts like comprehension, motivation (“an action research about reading comprehension and motivation” Level A (R2)) or listening (“My research interests cover L2 listening, grammar, and SLA” Level B (R6)) as worthy research, Questionnaire 1 contains no examples of concepts or approaches that were identified as worthy investigation by the students.

A small change was noted in Questionnaire 2, where the lecturers said that the three-day workshop provided them with ideas on “how to find out the current topics of the research”
However, in the same questionnaire in Question 2 of analysis (“What experiences need to be provided?” , Appendix, Table 4.15), no implications were drawn from these new insights as to any principles, methods or concepts that could be utilised in unit designs to stimulate investigative learning. By the end of Questionnaire 2, the study began to show a serious gap in ELTE, with lecturers potentially interpreting the concepts of research and inquiry in a way that did not challenge their regular teaching practices. In other words, change seemed to be more about the cosmetics, rather than about their scholarship and how it is demonstrated through their teaching.

In order to obtain more tangible data that goes beyond non-committal responses to questionnaires, lecturers’ actual syllabi were collected for analysis and feedback. Only two syllabi were delivered on time, prior to the teaching; the remaining eleven were sent after the teaching was completed. Evaluation of eleven syllabi by a CDU expert showed that, once again, lecturers failed to draw on personal research, when preparing their syllabi, and on the concepts and approaches that investigation and questioning would help students in developing their own learned perspectives. Altogether, the syllabi, Questionnaire 3 (inquiring about potential challenges in syllabus design), the data from Questionnaire 4 (reflecting on what lecturers achieved as a result of their participation in the project) and the follow-up interviews, all showed that lecturers were not clear as to how the process of investigation is to result in learning and what exactly students would need to investigate.

In the syllabi (Table 4.19; 4.20; 4.21; 4.22; 4.23; and Appendix 2, Table 4.24), lecturers demonstrated their inability to (a) break down the subject that they were teaching (e.g. Reading for Academic Purposes, Table 4.19) into concepts in order to specify the purpose of the unit that they taught; (b) relate the purpose of the units taught to students’ professional contexts, i.e. the values and goals in relation to which they construct themselves as English language teachers and/or English language users; and (c) identify the process by which the concepts of the unit could be investigated by the students in relation to those values and goals. However, to develop responses that account for all these relationships requires that lecturers include a great deal of detail. Yet, absence of detail in lecturers’ responses is evident throughout the study. Subsequently, in the follow-up interviews (Table 4.29), when discussing issues relevant to syllabus framing, Lecturer (R1) is seen to be vague in his/her explanations as to how s/he frames the units. In turn, Lecturer (R3) reverted to a content-
based approach to unit design, where what was studied, how and for what purpose was based on the lecturer’s understanding of “what students should master”, which was then interpreted as “the basic skills of English structure”, not what the students should investigate.

It needs to be reiterated that Questionnaire 1 involved a different population of ELTE lecturers than the subsequent data collection processes. Yet, all respondents failed to make explicit links between their own research and teaching.

5.2.1.2 University Funding, Workload and Support
The second most prominent challenge that emerged from the findings reported in Chapter 4 was a general absence of comments illustrating support given by universities and ELTE departments for academics to learn how to work with the new IQF (The Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2012) and the New Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015). Especially important is lack of evidence that universities put in place services that ensure that help is systematic and that academics, and academia in general, understand the nature of the change that is required of them.

This need for help and for collaboration between colleagues and administration was made evident first in Questionnaire 1, where ELTE lecturers from all over Indonesia, saw it was important for universities to offer professional development in all aspects of new curriculum design. However, not all lecturers felt left alone, “to support the department regarding the graduate competencies, we frequently discuss the progress of achieving the goals of department and conduct research” (Appendix 2, Table 4. 9, Level A (R10)), others commented on their university providing them with money to do research, “The university where I work provides research funds especially for classroom action research” (Appendix 2, Table 4. 9, Level A (R4)). However, lack of capacity building was reported by others (Appendix 2, Table 4. 9, Level B (R6)). One lecturer called the process of change “‘theory’ without practice” (Level B (R11)). Another lecturer expressed concerns about the quality of the accreditation processes applied by universities, the weak role that Quality Assurance bodies play in this process, low budget and lack of qualified staff and quality services: “Those circumstances [i.e. challenges] include the weakening position of the quality assurance body; illegitimate position of the faculty relative to the Institute; disproportional budget scheme for research and social service; small number of highly qualified teaching
staff; weak IT management and some other problems related to student services.” (Appendix 2, Table 4. 9, Level B (R7)).

As the study developed, the high level of responses in the area of **University Funding, Workload and Support** in Questionnaire 1 stands in stark contrast to responses offered in subsequent questionnaires. However, no comments were given by ELTE lecturers that would describe any support or training being offered by their universities, with the exception of participation in this research. The lecturers say nothing about any systemic processes that universities put in place in order to assist them to understand better what research and inquiry actually involve and to apply the expectations correctly. Questionnaire 3 is poor in responses in this area, with two out of seven lecturers sharing the desire for a more collaborative process to be applied in their institutions, “All the syllabus in my department should be discussed with all colleagues who get the same course at the same level so this needs much time to finish the learning outcomes and the description for each unit.” (Appendix 2, Table 4.18, R2). Another lecturer felt challenged due to the constraint on his/her time and resources, “Since it’s new for me, the process takes a lot of my time and resources” (R7). In Questionnaire 4, there is only one comment on this theme, with a lecturer feeling challenged by what is required of him, “Integrating outcomes into the unit description is not an easy process because it needs deep analysis to decide the level of the difficulty of the outcome.” (Level A (R10)).

In the follow-up interviews (Appendix 2, Table 4.29), lecturers offered more comments with Lecturer (R3) also calling for more opportunities for shared learning with faculty staff and students, “I think with research and inquiry; lecturer and students can collaborate. How to identify learning outcomes? Are they based on our opinions, arguments, needs, or from others? We need more discussions or perhaps workshops to cope with this issue”. This is a valuable comment considering that learning is not occurring in a vacuum and perspectives of stakeholders should matter. Lecturer (R4) expressed the need for support along similar lines, “I need support from all lecturers in the department/university, we need to work together, especially in integrated skills (L-S-R-W)”. Another lecturer (R6) shared his/her frustration with feeling lonely in relation to the mounting expectations placed on the lecturers by the new agenda: “Problems of communication between lecturers, preparation, and time. More time is needed to correlate the materials and learning objectives among related units. We have not found a good concept in integrating the skills. The challenge is the
synchronisation of unit content or learning materials. It is difficult to make the same goals with my colleagues. They do not care [about] the goals of the integration of research and inquiry in their teaching units”.

5.2.1.3 Stakeholders’ Awareness

The third most salient finding of the study was absence of principles that would ensure a strong presence of stakeholders in the process of unit development. In fact, not many comments were offered on the theme of Stakeholders’ Awareness, especially in the later stages of the study, as from Questionnaire 3. This makes it a significant problem because, as indicated when discussing Personal Research, when lecturers do not theorise what investigation entails, their units fail to account for the professional needs and goals of those who have stakes in the success of those units. This includes the lecturers themselves, their students, professional and accreditation bodies, and the universities, each contributing their perspective on those units.

Questionnaires 1 and 2 had the greatest response rate on the theme of Stakeholders’ Awareness (Figure 4.2). In Questionnaire 1, among the stakeholders mentioned were the students and other lecturers (as individuals). Some comments were positive, “My students are aware of skills and behaviour that they need to demonstrate after graduation. Therefore, students’ motivation in achieving good result is higher.” (Appendix 2, Table 4.4., Level A (R4)). Other comments were negative, “Problems in the implementation of graduate competencies relate to the mindsets of the teachers and learners.” (Appendix 2, Table 4.9, Level B (R6)). Lecturer A (R10) summarises his/her context, “I don’t think, they are aware of them. However, it does not become a big deal when we, as lecturers, do understand about the graduate competencies and try to implement them in the students learning process.” (Level A (R10). Questionnaire 2 expanded the list of stakeholders by pointing to administrative sections, such as departmental culture, “Sharing with each other. I, as a lecturer, have to be ready and need to share with others about all kinds of curriculum changing” (R12). Another lecturer included industry (although not explicitly named this way) and policy-makers, “Next time, invite a stakeholder or decision maker in the university” (R11). Gradually as the project progressed, in the syllabi and Questionnaires 3 and 4, the inclusion of stakeholders became minimal if present at all.
In Questionnaires 3 (Appendix 2, Table 4.18), there are three comments only from seven lecturers on this subject. In Questionnaire 4 (Appendix 2, Table 4.27), four comments from ten participants were identified as related to the theme of Stakeholders’ Awareness. In other words, not every respondent made references to the theme, not even half of them. In Questionnaire 3, one lecturer made a specific reference to schools (industry), indicating a need for “comparing the unit outcomes with the students'/school's culture” (R4) (Appendix 2, Table 4.18). Lecturers (R1) and (R2) point to the university and ELTE departments more as sources of expertise, “Then, to deliver the outcome component, I consult to those who have expertise in KKNI” (R1); and “All the syllabus in my department should be discussed with all colleagues who get the same course at the same level” (R2) (Appendix 2, Table 4.18).

This omission of stakeholders was also present in all eleven syllabi submitted to the researcher for analysis and feedback. Every syllabus failed to contextualise its purpose in relation to specific concepts, to be investigated by the students, that would account for their professional needs and goals as specified in various policy documents, including the IQF (The Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2012), the New Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015) and the national Indonesian school curriculum (The Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2013b). For example (Appendix 2, Table 4.24), one lecturer defined the purpose of his/her unit in traditional terms, referring to the skill of listening, “This unit prepares students to be able to first, listen to the variation of spoken texts that relate to professional context” with a view to learning to “comprehend the spoken texts”, and do so by “complet[ing] the dialogue, complet[ing] the missing words, true false, answer the question, etc. and the last, it prepares the students to analyse the register in spoken texts”. None of these goals draw on policies, goals or values of higher education and industry, or illustrate how students’ learning is to impact on how they define themselves professionally. Listening and completing exercises alone does not satisfy these conditions.

In the follow-up interviews, four lecturers commented on the subject of Stakeholders’ Awareness. The comments focused on the lecturers and the students, expressing the need for a greater engagement of their colleagues for everyone’s benefit, “[academic staff], they do not like to be challenged, they like to play safe. They love to do what they have now. They do not like to be challenged to do new things” (R1) (Appendix 2, Table 4.29). Regarding students, the lectures spoke in general terms, without making references to the
specific changes that they made in their teaching in order to both understand and address students’ professional goals. “In the beginning, they were scared. They questioned why the unit came with more activities than previous units. After I explained in more detail, and I give them examples, they started to understand and work actively” (R2) (Appendix 2, Table 4.29).

5.2.1.4 Global and National Contexts
The themes of Global and National Contexts were addressed only in Questionnaires 1 and 2, only to drop to zero in the subsequent stages of data collection (Figure 5.1). This result is consistent with the findings described above, all showing lecturers lacked processes for relating their units to the needs of the global and local communities that shape the professional lives of their students. With lecturers not being quite clear about the role of stakeholders in their teaching designs, references to Global and National Contexts were ignored as lecturers began to focus on the practicalities on teaching designs. It seemed as if those global and local contexts were unrelated to their pedagogic problems, which dealt with the “here and now”.

In Questionnaire 1, lecturers showed a good understanding of the new curriculum agenda from the perspective of its impact on (a) reputation of universities, “[t]he reputation of the university [is] largely based on the performance of its graduates when they move onto carrier and higher learning.” (Appendix 2, Table 4.4, Level C (R13)); (b) teaching quality, “in terms of the requirement to get their thesis-based articles published in reputable scholarly journals, students are not ready without any supports right from the beginning when they propose topics for their thesis.” (Appendix 2, Table 4.4, Level D (R1)); (c) international standards, “Graduate competence is one thing become important and my institution aware this term because of global needs”. (Appendix 2, Table 4.4, Level A (R3)); (d) global expectations, “[Due to] globalization, new direction of education is obliviously needed. [T]he new direction of graduate competencies mentioned in KKNI as well as in Decree 44, 2015 are better than before.” (Appendix 2, Table 4.4, Level A (R12)); (e) employability, “The graduate competencies are supposed to be reflections of abilities to deal with profession as well as the characters needed like leadership, team working ability, time management, and many jobs and professions. They must be relevant with the foundational knowledge and skills of the more.” (Appendix 2, Table 4.4, Level B (R6)); and on (f) education quality, “competencies deal with skills, behavior, and learning outcomes that students need to
demonstrate after they graduated.” (Appendix 2, Table 4.4, Level A (R4)). All the above-mentioned points were ignored in the later stages of the project despite the lectures having them discussed during the three-day workshop.

In Questionnaire 2 a number of national issues were identified that the new curriculum agenda has the potential to impact on, such as (a) **Degree quality and student quality**, “[I]t will be better if we discuss more about repairing our education system” (R1) (Appendix 2, Table 4.15); and (b) **Degree quality and employability**, “I finally found that students need to have better learning experiences that can fulfil industrial needs and that a lecture must force students to do a research and it in a good paper” (R13) (Appendix 2, Table 4.15). Some lecturers expressed concerns about the implementation process, “The survey findings shown on the first day of the workshop evidently proved that, in many universities, the IQF and graduate competencies are still disregarded when designing courses.” (R10) (Appendix 2, Table 4.13). Yet, none of these points was engaged when designing syllabi or evaluating their experiences in this study.

