

The Projection of HOTS level in Learning Outcomes of English Education and English Literature Study Programs

Nina Wanda Cassandra
English Education Study Program
Universitas Negeri Jakarta
Jakarta, Indonesia
ninsandra@unj.ac.id

Eva Leiliyanti
English Literature Study Program
Universitas Negeri Jakarta
Jakarta, Indonesia
eleiliyanti@unj.ac.id

Abstract—The shifting policy in the Presidential Decree No 8/2012 and Ministerial Decree no. 73/2013 regarding the implementation of Indonesian Framework for National Qualification (KKNI) has significant impact on the learning process of two study programs at one of state universities in Jakarta. Whilst English Education Study Program (EESP) and English Literature Study Program (ELSP) both determine their graduates to have B2 level of CEFR, they at the same time deploy different approach to achieve the standard. EESP determines to integrate the four language skills in the curriculum whereas ELSP deploys discrete approach. This paper argues that the implementation of these two different approaches potentially resulted in the different level of students' high order thinking skills (HOTS). This research aims to investigate the mechanism HOTS are represented in the language skills syllabi and measure the level of HOTS in each language skills courses of these two study programs. The data are the current semester lesson plans (RPS) of all language skills courses. They were analyzed based on the instrument designed to measure the level of HOTS by deploying the integration of Bloom Revised Taxonomy, Tuning Guide, KKNI and CEFR. This was conducted by measuring the extent program learning outcome (PLO) achieve HOTS (CEFR B2 Level) and the relevance of course learning outcome (CLO) and program learning outcome (PLO). The finding of this textual analysis demonstrates that whilst EESP and ELSP at the same time claim to deploy different approaches in their curriculum, their RPSs at the same time show the production of curriculum component emulsion as the result of interspersing these two approaches.

Keywords—*learning outcomes; integrated and discrete language skills based curriculum; higher order of thinking skills; language skills course syllabi*

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent assessment of Indonesia's Higher Education (HE) system suggests that Indonesia continues to produce graduates who lack of the skills employers need, particularly those required for professional and managerial roles [1]. One of four proximate causes of poor educational quality and learning outcomes in Indonesia is the lack of basic knowledge and pedagogical skills to be professional educators. World organization such World Bank & Organization for Economic

Cooperation & Development (OECD) recommended that the government should increase the education funding, improve teacher training and reform education administration [1]. The Minister of Higher Education, Research and Technology is in urge to shift the paradigm of educational system from mono-competence education to meta-competence as the answer to the demand of Industrial Revolution 4.0 [2]. In this light, Kamdi suggested that reformation is needed in formulating Learning Outcomes (LO) by offering more inclusive flexible LO that corresponds to developing individual capacity and discrete type of learning [2]. He continues to argue that the heutagogical learning paradigm is perceived as the solution as it reflects self-directed learning/determined learning which positions the students as the designers of their own learning. However, the existing curriculum studies in Indonesia paid little attention on the correlation between the government's demands of the students' meta-competence with the studies of LO, especially on the higher education context, let alone the heutagogical learning. A closer look at the curriculum studies in Europe, Africa and Indonesia unveils that in the past decade the curriculum research in these two continents and Indonesia dominantly concentrate on the issues of political influence in the implementation of curriculum, curriculum trends and themes [3,4], and curriculum comparison and changes [5], the alignment of curriculum's plan and nationally recognized competencies [6], curriculum history and its implementation in Indonesia [7]. By this, the study that focuses on investigating LO, in this case based on different approaches --discrete and integrated in Higher Education context--, is exigent. The study focuses on answering the problem, i.e. the extent Learning Outcome (LO) is formulated in the curriculum of EELSP and ELLSP that represent HOTS. To answer this question, a textual analysis research design was used that scrutinize the elements of LO.

LO represents not only as the outcome, but as well as the result from and/or the effect of the process of learning. This can be seen from the students' observable performance, i.e. what they are able to do with what has been learned reflexively mirrors the LO. This, at the same time, reflects learners' competence in using content, information, ideas, and tools successfully [8,9]. The measurable active verbs play a

significant role in formulating LO, as in the framework of Bloom Revised Taxonomy (hereafter BRT) the (intended) learning outcomes constitute as the subject matter content as well as the description of what is to be done with or to that content [10]. The subject matter content and skills description specifically clarify the goal of learning activities. Noun/noun phrase signifies the subject content, whilst verb/verbal phrase connotes the cognitive process during the learning process [9]. In order to fill in the lack of specification in the BRT-based formulation of the aforementioned description, we integrate Tuning Guide-based formula, i.e. verb, type, subject/topic, standard, scope) in the research instrument. We deploy this to scrutinize the semester lesson plans of English Education Study program (hereafter EESP) and English Literature study program (hereafter ELSP) in one of the universities in Jakarta. Within this framework, the research highlights the LO statements as its point of departure. The statements include: (a) (an) active verb(s); (b) the indication of the type of LO, i.e. knowledge, cognitive process, skills or other competence; (c) the topic area of the LO; (d) the standard or level in intended LO; and (e) the scope and/or context of LO [11].

The current syllabi at EESP and ELSP deploy different approach in language skills courses. The former determines the integrated approach whereas the latter discrete approach. These two approaches have two different focuses on its implementation. The cardinal focus of discrete approach lies on the language form, which however, at the same time, it also accords minimal administration [12,13]. Conversely, the integrated approach offers language variation, frequency and various interaction intensity, as well as improves the students' cognition and language skills, eases the students to learn content language instruction. It also opens to various teaching material. In this light, the deployment of this approach will potentially stimulate the learners' language and concept in order to facilitate himself/herself as well as their peers to actively participate in the learning process. By this, the approach also help the language instructor to respond to the challenge of dynamic interaction as it exposes the language learners with how language plays in context [14]. Brown also noted that language form focus is needed particularly to strengthen language learners' capacity in forming language at the basic level [12]. Due to the approach nature, Richards and Rodgers perceived that the outcome of this approach at various level of English proficiency exceedingly depends on the students' different level of proficiency and the instructors' level of competence [14]. This, in the lens of Brown, results in the condition where the discrete aspect of learning can potentially lose its uniqueness. As earlier mentioned, these two different approaches can be seen from the formula of CPMK (*Capaian Pembelajaran Mata Kuliah- the Course Learning Outcome*) at EESP and ELSP.

II. METHODOLOGY

This textual analysis aims to scrutinize the elements of learning outcomes taken from the statements of learning outcomes of language skills syllabi of EESP and ELSP. These data were classified based on the courses of language skills taught both at EESP and ELSP and/or the themes of the language skills courses at EESP. Other supporting data, such as

KKNI, education standards and curriculum guidance were deployed. The research instrument was designed based on the framework integrating KKNI, BRT, Tuning Guide and CEFR. This can be seen in the following table of analysis:

TABLE I. TABLE OF ANALYSIS

	Code	Course	LO Statement	Tuning-based Formula			BRT Classification	CEFR Level
				Verb	Type	Subject/Topic		
1								
2								