5.2.1.5 **Course and Unit Design and Pedagogy**

Figure 5.1 shows that, as the study began focusing on the specifics that inform teaching and learning in ELTE programs, responses on the themes of **Course and Unit Design** and **Pedagogy** grew disproportionately in relation to other aspects of unit designs. The discussion of the implications of this finding cannot be removed from the points made so far. The theme of **Personal Research** showed that ELTE lecturers make no explicit links between their own research and how they integrate research and inquiry into undergraduate programs. The themes of **Stakeholders’ Awareness** and **Global and National Contexts** showed that lecturers do not theorise what research and inquiry entail sufficiently well, in order for their unit designs to make evident who the stakeholders are and how they are integrated so as to enable the units to respond to global and national shifts that the new IQF (The Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2012) and the New Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015) seek to address. In addition, a clear lack of support from universities and their administration (**University Funding, Workload and Support**) makes the job of academics exponentially harder, especially junior staff, who were shown in Questionnaire 1 to have more experience in understanding the new curriculum policies (no major differences were detected in Questionnaire 4, which also accounted for academic rank).
Responses to the themes of **Unit and Course Design** and **Pedagogy**, when examined in the context of these earlier findings, appear more to be framed *ad hoc*, rather than by applying principles and questions that flow from them. The eleven syllabi offered by lecturers for analysis and feedback are a case in point here. When discussing their experiences with those in Questionnaire 4, lecturers’ comments are vague and thin on detail, which makes it evident that the descriptions provided by lecturers are lacking in experience and reflection, “[I identify unit outcomes by drawing on the unit description.] The unit prepares students to be able to be involved in academic fora (such as presenting papers, becoming moderators in discussions, questioning, answering questions, arguing, etc.)” (Appendix 2, Table 4.27, Level B (R7)). When compared with the actual syllabi (Appendix 2, Table 4.24), objectives, such as preparing students “to be involved in academic fora” are too general and need breaking down in order for the lecturer to know what exactly will be the focus of his/her students’ investigations, what approaches will they contrast and in relation to what goals for the unit relevant to their professional goals. Consequently, this lack of precisions impacts on pedagogy, “They will learn through an interactive model; group work will be encouraged and sharing of ideas and assignment drafts to stimulate discussion and critical knowledge building.” (Appendix 2, Table 4.27, Level B (R7)). No specific pedagogic model emerges from this description. While the activities in and of themselves may be interesting, the point of pedagogy is to create a bridge between objectives and outcomes, and this connection is missing here.

The example discussed above is the norm in the themes of **Unit and Course Design** and **Pedagogy**, especially in the later stages of research. In each syllabus, lecturers failed to make relevant links and Questionnaires 3 and 4 and the follow-up interviews explain the actual sources of the challenges that the syllabi reflect, with the key challenge being lecturers’ own research skills and their own approach to the discipline of ELTE. As mentioned in Chapter 4, the syllabi show that lecturers are not contending with the premises of the discipline of ELTE and their students are also taught to do the same. They are expected to “master knowledge”, “produce individual text analysis” … “[b]ased on the [unspecified] topics to be covered”, or use “summarizing, paraphrasing and synthesizing” as “the components of reading” that will enable them “to be independent readers and apply those strategies” (Appendix 2, Table 4.24). The links between expectations of the lecturers and their teaching methods do not explain what will be investigated and in relation to what research. However, while Questionnaires 3 and 4 offered much data in this regard, Questionnaires 1 and 2
showed a different trend. In Questionnaires 1 and 2 there were very few comments found under the themes of **Unit and Course Design** and **Pedagogy**. More precisely, in Questionnaire 1, there were 17 comments in total from thirteen lecturers, and in Questionnaires 2, there were 22 comments in total also from thirteen lecturers (Table 5.1). This is in stark contrast with 40 comments from seven lecturers on Questionnaire 3. It follows that as lecturers felt pressured to develop their new syllabi, they intensified their thoughts on the subject of **Unit and Course Design** and **Pedagogy**, a positive outcome, even if this exercise demonstrated many gaps in their thinking.

The findings illustrated a general failure of the entire higher education system to support ELTE departments in gaining skills necessary for integration of research and inquiry skills into undergraduate units. At each level of course and unit design, as well as in their own research, lecturers were shown unable to demonstrate the knowledge of the principles or the literature that would assist them in the challenges that the new reforms and the new policies brought with them. This general ineptness demonstrates that the Indonesian government and its higher education instructions will need to approach reform implementation as a system-problem and an opportunity for universities to review not only the content of their teaching programs and the pedagogy, but also, how the scholars themselves work with research and inquiry skills, including the ability to solve problems, being critical and, especially, being innovative.

### 5.2.2 Research Question 2: Integration of research and inquiry in the building of a 21st century model of ELTE programs in the Indonesian context

The Boyer Report (1998) and the subsequent reforms that have swept through the higher education sector around the world are a response to modern pressures that called into question the very existence of universities. The policies outlined a special set of characteristics that research universities share, among them, that education must cater for higher order thinking and skills to support learning as well as to build a strong foundation for students to remain actively involved in research and professional development throughout their lives. According to the Report (Boyer Commission, 1998, p. 16), when these characteristics are not addressed, the quality of undergraduate education suffers which then impacts on the quality of students’ professional engagements and on the community at large. Embracing the challenges of the new education reforms, therefore, is essential if universities are to create educational experiences that cater for the advancement of
knowledge that is both, generated and learned in the process of critique. The various skills or competences that are listed as graduate attributes provide academics with a generic outline of the processes, values and skills that are valued in a 21st century education. Research and inquiry facilitate the process for their integration at all levels of education, including undergraduate programs. Accounting for these is not optional, as a return to more traditional forms of higher education learning would leave universities looking for innovation and relevance outside their own contexts of knowledge production. Eventually, this would make universities irrelevant to the societies as new institutions will be created to take on the “job” of educating new generations. The current trend of MOOCs (Massive Online Open Courses) is already paving a way in this direction.

For universities and university education to retain their traditional status as centres of learning and innovation, universities need to develop strategies that facilitate the integration of the new reforms into each and every sector of their activities; this includes ELTE departments in Indonesia. In Chapter 4 (Section 4.6), the implementation of the new reforms was shown to hinge on the investment that academics and academia make in developing critical mindsets to their own beliefs and practices. This included (a) ongoing reflection on the meaning of the ELTE discipline and its needs, (b) the ability to create explicit links in the curricula with global and national (local) contexts in research and pedagogy, and (c) the development of theorised processes for engaging students in the problematic of the discipline and its relevance to their future roles as teachers. In other words, in respect to each of these findings, and following the reflections of Ramsden (1998) mentioned earlier in Chapter 2, a 21st century pedagogy requires a change in the very ways in which academics construct their vision of the ELTE discipline, their own roles as ELTE educators, and the message that their research and teaching communicate to the community, both professional and the society at large.

The findings of the study only confirm the need for a greater engagement of the entire higher education system, including policy makers, in designing processes facilitating change management. Among others, as mentioned by Ramsden (1998), this includes the establishment of support systems that provide assistance at all levels of management for the academic staff to develop and engage in strategies that facilitate their professional development. No community is an island unto itself and a 21st century ELTE program needs to demonstrate the process of building, connections between itself and other communities,
academic, professional and other, in order to build is critical base, act informed, be relevant and be visible through its various engagements. When ELTE scholarship and teaching practices are defined in relation to these parameters, ELTE students will follow suit, and will learn to see the discipline as open to new insights and questions, and themselves as a conduit between the different perspectives from which new questions and new opportunities for innovation may emerge.

5.2.3 Research Question 3: What are the optimal conditions required to support research and inquiry in undergraduate ELTE degree structures?

Implementation of research and inquiry policies in undergraduate ELTE programs requires support as well as the willingness of academics to participate in the new curriculum reform. In view of the findings presented in Chapter 4, the role of academic leadership is critical, but not only. From the perspective of ELTE, the new higher education policies were designed to improve the quality of English language teaching across Indonesia. Hence, schools, parents and other community stakeholders have stakes in the success of the new reforms and their needs and ambitions need to be taken account of. The new higher education curriculum policies are challenging and difficult to implement, because, as shown above, they challenge not only what ELTE departments do, but also how they view themselves. In other words, the new curriculum reform challenges the very essence of how academics construct their identities as scholars and teachers. Assisting change will require strategies that help target this identity in ways that lecturers will find relevant to them, possible to do, and enabling them to see the positive impacts of change. The suggestions that follow below draw from the findings of Chapter 4 and focus exactly on the means by which the identity of ELTE lecturers can be addressed in ways that are rewarding for all involved:

- University support: The findings indicate that, at least in the universities participating in the study, the role of these institutions in assisting the lecturers in the process of implementing the new reforms is not clear to the lecturers. All data pointed to the need for universities to invest in faculty staff professional development. This included opportunities for shared learning, building a collaborative and supportive culture in ELTE departments, devising systems that require collaborative planning of degrees and units taught within those degrees, and leadership in the area of pedagogy and curriculum planning. Time for developing the new skills was another issue, as academics reported being busy with their regular workloads.
• Research skills: While this area of development did not emerge from lecturers’ responses, it is clear that many, if not most, of the academics participating in the study showed to be lacking in research skills that they could then pass on to their students. Creative and critical approaches to research should be encouraged and supported with calls for change and innovation in this area from highly esteemed scholars, such as Professor Gary Thomas (2007). Playing with ideas and techniques should be seen as more preferable than obediently complying with models of the past developed to address the need of the past.

• Risk-taking and courage: Findings in Chapter 4 indicate that researchers had difficulties in identifying conflicting and contrasting approaches on the different issues that they taught. ELTE lecturers should be rewarded for thinking laterally, even if at times incorrectly, rather than for following long-established research paradigms and the ways of thinking of their disciplinary colleagues from Indonesia and overseas. As argued earlier, lecturers need to feel that they can trust their own questions in order for their research to impact, first and foremost, on their own development, rather than focusing too much on the international stage.

• Change in personal research agenda: Chapter 2 demonstrates that integration of research and inquiry is still low on many agenda of ELTE academics. This needs changing, especially in ELTE departments that, traditionally, harbour research in linguistics, or even applied linguistics. While these disciplines are important, the new higher education policies require that researchers create strong relationships between what they study and what they teach: the ELTE discipline can only benefit from a closer link between the two activities.

5.2.4 Research Question 4: “Community-building” approach as a professional development tool

This study adopted a “community-building” approach as a professional development tool to facilitate a process for information sharing and Other than a three-day workshop that involved academics in reflection on Questionnaire 1 findings, Facebook, WhatsApp groups were created for all participants to keep in touch, share problems, offer suggestions for change and, overall, to feel supported and motivated to participate in the study.

It is evident that the lecturers benefited from the project, however little support it offered to their professional development. Responses to Questionnaire 2 are testimony to this
Conclusion, with lecturers requesting that the workshop last longer, “[T]he workshop is really good for me as a lecturer to enhance my knowledge and my professionalism so I hope that this kind of workshop should be held continuously” (R7) (Appendix 2, Table 4.15); and “Doing the workshop continuously by showing .. members' syllabus and check together.” (R12) (Appendix 2, Table 4.15). In Questionnaire 2, workshop participants commented on the value of shared learning that the workshop offered to them, “… the discussion in the planning stage, really beneficial. It makes my understanding better especially in designing Learning Outcomes and learning objective. plus, how we integrate the IQF and Bloom's taxonomy.” (Appendix 2, Table 4.13, (R5)). New issues for discussion emerged, “it will be better if we discuss more about repairing our education system” (R1) (Appendix 2, Table 4.15), and new awarenesses, “It made me realized that we as lectures need a silabus that can be applied in all universities (R13) (Appendix 2, Table 4.15); and “in my point of view, the survey showed there were many problems in implementing the curriculum” (R8) (Appendix 2, Table 4.15). Furthermore, initially, responses on each questionnaire tended to be vague, lacking elaboration and structure. However, as illustrated in Table 4.29, with time, ELTE lecturers became more talkative and included more information in their responses.

The project failed though in building an online community. The lecturers preferred personal contact and personal feedback on their syllabus designs. It needs to be kept in mind that this project may have been the first experience for these lecturers, where their own work was being confronted directly, and keeping confidentiality was important. However, in other contexts, where lecturers build trust in sharing their work and discussing their opinions openly, confidential online spaces may prove to be suitable.

5.2.5 Research Question 5: Strategies for changing the culture and practices of pedagogy to contribute to the building of a 21st century model of ELTE programs in Indonesia

The new higher education curriculum reforms are informed by a very specific vision of universities in the 21st century society. From the perspective of these policies, the hallmark of a 21st century model of ELTE programs are courses and units that create educational experiences that cater for the advancement of knowledge that is both, generated and learned in the process of critical investigation. As argued in Chapter 3, the critical value of research and learning is obtained by purposefully seeking out conflict by comparing and contrasting widely different phenomena in order to evaluate their impact on what one sees or values.
Those “widely different phenomena” emerge when gathering perspectives from different stakeholders, e.g. academia and its different disciplines, industry contexts, and the broader community. A 21st century model of ELTE programs is embedded in the community and, to do so increasingly effectively, it needs to expand what it knows about it by reviewing critically how its offerings and methods of teaching construct its goals and identity. Findings reported in this study point to a number of contexts where a reflective communication with stakeholders could assist ELTE departments in this very objective.

Firstly, it is evident that higher education curriculum reforms are a challenge not only to ELTE academics, but also to their institutions. Institutions need to take responsibility over their own approach to leadership in the area of ELTE pedagogy. The fact that not many academics wanted to participate in the study and that the researcher had to do a great deal of work to convince various institutions as to the value of the study shows that the motivation to change may not be as strong as needed. Also, despite being assured of confidentiality of all data, the willingness of academics to open themselves to criticism is also a challenge that not many were willing to undertake. This needs changing, and institutions may need to design professional development sessions where lecturers are given time and opportunities to prepare, so that they can feel more confident about their own work and proposals.

Secondly, the largely atheoretical approach to addressing the requirements of the new higher education reforms reveals a need for a change in what institutions, and ELTE departments specifically, value as disciplinary research. Investment in research is needed, where researchers adopt a critical approach to the subject areas that they teach, by identifying and evaluating the impacts of different frameworks on the concepts that they study by comparing and contrasting their relevance to the goals and values of the teaching community. A principled and critical approach to one’s own pedagogic research will contribute to the development of a new culture and approach to teaching, one that rewards a more systematic and accountable process. It will also help academics confront their own thinking about the ELTE discipline and their own role as researchers and mentors. Syllabus design, when not viewed as a “necessary evil”, can provide opportunities for ongoing reflection about what lecturers teach, why, how, and what else could be done. As the findings make it apparent, developing such links is more challenging than may be currently appreciated by ELTE academics in Indonesia.
Thirdly, and most importantly, the findings of the present study provide an opportunity for international universities and academics to reflect on the nature of the mentoring and capacity-building support that they extend to colleagues in Indonesia. It is clear from the findings that Indonesian academics have acquired a great deal of knowledge throughout their professional career, but lacked the capability to generate new ways of thinking. The responses offered to different questionnaires show that “western” concepts and frameworks are not foreign to ELTE lecturers. The literature review in Chapter 2 illustrates that ELTE academics have a good command of literacy and TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) theories, research methods expertise, and rely heavily on linguistics as a tool for understanding texts. Yet creativity and, especially, critique of these disciplinary terms and methods was not evident in the presented study. However, traditional dependencies on longstanding truths can be broken, new ways of thinking are possible, and risky research, argued for by Thomas (2007), has plenty to draw on in order to generate new ways of thinking.

5.3 Conclusion

This chapter concluded the study and discussed its findings by addressing research questions posed in Chapter 1.

The challenge, that the study identified as most critical to the integration of research and inquiry, is an overwhelming absence of explicit links between the lecturers’ personal research (i.e. what they research, how and why) and the manner in which they taught their subjects. This impacted on the pedagogy of their units, where the lectures, uncertain how to theorise investigation, did not know what investigative learning would entail and what exactly needs to be investigated. When designing or describing their teaching designs, lectures had difficulties in identifying conflicting and contrasting approaches on the different issues that they taught, an indication that they themselves worked with the discipline “as it is”, rather than critically investigating the relevance of its terms and theories by engaging new perspectives and expanding the cumulative knowledge of the field as a result.

In order to address these major problems, the researcher proposed a number of strategies that ELTE departments could adopt to assist them in building a 21st century model of ELTE programs. Common to all these suggestions is the strategy of reflective communication with
a broad range of stakeholders, be it people or ideas, by which ELTE departments expand the frames of references in relation which they construct the vision of ELTE discipline and their own roles in ELTE.
Chapter 6: Future directions and conclusion

6.1 Summary of the study

Chapter 6 brings the thesis to conclusion. The study was a response to the challenges that the new higher education curriculum reforms, introduced on the heels of the teacher education reform in Indonesia, have had on the teaching and planning of ELTE undergraduate programs. The reforms were introduced recently in Indonesia to improve the teaching quality in the higher education sector across Indonesia. They were motivated by a 21st century vision of higher education that the Indonesian government and Indonesian universities adopted and integration of research and inquiry is central to that vision.

Around the world, the new higher education curriculum agenda was received with mixed feelings and was implemented with a varied and difficult to assess degree of success. Nonetheless, it is generally agreed that teaching matters and that the debates on quality teaching cannot be dissociated from the debates on the quality of institutional culture. The present study took all these considerations into account when researching the impacts of the new reforms on ELTE undergraduate teaching.

The policies are now in place, but how do Indonesian academics go about embracing the change? In an attempt to answer this question, the researcher set out to examine the challenges that Indonesian ELTE academics experience when designing curricula that integrate research and inquiry into their undergraduate programs. Designing investigative learning experiences is especially difficult in undergraduate courses, where, at least until the New Higher Education Standards were introduced (MRTHE, 2015), research was not featured prominently in undergraduate programs, and its integration was neither expected nor compulsory. In order to identify the challenges that the new reforms present, the study adopted qualitative research methods as best suited for obtaining as many perspectives as possible from ELTE colleagues on the issue and to examine the concepts and methods that they apply, as well as their own views on the subject matter.

As a methodology, the study utilised a dialogic model of inquiry, whose characteristics were drawn from a number of publications (Calhoun, 1996; Latour, 2004; Lian, 2006, 2012). The key feature of a dialogic model is to seek out conflict by comparing and contrasting widely
different phenomena and to engage various methods for data collection and analysis in order to generate many points from which patterns and perspectives could be ascertained and evaluated. The study literally sets out conditions for dialogue and its research tools and methods create conversations between the different data points. Furthermore, the researcher did not undertake to represent or reflect any voices. Simply put, the study explored the relevance of its own voice, i.e. the impact of the “conversations” that it created in order to learn more about the context of its concern: research and inquiry in undergraduate ELTE programs. The researcher took care to describe all its research processes precisely in order for the study to define neatly its conceptual limits and, thereby, its significance.

The findings of the study confirmed the initial hypothesis generated in the course of ELTE literature review. By and large, ELTE lecturers find integration of research and inquiry challenging. It is clear from the elicited that while Indonesian academics had been given a great deal of knowledge throughout their professional career, they lacked the capability to generate new ways of thinking. The findings demonstrate that ELTE lecturers did not approach the “job” of facilitating investigative learning experiences by theorising investigation and what it entails. Furthermore, university and ELTE departments were shown to be poor in initiatives for assisting lecturers in developing the skills necessary to meet the requirements of the new higher education curricula. For now, academics tend to struggle on their own, too frequently approaching change more as a technical skill rather than as an opportunity to reflect on the reasons for change and its potential impact on their own scholarship and the discipline of ELTE in general.

The author proposed a number of strategies that ELTE departments could implement in order to assist them in reducing the gap with the 21st century vision of education encapsulated in the New Higher Education Standards (MRTHE, 2015) and, in the process, build a 21st century model of ELTE programs. Common to all these suggestions was the strategy of reflective communication with a broad range of stakeholders for ELTE academics to develop a critical mindset regarding their own practices and the view of the ELTE discipline that informs them. The challenges identified in the study may not be peculiar to Indonesia. There is a strong likelihood, also expressed in Chapter 5, that the discipline itself needs renewing. The New Higher Education Standards may have just opened an opportunity for ELTE academics, from Indonesia and elsewhere, to embrace critique as its key research process.
and explore new territories, build new alliances and redefine themselves if only to enable the same processes for their students.

6.2 Contribution of the study to the field of ELTE

In Australia, frequently, scholars point out that, increasingly, they are asked to do more with less (Ramsden, 1998, p. 6). Star and Hammer (2008, p. 241) showed concern that the curriculum renewal agenda and its investment in higher education pedagogy weigh heavily on today’s academics adding to their workload that also includes other responsibilities, such as doing research, mentoring PhD students, developing new courses, building research communities, participating in a multitude of administrative meetings, or simply spending countless hours teaching, assessing students, providing individualised feedback for online students, to mention but a few. Similar concerns were also raised by ELTE lecturers: “How to find the time to do it all and well?” The pressures are even greater in countries like Indonesia or Cambodia, where, in many universities, academics are paid for teaching hours only. The present study offered a number of valuable insights that may provide direction for ELTE academics in Indonesia and, in fact, anywhere, as the research findings touch upon challenges that are applicable globally.

The findings of the study showed a clear relationship between research and teaching. When this relationship was broken, both research and teaching suffered. It is clear from the study findings that Indonesian ELTE academics are involved in research and have a thorough understanding of their discipline. The responses offered to the different questionnaires and the designs presented in the syllabi show that “western” concepts and frameworks are not foreign to ELTE lecturers. The literature review in Chapter 2 demonstrated that ELTE academics have a good command of literacy and TESOL theories and research methods expertise. Yet, the requirement to facilitate investigative learning experiences for their students revealed that they do not approach what their knowledge critically. When designing or describing their teaching, lecturers had difficulties in identifying conflicting and contrasting approaches on the different issues that they taught, an indication that they themselves worked with the discipline “as it is”, rather than critically investigating the relevance of its terms and theories by engaging new perspectives and expanding the cumulative knowledge of the field as a result. This approach to their own research impacted on the pedagogy of their units, where the lecturers, uncertain as to how to theorise
investigation, did not know what investigative learning would entail and what exactly needed to be investigated. Therefore, at times, terms like mastery or the study of the basic structures of English appeared in their comments as the defining goals of their teaching and their students’ learning.

The findings of the present study, the discussion chapter and the concluding remarks only vindicate the call for change made by Professor Gary Thomas (2007), who is highly critical of the stifling effect that disciplinary truths of education and its research methods have had on innovation and the growth of disciplinary knowledge and its impact. According to Thomas, when theories are “cherished, not falsified” (p. 90), they become “the proud fortress for one’s thinking”, rather than “the intellectual construction to be relentlessly assailed” (p. 146). This attitude results in a research, and teaching, culture that is obsessed with “what-is” and “what has-been”, thus “collectively excluding the raw light of new ideas” (p. 92). When teaching and syllabus design are not viewed as separate from the core of academic work, which is to contribute to concepts that guide disciplinary approaches for identifying facts and phenomena (Bourdieu 1992 cited in Thomas, p. 83), research and teaching, both inform one another. Each of the two aspects of academic work involves the researcher in the same task: identifying positions from which one’s goals become increasingly perceptible from the perspective of the questions that they ask, a true goal of a dialogic learning.

### 6.5 Limitations of the study

The study had several limitations.

The most striking is the low number (thirteen) of ELTE academics that responded to Questionnaire 1 and, the equally low number (thirteen) of lecturers, who agreed to participate in the professional development activities that formed the background of the study. The number of participating scholars varied between the different stages of data collection. However, some measures were undertaken in order to counter these negative effects. First, a literature review of ELTE studies was undertaken in order to learn about the culture of ELTE research and the presence of research and inquiry or New Higher Education Standards in those studies (MRTHE, 2015). As mentioned earlier, serious shortcomings were detected in the literature that was analysed, also confirmed by the present study.
Second, due to low response by ELTE departments to the project, the study worked with a cohort that came from different universities, but all lecturers were from the same geographic area. It is likely that this may have impacted somewhat on the results, considering that the participants may have shared similar attitudes and cultures, and degree of internationalisation. Another study would need to take this factor in consideration in order to obtain a better cross-section of the ELTE population.

Third, one may add that the limited number of participants could mean that a narrow range of ELTE subjects was included in the study and, especially, when syllabi are concerned. While this may be true, all syllabi had the same problems and showed academics still struggling with the meaning of investigative learning and its implications for them as teachers and syllabus designers.

Fourth, all data about pedagogy came from questionnaires and syllabi. No classroom observations were made as it would have made the study unwieldy.

Fifth, no data from the students was obtained, only from lecturers. The interpretations of the data relied solely on the comments provided by the lecturers and the data analysis tools that were applied in order to make sense of that data. Also, no other stakeholders were engaged, no teachers, no academic Heads of Schools, no people from the Department of Education or Ministry of Education, no community representatives, and no academics from neighbouring disciplines, like philosophers, biologists, or neuroscientists.

Sixth, the study relied on responses written in English as ELTE lecturers teach and publish in English and the data collection processes targeted their professional genres. Yet, it needs to be acknowledged that English may have been too difficult for the lecturers as most comments were short and lacked elaboration. This may have skewed the interpretation of the data. However, once again, this possibility was countered with the use of syllabi that exemplified the processes that the lecturers were applying and how they were thinking about their teaching designs. Also, follow-up interviews were organised at the end of the project. They were conducted in Indonesian and offered plenty of space for the lecturers to discuss how they felt throughout the project and what they thought needed changing for them to feel more confident and better supported in their new work context.
Seventh, in reviewing the units, there was only one single CDU expert involved in the project, making the unit reviews possibly too subjective. Expert panel would have helped reduce the subjectivity. A coefficient reliability could be developed from the panel, making the study to have more reliable results.

Finally, the professional development activities designed by the researcher were not sufficient to generate a profound change in ELTE syllabus practices. As the study shows, the problems are deeper and require a more profound addressing. The researcher did not seek to influence the lecturers, only provided points for reflection and discussion.

6.5 Future research directions

In the course of the study it was demonstrated that pedagogic innovation in undergraduate curricula revealed systemic weaknesses in higher education in all areas of responsibility, leadership, pedagogy, research and community service. In the context of ELTE, the findings of the present study clearly point to those areas as needing urgent addressing by research if internationalisation of higher education is to have a positive impact on the system.

6.5.1 Leadership and management

The study took place early in the days when the new pedagogic reforms were introduced, although the new IQF was already introduced in 2012 (MOEC, 2012) and the entire system of reforms was not completed until 2014 (MOEC, 2014). The study showed that despite the years of preparation, by 2016-2017, Indonesian universities, and especially ELTE departments, were still not ready for change.

In order to facilitate a better support and to gauge its effectiveness there is a need for research that would compare and contrast the measures undertaken internationally to address higher education pedagogy and in Indonesia. The literature review showed that more money does not necessarily result in better outcomes. In fact, emulating richer countries may have been the very reason why Indonesian ELTE academics showed lack of confidence in developing their own ideas and questions. Instead, they relied on frameworks and ways of thinking “sold” to them through education and literature and made appear as if this body of knowledge was to be disseminated across the globe rather than critically engaged or even ignored for scholars to discover alternative routes and reasoning. The findings of the present study indicate that it would be beneficial for ELTE departments in Indonesia to engage in research
projects investigating leadership and management structures that empower academics by generating opportunities for scholars to develop their own disciplinary identity, one that they both own and understand. Chasing foreign systems that developed in a different context and as a result of different political and economic pressures continues to put Indonesian ELTE scholars in the position of knowledge receivers, not its makers. It also makes Indonesia vulnerable and in danger of repeating the mistakes of the richer countries and, not necessarily, their successes. It is not surprising that when institutions do not have mechanisms for understanding their own problems, foreign institutions will supply their understandings. It is therefore critical that Indonesian institutions, when partnering with foreign institutions, do so with a clear understanding of their needs, in order to address those. This is not the same as buying knowledge. As Lor, Lian and Mak suggest (2020, in review),

[…] the dangers of uncritical acceptance of foreign models of thinking and practice are many, including building dependencies on foreign cultural capital, frequently to the detriment of one’s own interests, thinking traditions, values, attitudes, practices and heritage. People do not just exchange knowledge; they exchange entire political and social agenda. When unchecked, partnerships with foreign institutions may result in “the dispossession of their own societies under globalization, which results, in developing countries, in ‘social’ or ‘cultural’ death” (Samier, 2015, p. 697).

6.5.2 Pedagogy and its stakeholders

The reliance on the knowledge presented in the literature of the ELTE discipline and its research methods also impacted on pedagogy. The findings of the present study showed that ELTE academics viewed teaching largely as presentation of content and students’ job was to learn, understand, describe. None of these outcomes favoured critical and problem-solving skills. It was suggested that for students to approach their learning with an investigative mindset, it is critical that their lecturers view the ELTE discipline more as an interdisciplinary dialogue, rather than a set of methods “written in stone”.