The instrument was tested by deploying relevance test and validated based on the experts' judgement. The LO statements were divided into subject, standard, and scope. As for scope, the domain and situation are determined based on CEFR definition. The CEFR framework divides language proficiency into six levels: A1 & A2 (basic user), B1 & B2 (independent user), C1 and C2 (proficiency user). These reflect the proficiency based on detailed analysis of communicative contexts, tasks and purposes along with the descriptions learners need to acquire [15]. In addition, CEFR is also used to review language curricula, textbooks, and teaching materials.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study reveals that the EESP LO is dominated by procedural knowledge (C3, apply) at 27.5%. The measurable verbs used are to greet, to exchange, to describe, to ask and give, to exchange, to make, to rewrite, to create, to analyse, to review, to compare, and to produce. From 27.5% procedural knowledge, it demonstrates that students are not fully equipped with subject specific skill algorithm. This means that in the learning process students are not well informed that they have to undergo certain stages in order to achieve the learning objective. For instance, in English in Social Discourse, it is stated *read three different news items from three different resources* in the initial stage then followed with identifying definition, details and function of each details. Thus, the implementation of this procedural knowledge in the classroom needs further field research in order to see how this can later lead the students to come out with their conceptual knowledge as the result of the language learning. These verbs are also in line with CEFR's level of proficiency B2 (independent user). i.e. positioning the students in the level that can interact with certain degree of fluency and spontaneity in their regular interaction. This procedural knowledge represents the characteristic of language skills in which students actively use the language. The absence of metacognitive knowledge (C1, understand - execute) is found at EESP's syllabi. This implies not only that the language skills courses do not prepare the students to execute the knowledge and skills gained in one

setting or situation into another as the taxonomy and the heutagogical learning suggests, but also the LO statements represent emulsion in the form of mixing different domains of knowledge in irregular leaping pattern. This, however, in turn, cannot be easily dissolved. Whilst for ELSP’s syllabi the absence lies on the metacognitive level (C1, remember – appropriate use; C3, apply - construct, C4, analyse - achieve). This demonstrates that the courses do not equip the students with the appropriate use of language skills. At the same time, they neither facilitate the students with the ability to construct various texts based on the knowledge skills given nor achieving the courses’ learning objectives. This goes parallel with Richard’s argument that criticized the weaknesses of integrating skills in language learning.

Similar findings in ELSP’s syllabi demonstrate that the LO statements of language skills syllabi are dominated by procedural knowledge (C6, create - compose), i.e. 36.6%. Although the percentage is higher than the LO in EESP, it fails to specify the standard and scope. Below exemplifies the complete LO statement (see table 2).

Below exemplifies the complete LO statement of English for Business Communication course, i.e. “students are able to write introductory letters for business socialization purposes according to their social function, rhetorical structures, and language features of business socialization texts”, (see table 2):

TABLE II. LEARNING OUTCOMES TABLE ANALYSIS

verb	Type	subject	Standard	scope/ context
To write	Introductory letters	Business socialization purposes	according to their social function, rhetorical structures, and language features	Business socialization text

Table III demonstrates the incomplete LO statement of English for Business Communication course, i.e. “students are able to greet others, introduce themselves and others, exchange personal information and express parting/closing”, see below:

TABLE III. LEARNING OUTCOMES TABLE ANALYSIS

verb	Type	subject	standard	scope/ context
to greet	Themselves	others	-	-
to introduce	-	-	-	-
to exchange	personal information	-	-	-
to express	parting/ closing	-	-	-

The table above presents the absence of subject, scope and standard in LO. The absence of these elements in LO may lead to confusion, especially on the extent the linguistics competence need to be taught, what standard of learning need to achieve, and the focus scope in the process of teaching and learning.

By this, the results imply that the procedural knowledge ostensibly meets the intended learning outcomes of language skills courses in EESP. This also suggests that the procedural

knowledge in BRT (C3-Apply) seems congruent with the language micro skills Brown proposed in language learning. The operational verbs, such as to create, to produce, to use, and to distinguish are in line with C3-apply level of BRT. In contrast, the sample of incomplete LO statement of Basic Writing course of ELSP, stated “students are able to write a functional descriptive text,” (see table 4):

TABLE IV. LEARNING OUTCOMES TABLE ANALYSIS

verb	Type	subject	Standard	scope/ context
To write	-	Descriptive text	Functional	-

Table IV also demonstrates the incomplete LO statement of Basic Writing Course. The absence of type and scope/context lead to confusion the extent the linguistics competence need to be taught and the focus scope in the process of teaching and learning. The verb to write in this LO statement is understood to be equal to level C6 (create-compose) of BRT. This incomplete statement of LO found among all the discrete language skills courses in ELSP by 36.6%.