For research to inspire critical mindset and thinking skills in research and pedagogy, it is necessary to support research projects which are interdisciplinary, imaginative and risky over and above traditional studies. Traditional ELTE research tends to draw on its own long-standing paradigms (Lian, A.B., 2018). Yet, new questions can emerge only from new perspectives and empirical research from disciplines other than those traditionally viewed as relevant to ELTE. Examples of such disciplines, as mentioned by Lian, A.B. (2018) are neuroscience, but also verbotonalism (a subfield of phonetics), physics, anthropology, semiotics and cultural studies. This is also the course of action also proposed by key
researchers in education who, as mentioned earlier (Thomas, 2007), argue for a break with traditions in order for the field to escape its stagnation and the tendency to look in a rear vision mirror. Innovative research sounds challenging when confidence is lacking. However, the aim is not always to find answers, but to learn the process of working toward innovation. This is a critical point. Too often it is expected that research generates answers, i.e. results. This makes academics rush through concepts and difficulty points and ignore challenging questions. The problem is that this attitude is then transferred onto the students, who learn that innovation in classroom is a matter of changing one factor or another, and research will deliver a meaningful outcome. Slowing down projects, supporting theoretical studies that develop ideas, concepts and models, is needed more than quick data from studies with weak foundations. On the other hand, hurrying thinking to obtain data quickly perpetuates traditional mindsets where questions are discouraged and where the teacher is in control of what matters to learning and what failure or success mean. This was also reflected in ELTE lecturers’ teaching plans, where students as stakeholders in their process of learning were ignored. Frameworks were missing that would invite students to reflect on the value of their learning to their own life, professional or personal, as were ideas about categories that would help students to do so. Interdisciplinary research has the potential to provide lectures with a variety of perspectives which can enrich their understanding of what matters to learning English. This, in turn, will enrich their own teaching of pre-service teachers. In other words, by learning to broaden the sources of discipline’s questions, ELTE academics can not only improve their own research. They can also improve their pedagogy of higher learning by focusing students learning to look for information (research skills) and pose questions (critical thinking skills) and assess the value of different ways of thinking to a problem at hand (problem-solving skills). Role modelling relies on experts learning to understand and perform their roles.

### 6.6 Final Thoughts

It is hoped that the conclusions reached in this study will be of value not only in the context of the Indonesian educational system and ELTE but, to the extent possible, that they may apply to other areas of educational development, to all levels of education and in all systems. These considerations bring this dissertation to a close.
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Appendix 1

Table: 3.2: Pilot Questionnaire

1. Please, identify your academic level!
   a) Level E (Guru Besar/Pembina Utama/Gol.IV.e)
   b) Level D (Guru Besar/Pembina Utama Madya/Gol.IV.d)
   c) Level C (Lektor Kepala)
   d) Level B (Lektor)
   e) Level A (Asisten Ahli)
2. What subjects do you teach within the English Language Teacher Education program?
3. Do you coordinate any degree programs? Which ones?
4. Can you briefly describe your research agenda?
5. Have you produced co-published research? How many colleagues were on your team? Identify the number and specify if they all were from your university.
6. Have you got good access to the Internet in your university?
7. Do your students have a good access to the Internet in your university?
8. Do you teach external students (who do the degree externally, online only)?
9. Have you participated in the new accreditation process? What are your views on this process?
10. Have you had a training to support your understanding of graduate competencies? How did it look like?
11. What impact does the introduction of the competencies have on the planning of the degrees programs and the units you teach? Please explain.
12. Are your students aware of graduate competencies and their impact on research skills? How do the students feel about the introduction of the graduate competencies? Please, explain your beliefs.
13. Do you also make your students aware of the objectives entailed in the graduate competencies in relation to the units you teach? If so, how? If not, why not?
14. In the U.S. undergraduate and graduate students (especially in medical research) are part of their mentors’ research. Have you published with your undergraduate students? Has anyone from your department done so?
15. How does the non-higher education community feel about the introduction of the graduate competencies and the IQF? Explain your views.
16. What graduate competencies are relevant to research and inquiry in the context of your own teaching? Explain your views.
17. If you conduct research in English language teacher education, do you make references to graduate competencies relevant to research and inquiry? How? Can you briefly describe your approach?
18. What do you think could be an obstacle to successful implementation of graduate competencies? Explain your views.
19. Can you think of any positives that can emerge from the introduction of graduate competencies? Please, outline.
20. If you conduct research integrating competencies relevant to research and inquiry, do you engage stakeholders (outside Higher Education community) and if so, in what way?
21. Today, we live in the era when inclusion is one of the key factors informing our educational policies. However, it is not clear if graduate competencies relevant to
research and inquiry skills reflect this inclusive dimension. What are your views? Please explain.

22. What forms of innovation take place in your university or your department supported when it comes to the implementation of graduate competencies? Please, describe.

23. Have you participated in any of those innovation projects? What was/is your role and how does it impact on your daily teaching and research?

24. Do you have any suggestions for innovation? Can you please feel free to identify those and your proposed approach?

25. Please identify any other factors on which you would like to comment in this questionnaire. There is no word limit.

Table 3.3: Questionnaire 1

1. Please identify your academic level!
   a. Level E (Guru Besar/Gol.IV.E)
   b. Level D (Guru Besar/Gol.IV.D)
   c. Level C (Lektor Kepala)
   d. Level B (Lektor)
   e. Level A (Asisten Ahli)

2. Briefly describe yourself in terms of teaching, research interests and any information you wish to share? What research have you produced relating to your teaching?

3. In as many words as you wish, please describe your experiences with Graduate Competencies. In your response, you may wish to consider the following guiding points:
   a. Briefly describe your views of the Graduate Competencies.
   b. Are you using Graduate Competencies in your teaching?
   c. In your opinion, what impact do Graduate Competencies have on the planning of the English degree program and the units that you teach?
   d. Are your students aware of Graduate Competencies? If so, how do you perceive the Graduate Competencies impact on their learning?
   e. In your research, do you make references to Graduate Competencies? Briefly describe how.
   f. What problems do you find with Graduate Competencies? Explain your views.
   g. Have you been supported by your university or Department in working with Graduate Competencies? How have these supports been made available?

Table 3.4: Questionnaire 2

1. Was the workshop a worthwhile experience? Why yes and why not?
2. In what ways do you think the workshop relevant or irrelevant to you?
3. What would you like to suggest the workshop could have done better?
4. Please comment on the activities and materials in the first day of the workshop about "questionnaire findings: mapping your voice"
5. Please comment on the activities and materials in the second day of the workshop about "literature review"
6. Please comment on the activities and materials in the third day of the workshop about "planning strategies"
7. Any other comments?
Table 3.5: Questionnaire 3

1. How do you identify your unit outcomes (has to be 6 outcomes)?
2. How do you integrate unit outcomes into the unit description?
3. How do you link the structure and the key ideas of the syllabus with the unit outcomes?
4. What is the general logic that informs your choice of unit materials in your unit?
5. How do you integrate research and inquiry (higher order skills in the IQF and graduate competencies) into your teaching plan?
6. How do you develop assessment tasks?
7. How do you integrate research and inquiry (higher order skills in the IQF and graduate competencies) into your teaching plan?
8. Other challenges (Please identify if any).

Table 3.6: Questionnaire 4

1. Please, identify your academic level!
   a. Level E (Guru Besar/Gol.IV.E)
   b. Level D (Guru Besar/Gol.IV.D)
   c. Level C (Lektor Kepala)
   d. Level B (Lektor)
   e. Level A (Asisten Ahli)
2. How do you identify your unit outcomes (has to be 6 outcomes)?
3. How do you integrate unit outcomes into the unit description?
4. How do you link the structure and the key ideas of the syllabus with the unit outcomes?
5. What is the general logic that informs your choice of unit materials in your unit? Identify the number and specify if they all were from your university.
6. How do you integrate research and inquiry (higher order skills in the IQF and graduate competencies) into your teaching plan?
7. How do you develop assessment tasks?
8. How do you integrate research and inquiry (higher order skills in the IQF and graduate competencies) into your teaching plan?
9. Other challenges (Please identify if any).

Table 3.7: Follow-up interviews

1. How do the staff respond to the integration of research and inquiry into ELTE programs?
2. How do the students respond to the integration of research and inquiry into ELTE programs?
3. How did you work with the syllabus? Do you see the relevance of syllabi and the application of the syllabi plans?
4. Do you see the importance of synchronizing learning materials across units in the curriculum? Please explain.
5. Would you describe challenges in the integration of research and inquiry in ELTE programs’ units?
6. Would you describe the inquiry processes happened in the field (classes)?
7. What kinds of support or resources do you need to support the integration of research and inquiry into ELTE programs’ units?
8. How do you design the assessment? How do you relate it with the course description?
9. Is there anything else you would like to say regarding this project?
Appendix 2

Table 4.4: Questionnaire 1, Question 1. Examples of responses for each theme and subtheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Number of responses and examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Global Relevance</td>
<td>6 comments from 13 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtheme:</strong> International reputation</td>
<td>“in terms of the requirement to get their thesis-based articles published in reputable scholarly journals, students are not ready without any supports right from the beginning when they propose topics for their thesis.” (Level D (R1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtheme:</strong> International standardisation</td>
<td>“Graduate competence is one thing become important and my institution aware this term because of global needs”. (Level A (R3))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtheme:</strong> International standardisation</td>
<td>“competencies deal with skills, behavior, and learning outcomes that students need to demonstrate after they graduated.” (Level A (R4))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtheme:</strong> Standardisation and employability</td>
<td>“[Due to] globalization, new direction of education is obliviously needed. [T]he new direction of graduate competencies mentioned in KKNI as well as in Decree 44, 2015 are better than before.” (Level A (R12))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtheme:</strong> Standardisation and employability</td>
<td>“The graduate competencies are supposed to be reflections of abilities to deal with profession as well as the characters needed like leadership, team working ability, time management, and many jobs and professions. They must be relevant with the foundational knowledge and skills of the more.” (Level B (R6))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtheme:</strong> International degree recognition</td>
<td>“[t]he reputation of the university [is] largely based on the performance of its graduates when they move onto carrier and higher learning.” (Level C (R13))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. National Relevance</td>
<td>1 comment from 13 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtheme:</strong> Degree quality and student quality</td>
<td>“Graduates should [be] able to transfer their knowledge into practical applications based on needs analysis of the subject.” (Level B (R9))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtheme:</strong> Degree quality and student quality</td>
<td>“my concern in this area has been increasing due to the fact both students and teachers are more and more triggered to publish their research results and that my students' research ability is still low.” (Level A (R10))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Course and Unit Design</td>
<td>2 comments from 13 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtheme:</strong> Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and IQF</td>
<td>“… graduate competencies are in line with curriculum imposed by the national and local institution” (Level B (R11))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtheme:</strong> Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and IQF</td>
<td>“graduate competencies play an important role in decision –making regarding selecting learning outcomes, references selection, teaching approaches, assessment methods, and elective courses.” (Level B (R6))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pedagogy</td>
<td>3 comments from 13 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtheme:</strong> Planning teaching</td>
<td>“It is very important in designing my teaching framework.” (Level A (R4))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"The graduate competencies in my institution are quite clear; however, the competencies need to be breakdown in every teaching and learning process.” (Level B (R6))

“It is very crucial for the students because it underpins every task … given by university and provides for deep learning.” (Level C (R13))

5. Stakeholders’ Awareness

1 comment from 13 participants

**Subtheme: Raising students’ awareness (1)**

“My students are aware of skills and behavior that they need to demonstrate after graduation. Therefore, students’ motivation in achieving good result is higher.” (Level A (R4))

6. University Funding, Workload and Support

No comments

7. Personal Research

No comments

---

**Table 4.7: Questionnaire 1, Question 2. Examples of responses for each theme and subtheme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Number of responses and examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Global Relevance</td>
<td>2 comments from 13 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtheme:</strong> International reputation</td>
<td>“They must review previous research findings published in internationally reputable journals” (Level D (R1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“…contribute to the body of knowledge, adding something new….” (Level D (R1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. National Relevance</td>
<td>1 comment from 13 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtheme:</strong> Degree quality and student quality</td>
<td>“the graduate competencies must be based on the institution’s and the department’s vision regarding the profile of the graduates” (Level A (R10))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Course and Unit Design</td>
<td>2 comments from 13 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtheme:</strong> Program evaluation,</td>
<td>“Also, lecturers need to provide a framework for curriculum evaluation.” (Level A (R4))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtheme:</strong> Challenge: A need to</td>
<td>improve degree design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improve degree design</td>
<td>They need “an additional course to develop their competencies in writing scholarly articles targeted for publication in an internationally reputable journals.” (Level D (R1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pedagogy</td>
<td>3 comments from 13 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subthemes:</strong> Planning Teaching</td>
<td>“The graduate competencies should become the goal of the teaching and learning process. Hence, the whole [i.e. all] activities [i.e. should] aim at achieving the graduate competencies.” (Level B (R8))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subthemes:</strong> Teacher’s role</td>
<td>“Graduate competencies give more challenges to lecturers, for example they are required to take on multiple teaching roles.” (Level A (R4))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Stakeholders’ Awareness</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. University Funding, Workload and</td>
<td>2 comments from 13 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td><strong>Subtheme:</strong> Challenge: Need for research in QA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“An institution should have some educators with expertise in graduate competencies. They need both theoretical and practical knowledge which need to be improve[d] gradually by conducting some study about it thoroughly as the process of evaluation.” (Level B (R9))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Subtheme:** Challenge: No capacity building/Insufficient administrative support

“The institution needs to give more support in working with graduate competencies.” (Level B (R8))

7. Personal Research

<p>| Table 4.9: Questionnaire 1, Question 3. Examples of responses for each theme and subtheme. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What has been done in your area of responsibility of integrating R&amp;I skills into ELTE curricula?</th>
<th>Number of responses and examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Global Relevance | 1 comment out of 13 participants  
**Subtheme:** Awareness of (international) pressures  
“... my institution is aware of this term because of global needs so we try to cover it by supporting skills beside the standard skills such as becoming a translator or interpreter, and so on” (Level A (R3)) |
| 2. National Relevance | No comments |
| 3. Course and Unit Design | 4 comments out of 13 participants  
**Subtheme:** Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and IQF  
[When I plan for teaching] “I do consider the graduate competencies stated in the department’s curriculum since it would lead [i.e. result in] the clear goals of [i.e. as guided by] the department.” (Level A (R10))  
**Subtheme:** Program evaluation  
“the university has assigned me to handle several structural jobs like academic quality assurance office along with international office and student affairs” (Level B (R6)) |
| 4. Pedagogy | 3 comments out of 13 participants  
**Subtheme:** Planning teaching  
“I try to make sense of my own GCs for teaching my EFL teacher-trainees.” (Level B (R5))  
**Subtheme:** Challenges: Lack of understanding how R&I work  
“I myself am not fully aware about this notion (despite the fact that I was involved in the evaluation team as aforementioned) instead of focusing on one thing: research.” (Level A (R10)) |
| 5. Stakeholders’ Awareness | 9 comments out of 13 participants  
**Subtheme:** Raising students’ awareness  
“... my students are becoming aware of the so-called graduate competencies but it does need further socialisation.” (Level B (R7))  
“I’m not sure that my students [are] aware of graduate competencies. I always remind them about the goal the education, and hopefully it will influence the way they learn.” (Level B (R8))  
**Subtheme:** Challenge: Change is not popular  
“the socialization of this new direction is not that popular in the "grass root”” (Level A (R10))  
“many of teachers in my university still don't get what is KKNI and the new setting of graduate competencies.” (Level A (R10))  
“Problems in the implementation of graduate competencies relate to the mindsets of the teachers and learners.” (Level B (R6))  
**Subtheme:** Neglect to raise students’ awareness  
“I don’t think, they are aware of them. However, it does not become a big deal when we, as lecturers, do understand about the graduate competencies and try to implement them in the students learning process.” (Level A (R10)) |
“Two thirds of my students, I reckon, are not really aware of Graduate Competencies. “Most of them seem to learn in order to pursue scores and degree. They do not care of what they have got from a course. All they want is merely a success of passing a course. Comprehension and competencies are not [a] big deal for them to consider.” (Level B (R6))

6. University Funding, Workload and Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtheme: Funding for research in QA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The university where I work provides research funds especially for classroom action research.” (Level A (R4))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtheme: Administrative support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“the university have assigned me to handle several structural jobs like academic quality assurance office along with international office and student affairs” (Level B (R6))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtheme: Shared learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“to support the department regarding the graduate competencies, we frequently discuss the progress of achieving the goals of department and conduct research”  (Level A (R10))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtheme: Challenge: Conceptual, workload and PD funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The evaluation as well as the changing of my university's academic standards to study program specification has been a “theory” without practice.” (Level B (R11))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtheme: Challenge: No capacity building/Insufficient administrative support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Lack of capacity building cause less concern of university upon graduate competencies.” (Level B (R6))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtheme: Challenge: Excessive workload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Multitasking and multi-responsibility diminish my time to read, to conduct a research and to write publication. I am lack of productivity in term of research interest.” (Level B (R6))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Personal Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtheme: Challenge: Disregarding graduate competencies and research skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“professional teaching standards of Indonesian EFL teachers” (Level B (R5))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtheme: Challenge: Disregarding graduate competencies and research skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Today, I've produced 2 journals; they are (1) an action research about reading comprehension and motivation, (2) a case study of students' difficulties in speaking English. And now, I've been conducting a research about the most common mistakes in listening comprehension paper test”. (Level A (R2))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtheme: Challenge: Disregarding graduate competencies and research skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“My research interests cover L2 listening, grammar, and SLA.” (Level B (R6))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtheme: Challenge: Disregarding graduate competencies and research skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Problems Faced by Indonesian EFL Learners in Writing Argumentative Essay.” (Level A (R4))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtheme: Challenge: Disregarding graduate competencies and research skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I have produced research on the semiosis - the meaning making practices - as found in the students' texts (both written and spoken); the pedagogy of writing; and critical discourse analysis as an approach to reading skills. “I have a strong research interests in academic literacy, discourse analysis, Systemic Functional Linguistics, Phonology, and Semantics-Pragmatics.” (Level B (R7))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.13: Questionnaire 2, Question 1: Examples of responses for each theme and subtheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Number of responses and examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Global Relevance</td>
<td>5 comments from 13 participants&lt;br&gt;&lt;Strong&gt;Subtheme&lt;/Strong&gt;: International standardisation&lt;br&gt;Examples:&lt;br&gt;“IQF AND GC here are widely opened” (R2)&lt;br&gt;“We can learn about some misunderstandings when learning about education worldwide” (R2)&lt;br&gt;&lt;Strong&gt;Subtheme&lt;/Strong&gt;: Challenge: Implementation issues&lt;br&gt;“The activities and materials delivered on the second day showed me 'new' things. I was quite surprised by the fact that the 'same' situations also happens in other countries in which I assumed that this situation will not be found in some countries such Australia and USA.” (R7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. National Relevance</td>
<td>4 comments from 13 participants&lt;br&gt;&lt;Strong&gt;Subtheme&lt;/Strong&gt;: Degree quality and student quality&lt;br&gt;“it's relevant, since it helps us know how to construct the teaching and learning alignment with the government's intentions.” (R5)&lt;br&gt;&lt;Strong&gt;Subtheme&lt;/Strong&gt;: Challenge: Implementation issues&lt;br&gt;“The survey findings shown on the first day of the workshop evidently proved that the implementation of learning of the courses at many universities and the research findings were still irrelevant with the IQF and GC expected.” (R10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Course and Unit Design</td>
<td>8 comments from 13 participants&lt;br&gt;&lt;Strong&gt;Subthemes&lt;/Strong&gt;: Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and IQF&lt;br&gt;“In my opinion the workshop that we have done for three days is very useful and relevant to improve our knowledge about IQF.” (R8)&lt;br&gt;“This workshop is relevant to my teaching since it teaches how to create a teaching and learning processes based on IQF. Moreover, this workshop helps me to increase my professional development as a lecturer” (R7)&lt;br&gt;&lt;Strong&gt;Subtheme&lt;/Strong&gt;: Building connections between the unit components&lt;br&gt;“It was very great and enjoy so that I can explore lot of strategies how to plan our academic process” (R4)&lt;br&gt;“i think in this part is the most important part because we can learn a lot about how to design syllabi and integrate it in research and inquiry” (R8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pedagogy</td>
<td>6 comments from 13 participants&lt;br&gt;&lt;Strong&gt;Subtheme&lt;/Strong&gt;: Planning teaching&lt;br&gt;“the activities conducted, and the materials given somehow opened my eyes as a lecturer about what to include in our lesson planning in a semester” (R5)&lt;br&gt;&lt;Strong&gt;Subtheme&lt;/Strong&gt;: Teaching research and inquiry skills&lt;br&gt;“today we discussed about how to make a syllabus, which related to research &amp; inquiry skills” (R1)&lt;br&gt;“The planning strategies really equip me some important elements what to do in the future teaching process” (R10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5. Stakeholders’ Awareness   | 5 comments from 13 participants<br><Strong>Subtheme</Strong>: Raising lecturers’ awareness<br>“It was very powerful material and usefulness to my academic knowledge.” (R4)<br>“I believe the workshop has provided crucial information regarding the IQF and GC in which before the workshop I knew little about
the implementation of IQF & GC must be taken into consideration in the courses.” (R10)

6. University Funding, Workload and Support

6 comments from 13 participants

Subtheme: Shared learning
“... the discussion in the planning stage really beneficial. it makes my understanding better especially in designing Learning outcomes and learning objective. plus, how we integrate iqf and bloom’s taxonomy.” (R5)
“The materials and activities in the first day is very interesting in a way that it opens the perspectives of the participants of the workshop, especially for me.” (R7)

Subtheme: Challenge: Conceptual, workload and PD funding
“It is not easy for me to design my teaching planning based on R&I and IQF but at least I have some points about what should be done next based on the discussion today” (R7)

Subtheme: Challenge: No capacity building/Insufficient administrative support
“It is rather irrelevant coz i am not the decision maker in the university, who decide if the curriculum needs to be changed or not in order to make it in line with IQF” (R11)

7. Personal Research

3 comments from 13 participants

Subtheme: Research addressing R&I in higher learning
“The activities in the second day provided me with how to find out the current topics of the research” (R9)
“We understand more about critical review etc” (R2)

Table 4.15: Questionnaire 2, Question 2. Examples of responses for each theme and subtheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Number of responses and examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Global Relevance</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. National Relevance | 4 comments from 13 participants
Subtheme: Degree quality and student quality
“it will be better if we discuss more about repairing our education system” (R1)
“It made me realized that we as lectures need a silabus that can be applied in all universities [a need to create explicit links with the curricula from other universities]” (R13)
Subtheme: Degree quality and employability
“I finally found that students need to have better learning experiences that can fulfil industrial needs and that a lecture must force students to do a research and it in a good paper” (R13)
Subtheme: Challenge: Implementation issues
“in my point of view, the survey showed there were many problems in implementing the curriculum” (R8) |
| 3. Course and Unit Design | 4 comments from 13 participants
Subtheme: Building connections between the curriculum components
“there are some problems in our curriculum, we should think of English as a set of integrated skills” (R1)
Subtheme: Challenge: A need to improve degree design
“To plan the program of IQF implementation in the next semester, I think it would be better if we can design the program effectively” (R9)
Subtheme: Challenge: Program evaluation
“i think to have good result in workshop, we have to concept detail program include with the evaluation” (R8) |
4. Pedagogy

4 comments from 13 participants

**Subtheme: Teaching R&I skills**

“The workshop should provide and make sure the full understanding of the concept in order to make the participants can carry out things to do” (R10)

**Subtheme: Taking account of published research**

“in my point of view, the survey showed there were many problems in implementing the curriculum” (R8)

“ It should ensure the way we need to achieve lot of progress by giving widely local academic sources” (R4)

5. Stakeholders’ Awareness

5 comments from 13 participants

**Subtheme: Raising lecturers’ awareness**

“do you think by design all universities are led to be research-based university?” (R6)

“the activities and materials were interesting but there is a big question about how to implement those in our country” (R8)

**Subtheme: Challenge: Change is not popular**

“if i were a layman, i would think that iqf is somehow cool, important, applicable. unfortunately i am quite opposed to that. while, the discussion about r&i is quite enlightening. it’s something relatively new for me. but it was conveyed unconvincingly.” (R6)

**Subtheme: Accounting for the departmental culture**

“Sharing with each other. I, as a lecturer, have to be ready and need to share with others about all kinds of curriculum changing. [learning by sharing with others]” (R12)

**Subtheme: Accounting for the needs of stakeholders**

“Next time, invite a stakeholder or decision maker in the university” (R11)

6. University Funding, Workload and Support

14 comments from 13 participants

**Subtheme: Understanding the process of learning R&I skills**

“Everything in workshop runs well so I don't have any suggestion. Otherwise, the workshop is really good for me as a lecturer to enhance my knowledge and my professionalism so I hope that this kind of workshop should be held continuously” (R7)

“Doing the workshop continuously by showing the own members' syllabus and check together. [more sharing activities needed]” (R12)

**Subtheme: Shared learning**

“… so we need to overcome them with good teaching programs and joining workshops like we are taking.” (R12)

**Subtheme: Challenge: Time for capacity-development**

“It would be better to give more time to conduct this workshop in such a long project [more days]” (R3)

“we need more time to complete the assigned task” (R5)

“IQF is new for me since it hasn't been implemented even discussed in my institution, so I need time to think more about IQF” (R7)

“I think it would be better if the workshop can be continued so that we can see the implementation of the National Qualification. and it should be done in the classroom or bringing the recorded video of the lesson to the workshop.” (R9)

**Subtheme: Challenge: Conceptual, workload and PD funding**

“the findings were interesting. though the audiences' background knowledge I think need to be tap first” (R5)

“But I am still confused how to adapt it into practical works. I need to recognize well the concept of IQF, then revise my syllabus of teaching relying on the IQF standard” (R9)

“prior knowledge and issue about iqf and gc should be conveyed convincingly.” (R6)

“These activities and materials in the third day were really hard for me since I don't have sufficient knowledge background about IQF.
Both IQF and R&I, I need to learn more about them. Thank you so much for the workshop. Good luck for your project! Hopefully everything will run well. Fighting!” (R7)

7. Personal Research

Table 4.18: Questionnaire 3. Examples of responses for each question of analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Q1: What is involved?</th>
<th>Q2: What experiences need to be provided?</th>
<th>Q3: What was achieved?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-themes</td>
<td>Sub-themes</td>
<td>Sub-themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 sub-themes (Table 4.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 sub-themes (Table 4.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and Unit Design</td>
<td>0 comment altogether</td>
<td>2 comments altogether</td>
<td>20 comments altogether</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 sub-themes (Table 4.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Linking assessment with learning outcomes

“the assessment must be based on the tasks provided to measure the students’ progress and effort of completing the projects.” (R6)

Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and the IQF

“I identified the KKNI document to put what learning outcomes should be included in my lesson plan.” (R1)

“I draw on the unit description and standard competencies that are discussed in our department.” (R2)

“I described [identified] the elements included in English for Specific Purposes approaches and how they are applied to diverse classroom environments. I examined the role of assessment in teaching and learning for ESP development.” (R3)

“The unit focuses on key concepts, recognises and engages students as active participants, and provides them with multiple opportunities to source, review and analyse information, and then to apply their knowledge to the teaching of ESP in diverse classrooms.” (R3)

“The unit will develop students’ skills to think critically, creatively and constructively through...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building connections between the unit components</th>
<th>Diversifying assessment activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The most common way to do this is by employing certain outcomes such as responsible, integrity outcome into the indicator of lesson plan.” (R1)</td>
<td>“assessment will be taken from students’ activity in the classroom... the score is taken from task, midterm test and final exam” (R3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I translated the aims of the unit into learning objectives and then developed activities that need to follow, including research activities” (R1)</td>
<td>“there are 2 parts, theoretical and practical [assessments]” (R7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“[students] analyse pedagogical approaches for English Specific Purpose across the curriculum with particular reference to the needs of students within the teaching and learning context.” (R3)</td>
<td>“attitude, knowledge and skill”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“[…] by looking at the students’ competence [requirements] and the purposes of the unit; analyzing the unit outcomes while comparing with the brief meaning/history of the unit, then arranging into description paragraph” (R4)</td>
<td>Diversifying assessment activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“[…] by connecting the outcomes to the activities, principles and theories” (R5)</td>
<td>“The learning outcomes are systematically designed in each session to get the implementation, demonstration or the practice of accumulated three aspects: attitude, knowledge and skill”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building connections between the unit components</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Content-oriented assessment goals

“quiz and writing task” (R5)  
“Students will learn to demonstrate the ability to link the purpose of texts with appropriate genres; describe the features of different genres (e.g. argument construction, summarizing, paraphrasing and synthesizing)” (R5)  
“Quiz is to check their literal and inferential level of comprehension in reading. While writing task is to check their evaluative and critical level of comprehension in reading.” (R5)