Thus, these evidences potentially represents the failure of both study programs to mirror their LO with the meta-competence the government demands in the education 4.0. The failure shows by only 27.5% of LO statements represents Hots in EESP and 36.6% of LO statements represents Hots in ELSP. These then become evident to infer that both study programs have not yet prepared students to develop their Hots in language skills courses either in integrated form or in discrete form. The meta-competence itself requires the students to conceptualize the procedural knowledge gained then use this skill to articulate and design a new concept.

IV. CONCLUSION

Learning Outcomes plays significant role in the design of curriculum. It reflects the center of learning process. Focusing only on the observable verbs and subject matter content lead to incomplete contextual description and lack in standard. The LO statements in both study programs represent the dominant use of procedural knowledge (C3, Apply) and (C6, Create). The absence of standard and scope results potentially results in the covert representation of language proficiency in CEFR. In this sense, the LO statements emulsion can arguably be seen neither complying with the paradigm of 4.0 Higher Education nor let alone answering the demand of self-directed learning. Reformulating LO is exigent as the findings demonstrate the construction of the curriculum elements emulsion. This is needed as a starting point to reform of the existing curriculum documents.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors thank to the Faculty of Languages and Arts of UNJ who have made this research possible by funding the research. The gratitude also goes to all the faculty members at EESP and ELSP and our research assistants.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Andrew, *Beyond Access: Making Indonesia's Education System Work*. Lowy Institute: Victoria State Government, p. 9, 2018.
- [2] W. Kamdi, "Pendidikan Tinggi 4.0". [Online]. Retrieved from <https://kompas.id/baca/opini/2018/03/03/pendidikan-tinggi-4-0/>, accessed on 03 March 2018.
- [3] N.C. Zavale, "Using Michael Young's Analysis on Curriculum Studies to Examine the Effects of Neoliberalism on Curriculum in Mozambique," *Policy Features in Education*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 621-636, 2013.
- [4] Kilborn, Larusso, & Francis, "An Analysis of Canadian Physical Education Curricula," *European Physical Education Review*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 23-46, 2015.
- [5] L. Yates, "Transnational Curriculum Movements and Comparative Curriculum Theorizing," *European Educational Research Journal*, vol. 15, no. 3, 2016.
- [6] B.K. Merrit, A.I. Blake, A.H. McIntyre, and T.L. Packer, "Curriculum Evaluation: Linking Curriculum Objectives to Essential Competencies," *Educational Research Journal*, vol. 79, no. 3, pp. 175-180, 2012.
- [7] M. Junaidi. "Teaching English As A Foreign Language (TEFL) in Indonesia," *Teaching English to the World: History, Curriculum, and Practice* edited by George Braine. New York: Routledge, p. 74, 2011.
- [8] D.R. Krathwohl, *A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy: Theory Into Practice*, vol. 41, no. 4, p. 213, 2002.
- [9] W.G. Spady, *Outcome-Based Education: Critical Issues and Answers*. Arlington Va: American Association of School Administrators, 1994.
- [10] A. Amer, "Reflection on Bloom's Revised Taxonomy," in *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, no. 8, vol. 4, pp. 213-230, 2006.
- [11] J. Lokhoff, W.B. Durkin, K. Wagenaar, R. Gonzalez, and J. Isaacs, *Tuning Educational Structures in Europe: A Guide to Formulating Degree Programme Profiles*. Europe: the European Commission, pp.43-45, 2010.
- [12] H.D. Brown, *Teaching by Principles: An Integrated Approach to Language Pedagogy*, 2nd ed. NY: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc., 2001.
- [13] R. Oxford, *Integrated Skills in the ESL/EFL Classroom* [Online]. Retrieved from <https://www.ericdigests.org/2002-2/esl.htm>. Accessed on 03 March 2018.
- [14] J.C. Richards and T.S. Rodgers, *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- [15] Council of Europe, *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment 2001*. [Online]. Retrieved from: <https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/?desktop=true>, accessed on 30 July 2018.