### Competence-oriented assessment activity

“Assessment may be both project and portfolio. Those prefers holistically accommodate to the evaluation of learning.” (R1)  
“Reading and writing assessment tasks examine students’ abilities to interpret and respond to texts critically and express an informed opinion on issues addressed in class in a written form.” (R5)  
“[I generate assessment tasks] by relating the expected outcomes of the unit to the performance expected from the students” (R6)  
“I would prefer to see the student’s work collection [portfolio]. The portfolio collected will consist of 5 activities which i believe would draw on the unit outcomes. it should show the sustainability and consistency of a student’s working process to accomplish the assignments.” (R7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy 12 sub-themes (Table 4.1)</th>
<th>1 comments altogether</th>
<th>4 comments altogether</th>
<th>13 comments altogether</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenge: Lack of understanding how R&amp;I work</td>
<td>“Actually I still couldn’t find the way how to implement or order my students to do research in my course,”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated learning</td>
<td>Differentiated learning</td>
<td>Differentiated learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It is important for a lecturer to have an informed view on his role in establishing ESP environments in diverse classroom contexts. I address the needs of the diverse student population” (R3)</td>
<td>“since each meeting has different learning objectives, different approaches must be employed based on the appropriateness of the topics being learned” (R6)</td>
<td>“By considering level of difficulties and students’ learning experience” (R5) “[…] by taking the most critical points of the course into consideration and the students' needs of the particular course.” (R6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualised instruction, time on task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“students have difficulties in understanding approaches. Students need more time in understanding the topic.” (R3) “students [need to] establish direct communication with the lecturer.” (R3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit material choice and organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“the learning outcomes must be evidently figured in the sequential steps of the unit description to determine clear activities to do in the course” (R6)</td>
<td>“Different texts or approaches are presented in my unit due to different unit outcomes in the unit” (R5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking account of published research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Inviting students to get and review the journals talked about in the unit then share them.” (R4) “[…] by integrating particular research-based instructions into the course activities” (R6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“the course that is given to me is ‘Speaking for group activities’, so that almost all the activities, which run in my class, will be in groups, but the score will be taken individually (based on speaking rubric)” (R2)
“[students] analyse pedagogical approaches for English Specific Purpose across the curriculum with particular reference to the needs of students within the teaching and learning context.” (R3)
“I will review students’ tasks in every meeting and give scores to students.” (R3)
“[students] identify strategies which authors use to make texts appear clear and coherent; analyse their own writing in relation to the attributes of good texts.” (R5)
“Students are to do interview teachers in which Research is implemented within three weeks to see the needs and the difficulties in a real practice of TEFL in schools. Later, after findings are elaborated, students are geared to design learning strategies as well as designing the lesson plan based on the findings.” (R7)
“I integrate outcomes into the unit description by designing activities within the unit that support the outcomes” (R7)
“Each session is complemented with the objective and the enabling objective by showing some indicators in order to show clearer objective in each meeting” (R7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders’ Awareness</th>
<th>0 comment altogether</th>
<th>1 comment altogether</th>
<th>2 comments altogether</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 sub-themes (Table 4.1)</td>
<td>Accounting of the schools’ culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“comparing the unit outcomes with the students'/school's culture” (R4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accounting of the university departmental culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“All the syllabus in my department should be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accounting of the university departmental culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Then, to deliver the outcome component, I consult to those</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Funding, Workload, and Support  
10 sub-themes (Table 4.1)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Funding, Workload, and Support</th>
<th>2 comments altogether</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 sub-themes (Table 4.1)</td>
<td>Shared learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“All the syllabus in my department should be discussed with all colleagues who get the same course at the same level so this needs much time to finish the learning outcomes and the description for each unit.” (R2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenge: Time for capacity development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Since it’s new for me, the process takes a lot of my time and resources” (R7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personal Research (for Publication)  
2 sub-themes (Table 4.1)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Research (for Publication) 2 sub-themes (Table 4.1)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 4.24: Syllabi analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllabi commented on by a CDU expert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Description by ELTE lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening in Professional Contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This unit prepares students to be able to first, listen to the variation of spoken texts that relate to professional context as they might faced and used it in real life activities, such as the spoken text about refinery industry, agriculture, fashion industry, etc. the spoken text can be in the form of monologue or dialogue. Second, this unit prepares students to understand the topic and the content of the spoken texts given. Third, it prepares the students to comprehend the spoken texts [by students] comple[ting] the dialogue, comple[ting] the missing words, true false, answer the question, etc and the last, it prepares the students to analyse the register in spoken texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Description by ELTE lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Unit course is divided into four aspects of skills: Reading, Listening, Writing and Speaking. This unit helps the students get used to reading and listening to poetry. Students should prepare a poetry text and a video of reading Poetry (You Tube/Internet). Then, this course unit helps the students to work with the concepts of poetry as literary genre. It covers types, elements, comprehend and appreciation of poetry. This course unit will guide the students to produce a poem through understanding the elements of poetry such as: the use of figurative language, imagery, sounds and rhythm, symbols and allusions. Then, this course unit will help the students to develop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments by a CDU expert on the syllabi Table 4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem posing – No single purpose of the unit emerges from the provided description in relation to the leading concepts to be investigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual context of the unit – No mention is made of approaches that students are to investigate and evaluate in relation to the concepts that will be studied and goals to be attained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of study – The list gives an impression that the unit adopts an additive model of knowledge building. There is no mention of a process that would engage students in research and inquiry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes – This is unclear. It appears that are expected to acquire knowledge presented by the lecturer, rather than demonstrating the ability to apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement assessment is done by assessment of students’ participation in class discussion, assignment, final project, mid test and final test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Outcomes by ELTE lecturer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listening in Professional Contexts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To improve students listening skill in professional context spoken texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To understand the topic and the content of spoken texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To comprehend the spoken texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To analyse the register in spoken texts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
provide experiences and exercises in specific vocabulary for specific discipline. This unit covers practical experiences in fieldworks, lectures on theories covering the topics of the background and development of ESP, approaches to ESP and unit design, designing a language unit: theories, designing process, and application.

### Learning Outcomes by ELTE lecturer

**English for Specific Purpose**

On successful completion of this unit the student should be able to:

1. Analyse pedagogical approaches for ESP with particular reference to the needs of students within the teaching and learning context;
2. Describe the elements included in ESP approaches and how they are applied to diverse classroom environments;
3. Examine the role of assessment in teaching and learning for ESP.
4. Express an informed view of the role of the teacher in establishing ESP classroom contexts.
5. Reach comprehensive understanding of the theories and concepts underlying the development of an ESP unit design.
6. Contribute to the common knowledge of colleagues in a developing professional network.

**Speaking for group activities**

This course is designed to:

1. Develop students’ speaking skill in various topics.
2. Develop students’ speaking skill in discussing, sharing ideas and experiences in group.
3. Develop students’ speaking skill in groups compare ideas.

### Assessment tasks by ELTE lecturer

**English for Specific Purpose**

Not specified

**Speaking for group activities**

Not specified

### Unit Description by ELTE lecturer

**Cross Cultural Understanding**

This course is intended to introduce and help the students understand the basic concepts, the nature, elements and principles of the cross-cultural communication, cultural pattern behavior, cultural identity, and cultural diversity between the target and the native language culture. This course also helps students to better understand how differences cause barriers and lead to the communication problems. By mastering such knowledge mentioned earlier,

**Exploring Prose**

This compulsory course provides students with the opportunity to explore the contents found in fiction with emphasis laid on English short stories and novels. To arrive at this objective, therefore, focuses on analysis on the elements of fiction are given attention. Based on the topics to be covered in the whole semester, students are expected to produce individual text analysis of the texts provided. Students’ learning is assessed through mid-

### Comments by a CDU expert on the syllabi Table 4.23

- **Problem posing** – No single purpose of the unit emerges from the provided description in relation to the leading concepts to be investigated.
- **Intellectual context of the unit** – No mention is made of approaches that students are to investigate and evaluate in relation to the concepts that will be studied and goals to be attained. Mastering is not the same as investigating.
- **Method of study** – The list gives an impression that the unit adopts a process that would engage students in research and inquiry.

Outcomes – This is unclear. It appears that are expected to acquire knowledge presented by the lecturer, rather than demonstrating the ability to apply their understandings critically in contexts that matter to them as future ELTE teachers.

Long-term benefits – This is unclear.

Learning Outcomes by ELTE lecturer

The Unit Description does not indicate that any of these Learning Outcomes will be taught or that they are central to students’ learning. No relationship is developed between what will be studied and how the object of student’s learning will be assessed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcomes by ELTE lecturer</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes by ELTE lecturer</th>
<th>Comments by a CDU expert on the syllabi Table 4.23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross Cultural Understanding</strong></td>
<td><strong>Exploring Prose</strong></td>
<td>The Unit Description does not indicate that any of these Learning Outcomes will be taught or that they are central to students’ learning. No relationship is developed between what will be studied and how the object of student’s learning will be assessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the end of this course, you should be able to:</td>
<td>1. ability to analyze the elements of fiction found in the short stories and novels listed. 2. positive attitude to literary interpretation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. understand the basic concept, the nature, elements and principles of the cross-cultural communication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. understand the cultural pattern behavior, cultural identity, and cultural diversity between the target and the native language culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. use the target language appropriately so that you can avoid misunderstanding and misbehaving, either in using or comprehending the target language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment tasks by ELTE lecturer</th>
<th>Assessment tasks by ELTE lecturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross Cultural Understanding</strong></td>
<td><strong>Exploring Prose</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Description by ELTE lecturer</th>
<th>Unit Description by ELTE lecturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading IV (Academic Reading)</strong></td>
<td><strong>English Sentence Structures 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This course is intended to introduce and help the students to understand the components of reading that are parts of becoming a more fluent reader and to guide them as they work with the lecturer to set their own goals for reading. This course covers comprehension of academic texts such as essays, opinion paper, journal articles, and reviews. The students are expected to get familiar with reading strategies that include summarizing, paraphrasing and</td>
<td>This course is aimed at helping students to develop students’ knowledge and ability to use basic structure of English at both receptive and productive levels. In addition, this course encourages them to build networking and teamwork in order to be an independent learner. In the end of this course, the students are required to produce a report text with a good structure. This course deals with basic structure of English by highlighting the word order in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments by a CDU expert on the syllabi Table 4.23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem posing – No single purpose of the unit emerges from the provided description in relation to the leading concepts to be investigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual context of the unit – No mention is made of approaches that students are to investigate and evaluate in relation to the concepts that will be studied and goals to be attained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of study – The list gives an impression that the unit adopts an additive model of knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
synthesize) to be independent readers and apply those strategies.

phrases (Noun Phrase, Adjective Phrase, Adverbial Phrase, Verb Phrase, and Prepositional Phrase), clauses (Noun Clause, Adjective Clause, Adverbial Clause), and Sentences.

building. There is no mention of a process that would engage students in research and inquiry. **Outcomes** – This is unclear. It appears that are expected to acquire knowledge presented by the lecturer, rather than demonstrating the ability to apply their understandings critically in contexts that matter to them as future ELTE teachers. **Long-term benefits** – This is unclear.

**Learning Outcomes by ELTE Lecturer**  
**Reading IV (Academic Reading)**  
At the end of this course, you should be able to:
1. comprehend different types of texts (essay, opinion paper, journal articles, reviews)
2. get familiar with reading strategies to be independent readers
3. developing reading strategies (identifying authors’ point of view, purpose and tone, intended audience, summarizing, paraphrasing and synthesizing)

**Learning Outcomes by ELTE Lecturer**  
**English Sentence Structures 2**  
Students are able to:
1. Analyse basic English structure from text and video;
2. Write a report text with a good structure;
3. construct correct English sentences in every context;
4. recognize mistakes in sentences and reconstruct them in proper English;
5. have positive attitude to English sentence structures, discipline in applying grammar rules.

**Comments by a CDU expert on the syllabi Table 4.23**  
The Unit Description does not indicate that any of these Learning Outcomes will be taught or that they are central to students’ learning. No relationship is developed between what will be studied and how the object of student’ learning will be assessed.

**Assessment tasks by ELTE Lecturer**  
**Reading IV (Academic Reading)**  
Not specified

**Assessment tasks by ELTE Lecturer**  
**English Sentence Structures 2**  
**Assignment 1**  
An identifying word order:
1. Search a short English Video from YouTube.
2. Select one that of the most interesting for you to explore
3. Analyse the part of speech and phrase from the video.
4. Present your analysing to all students

Assessment 1 outcome:
- Analysing basic English structure from text or video.

**Assignment 2**  
1. Search an article or news from Internet.
2. Analyse word order of clauses (Noun Clause, Adjective clause, and Adverbial Clause)
3. Analyse form of sentences (simple, complex, compound, and compound complex sentence)
4. Write a text with a good structure.

**Comments by a CDU expert on the syllabi Table 4.23**  
On the surface, the assessment tasks do include research and inquiry skills, and seek to engage students’ in the process of reading and evaluation. However, because the Unit Description does not present any central concepts of the unit, it is not clear what concepts or frameworks will provide students with criteria for generating their evaluations, be it in oral presentations, or their final term paper.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment 2 outcomes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Analysing basic English structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrate the ability to write a text with a good structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Construct correct English sentences in every context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognising mistakes in sentence and reconstruct them in proper English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have positive attitude to English sentence structure, discipline in applying grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rules.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Description by ELTE lecturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEFL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This course aims to prepare pre-service English teacher. It provides students with a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong set of practical teaching skills to aid them in the sound application of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contemporary language teaching. It supplements the students in two dimensions; theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and practice. This course gives a chance for students to <strong>analyze and describe</strong> the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common problems occurred in TEFL practice. Also, Students are to **show their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understanding** about TEFL in practice through presentation and discussion. To deepen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their understanding of the concepts, this course facilitates students to utilize their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understanding by <strong>analyzing and evaluating</strong> the model of teaching and learning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By doing so, students, then, are geared to be able to <strong>design</strong> as well as to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>demonstrate</strong> their TEFL theory into teaching practice which will benefit them into</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>real teaching later. This course covers the theory of teaching in integrated skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>context, the practice of lesson planning, learning strategy design (a character based)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments by a CDU expert on the syllabi Table 4.23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem posing</strong> – No single purpose of the unit emerges from the provided description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in relation to the leading concepts to be investigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intellectual context of the unit</strong> – No mention is made of approaches that students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are to investigate and evaluate in relation to the concepts that will be studied and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goals to be attained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method of study</strong> – The list gives an impression that the unit adopts an additive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>model of knowledge building. There is no mention of a process that would engage students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in research and inquiry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong> – This is unclear. It appears that are expected to acquire knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presented by the lecturer, rather than demonstrating the ability to apply their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understandings critically in contexts that matter to them as future ELTE teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-term benefits</strong> – This is unclear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcomes by ELTE lecturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEFL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Be responsible student and accept responsibility for their learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Having theoretical concepts about language pedagogy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments by a CDU expert on the syllabi Table 4.23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Unit Description does not indicate that any of these Learning Outcomes will be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taught or that they are central to students’ learning. No relationship is developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between what will be studied and how the object of student’s learning will be assessed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Having theoretical knowledge about language skills teaching concepts
5. Able to apply the theoretical knowledge of language pedagogy into practice
6. Able to utilise information technology to develop language teaching.

**Assessment tasks by ELTE lecturer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEFL</th>
<th>Scoring are based on the following portfolios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Interview result: 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Presentation and paper: 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Learning strategy design: 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Lesson planning: 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>teaching practice: 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments by a CDU expert on the syllabi Table 4.23
On the surface, the assessment tasks do include research and inquiry skills, and seek to engage students’ in the process of reading and evaluation. However, because the Unit Description does not present any central concepts of the unit, it is not clear what concepts or frameworks will provide students with criteria for generating their evaluations, be it in oral presentations, or their final term paper.

**Table 4.27: Questionnaire 4. Examples of responses for each theme and subtheme.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Number of responses and examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Global Relevance</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. National Relevance</td>
<td>No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Course and Unit Design</td>
<td>52 comments from 10 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtheme:</strong> Unit learning outcomes based on graduate competencies and IQF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I identify unit outcomes from the course description given from university guidance” (Level A (R1))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“In our department, [we] refer to the description of the course ... given from the university. We often integrate the description into the outcome.” (Level A (R1))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“[I identify unit outcomes by drawing on the unit description.] The unit prepares students to be able to be involved in academic fora (such as presenting papers, becoming moderators in discussions, questioning, answering questions, arguing, etc.).” (Level B (R7))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtheme:</strong> Content-based approach to unit design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“[The general logic that informs my choice of unit materials draws on “TEFL worlds”]: First, the course begins by introducing the TEFL worlds. I identify unit outcomes by .. try[ing] to categorize the outcomes into theoretical and practice. Both are components to be achieved after finishing the course; these are developed into outcomes.” (Level A (R6))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“[I identify unit outcomes by] identify[ing] and examin[ing] the strategies and register (expressions) in academic speaking in a situated academic forum (unit teaching academic writing)” (Level B (R7))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“[I identify my Unit Outcomes in relation to assessment]. In the end of this course, the students are required to produce a report text with a good structure. The unit is aimed at helping students to develop students’ knowledge and ability to use basic structure of English at both receptive and productive levels. This course deals with basic structure of English by highlighting the word order in phrases, clauses, and sentences. The learning outcomes of this course [are] as follows:

1. Students are able to analyze basic English structure from text or video.
2. Students are able to write a report text with a good structure.
3. Students are able to construct correct English sentences in every context.
4. Students are able to recognize mistakes in sentences and reconstruct them in proper English.

(Level A (R8))

**Subtheme: Building connections between the unit components**

“All the learning outcomes must align with the course description and the contents of the syllabus must integrate with the outcomes. Each unit in the Syllabus must represent at least one learning outcome.” (Level A (R1))

“[I identify unit outcomes] by drawing on unit description that provides some key words referring to the learning outcomes and it has to be matched.” (Level A (R6))

“using the rubric and some indicators.” (Level B (R2))

“I integrate the unit outcomes into the unit description by inserting the outcomes as the explanation of the way I designed the unit” (Level A (R4))

“I linked them [the structure and the key ideas of the unit with the UO] by reflecting the outcomes in the form of unit outline, teaching procedure, and assessment” (Level A (R4))

“[I identify unit outcomes by] identifying what should be learned and what can be assessed. I also describe the task, activities, tests and assessments.” (Level A (R5))

“[I link the structure and the key ideas of the syllabus with the unit outcomes] by ensuring the alignment of course description, learning outcomes, learning materials and activities. Also, assessments provided.” (Level A (R6))

“First, I design the learning outcomes, integrate it into learning description, then develop it into teaching activity” (Level B (R7))

**Subtheme: Linking assessment with learning outcomes**

“Assessment is one of the ways in evaluating students’ progress in learning so it shouldn’t go beyond the learning outcomes.” (Level A (R1))

“it was taken from student's task in writing a journal about literature research especially in prose research” (Level A (R3))

“The assessments accommodate the learning objectives (outcomes) of the course. Hence, each assessment has to resemble the outcomes about to achieve from the course.” (Level A (R6))

“Listening is skill that must be trained by EFL if they want to succeed in learning English, but it needs long process to master it. It means that to reach the key outcome the assignment and quizzes are set step by step to meet the goal. For example, the first assignment and quiz will cover the first and second learning outcome and etc. until the end of the meeting; the key outcome can be mastered by the students.” (Level A (R10))

**Subtheme: Content-oriented assessment goals**
“not only they [students] can analyze the structure of sentence or whole text also they can demonstrate to all student their analysing. In every task, students should analyze sentence and text.” (Level A (R8))

“the assessment is used to evaluate whether the learning outcomes have been achieved by the students or not. From the assessment it can be identified that some of the students still have the problems in writing an academic essay.” (Level A (R9))

“there are some criteria of essay evaluation which are used assess the students’ work. The criteria deal with organization, idea development, grammar and vocabulary choice, and technical writing.” (Level A (R9))

“the assignment asks students to analyze the content of listening material.” (Level A (R10))

Subtheme: Competence-oriented assessment goals

“The students will critically analyse some studies in TEFL, and design a presentation about the literature review in TEFL and present their review in form of mini-conference.” (Level B (R7))

Subtheme: Content-oriented assessment activity choice

“The students are able to think critically in speaking activity. The students are able to make some questions using Bloom’s taxonomy of question and delivering the questions orally to their friends. The students are able to tell their opinion of something controversial in a story. The students are able to do oral summarizing or oral paraphrasing” (Level B (R2))

“to produce their original critical response essay of an article which has been read.” (Level A (R4))

“Formal assessment such as mid and final exams, presentation, paper, or chapter report. Informal assessment such as students’ activity during teaching and learning process.” (Level A (R5))

“The assessment in my course is a collection of students’ works (portfolio) of their theoretical content knowledge and their performance within the course.” (Level A (R6))

“Then they also write a report text with a good structure. I choose report text as the final task because I integrated with other subject especially writing 4.” (Level A (R8))

“To develop assessment task for students, I provide assignment and quizzes. The quizzes are served in oral and written. Besides, there is daily quiz that trains the students understand how to overcome WH + H question.” (Level A (R10))

4. Pedagogy

44 comments from 10 participants

Subtheme: Teaching R&I skills

“I asked … students to discuss and analyze some theory in English literature including prose theory. in the last meeting, they were presenting their own research article in the classroom.” (Level A (R3))

“I made the students experienced in project-based learning which involves them in every single knowledge acquiring process” (Level A (R4))

“In my reading course, I asked students to read a lot about research or articles related to course materials given. Then, I asked them to make summary of their reading. Finally, they have to present their reading result in paper or in presentation task.” (Level A (R5))

“They will learn through an interactive model; group work will be encouraged and sharing of ideas and assignment drafts to stimulate discussion and critical knowledge building.” (Level B (R7))

“After deciding on the unit outcomes, instructional design was developed in accordance with the learning outcomes. Research and
Inquiry are integrated in the teaching through Instructional design and learning materials.” (Level A (R9))
“I arrange the outcome in the unit description start from the easiest to the most difficult and refer to Bloom’s Taxonomy.” (Level A (R10))

**Subtheme:** Individualised instruction, time on task

“Time management. For some reasons, there were some disturbances (e.g. national holidays or incidental occasion). Sometimes, it was hard to find free time replacing the time spent. So, the lesson plan written in the syllabus was not achieved.” (Level A (R5))

“Students' resources (students' understanding, motivation, etc.). I don't know if this happen to others, but I often faced with the condition where the students were difficult to study even if I had given clear examples especially when I asked them to find sources by themselves (inquiry)” (Level A (R5))

“Research and inquiry in my opinion need more independent and autonomous learners which i saw less in most of my students, mainly those who are belong to class C and D.” (Level A (R6))

“The assistance during the process is frequently needed. yet, some students misinterpret the tasks given” (Level A (R6))

“This course deals with the basic structure of English. Considering previous semester, there are many students encountered some problem in using basic role of structure.” (Level A (R8))

**Subtheme:** Unit material choice & organisation

“[selection based on] the syllabus, the vision and mission of the university” (Level B (R2))

“[unit materials] it's related to the curriculum in our department, that's why i believe that my students are able to adapt in doing research and inquiry.” (Level A (R3))

“The materials include critical thinking engagement, ICT performance, research led experience, analysis requirements, etc (which all stated in unit outcomes)” (Level A (R4))

“The purpose of the unit, students' need, unit outcomes, recent issues happening in the world, books, articles, news, etc.” (Level A (R5))

“I chose the material from my book preferences which has correlation with the learning outcomes, first i saw the learning outcome then i choose the appropriate books which support the learning outcomes, some of them taken from internet. From 10 meetings there are 10 materials taken from 2 books.” (Level B (R7))

“I choose the unit material by considering the result of previous course. The students are difficult to write a simple sentence with a good order. Moreover, they did not understand the word order of phrase and clause. So i decided to teach this unit to develop students’ knowledge and ability to analyse and write a sentence.” (Level A (R8))

“Materials were chosen based on the learning outcomes.” (Level A (R9))

“I use] different texts or approaches in the unit … to facilitate or help students to achieve the unit outcome. … In order to success the goal of learning outcome, there are many varied materials which are served to students. These materials are prepared to equip students with some useful skills which help them to get new knowledge. I try to select the material and exercise start from the simple to complex.” (Level A (R10))

5. Stakeholders’ Awareness 4 comments from 10 participants
Subtheme: Accounting for the departmental culture
“But if we usually discuss the outcomes with colleagues who teach the same course, we decide on the outcomes based on the level of the course and the industrial needs” (Level A (R1))
“[My suggestion is] to have such a consortium of both reading and writing lectures. We need to discuss the outcomes of each unit together” (Level A (R4))
“first, i study the previous syllabus, then discuss it with colleague, compare with other syllabus, find some book references, relate it to departments’ profile then decide the unit outcomes” (Level B (R7))

Subtheme: Neglecting departmental culture
“Other challenges in making outcomes is to get the same perception with colleagues in making outcomes and assessment, because in our department, lecturers who are in the same course should run the same learning outcomes and the assessment” (Level A (R1))

6. University Funding, Workload and Support
1 comment from 10 participants
Subtheme: Challenges: Conceptual, workload and PD funding
“Integrating outcome into the unit description is not an easy process because it needs deep analysis to decide the level of the difficulty of the outcome.” (Level A (R10))

Table 4.29: Follow-up interviews data analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus: Facilitating better teacher preparation with the help of R&amp;I skills</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Framing the object of study How were R&I skills utilised for students to identify and understand the key concepts of units? (i.e. what is important for the students to learn about or understand?) | **Course and Unit Design**
- **Building connections between the unit components:** The link between the pedagogy (“we shaped the content (idea, etc.) of the writing and the text (sentence) structures”) and the assessment task (“write a report text”) is not explained. In other words, missing are concepts that would make evident what exactly the students were to learn through the report writing activity and why the chosen assessment activity and pedagogy were selected as best suitable for this “job”. The syllabi analysed earlier also failed to mention the leading concept(s) around which the units were structured and which, in turn, research and inquiry processes would help explore or investigate, not learn, in relation to the assessment tasks.
(R3): I combined my teaching structure of the unit with another unit taught by a colleague that is Writing 4 (writing for academic purpose). The final assignment was one, to write a report text, and together in these two units, we shaped the content (idea, etc.) of the writing and the text (sentence) structures. They were interested in integrating research and inquiry into their teaching.
Lecturer (R1) explains that ensuring consistency in the unit design is important but does not elaborate on the process. Missing are the criteria for developing the concepts that frame the unit which would then offer points of focus for students’ investigations.
(R1): I included all the targets explicitly in the description of the unit. I tried to address the outcomes through assessment.
- **Challenge:** Difficulty in building connections between the unit components: lecturer (R3) admits being unaware of the process for linking unit components to generate consistency in his/her unit design.
(R3) I do not know how to design learning outcomes, so I just do traditional tests, traditional forms of assessment, quizzes. |
Content-based approach to unit design: No justification was proposed that would link the “basic skills of English structure”, the key concept of the unit, with the requirement for the students to utilise research and inquiry. No method or principles are referred to for identifying the leading concepts of the unit that would frame it and identify its goals to the students. Instead, the lecturer uses his/her own intuition when designing the learning objectives (“I took only two learning objectives from the department and wrote the rest based on my own judgement”). Hence, it is not clear why the knowledge of the “basic skills of English structure” was identified as important. A similar absence of clear connections was also shown present in the syllabi analysed above. There, students were expected to acquire knowledge presented by the lecturer, rather than to demonstrate their ability to utilise skills that enable them to approach and apply concepts critically in contexts that are relevant to them as English language users and/or as future language teachers.

(R3): I started to rewrite my syllabus by considering what students should master as the basic skills of English structure. Unit description was adapted from the guidelines from the department, combined with research and inquiry concepts. Learning Outcomes were outlined based on the combination between what university has given and the students’ condition (after my observation in the beginning of the class/first meeting). I took only two learning objectives from the department and wrote the rest based on my own judgement. I made some adjustments, including the assignments, during the teaching and learning process. I made my syllabus during my unit teaching.

Challenge: A need to improve degree design: The lecturer focuses on materials as a factor that generates coherence between the units of a specific course. No reference is made to a process or principles by which the key concepts of the course are selected to support internal coherence of the degree program and, if needed, the materials being used. In the syllabi discussed earlier, no mention is made of principles for text selection by the lecturer or by the students. Instead, in the two syllabi analysed, an itemised approach to curriculum was noted, with the lecturer sequencing learning according to arbitrarily identified scales of difficulty and, presumably, providing reading materials that aligned with those scales. The expectation is that the course will engage students increasingly more in those materials, not concepts.

(R3): I see the importance of synchronizing learning materials across the curriculum. This is to make the students understanding of the units and the materials get better and better through the course/program. I see the importance of synchronizing English Structure unit with Writing units, can also be synchronized with all units.

Pedagogy

Planning teaching: The selection of the teaching activity was arbitrary, and no concepts are offered to illustrate its relationship to the leading concepts of the unit that would define its focus and meaning to the learning students. This then impacts on pedagogy. It is not clear why interview guidelines were chosen as a suitable learning support. It is also not explained how the students were expected to work with those guidelines and how was this to support students’ research and inquiry skills. The lecturer is disappointed with the outcomes of Group D but does not elaborate on the meaning of success in his/her unit and the criteria or principles in relation to which it was constructed.

(R5): I gave them interview guidelines with some prompts, and the students were to develop their own questions based on the guidelines. The guidelines somehow scaffolded their questions. They came to the class and shared what they had in the interviews and they said: “Wow! This is something new.” So, I thought that research and inquiry in this case was quite successful. However, I found the results were different. The instructions were the same, but the results from class A, B, C, and D were different. I think students’ characteristics play...
important roles here. Autonomous and independent learners play important roles in the inquiry and research process. For me, research and inquiry are an exploration being autonomous, being independent, teachers’ job is just to observe and scaffold things, making sure students come to certain goals. I taught different classes with different levels of students which need different treatments.

**University Funding, Workload and Support**

- **Shared learning:** No mention is made of research and inquiry skills in respect to this subtheme. The list of skills provided (Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing) is reminiscent of traditional concepts used to refer to language-learning goals, which in and of themselves present English language-learning as decontextualised. No principles are proposed for organising courses or units around concepts that would necessitate making use of these traditional skills, while also accounting for graduate qualities that involve higher levels of thinking. In the syllabi discussed earlier, the tendency to use an itemised approach to unit design and arbitrarily identified scales of progression confirm that concept that engage students in research and inquiry are still absent from lecturers’ designs.

(R4): I need support from all lecturers in the department/university, we need to work together, especially in integrated skills (L-S-R-W).

(R1) Facilities, like software, so the students can work independently (grammar checkers, dictionaries). The internet connection available at the campus are not suitable for professional purpose.

(R4) and another lecturer (R6) show to be aware of the problem, which appear to be systemic since, in their view, research and inquiry skills are not high on his/her colleagues’ agenda. Still, (R6) proposes no process or principles for identifying concepts for framing units.

(R4): Problems of communication between lecturers, preparation, and time. More time is needed to correlate the materials and learning objectives among related units. **We have not found a good concept in integrating the skills.** The challenge is the synchronisation of unit content or learning materials.

(R6): It is difficult to make the same goals with my colleagues. They do not care with the goals of the integration of research and inquiry in their teaching units. Because we did not teach the same course (different units), we did not share anything. Once I spoke to a colleague teaching similar unit, Speaking for Higher Level. I tried to make links/to relate between my unit (basic) with his unit (next level).

**Course and Unit Design**

- **Competence-oriented assessment activities:** Failure to acknowledge that Learning Outcomes alone do not specify the direction of unit design and that each unit requires concepts that frame its agenda impacts on the pedagogy of the unit and, specifically, on the objectives that inform students’ engagement in research and inquiry. On the surface, assessment tasks in units appear to comply with research and inquiry, as does the task of Responding to Texts (R1). Yet, Responding to Texts is not the same as students investigating the relevance of their perspectives, or perspectives expressed some text, to their personal goals and professional goals. The two activities differ in scope because they differ in complexity and therefore the degree of challenge that they present to students. (R1) I think we need a kind of consortium, where one lecturer talks about his/her unit and other lecturers talk about how to support each other. For example, the students in Reading unit, they need also to write their responses towards the readings in the unit, while perhaps they also need research skills to help them write critical responses towards readings taught in the unit.

**Pedagogy**

- **Teaching R&I skills:** The activities described by Lecturer (R1) illustrate the point that texts alone cannot be a source of critique. The design lacked in the goals that inform students’ engagement in research and inquiry with a view for the inquiry to contribute to students’ personal goals and general knowledge of the discipline. Lecturer (R1) does not elaborate on the inquiry chart and its
source, nor on the relevance of the questions that the students asked of themselves to their personal and professional goals. No clear construct of thinking critically emerges from the description of Lecturer (R1) and the students appear to be left to their own devices, with little support provided. Lecturers (R2), (R3), (R4) and (R6) also offer no clear construct of thinking critically. Lecturer (R5) offers a refreshing activity, encouraging meaningful exploration. Yet, due to the absence of the unit concepts that would lead students’ inquiries, the learning activities implemented are not contextualised in relation to academic goals. This reduced the complexity of students’ inquiries.

(R1): Because my project was about responding to the text they just read. First, they tried to select the text by themselves. Second, in responding to the texts, the students were asked to think critically, by answering their own questions based on the texts (I gave them an inquiry chart).

(R2): After they were asked to find and analyse journals (research articles), they were asked to make their own mini research. After they found their own topics, they started to write, and they consulted me at every meeting and in the last meeting they presented in the classroom.

(R3): They understand more by watching videos, analyzing the texts, discussions with their friends about problems encountered in analysing the English structure analysed. Based on my experiences teaching this unit, they performed better in terms of analyzing and explaining sentence structures, and by asking them analyzing short videos, they explored more, touching parts that I had not touched in my explanation in the class (teaching). They asked and consulted with me about the assignments. The students’ responses are good they became more active, even some students wanted to further analyze complex sentences (not in the syllabus).

(R4): Some planned plan worked and some were not. I just followed the plan designed by my colleague (Reading for Academic Purposes). Some materials for speaking activities were taken from Reading unit. I had to revise the syllabus in the middle of ongoing semester. Presentation, debate, interview, and moderating sessions were the materials learned. They were asked to find articles in the area of English Language Teaching, and they practiced presenting the content in front of their group, then in the next meeting, they need to re-present it in front of the class. The next thing is they present it in front of other students from different class. The final evaluation was presenting their own article in a conference.

(R4): They had to find and identify registers of Speaking for Academic Purposes from videos in YouTube, including public speaking, speech, debate, seminar. After that, they were asked to analyse the videos and see what they could learn from the videos and found out how to do as what they saw in the videos. They were also asked to observe using an observational guidelines/checklist I provided, and to identify which strategies in speaking used in the videos they analysed. They may add up new strategies which are not listed in the guideline.

(R5): One of the questions, I assigned the students to ask to the [school] teachers, was how teachers integrate character building in their teaching English. The students found out that the teachers did not comprehensively understand how to integrate character building in teaching English. Based on this finding, I asked my students to design a learning strategy which integrated character education in teaching English. They were asked to design, recondition other works, or make their own design and reported how to use that learning strategies in teaching English. My job was to guide them, and they had to explore. This is what I understand about inquiry. The students had to make a paper that discussed what it is, how to conduct it, and in which part it has the integration with character building and living values. I interpret these as inquiry process. The second was presentations about the findings and the students presented in front of the class. Coaching and discussions also happened outside the classes, between students and me. I also called this as inquiry processes.

(R6): They were enthusiastic. They did not find any problems because they just did a simple research. I asked them to identify the most common mistakes in students’ speaking (e.g. pronunciation, grammar). First, I asked my students to
speak about an hour in the class. They have to find their friends’ mistakes in speaking. After that, they have to collect or identify during 2 months of study, the common mistakes made by their friends classmates.

- Lack of understanding of how to teach R&I skills: Lecturer (R2) makes no link between the learning activities and the research and inquiry process.
- Lecturer (R3) questioned his/her pedagogic abilities in relation to R&I skills (R2): I gave them time to present their research, using power point. When I asked them to make posters, they rejected the idea because they thought the time was not enough (too close to the final session). PowerPoint was the agreed solution to display their research findings. The presentations lasted 30 minutes per student. They were asked to make research about literature (analyzing Indonesian novels).
- Lecturer (R3): How can I make them come to learn with me, have discussion, not just come and listen to me explaining the materials. The challenges were both in two sides, the teacher and the students.

University Funding, Workload and Support
- Challenges: Conceptual, workload and PD funding: Lecturer (R3) showed doubts in his own understanding of the process of supporting R&I skills and wished for more support from his colleagues and the university.
- Lecturer (R3): Research and inquiry is very interesting concept. Is research an inquiry? I plan to implement the research and inquiry next semester. I think with research and inquiry; lecturer and students can collaborate. How to identify learning outcomes? Are they based on our opinions, arguments, needs, or from others? We need more discussions or perhaps workshops to cope with this issue.

- Challenge: No capacity building/Insufficient administrative support: Responses to this subtheme do not address directly the process of working with R&I skill, but do raise an important issue of resources, of which much is missing in the universities of the participating academics. This certainly impacts on what they can do and how they can think of their teaching.
- Lecturer (R2): Books are another resource we need as we just have very limited supply of books. The internet connection is good, and the students can connect to the internet using their username and passwords. I asked the students about use the internet in the classroom. Every student has his/her own laptop/netbook (except for one or two students who did not bring theirs).
- Lecturer (R3): Needed are internet connection, good modules and books, and devices.
- Lecturer (R4): Needed are books related to Speaking for Academic Purposes, more information about IQF, internet access was provided by the university.
- Lecturer (R5): Internet is not a problem, but the problem is how to use internet to collect or select correct information for learning.
- Lecturer (R6): Needed are books and teaching teams.

The beneficiaries of the study
How were R&I skills utilised for students to understand their benefits to their personal and professional goals? (i.e. for whose benefit?)

Course and Unit Design
- Competence-oriented assessment activities: With no processes proposed to link learning to students’ own professional or personal contexts, students’ journey through the units is likely to lack direction and, therefore, meaning. Lecturer (R2) identifies sources of his/her assessment, but they are of general nature and vague (“I put stress on their resourcefulness in making their own research (journal/article)”). Missing is an explicit rationale that would explicate the value of the unit to students’ personal and professional goals.
- Lecturer (R2): The university has its own system to measure students learning outcomes. The grades were taken from final and mid examination, structured assignment, and independent assignment. I put stress on their resourcefulness in making their own research (journal/article) and how they presented their research findings. The most important is the journal (research article). The criteria of the articles are good enough, easy to read, and the idea must be relatively new. I provided the scoring rubric, and the students had already known about it.

National Relevance
**Degree quality and student quality:** Despite failing to provide an explicit link between research and inquiry and the students’ professional and personal goals, Lecturer (R5) acknowledges that the link must be made to make the learning experience relevant. (R5): I found this integration is beneficial as my students can see real teaching practices and real problems in the real classrooms at schools.

**Challenge:** Degree quality and student quality: Lecturer (R1) acknowledges his/her difficulties in working with the IQF for the benefit of students. (R1): Sometimes the students were enthusiastic in analyzing the journals or articles but at other times they did nothing. It may be motivational problems, but I also think it is skills problems. Maybe in the future when we apply IQF-based curriculum, the students will feel more enthusiastic in studying with integrating research and inquiry.

**Pedagogy**

**Challenge:** Lack of understanding how R&I work: With the loss of meaning came unmotivated students and lack of clarity in Lecturer (R2)’ class. On the other hand, Lecturer (R5) modified his/her teaching materials but does not explain how this was to assist his/her students. Lecturer (R5) (R2): The idea of research and inquiry for me is very good but it was difficult to implement…. Sometimes the students misinterpreted my tasks. … The main challenge was the students’ motivation. I think we should work together so students can work better in doing research. When students got bored, I tried to motivate them, but it did not work. (R5): This is something new for me and I found it hard to implement, especially in my unit (TEFL). I tried to implement the inquiry and research process but then in the reality I modified the materials.

**The critical perspective**

**Did the lectures approach the job of integrating R&I critically?**

**Stakeholder awareness**

**Challenge:** Change is not popular: The comment below vindicates the criticism developed thus far. Teaching research and inquiry requires that academics approach their own practices critically. This would benefit not only the students, but also their own work as scholars and field leaders. (R1): Staff are not interested enough to join this project, due to something else, their business. It is also about the culture here. They are not ready to prepare something systematically or earlier (beforehand), They do not like to be challenged, they like to play safe. They love to do what they have now. They do not like to be challenged to do new things

**Shared learning:** Some lecturers are keen on shared professional development. (R4): I need support from all lecturers in the department/university, we need to work together (R2): We need other peoples’ presence, such as colleagues, other lecturers to integrate R&I skills between one course (unit) with other courses (units). If we work alone, it is a little bit difficult to motivate the students.

**The global and local context**

**How did the global and local policy context inform the implementation of R&I?**

**University Funding, Workload and Support.**

**Challenge:** No capacity building/no administrative support: Lecturer expresses a need for a greater connection with administrative bodies to learn and to be able to implement change. (R5): Clear rules and good supports from the faculty. For example, the making of letter of recommendations or letter of permissions addressed to schools to collect data.

**The generative perspective**

What new practices were conceptualised for integrating R&I as a result of the project?

**Stakeholder awareness**

**Raising students’ awareness and Accounting for the needs of stakeholders:** Lecturers found techniques for reassuring their students that the new methods and standards have value and are not beyond their capabilities.
(R2): In the beginning, they were scared. They questioned why the unit came with more activities than previous units. After I explained in more detail, and I give them examples, they started to understand and work actively.

(R5): They had mostly positive responses: the students, the teachers in schools, and my colleagues. One student told me that a [school] teacher was happy to see the students coming to the teacher’s class and asking about problems in his/her teaching.

**Course and Unit Design**

- **Challenge:** Differentiated instruction: Adjusting pedagogy to suit the diversity of needs of the student cohort and their levels of managing the workload showed to be a challenge. The issues with the unit design and support, discussed above, would aggravate the situation, making it harder for everyone to cope.

(R1): I learned from some other syllabuses and I tried to design my own. I made some small changes during the unit running, based on the students’ responses and capabilities. In the beginning, the project was planned to end with the students writing an article, but we could not make it because the students thought it was too hard for them, and there was no support from other lecturers in co-authoring students’ articles.